# Round 2 vs Kansas KS (DoD SMR)

## Offcase 1NC

### 1NC

#### -- Aff must specify which branch passes the plan – they don’t

#### -- Vote Neg –

#### 1. Ground – robs courts, congress, executive counterplans, agent specific disads and case arguments

#### 2. “resolved” means a “firm course of action” – not specifying allows them to shift and clarify in the 2AC

#### 3. No solvency – there’s no actor as the “Federal Government”, only specific branches

### 1NC

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

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

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

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

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

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incentives fundamentally changes the process of organ procurement, it has been argued that the term "donor" is no longer applicable and would need to be replaced by a term such as 'vendor."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

#### Prefer our interpretation –

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

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

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

### 1NC

#### Obama will win now 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

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a **devastating nuclear attack** on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East **without resorting to nuclear weapons** is a 21st-century nightmare. **All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship** stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### 1NC

#### CP Text: The Department of Defense should enter into a power purchase agreement with private entities who decide to construct small modular nuclear reactor on military installations in the United States

#### Alternative financing arrangements reduce costs and spur unique commercial spillover

Fitzpatrick, Freed and Eyoan, 11

Ryan Fitzpatrick, Senior Policy Advisor for Clean Energy at Third Way, Josh Freed, Vice President for Clean Energy at Third Way, and Mieke Eoyan, Director for National Security at Third Way, June 2011, Fighting for Innovation: How DoD Can Advance CleanEnergy Technology... And Why It Has To, content.thirdway.org/publications/414/Third\_Way\_Idea\_Brief\_-\_Fighting\_for\_Innovation.pdf

The DoD has over $400 billion in annual purchasing power, which meansthe Pentagon could provide a sizeable market for new technologies. This can increase a technology’s scale of production, bringing down costs, and making the product more likely to successfully reach commercial markets. Unfortunately, many potentially significant clean energy innovations never get to the marketplace, due to a lack of capital during the development and demonstration stages. As a result, technologies that could help the military meet its clean energy security and cost goals are being abandoned or co-opted by competetors like China before they are commercially viable here in the U.S. By focusing its purchasing power on innovative products that will help meet its energy goals, DoD can provide more secure and cost-effective energy to the military—producing tremendous long-term savings, while also bringing potentially revolutionary technologies to the public. Currently, many of these technologies are passed over during the procurement process because of higher upfront costs—even if these technologies can reduce life-cycle costs to DoD. The Department has only recently begun to consider life-cycle costs and the “fullyburdened cost of fuel” (FBCF) when making acquisition decisions. However, initial reports from within DoD suggest that the methodology for determining the actual FBCF needs to be refined and made more consistent before it can be successfully used in the acquisition process.32 The Department should fast-track this process to better maximize taxpayer dollars. Congressional appropriators— and the Congressional Budget Office—should also recognize the savings that can be achieved by procuring advanced technologies to promote DoD’s energy goals, even if these procurements come with higher upfront costs. Even if the Pentagon makes procurement of emerging clean energy technologies a higher priority, it still faces real roadblocks in developing relationships with the companies that make them. Many clean energy innovations are developed by small businesses or companies that have no previous experience working with military procurement officers. Conversely, many procurement officers do not know the clean energy sector and are not incentivized to develop relationships with emerging clean energy companies. Given the stakes in developing domestic technologies that would help reduce costs and improve mission success, the Pentagon should develop a program to encourage a better flow of information between procurement officers and clean energy companies—especially small businesses. Leverage Savings From Efficiency and Alternative Financing to Pay for Innovation. In an age of government-wide austerity and tight Pentagon budgets, current congressional appropriations are simply not sufficient to fund clean energy innovation. Until Congress decides to direct additional resources for this purpose, the Defense Department must leverage the money and other tools it already has to help develop clean energy. This can take two forms: repurposing money that was saved through energy efficiency programs for innovation and using alternative methods of financing to reduce the cost to the Pentagon of deploying clean energy. For several decades the military has made modest use alternative financing mechanisms to fund clean energy and efficiency projects when appropriated funds were insufficient. In a 2010 report, GAO found that while only 18% of renewable energy projects on DoD lands used alternative financing, these projects account for 86% of all renewable energy produced on the Department’s property.33 This indicates that alternative financing can be particularly helpful to DoD in terms of bringing larger and more expensive projects to fruition. One advanced financing tool available to DoD is the energy savings performance contract (ESPC). These agreements allow DoD to contract a private firm to make upgrades to a building or other facility that result in energy savings, reducing overall energy costs without appropriated funds. The firm finances the cost, maintenance and operation of these upgrades and recovers a profit over the life of the contract. While mobile applications consume 75% of the Department’s energy,34 DoD is only authorized to enter an ESPC for energy improvements done at stationary sites. As such, Congress should allow DoD to conduct pilot programs in which ESPCs are used to enhance mobile components like aircraft and vehicle engines. This could accelerate the needed replacement or updating of aging equipment and a significant reduction of energy with no upfront cost. To maximize the potential benefits of ESPCs, DoD should work with the Department of Energy to develop additional training and best practices to ensure that terms are carefully negotiated and provide benefits for the federal government throughout the term of the contract.35 This effort could possibly be achieved through the existing memorandum of understanding between these two departments.36 The Pentagon should also consider using any long-term savings realized by these contracts for other energy purposes, including the promotion of innovative technologies to further reduce demand or increase general energy security. In addition to ESPCs, the Pentagon also can enter into extended agreements with utilities to use DoD land to generate electricity, or for the long-term purchase of energy. These innovative financing mechanisms, known respectively as enhanced use leases (EULs) and power purchase agreements (PPAs), provide a valuable degree of certainty to third party generators. In exchange, the Department can leverage its existing resources—either its land or its purchasing power—to negotiate lower electricity rates and dedicated sources of locallyproduced power with its utility partners. DoD has unique authority among federal agencies to enter extended 30-year PPAs, but only for geothermal energy projects and only with direct approval from the Secretary of Defense. Again, limiting incentives for clean energy generation to just geothermal power inhibits the tremendous potential of other clean energy sources to help meet DoD’s energy goals. Congress should consider opening this incentive up to other forms of clean energy generation, including the production of advanced fuels. Also, given procurement officials’ lack of familiarity with these extended agreements and the cumbersome nature of such a high-level approval process, the unique authority to enter into extended 30-year PPAs is very rarely used.37 DoD should provide officials with additional policy guidance for using extended PPAs and Congress should simplify the process by allowing the secretary of each service to approve these contracts. Congress should also investigate options for encouraging regulated utility markets to permit PPA use by DoD. Finally, when entering these agreements, the Department should make every effort to promote the use of innovative and fledgling technologies in the terms of its EULs and PPAs. CON C L U S ION The Defense Department is in a unique position to foster and deploy innovation in clean energy technologies. This has two enormous benefits for our military: it will make our troops and our facilities more secure and it will reduce the amount of money the Pentagon spends on energy, freeing it up for other mission critical needs. If the right steps are taken by Congress and the Pentagon, the military will be able to put its resources to work developing technologies that will lead to a stronger fighting force, a safer nation, and a critical emerging sector of the American economy. The Defense Department has helped give birth to technologies and new economic sectors dozens of times before. For its own sake and the sake of the economy, it should make clean energy innovation its newest priority.

### 1NC

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

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

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

#### The aff causes defense budget tradeoffs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 1NC

#### Text: The United States Department of Defense should increase procurement contracts for small gas-cooled nuclear reactors, small liquid metal-cooled nuclear reactors, and small molten salt-cooled nuclear reactors located on military installations in the United States.

#### It competes – “small modular reactors” include 60 different reactor designs – the plan mandates the inclusion of “water reactors” – the CP excludes it

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

Status of SMR technologies and commercialization

According to two recent International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reports, more than 60 SMRs with a diverse set of features and spanning the full gamut of technical readiness are being studied by various countries [4, 5]. The systems are typically categorized by their primary coolant:

• Water - light and heavy

• Gas - carbon dioxide and helium

• Liquid metal - sodium, lead, and lead-bismuth

• Molten salt - with or without dissolved fuel.

Using the number of reactor-years of experience as a basis of technology maturity, it follows that water-cooled reactors have the greatest maturity (greater than 20,000 reactor years), followed by gas-cooled reactors (~1,500 reactor-years), sodium-cooled reactors (~320 reactor-years), and lead or lead-bismuth-cooled reactors (~80 reactoryears). Clearly water- and gas-cooled reactors make them better suited for near-term deployment. Other designs, such as liquid-metalcooled fast reactors, have attractive performance potential for longer7 term sustainable development and deployment, but they require additional development to achieve viability in the market place. Several U.S.-based companies are seeking to bring new SMR designs to market within the next decade. In the category of LWR-based designs, vendors that have already initiated discussions with the NRC include Westinghouse, NuScale, and Babcock and Wilcox (B&W). Beginning in 1999, Westinghouse led an international consortium in the development of the International Reactor Innovative and Secure (IRIS) design, which is a 335 MWe integral pressurized water reactor (PWR) design. In August 2010, Westinghouse withdrew from the consortium in favor of developing an alternative design, the details of which have not been released yet. Also beginning in 1999, Idaho National Laboratory and Oregon State University collaborated on a 45 MWe integral PWR, which was later licensed to a new "start up" company called NuScale. In July 2009, B&W announced its 125 MWe mPower integral PWR design. While the IRIS design was expected to be deployed as single or twin-pack units, the reference NuScale plant is composed of 12 modules, and the mPower plant uses four modules. Models of the IRIS, mPower, and NuScale designs are given in figure 1.

Beyond these near-commercial designs, several advanced SMR designs are also being developed by U.S. vendors, including familiar vendors such as General Electric-Hitachi (GE-H) and General Atomics (GA), and new "start up" companies such as Hyperion and Advanced Reactor Concepts (ARC). The 311 MWe GE-H Power Reactor Inherently Safe Module (PRISM) design was first developed in the 1980s as part of the DOE-funded Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor program. The sodiumcooled reactor design is almost entirely complete and has had extensive review by the NRC. The helium-cooled 280 MWe Modular Hightemperature Reactor (MHR) design emerged in the 1990s and also has had significant NRC review. The 25 MWe Hyperion Power Module (HPM) design, which uses lead-bismuth coolant, has been under development since 2009, as is the 100 MWe sodium-cooled Advanced Reactor Concept (ARC) design. It is expected that additional advanced SMR designs will emerge as vendors address specific energy markets that are best served by small-sized power units. Models of the PRISM, MHR, and HPM designs are given in figure 2.

#### Independently – not specifying which type of SMR they use is a voter – there are over 60 different types of reactors with distinct cooling systems and designs – that’s key to negative disad and cp ground. Absent that, the aff is a moving target.

#### It’s net-beneficial –

#### Light water reactors causes widespread proliferation

Sokolski 4 (Henry, Executive Director – Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, in the Preface of "A Fresh Examination of the Proliferation Dangers of Light Water Reactors," NPEC, 10-19, http://npec.xykon-llc.com/files/20041022-GilinskyEtAl-LWR.pdf)

The U.S. and its allies are now trying to deny Iran the ability to enrich uranium out of fears it might use this capability to make bombs. The problem is that no country has yet clearly countered Iran’s claim that it has a legal right to pursue all of its nuclear activities. A key reason why is the peaceful status the U.S. and others have long conferred upon the centerpiece of Iran’s nuclear program -- the light water power reactor. LWRs, in fact, produce and consume massive quantities of lightly enriched uranium and plutonium-laden spent fuel, materials that are quite useful to would-be bomb makers if they have reprocessing or uranium enrichment plants. Yet, for years, it was assumed that these plants and their construction could not be concealed from international inspectors or national intelligence agencies and that therefore, one could promote peaceful nuclear power with LWRs without risking the spread of nuclear weapons. Supporters of nuclear power also have insisted that the plutonium LWRs produce could not be used to make nuclear weapons. This last point was debated throughout the l970s: Nuclear critics insisted that even “reactor-grade” plutonium could be used to make workable, if not optimal, nuclear explosives. As for the inability to covertly reprocess or enrich, though, most nonproliferation analysts were all too willing to downplay or dismiss it. The reason why, in part, was to avoid the worst. At the time, many nuclear supporters insisted that “advanced” states should have the complete fuel cycle, including large reprocessing and enrichment plants. Yet, these bulk handling facilities were much more dangerous than having LWRs alone. Nuclear critics saw promoting LWRs without reprocessing or the further spread of enrichment plants, then, as the best path. Enrichment and reprocessing, they argued, would be difficult to hide and, therefore, could and should be discouraged. The report that follows, which The Nonproliferation Policy Education Center first released September 27, 2004, constitutes a significant qualification of this given wisdom. Written by national authorities on nuclear chemistry, commercial nuclear power reactors, and nuclear weapons designs, the report makes clear that building and operating small, covert reprocessing and enrichment facilities are now far easier than they were portrayed to be 25 years ago. A key reason why is the increasing availability of advanced centrifuge enrichment technology. This allows nations to make weapons-grade uranium with far less energy and in far less space than was required with older enrichment methods. It also allows them to distribute and hide their uranium enrichment facilities among a number of sites, something traditional gaseous diffusion uranium enrichment (the next most popular way to enrich uranium) does not permit. Another reason why is that nations can quickly separate out the plutonium contained in spent reactor fuel in relatively affordable facilities that can be quite small (as little as 65 feet square) and therefore, be easily hidden. The bottom line -- LWRs no longer should be given to any nation that might divert the reactor’s fresh lightly enriched fuel or the plutonium-laden spent fuel to make bombs. The report details how fresh and spent LWR fuel can be used to accelerate a nation’s illicit weapons program significantly. In the case of a state that can enrich uranium (either covertly or commercially), fresh lightly enriched reactor fuel rods could be seized and the uranium oxide pellets they contain quickly crushed and fluoridated. This lightly enriched uranium feed material, in turn, could enable a would-be bomb maker to produce a significant number of weapons with one-fifth the level of effort than what would otherwise be required to enrich the natural uranium to weapons grade. As for spent LWR fuel, the report details how about a year after an LWR of the size Iran has was brought on line, as much as 60 Nagasaki bombs’ worth of near-weapons grade material could be seized and the first bomb made in a matter of weeks. The report also details how the reliability of the bombs made of this material, moreover, is similar to that of devices made of pure weapons grade plutonium.

#### Specifically – water-based reactors produce massive amounts of tritium as a byproduct

Morgan and Shea 10 (Daniel, and Dana A., Special in Science and Technology – CRS, “The Helium-3 Shortage: Supply, Demand, and Options for Congress,” Congressional Research Service, 12-22, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41419.pdf)

In addition to the nuclear weapons program, potential sources of helium-3 include tritium produced as a byproduct in commercial heavy-water nuclear reactors; extraction of naturally occurring helium-3 from natural gas or the atmosphere; and production of either tritium or helium-3 using particle accelerators. Until recently, the ready supply of helium-3 from the nuclear weapons program meant that these alternative sources were not considered economic. With the current shortage, this perception may change.

#### Even a limited amount of tritium causes thermonuclear weapon development – makes nuclear terrorism feasible

Gsponer and Hurni 8 (Dr. Andre, PhD in Physics and Research Associate – University of Chicago, and Jean-Pierre, PhD in Physics – University of Geneva, “ITER: The International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor and the Nuclear Weapons Proliferation Implications of Thermonuclear-Fusion Energy Systems,” Independent Scientiﬁc Research Institute, 2-2, http://arxiv.org/pdf/physics/0401110.pdf)

Technical points related to thermonuclear weapons and their proliferation • A few grams of tritium are sufﬁcient to “boost” ﬁssion explosives made of a few kilograms of military- or reactor-grade plutonium. (As is explained in section 2.1, this is because tritium boosting obviates the preignition problems which makes non-boosted plutonium weapons unreliable and unsafe). Such boosted explosives are sufﬁciently compact to be used in relatively unsophisticated long-range missiles, or as primaries of two-stage thermonuclear bombs (see Fig.4 and Sec.2.2.2). • A few tens of grams of tritium are sufﬁcient to “boost” the “sparkplug” of the secondary of a two-stage thermonuclear weapon, which can then be made sufﬁciently small to be deliverable by a missile. In such weapons a “third-stage” made of a few tens of kilograms of ﬁssile material is often used to provide additional yield without increasing the size and weight of the warhead. While this third-stage (i.e., essentially a “blanket” surrounding the secondary of a two-stage H-bomb) is preferably made of enriched uranium, it can also be made of reactor-grade plutonium without degrading the military performance of the device, which may correspond to yields in the range of 200–500 kilotons equivalent TNT (see Fig.4 and Sec.2.2.2). • Next-generation (i.e., fourth-generation) nuclear weapons will have substantially lower yields (i.e., tons instead of kilotons) and will rely on fusion materials rather than on ﬁssile materials for their main explosive charge (see Sec.2.6.3). This means that the emphasis of safeguarding militarily useful materials will gradually shift from ﬁssion materials such as plutonium to fusion materials such as tritium. • Both magnetic conﬁnement fusion (MCF) reactors, such as ITER, and inertial conﬁnement fusion reactors (ICF), such as the GEKKO XII laser facility of the Institute of Laser Engineering at Osaka University in Japan, have nuclear-weapon-materials proliferation implications due to their use of tritium (see Sec.2.5). However, ICF facilities have the additional proliferation problem that they enable the physics of thermonuclear weapons to be studied in the laboratory (see Sec.2.6). As a result, it is well known by nuclear proliferation experts that Japan has not only the capability to build boosted 15nuclear weapons, but also the potential to build two-stage thermonuclear weapons that are likely to work ﬁrst-time without testing. 13 Today, the main impediment that would prevent Japan from building such second-generation nuclear weapons on short notice is the unavailability of sufﬁcient amounts of tritium. • Any future commercial fusion reactor (based on the either the MCF or ICF principle) poses the problem of tritium proliferation because during operation each such reactor will contain several tens of kilograms of tritium, i.e., enough for an arsenal of several hundreds or thousands thermonuclear weapons (see Sec.2.5.2). • Since 1 g of deuterium-tritium fuel produces about 340 GJ of energy, a nominal 1 GW (electric) commercial fusion power plant with a thermal efﬁcient of 30% would consume 10 mg of DT-fuel per second. 14 If the plant is based on the MCF principle this amount of fuel is burnt relatively slowly in a steady-state plasma conﬁned by magnetic ﬁelds. However, if the plant is based on the ICF principle, the fuel is burnt in a continuous salvo of micro-thermonuclear-bombs (so-called “pellets”) exploding at the center of a containment vessel. Assuming that one pellet is detonated each second, the explosive yield of each pellet would be 3.4 GJ, i.e., equivalent to about 810 kg of TNT (see Sec.2.4). • The many kilograms of tritium implied in the daily operation of a number of GW-scale reactor in a fusion-based power industry will provide numerous possibilities of diversion or theft of tritium for military or terrorist purposes. With ICF reactors, one will have the additional problem of safeguarding the fusion pellets themselves, because they may possibly be used as the explosive charge of some future-generation nuclear weapons.

#### Extinction

Wilson 4 (Jim, Professor – Naval Post Graduate School and Chief Scientist – Neptune Sciences, “Dangerous Science,” Popular Mechanics, Vol. 181, Iss. 8; pg. 75, Research Library database. 2004, August. Project muse)

BEYOND H-BOMBS Although explosions have from time to time occurred in cold fusion apparatus (see "Two Deaths And Two Mysteries," page 79), these devices would not be incorporated directly into nuclear weapons. Instead, cold fusion cells could, with minimal effort and expense, be used to provide a supply of much-needed tritium. It is difficult to speculate about how much gas they would have to produce since the size of the nation's tritium reserve and the current production of civilian power reactors is, for obvious reasons, a closely guarded secret. Even if the tritium production from some of these devices proves to be too small to be significant for America's H-bomb production needs, a positive review from the new DOE cold fusion evaluation committee will move this controversial field of research back into the scientific mainstream. Cold fusion researchers are rightly excited by this possibility. Among other things they are hopeful that Science and Nature, the two leading international science journals, will begin publishing results of their cold fusion research. But this time their dream must be tempered with the fearsome new reality of international terrorism. Mallove told PM that scores of cold fusion experiments have revealed the production of enriched uranium, plutonium and tritium. If, as much of this research suggests, cold fusion can be used to produce weapons-grade materials, terrorists will have the ability to unleash destructive force previously available only to the world's major nuclear powers. The same tabletop devices that fulfill mankind's dream of creating unlimited quantities of cheap power may also be the source of the world's greatest nightmare: homemade H-bombs in the hands of terrorists bent on ending civilization.

## Solvency 1NC

### NRC Blocks 1NC

#### 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 can’t exempt

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].

### Military Says No 1NC

#### Military says no

Butler 11 (Lt. Col. Glen Butler, Headquarters, North American Air Defense Command-U.S. Northern Command/J594 (Strategy, Policy, and Plans Directorate), Security Cooperation Integration Branch, 3-1-11, “Not green enough: Why the Marine Corps should lead the environmental and energy way forward and how to do it,” http://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/not-green-enough)

Fourth, SMR technology offers the Marine Corps another unique means to lead from the front—not just of the other Services but also of the Nation, and even the world.28 This potential Pete Ellis moment should be seized. There are simple steps we could take,29 and others stand ready to lead if we are not.30 But the temptation to “wait and see” and “let the others do it; then we’ll adopt it” mentality is not always best. Energy security demands boldness, not timidity.

[Their Card Ends]

To be fair, nuclear technology comes with challenges, of course, and with questions that have been kicked around for decades. An April 1990 Popular Science article asked, “Next Generation Nuclear Reactors—Dare we build them?” and included some of the same verbiage heard in similar discussions today.31 Compliance with National Environment Policy Act requirements necessitates lengthy and detailed preaction analyses, critical community support must be earned, and disposal challenges remain. Still, none of these hurdles are insurmountable.32 Yet despite the advances in safety, security, and efficiency in recent years, nuclear in the energy equation remains the new “n-word” for most military circles. And despite the fact that the FY10 National Defense Authorization Act called on the DoD to “conduct a study [of] the feasibility of nuclear plants on military installations,” the Office of the Secretary of Defense has yet to fund the study.33

### Expertise 1NC

#### 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.

### Accidents Turn 1NC

#### 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.

#### 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

### Prolif Turn 1NC

#### Turn – military SMRs cause prolif

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.

#### Global nuclear war

Utgoff 2 (Victor A., Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis, Survival Vol 44 No 2 Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions, p. 87-90)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

### Nat Gas Blocks 1NC

#### Natural gas blocks

**Biello 12** (David, Associate Editor at Scientific American, March 27, "Small Reactors Make a Bid to Revive Nuclear Power", <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=small-reactors-bid-to-revive-nuclear-power>)

Regardless of how cheap such Small Modular Reactors may allow nuclear to be in future, it is unlikely to be as cheap as natural-gas-fired turbines in the present. In fact, low natural gas prices stalled the U.S. nuclear renaissance outside Georgia and South Carolina, long before the reactor meltdowns at Fukushima Daiichi in Japan. "Because of an unanticipated abundance of natural gas in the United States, nuclear energy, in general, is facing tough competition," noted an analysis of the prospects for small modular reactors from the University of Chicago published last November. The analysis also suggested that small reactors would be more expensive than large reactors on a per-megawatt basis until manufacturing in significant quantities has happened. "It [is] unlikely that SMRs will be commercialized without some form of government incentive." But the Department of Energy funding may only support two designs. Innovation spurred by competition seems unlikely. And that may ultimately erode the current U.S. nuclear industry advantage—from design to operation to regulation.

### Long Timeframe 1NC

#### Long timeframe to deployment

**ITA, 11** – International Trade Administration (U.S. Department of Commerce, February. Manufacturing and Services Competitiveness Report. “The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors.” http://trade.gov/mas/ian/build/groups/public/@tg\_ian/@nuclear/documents/webcontent/tg\_ian\_003185.pdf)

Although SMRs have significant potential and the market for their deployment is growing, their designs must still go through the technical and regulatory processes necessary to ensure that they can be safely and securely deployed. Lightwater technology–based SMRs may not be ready for deployment in the United States for at least a decade, and advanced designs might be even further off. Light-water SMRs and SMRs that have undergone significant testing are the most likely candidates for near-term deployment, because they are most similar to existing reactors that have certified designs and significant operating histories. NuScale is on track to submit its reactor design to the NRC by 2012, as is Babcock & Wilcox for its mPower design. In addition, GE-Hitachi, which already completed an NRC preapplication review for its PRISM reactor in 1994, plans to submit its PRISM design for certification in 2012.

### No Commercialization 2NC

#### DoD doesn’t drive the domestic market

Dimotakis 6 (Paul Dimotakis, The MITRE Corporation, 2006, December 09, 2006, Reducing DoD Fossil-Fuel Dependence, http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/jason/fossil.pdf)

The 2006 DoD fossil-fuel budget is, approximately, 2.5-3% of the national-defense budget, the range dependent on what is chosen as the total national-defense budget. iv Larger (percentage) fuel costs are borne by families and many businesses, for example, and fuel costs have only relatively recently become noticeable to the DoD. 3. At present, there is a large spread between oil-production cost and crude-oil prices. Many projections, however, including that of the U.S. Energy Information Agency, indicate that crude oil prices may well decrease to $40-$50/barrel within the next few years, as production and refining capacity increases to match demand. 4. DoD is not a sufficiently large customer to drive the domestic market for demand and consumption of fossil fuel alternatives, or to drive fuel and transportation technology developments, in general. Barring externalities, e.g., subsidies, governmental and departmental directives, etc., non-fossil-derived fuels are not likely to play a significant role in the next 25 years. 5. DoD fuel consumption constraints and patterns of use do not align well with those of the commercial sector. Most commercial-sector fuel use, for example, is in ground transportation, with only 4% of domestic petroleum consumption used for aviation. In contrast, almost 60% of DoD fuel use is by the Air Force, with additional fuel used in DoD aviation if Naval aviation consumption is included. Options for refueling ships at sea are more limited (or nonexistent) compared to those for commercial vehicles in urban areas. Options for DoD use of electrical energy on ground vehicles are limited, since one can not expect to plug into the grid in hostile territory, for example, to refuel/recharge an electric vehicle. Furthermore, drive cycles for DoD ground vehicles differ significantly from EPA drive cycles that, as a consequence, provide poor standards for fuel consumption.

## Grid Advantage 1NC

### Military Backup 1NC

#### Backup capacity solves blackouts

Aimone 9-12 (Dr. Michael, Director of Business Enterprise Integration – Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), “Statement Before the House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies,” 2012, http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony%20-%20Aimone.pdf)

DoD’s facility energy strategy is also focused heavily on grid security in the name of mission assurance. Although the Department’s fixed installations traditionally served largely as a platform for training and deployment of forces, in recent years they have begun to provide direct support for combat operations, such as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) flown in Afghanistan from fixed installations here in the United States. Our fixed installations also serve as staging platforms for humanitarian and homeland defense missions. These installations are largely dependent on a commercial power grid that is vulnerable to disruption due to aging infrastructure, weather-related events, and potential kinetic, cyber attack. In 2008, the Defense Science Board warned that DoD’s reliance on a fragile power grid to deliver electricity to its bases places critical missions at risk. 1 Standby Power Generation Currently, DoD ensures that it can continue mission critical activities on base largely through its fleet of on-site power generation equipment. This equipment is connected to essential mission systems and automatically operates in the event of a commercial grid outage. In addition, each installation has standby generators in storage for repositioning as required. Facility power production specialists ensure that the generators are primed and ready to work, and that they are maintained and fueled during an emergency. With careful maintenance these generators can bridge the gap for even a lengthy outage. As further back up to this installed equipment, DoD maintains a strategic stockpile of electrical power generators and support equipment that is kept in operational readiness. For example, during Hurricane Katrina, the Air Force transported more than 2 megawatts of specialized diesel generators from Florida, where they were stored, to Keesler Air Force Base in Mississippi, to support base recovery.

### Grid Safe Now 1NC

#### Grid stable now

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 Cyber Terror 1NC

#### No risk of cyberattack and no impact

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)

"That's a good example of what some kind of attacks would be like," he said. "You don't want to overestimate the risks. You don't want somebody to be able to do this whenever they felt like it, which is the situation now. But this is not the end of the world." The question of how seriously to take the threat of a cyber attack on critical infrastructure surfaced recently, after Congress rejected a White House measure to require businesses to adopt stringent­ new regulations to protect their computer networks from intrusions. The bill would have required industries to report cyber security breaches, toughen criminal penalties against hacking and granted legal immunity to companies cooperating with government investigations. Critics worried about regulatory overreach. But the potential cost to industry also seems to be a major factor in the bill's rejection. A January study by Bloomberg reported that banks, utilities, and phone carriers would have to increase their spending on cyber security by a factor of nine, to $45.3 billion a year, in order to protect themselves against 95 percent of cyber intrusions. Likewise, some of the bill's advocates suspect that in the aftermath of a truly successful cyber attack, the government would have to bail the utilities out anyway. Joe Weiss, a cyber security professional and an authority on industrial control systems like those used in the electric grid, argued that a well-prepared, sophisticated cyber attack could have far more serious consequences than this summer's blackouts. "The reason we are so concerned is that cyber could take out the grid for nine to 18 months," he said. "This isn't a one to five day outage. We're prepared for that. We can handle that." But pulling off a cyber assault on that scale is no easy feat. Weiss agreed that hackers intent on inflicting this kind of long-term interruption of power would need to use a tool capable of inflicting physical damage. And so far, the world has seen only one such weapon: Stuxnet, which is believed to have been a joint military project of Israel and the United States. Ralph Langner, a German expert on industrial-control system security, was among the first to discover that Stuxnet was specifically designed to attack the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system (SCADA) at a single site: Iran's Natanz uranium-enrichment plant. The computer worm's sophisticated programs, which infected the plant in 2009, caused about 1,000 of Natanz's 5,000 uranium-enrichment centrifuges to self-destruct by accelerating their precision rotors beyond the speeds at which they were designed to operate. Professionals like Weiss and others warned that Stuxnet was opening a Pandora's Box: Once it was unleashed on the world, they feared, it would become available to hostile states, criminals, and terrorists who could adapt the code for their own nefarious purposes. But two years after the discovery of Stuxnet, there are no reports of similar attacks against the United States. What has prevented the emergence of such copycat viruses? A 2009 paper published by the University of California, Berkeley, may offer the answer. The report, which was released a year before Stuxnet surfaced, found that in order to create a cyber weapon capable of crippling a specific control system ­­-- like the ones operating the U.S. electric grid -- six coders might have to work for up to six months to reverse engineer the targeted center's SCADA system. Even then, the report says, hackers likely would need the help of someone with inside knowledge of how the network's machines were wired together to plan an effective attack. "Every SCADA control center is configured differently, with different devices, running different software/protocols," wrote Rose Tsang, the report's author. Professional hackers are in it for the money -- and it's a lot more cost-efficient to search out vulnerabilities in widely-used computer programs like the Windows operating system, used by banks and other affluent targets, than in one-of-a-kind SCADA systems linked to generators and switches. According to Pollard, only the world's industrial nations have the means to use the Internet to attack utilities and major industries. But given the integrated global economy, there is little incentive, short of armed conflict, for them to do so. "If you're a state that has a number of U.S. T-bills in your treasury, you have an economic interest in the United States," he said. "You're not going to have an interest in mucking about with our infrastructure." There is also the threat of retaliation. Last year, the U.S. government reportedly issued a classified report on cyber strategy that said it could respond to a devastating digital assault with traditional military force. The idea was that if a cyber attack caused death and destruction on the scale of a military assault, the United States would reserve the right to respond with what the Pentagon likes to call "kinetic" weapons: missiles, bombs, and bullets. An unnamed Pentagon official, speaking to the Wall Street Journal, summed up the policy in less diplomatic terms: "If you shut down our power grid, maybe we will put a missile down one of your smokestacks." Deterrence is sometimes dismissed as a toothless strategy against cyber attacks because hackers have such an easy time hiding in the anonymity of the Web. But investigators typically come up with key suspects, if not smoking guns, following cyber intrusions and assaults -- the way suspicions quickly focused on the United States and Israel after Stuxnet was discovered. And with the U.S. military's global reach, even terror groups have to factor in potential retaliation when planning their operations.

### Oil Dependence 1NC

#### Can’t solve military oil dependence

Nikitin et al, 11 – Specialist in Nonproliferation for the Congressional Research Service (Mary Beth, with Anthony Andrews, Specialist in Energy and Defense Policy, and Mark Holt, Specialist in Energy Policy, 9/12. “Managing the Nuclear Fuel Cycle: Policy Implications of Expanding Global Access to Nuclear Power.” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34234.pdf)

Energy security has been a primary driving force behind the development of nuclear energy, particularly in countries such as France and Japan that have few natural energy resources. Recent cutoffs in oil and gas around the world have underscored the instability of oil and gas supply, which could be mitigated by nuclear energy. For example, in 2006, a natural gas price dispute between Russia and Ukraine resulted in a temporary cutoff of natural gas to Western and Central Europe; in 2007, price disputes between Russia and Azerbaijan and Belarus caused a temporary cutoff in oil to Russia from Azerbaijan and in oil from Russia to Germany, Poland, and Slovakia. Moreover, temporary production shutdowns in the Gulf of Mexico and the Trans-Alaskan pipeline, instability in Nigeria, and nationalization of oil and gas fields in Bolivia in 2006 all raised concerns about oil and gas supplies and worldwide price volatility. Relative to gas and oil, the ability to stockpile uranium is widely seen as offering greater assurances of weathering potential cutoffs. However, nuclear electricity in most cases is not directly substitutable for oil’s most common use, as transportation fuel. Worldwide uranium resources are generally considered to be sufficient for at least several decades. Uranium supply is highly diversified, with uranium mining spread across the globe, while uranium conversion, enrichment, and fuel fabrication are more concentrated in a handful of countries. But because most reactors around the world rely at least partly on foreign sources of uranium and nuclear fuel services, nuclear reactors nearly everywhere face some level of supply vulnerability. To mitigate such concern, countries such as China, India, and Japan are seeking to secure long-term uranium contracts to support nuclear expansion goals. Efforts are underway to establish an international nuclear fuel bank to provide greater certainty in fuel supplies, as discussed in the next section.

### Heg D

#### Heg doesn’t prevent war

**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.

### Heg Unsustainable

#### Heg is unsustainable – rising powers, overstretch and loss of economic power

Layne 11 [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 unipolar exit: beyond the Pax Americana”, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 24:2, 149-164, Chetan]

In this article I challenge Brooks and Wohlforth. I show that the unipolar era already is visibly drawing to a close. Three main drivers explain the impending end of the Pax Americana. First, the rise of new great powers—especially China—is transforming the international system from unipolarity to multipolarity. Second, the United States is becoming the poster child for strategic over-extension, or as Paul Kennedy (1987) dubbed it, imperial overstretch. Third, the United States’ relative economic power is declining. In particular, mounting US fiscal problems and the dollar’s increasingly problematic role as the international financial system’s reserve currency are undermining US hegemony. To comprehend why the Pax Americana is ending we need to understand the linkages among these trends, and how each has feedback effects on the others. After examining how these trends undermine the Brooks and Wohlforth argument for unipolar stability and the durability of US hegemony, I conclude by arguing that over the next two decades the Pax Americana’s end presages dramatic changes in international politics—the outlines of which already are visible.

## China 1NC

### Prices

#### Electricity prices are declining

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

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

#### Plan raises prices

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

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

#### That kills the economy

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.

#### 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.

### China

#### No nuclear leadership for China – no safety or transparency

The Guardian 9-21-12 ("Should China be involved in the UK's nuclear energy infrastructure?", http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2012/sep/21/nuclearpower-energy)

In Tibet, the Chinese nuclear industry is engaged in a determined effort to secure uranium deposits located in Amdo, where leaching and open pit extraction are reported to have resulted in significant environmental contamination. Regulation of safety oversight mechanisms is relatively weak in the Chinese nuclear industry, and according to a recent Nuclear Materials Security Index report, China ranks 29th among the group of 32 nuclear nations in terms of nuclear security and materials transparency. Although it's to be hoped that greater corporate social responsibility and sensitivity to vulnerable industrial communities is evolving in both Russia and China, it's still troubling to reflect on their respective human rights situations, documented by Amnesty International.

### No Asian War 1NC

#### 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.

### Africa

#### -- African war inevitable

Thakur 6 (Ramesh, Senior Vice Rector – UN University (Tokyo), “At Least No New Wars Began”, Japan Times, 2-15, Lexis)

In Africa, the Ethiopia-Eritrea peace frayed dangerously with neither side showing willingness to compromise in the ongoing border dispute. The security and humanitarian situation in Darfur remained dire. The small and belatedly deployed African Union peace force could not adequately protect displaced civilians, new fighting erupted, the rebel movement remained divided and Khartoum was less than cooperative. The political settlement sought by the A.U. looks far off. The Democratic Republic of Congo's shaky transition inched forward amid widespread insecurity. Up to 1,000 still die every day from disease, malnutrition and violence. Almost 4 million have perished in eight years of war. Zimbabwe's March parliamentary election gave the ruling ZANU-PF party a controversial landslide over the opposition, but failed to resolve the five-year political impasse. Better news came with Liberia's successful elections in November, choosing the continent's first woman president. Burundi's peace process progressed with major victories by the former opposition (and insurgent) CNDD-FDD in communal and legislative elections.

## DoD Tradeoff 2NC

### Cuts likely

Cuts likely

AP, 11 (Donna Casata and Lolita Baldor, 8/4. “Military money on chopping block.” <http://www.heraldsun.com/view/full_story/14954354/article-Military-money-on-chopping-block>)

Defense spending, which has nearly doubled in the last decade, is no longer untouchable in Washington.¶ Tea partyers and fierce fiscal conservatives in Congress are more willing to include Pentagon dollars in their mix of budget cuts despite opposition from veteran defense hawks. The death of Osama bin Laden, the diminished role of al-Qaida and the winding down of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have prompted some lawmakers to question the need for such robust military spending.¶ Among the things that could be on the block: A troubled new jet fighter, expensive plans to modernize the nation's nuclear arsenal and perhaps some of the gold-plated benefits now guaranteed to military retirees.¶ "I think programs that can't meet schedule, that can't meet cost ... requirements are very much in jeopardy and will be very much under scrutiny," Mullen said.¶

### Uniqueness – Modernization Funding Now

#### Nuclear modernization will be funded now

UPI, 9/11/12 (United Press International, “House to act on spending resolution,” <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2012/09/11/House-to-act-on-spending-resolution/UPI-97771347386184/#ixzz26xJmMD1l>)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 11 (UPI) -- The U.S. House ended its recess Tuesday and turned its attention to fiscal matters amid warnings from a credit-rating service.¶ A continuing resolution to increase spending 0.6 percent for all agencies, conforming to a deal reached in August 2011 that set the debt ceiling at $1.047 trillion, could come up as early as Thursday, The Hill reported.¶ The continuing resolution comes up as action remained stalled on the so-called "fiscal cliff" that looms at the end of the year -- the end of Bush-era tax cuts and automatic across the board spending cuts. Moody's Investors Service Tuesday warned it would strip the United States of its AAA credit rating if the issues are not resolved. Standard & Poor's did just that during last year's political infighting.¶ The bill does not include of the 1996 welfare reform law, which expires this month. It also continues a pay freeze for federal workers.¶ The Obama administration had requested a 0.5 percent increase.¶ Some budget areas got special treatment. Money to fight wildfires, to modernize nuclear weapons and to increase border patrols got emergency funding.¶However, there were losers too, Politico reported.

#### Nuclear modernization is set to be funded now, but could still be cut

**RT, 9/16**/12 (“Aging US nuclear arsenal set for multibillion-dollar revamp,” <http://rt.com/usa/news/us-nuclear-arsenal-modernization-272/>)

Washington is set to shell out hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade to overhaul its aging nuclear arsenal. The daunting task comes as Capitol Hill is faced with $1.2 trillion in federal budget cuts over the same period.¶ Despite nearly two decades of avoiding costly and politically unpopular modernizations of the American nuclear weapons complex, the Washington Post reports that plans for a full-scale overhaul of the country’s arsenal are underway.¶ The modernization of the US nuclear weapons complex – which includes an inventory of some 5,113 warheads, their strategic delivery systems and production facilities – has been conservatively estimated at $352 billion over the coming decade by nonpartisan think tank the Stimson Center the Post reports. However, that figure could rise, especially if the hugely vital but publicly undervalued task is put off any longer.¶ But in an age of asymmetrical warfare, where the Pentagon is facing massive cuts to its conventional force, spending hundreds of billions to refurbish the country’s nuclear arsenal is a tough sell as the United States remains embroiled in the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.¶ Further complicating matters, Congress is facing an astounding $1.2 trillion in automatic, across-the-board cuts to the federal budget over the next ten years under the highly contentious 2011 Budget Control Act (BCA).¶ Apart from slashing 9.4 per cent from defense discretionary funding – $54.7 billion from the Pentagon for fiscal year 2013 alone – a further 8.2 per cent cut in non-defense funding is also slated, bringing the 2013 total to $109 billion.¶ That Washington will be forced to cut 11.1 billion from Medicare as billions more are allocated to the nuclear arsenal could be a bitter pill for many Americans to swallow.¶ In fact, for fiscal year 2013, the Obama administration has already requested nearly $7.6 billion in funding – a five per cent increase from last year – for weapons activities in the Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which oversees the US nuclear stockpile and production complex, the Arms Control Association reported in August. Ironically, bad management, poor planning and waste on the part of the NNSA have been blamed for the exorbitant projected costs of modernization.

### Links – Yes Tradeoff – DOD Budget Zero Sum

#### Sequestration means the aff forces tradeoffs – the budget is zero sum

Garamone, 12 – American Forces Press Service (Jim, 4/16. “Panetta, Dempsey Say Pentagon Feels Sequestration’s Shadow.” <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=67950>)

Panetta and Army Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, spoke about sequestration and the defense budget during a news conference at the Pentagon.¶ “Sequestration” refers to a mechanism based into the Budget Control Act that would trigger an additional $500 billion cut across the board for defense spending over the next decade if Congress doesn’t find an alternative by January.¶ “I think … the shadow of sequestration is there,” Panetta said. While the Defense Department has received no guidance from the Office of Management and Budget to begin planning for sequestration, the threat of it is having an impact on the department and on the industries the department depends on, the secretary said.¶ “In the end, it’s up to Congress,” Panetta said. “In the coming weeks, they will begin considering the defense authorization and appropriations bills. Our hope is that Congress will carefully consider the new defense strategy and the budget decisions that resulted from that strategy.”¶ Any changes the Congress contemplates will affect other sections of the budget, because it is a zero-sum game, the secretary noted. Because of the Budget Control Act, he added, any change in any one area of the budget and force structure will inevitably require offsetting changes elsewhere.¶ “That carries the real risk that … if this is not done right, the result could be a hollow, unbalanced or weaker force,” he said. “Our hope is that our strategy will not be picked apart piece by piece.”

## Solvency 2NC

### NRC Blocks 2NC

#### More reasons they block –

#### A) Siting constraints

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

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

#### B) Costs

**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)

Furthermore, the regulatory timeline and costs for licensing are also sources of financial uncertainty. NRC licensing processes have historically evolved around LWRs, and although NRC officials have begun dialogue on licensing for small reactors, they have estimated in the past that it could take a decade to develop new regulatory guides and licensing reviews.25 The NRC fee structure is also a barrier for small reactors. Under current regulations, the annual fee to operate each licensed nuclear reactor is $4.5 million—a prohibitive cost for many small reactor developers and users. The NRC is considering a variable fee structure based on reactor output, but it has deferred any actions or decisions until a licensing application is submitted.26

#### C) Fights over design

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)

Unresolved certification and licensing issues and time likely required for resolving them While the NRC guides and regulations provide a comprehensive representation of certification and licensing issues, others may arise once a vendor actually submits an SMR design to the NRC. However, the likely issues have been identified because the NRC has engaged DOE and facilitated discussion with potential SMR vendors about potential policy, licensing, and key technical issues for SMR designs. The NRC has encouraged the earliest possible interaction of applicants, vendors, and other government agencies to provide for early identification of regulatory requirements for advanced reactor designs and to provide all interested parties, including the public, with a timely and independent assessment of the safety and security characteristics of advanced reactor designs [48]. This approach will minimize complexity and add predictability to the licensing process. These actions are timely because some nuclear reactor vendors have notified NRC that they intend to submit design and license applications for SMRs to NRC as early as FY 2012. The issues that have been identified generally result from key differences between the new designs and current generation reactors regarding size, moderator, coolant, fuel design, and projected operational parameters. The differences also result from industry proposed approaches and modifications to current policies and practices. Organizations such as the NRC, Nuclear Energy Institute, and the American Nuclear Society have activities underway to develop proposed solutions to these issues. The issues most relevant to DoD's considerations of small modular reactors are as follows: • Implementation of the defense-in-depth philosophy for advanced reactors

### Accidents Turn 2NC

#### 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.

### \*A2: SMRs = Avoid Turns

#### SMRs are a myth created by the nuclear industry – just as problematic as regular reactors

Smith 11 (Gar, Editor Emeritus – Earth Island Journal, “Don’t Mini-mize the Dangers of Nuclear Power,” Earth Island Journal, Summer, http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/eij/article/dont\_mini-mize\_the\_dangers\_of\_nuclear\_power/)

And that’s just a partial list. The problem with nuclear power is simple: It’s too complex. When things go wrong – as they inevitably do, because humans are fallible – the consequences can be deadly. The Fukushima disaster has severely hobbled the atomic industry’s hopes for a big-ticket nuclear renaissance. So the American Nuclear Society has proposed a mini-renaissance based on “Small Modular Reactors,” or SMRs. Cheaper, quicker to build, and small enough to fit in a garage, SMRs could power homes, factories, and military bases. South Carolina’s Savannah River National Laboratory hopes to start building SMRs at a New Mexico plant and is taking a lead role in a GE-Hitachi demonstration project. Even as Japanese engineers were working to contain the radiation risks at Fukushima, an international SMR conference in South Carolina in April attracted representatives from Westinghouse, AREVA, GE, the International Atomic Energy Agency, China National Nuclear Corp., Iraq Energy Institute, the US Army, and many US utilities. But SMRs still depend on designs that generate intense heat, employ dangerous materials (highly reactive sodium coolant), and generate nuclear waste. SMRs also retain all the risks associated with supplying, maintaining, safeguarding, and dismantling large nuclear reactors – only now those risks would be multiplied and decentralized. The planet can’t afford nuclear energy – be it mega or mini. As Dave Brower observed 30 years ago: “Is the minor convenience of allowing the present generation the luxury of doubling its energy consumption every 10 years worth the major hazard of exposing the next 20,000 generations to this lethal waste? “We are at the edge of an abyss and we’re close to being irrevocably lost,” Dave warned. “As the Welshman Allen Reese puts it: ‘At the edge of the abyss, the only progressive move you can make is to step back.’”

### Prolif Turn

#### Prolif risks nuclear war – balance of risks says we should avoid it

**Booth ‘7** (Ken, Dept. Head and Prof. Int’l. Pol. – U. Wales, “Theory of World Security”, p. 406)

It is my clear view that the balance of risk favours moving away from the accelerating threats of a proliferating world towards global nuclear abolition (the explicit goal of the NPT), and the parallel step of moving away from the notion of nuclear weapons as the ultimate insurers of national security towards the unequivocal support for their illegitimacy. Pro-nuclear opinion in different countries claims that because we live in an uncertain world, it is rational that their own states develop or keep nuclear weapons (seemingly ignoring the point that what is rational for one country in this regard is a recipe for rational nuclear possession universally). There is no doubt that we live in an uncertain world, but the point is that the predictable uncertainties of nuclear proliferation (the increased dangers of accidental or inadvertent nuclear war, the increased risk of nuclear material being acquired by terrorists, etc.) are more threatening than the unpredictable uncertainties of abolition (treaty 'breakout', cheating, etc.). If the trends to nuclear proliferation are not stoppedalmost immediately, then we face the prospects of a new nuclear age, this time with many more nuclear powers, complex security dilemmas, and the problems resulting from confrontations between states whose nuclear weapons systems and command and control arrangements are less technologically sophisticated than those of the long-established nuclear powers. The world was lucky to escape the first (largely bipolar) nuclear age without a catastrophe; it will be luckier still to survive a multipolar age characterised by nuclear contagion.

### Nat Gas Blocks 2NC

#### Prefer our evidence – recent trends decisively conclude neg, but their authors always think that the Renaissance is around the corner

Maize 12 (Kennedy, Staff Writer – POWER Magazine, “A Bumpy Road for Nukes,” 8-6, POWERnews, http://www.powermag.com/nuclear/4859.html)

It’s been a rough road for nuclear advocates in the U.S. of late, although nothing seems to dent the Pollyanna armor of the nuclear crowd, always appearing to believe a revival is just over the horizon and headed into view. Here are a few fraught developments for the nuclear business that suggest the positive vision just might be a mirage. \* GE CEO Jeff Immelt in a recent interview with the Financial Times revealed a surprising and somewhat uncharacteristic realism with regard to the company’s nuclear future and that of its partner in radioactivity, Hitachi. In London for the Summer Olympics, Immelt told a reporter for the FT, “It’s really a gas and wind world today. When I talk to the guys who run the oil companies, they say look, they’re finding more gas all the time. It’s just hard to justify nuclear, really hard. Gas is so cheap, and at some point, really, economics rule.” For the nuclear industry, economics has always been the fundamental enemy – not the green-tinged, hairy anti-nuke activists, but the folks with the green eye shades, sharp pencils and, today, even sharper spreadsheets. The nuclear execs long have pursued governments as their bulwark against markets, and that has often worked. Today, as Immelt notes, gas has made the market forces so overwhelming, at least in those places such as the U.S. where gas is astonishingly abundant, that even government likely can’t come to the rescue of nuclear power. Could that have something to do with the abject failure of the 2005 Energy Policy Act’s loan guarantee provisions, which have not worked for renewables any better than they have worked for nukes? Indeed, the threat of gas is at least as potentially toxic for many wind and solar projects as it is for nuclear and coal new build. \* In Georgia, the Southern Company is facing what looks like growing problems with its Vogtle project, which aims for two new nuclear units using the unproven but promising Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design. With its federal loan in jeopardy (Southern says it can go ahead without taxpayer funds) and the project running behind schedule and over budget, the Atlanta-based utility now faces lawsuits brought by the reactor vendor and the construction contractor Shaw Group. The amount in dispute, some $29 million, is tiny compared to the multi-billion-dollar price tag for the project. But it may be revealing of ruptures in the deal. Robert Marritz, an energy lawyer and veteran industry observer, publisher of ElectricityPolicy.com, commented that “the very filing of a lawsuit at this stage of the first nuclear plant construction in decades is stunning, reflecting stresses in a relationship that should, one would think, be contained and resolved rather than boiling over into public view.” Indeed, the parties are also engaged in a larger, perhaps nastier, dispute involving $800 million that has not gotten much public exposure. And that’s real money. \* Moving to California, the long-running saga of Edison International’s San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS, how’s that for an inept acronym?) continues, with little clarity in sight. The plant has been out of service since January as a result of unexpected and still unexplained tube wear in the plant’s steam generators. According to Bloomberg New Energy Finance, the outage is costing the utility about $1.5 million a day just in lost revenue. The cost to the state in jeopardized reliability hasn’t been calculated, although Edison has started up mothballed gas capacity to fill the supply gap. There is no firm date for restart at the nuclear plant. In the meantime, the California Public Utilities Commission is planning a formal investigation of the outage and Edison’s response, but recently decided to delay that until the utility files a legally-required report with the CPUC November 1. CPUC President Mike Peevey is a former executive with the Los Angeles-based utility.

#### Gas destroys nuclear – more predictable, cheaper, and faster

Smith 12 (Rebecca, Staff Writer, “Cheap Natural Gas Unplugs U.S. Nuclear-Power Revival,” 3-15, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304459804577281490129153610.html)

What killed the revival wasn't last year's nuclear accident in Japan, nor was it a soft economy that dented demand for electricity. Rather, a shale-gas boom flooded the U.S. market with cheap natural gas, offering utilities a cheaper, less risky alternative to nuclear technology. "It's killed off new coal and now it's killing off new nuclear," says David Crane, chief executive of NRG Energy Inc., NRG +3.58% a power-generation company based in Princeton, N.J. "Gas has come along at just the right time to upset everything." Across the country, utilities are turning to natural gas to generate electricity, with 258 plants expected to be built from 2011 through 2015, federal statistics indicate. Not only are gas-fired plants faster to build than reactors, they are much less expensive. The U.S. Energy Information Administration says it costs about $978 per kilowatt of capacity to build and fuel a big gas-fired power plant, compared with $5,339 per kilowatt for a nuclear plant. Already, the inexpensive natural gas is putting downward pressure on electricity costs for consumers and businesses. The EIA has forecast that the nation will add 222 gigawatts of generating capacity between 2010 and 2035—equivalent to one-fifth of the current U.S. capacity. The biggest chunk of that addition—58%—will be fired by natural gas, it said, followed by renewable sources, including hydropower, at 31%, then coal at 8% and nuclear power at 4%. "What utility doesn't want cheap fuel?" says Steve Piper, associate director of energy fundamentals at SNL Financial, a research company. He predicts natural gas will remain the "default fuel" for as long as gas production remains high and prices stay low.

## Grid 2NC

### Military Backup 2NC

#### In house mitigation efforts solve

Aimone 9-12 (Dr. Michael, Director of Business Enterprise Integration – Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), “Statement Before the House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies,” 2012, http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony%20-%20Aimone.pdf)

Chairman Lungren and distinguished Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I was asked to address the question of how the Department of Defense (DoD) would operate during a significant outage of the commercial electric power grid. Although today’s hearing is focused on the prospect of an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) event, such an event is only one scenario for a grid outage. DoD is heavily dependent on the commercial electric power grid. The Department has two closely coordinated sets of activities that focus on the need to maintain critical mission activities in the event of a commercial grid outage. One set of activities, led by DoD’s office of homeland defense, is part of the Department’s explicit “mission assurance strategy.” The other set of activities, focused on the Department’s fixed installations and led by its Installations and Environment office, falls under DoD’s “facility energy strategy.” Mission Assurance Strategy The Department has long had a major focus on mitigating risks to high priority DoD facilities and infrastructure and the critical global missions they support. Toward that end, DoD recently adopted an explicit Mission Assurance Strategy, which is focused on ensuring operational continuity in an all-hazard threat environment. This strategy entails a two-track approach. Track I includes "in-house" mitigation efforts-- activities that the Department can execute largely on its own. A key element is DoD’s Defense Critical Industry Program (DCIP)—an integrated risk management program designed to secure critical assets, infrastructure and key resources for our nation. DoD and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) work closely together as part of DCIP. Under Track I of the Mission Assurance Strategy, DCIP will continue to update the list of DoD's most critical assets and target them for special mitigation efforts through DoD’s budget and other internal processes. Track II of our Mission Assurance Strategy tackles the many challenges to DoD mission execution that require external collaboration with partners such as the Department of Energy (DOE), DHS and industry. Given that DoD mission execution relies heavily upon the energy surety of the communities surrounding our installations, Defense Industrial Base facilities spread across entire regions, and on private sector infrastructure that will collapse without electricity, this two-track approach can help **meet the challenges to DoD mission assurance that lie far beyond our military bases**.

### Grid Safe Now 2NC

#### Grids resilient – backup solves

Wood 12 -- Senior Communications Advisor at Business Roundtable (Carter, 8/2/12, "The grid: After India, America? No, but still…" http://businessroundtable.org/blog/the-grid-after-india-america-no-but-still/)

A blackout of such scale could not happen in the United States. For one thing, we don't have 600 million people. And America's electrical grid is certainly much more resilient than the one in India, a still-developing country with ineffective governments. Still, as The Washington Post reports today, "Aging power grid on overload as U.S. demands more electricity." At CNBC, Jim Cramer asked Thomas F. Farrell II, Chairman, President & CEO of Dominion Resources, about India. Could the same thing happen in the United States? Farrell responded: Our system has a lot more rigor to it and partly because we have reserve margins, meaning we have more power stations than we need to run at any particular moment in time, so that if a power station goes out, there's a back-up to help keep the grid stable. They don't have that much excess power in India, and when they get to the root cause, they'll probably find that was somewhere in there.

## Prices 2NC

### Nuclear Power – 2NC

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Nuclear power displaces the low prices of natural gas – causes spikes in consumers rate

Niemeyer 3/6/12 (Kyle, science writer for Ars Technica. He has B.S. and M.S. degrees in Aerospace Engineering from Case Western Reserve University, and is currently a Ph.D. candidate focusing on combustion modeling, "Chain reaction: the (slow) revival of US nuclear power," http://arstechnica.com/science/2012/03/chain-reaction-the-slow-revival-of-us-nuclear-power/)

Proponents for greater use of nuclear power often tout its low cost and zero emissions. According to the US Energy Information Administration, electricity from nuclear power will cost 11.39 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) in 2016. By comparison, conventional coal plants would generate electricity at 9.5 cents per kWh and onshore wind at 9.7 cents per kWh. Advanced natural gas plants offer by far the lowest cost at 6.6 cents per kWh.¶ However, it isn’t the cost of electricity that’s the problem. The largest barrier to more nuclear power plants may be the initial cost of construction. According to the report, the capital cost of nuclear plants always escalated over original estimates. The final costs of plants built through 1980—meaning all of them, since only one has been built since 1978—were on average 50 percent higher than comparable coal plants. This even includes retrofits to the coal plants to meet the higher emissions standards of the Clean Air Act.¶ Comparison of electricity costs from nuclear, coal, and gas from different studies.¶ Wikimedia Commons¶ Cost escalation remains an issue. A group of companies announced a two-reactor project in Texas in 2006, with an estimated cost of $5.2 billion. Three years later, the cost was revised to $10 billion, then $13 billion a few weeks later. The final estimate eventually reached $18.2 billion, over three times the original estimate. That's more expensive than an equivalently-sized natural gas plants, which also wouldn’t take nearly as long to build.¶ Considering the increasingly low price of electricity from natural gas, the report emphasized the need for some sort of carbon pricing to make nuclear attractive. Natural gas power plants are beginning to replace coal plants and they emit about half the greenhouse gases. Without a price on carbon dioxide emissions, nuclear power is actually more expensive than coal, oil, or natural gas, due to the massive upfront cost.

### Econ Collapse = War

#### Decline cause miscalculation and conflict – prefer statistically significant evidence

**Royal 10** (Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases**,** as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularlyduring periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate externalmilitary conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in theuse of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflictat systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### Turns Nuclear Power

#### Econ decline tanks nuke power – undermines necessary investment

Simpson 9 (Fiona, associate director of New York University's Center on International Cooperation, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, "The recession alone won't stop nuclear power's growth," http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-recession-alone-wont-stop-nuclear-powers-growth)

None of the IAEA's projections, however, account for the financial crisis, which may negatively impact the appeal of nuclear energy. Clearly, investors that need credit to build new nuclear plants face a great deal more uncertainty and difficulty securing financing. Such a situation, on the surface, would indicate that nuclear power will be less attractive to investors. The downturn also may reduce electricity demand and thus, potentially, make the need for new power plants less urgent.¶ At the same time, prices for natural gas and oil have fallen from earlier highs, increasing their attractiveness as energy sources (although the price of each has increased recently). Additionally, nuclear power plants have significant "front-loaded" costs, requiring much more investment at the outset than fossil-fuel burning plants, even if nuclear plants may eventually be cheaper to run. In light of the ongoing credit crunch, investors in countries that don't rely on state-owned enterprises may find the economic circumstances simply too difficult to justify an investment in nuclear power--especially if there's reliable (and domestic) access to natural gas, coal, or oil. One also would expect private lenders to shy from nuclear projects--both because they have less money to lend and because of nuclear power's history of cost overruns and delays. Finally, from the point of view of developing countries interested in nuclear power, multilateral development banks, such as the World Bank, tend to prohibit investment in new nuclear projects.

### Turns Heg

#### Turns leadership

Brzezinski 97 (Zbigniew, Former National Security Advisor – The Grand Chessboard, <http://book-case.kroupnov.ru/pages/library/Grand/part_1.htm>)

America’s economic dynamism provides the **necessary precondition** for the exercise of global primacy. Initially, immediately after World War II, America’s economy stood apart from all others, accounting alone for more than 50 percent of the world’s GNP. The economic recovery of Western Europe and Japan, followed by the wider phenomenon of Asia’s economic dynamism, meant that the American share of global GNP eventually had to shrink from the disproportionately high livels of the immediate postwar era. Nonetheless, by the time the subsequent Cold War had ended, America’s share of global GNP, and more specifically its share of the world’s manufacturing output, had stabilized at about 30 percent, a level that had been the norm for most of this century, apart from those exceptional years immediately after World War II. More important, America has maintained and has even widened its lead in exploiting the latest scientific breakthroughs for military purposes, thereby creating a technologically peerless military establishment, the only one with effective global reach. All the while, is has maintained its strong competitive advantage in the economically decisive information technologies. American mastery in the cutting-edge sectors of tomorrow’s economy suggests that American technological domination is not likely to be undone soon, especially given that in the economically decisive fields, Americans are maintaining or even widening their advantage in productivity over their Western European and Japanese rivals.

## Elections 1NR

### Impact – 2NC

#### DA outweighs –

#### It’s the only existential threat

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

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

#### Romney collapses leadership --- causes aggressive counterbalancing and alienates allies.

**Jentleson and Kupchan**, 8/30/**2012** (Bruce – professor of public policy and political science at Duke University, and Charles A. – professor of international affairs at Georgetown University and senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, A Dangerous Mind, Foreign Policy, p. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/30/a_dangerous_mind_mitt_romney?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full>)

It's not just Romney's positions on particular issues, however vague they may be, that are cause for concern. It's his core world view. Guided by a Republican Party virtually devoid of moderate centrists, Romney has embraced a global assessment distorted by ideological excess, pledged to wield power in a way that will leave the nation weakened and isolated, and demonstrated a failure to appreciate the key linkages between strength at home and influence abroad. Romney's view of the changing global landscape rests not on a sober assessment of the world that is emerging, but on the same neoconservative myths that led George W. Bush astray. Like Bush, Romney seems to fixate on the wrong threats -- and dangerously inflate them. He has, for example, identified Russia as America's chief geopolitical foe. But with the Cold War long over, terrorists still planning attacks against Americans, Iran seeking nuclear weapons, and China flexing its muscles, it is a flight of fancy to see Moscow as the nation's top threat. On Afghanistan, Romney regularly bashes Obama for his scheduled withdrawal of U.S. troops -- but without providing a clear rationale for extending the U.S. mission. Absent more capable partners in Afghanistan and cooperation from Pakistan, U.S. forces have limited ability to bring stability. To pretend otherwise is to fritter away American lives and resources. American forces have accomplished their main objective -- dismantling al Qaeda and eliminating Osama bin Laden; it is now up to local parties to find their way to peace. Good statecraft aims at the achievable, not impossible maximums. Romney's worldview also reveals a basic misunderstanding of the role of power in international affairs. The Republican Convention has been one long paean to American Exceptionalism. In speech after speech, Romney and his entourage invoke "leadership" and "resolve" as if all the United States has to do is take a stand and flex its muscles -- others will get in line, get out of the way, or pay the price. The United States unquestionably occupies a unique role in history of which it should be plenty proud, and American security and leadership ultimately rest on the nation's economic strength and military superiority. It's also true that most threats can best be met and problems best be solved if the U.S. plays a leadership role. Leadership, however, is much less about chest-thumping and self-congratulation than building partnerships and taking effective action with like-minded nations. Brute force and national self-confidence certainly have their place, but they can do more to invite resistance than acquiescence unless wielded with care. How the United States deploys its power and influence is key to its success as the world's dominant country. Judicious diplomacy, the fashioning of coalitions, engagement with international institutions -- these are the critical elements of good statecraft. These guidelines will preserve strong relations with traditional allies like Europe, Japan, and Israel. They also need to be applied when dealing with emerging powers like India, Turkey, and Brazil that are seeking partnerships with Washington based on mutuality and respect, not hierarchy and deference. And the Middle East is in the midst of political transformation, defying the neoconservative penchant for putting nations into neat democratic/nondemocratic, secular/Islamist, for us/against us camps. American diplomacy must adjust nimbly to a world in flux. It is worrying that Romney pledges to reinstate a foreign policy of reflexive toughness just four years after Bush's assertive unilateralism left the United States mired in Iraq and estranged from much of the world. In Tampa this week, Senator John McCain put his bellicosity on full display and Secretary Condoleezza Rice glossed over her role in the errant war in Iraq. The Republicans would do better to heed the wisdom of their own Robert Gates, the former defense secretary, who has warned that a president who wants to take the nation into another major war that is not absolutely necessary should "have his head examined." To be sure, Americans don't want a president who is too gun shy. Against bin Laden, in drone attacks on terrorists, in Libya, and in developing a NATO-backed missile defense system, President Obama has shown that he is not. Polls show that only 38 percent of Americans believe Romney would be a good commander-in-chief, indicative of anxiety that he and his team might be too trigger happy.

### Asian Engagement 2NC

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

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

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

### U – 2NC

#### Charlie Cook is the foremost expert on American politics

Milbank 10/25/06 (Dana, Wash Post, "When It Comes to Politics, Charlie Cook Has the Prophecy Market Cornered," http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/24/AR2006102401248\_pf.html)

**The pharaoh had Joseph. The Greeks had the Oracle at Delphi. Washington has Charlie Cook.**¶Please tell us, Seer of Future Congresses, how many seats the Democrats will pick up in the House on Election Day.¶ "Twenty to 35," Cook answers.¶ And how about in the Senate, OProphet on the Potomac?¶ "At least four," the man with the crystal ball says. "Most likely five or six."¶ What fate does the seer see for Sen. George Allen (R-Va.)?¶ "He wins ugly, but he wins," Cook divines.¶ And, pray tell, how are the planets aligning for Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.)?¶ "Gone," he decrees.¶ The midterm elections are two weeks away, but the powerful cannot wait that long to learn of the outcome. And so they call in Cook, who, for a fee of $5,000 to $20,000, gives his audiences the (very) early returns.¶ Last week he spoke to pharmaceutical and insurance groups. On Monday, he flew to Las Vegas and back to talk to the American Beverage Association. Later this week it's American Express and a hedge fund in New York and the paper industry in Georgia. Yesterday found Cook at a breakfast with the DLA Piper law firm, lunch with automobile manufacturers and dinner in Boston with a corporate housing group.¶ All are looking for the same thing: next month's election returns. And Cook has them. "Senators Santorum in Pennsylvania and Mike DeWine in Ohio are pretty much done," he told the Piper audience at the Willard hotel. And the lifelines of Sens. Conrad Burns (R-Mont.) and Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.) aren't looking any longer. "I'd be surprised if any of those four can survive," Cook informed the crowd of lobbyists, diplomats and journalists.¶ The firm's representatives treated their visiting sage with great deference. James Blanchard, a former Michigan governor, introduced him as "**a renowned expert**." Former defense secretary Bill Cohen read Cook's credentials to the audience: "**one of the best political handicappers . . . the Picasso of election analysis**."¶ "He's hot," observed Rosemary Freeman, one of the event coordinators.¶ That's not the first description that comes to mind for Cook, who entered the ballroom lugging an overstuffed canvas bag, a torn, padded envelope and an overflowing blue file folder. Chubby and partial to big eyeglasses, he had the tail of his tie tucked into his shirt. He planted his Starbucks venti caffe latte on the head table, where he was joined by the Canadian ambassador and a former NATO secretary general.¶ Cook's well-rehearsed speech includes a reference to his posterior, an allusion to the movie "Young Frankenstein," and a tortured metaphor involving storms and levees to compare the 2006 election to the one in 1994. "The wave is bigger, but there are fewer structures on the beach," he forecast.¶ Cook is not the boldest of election prognosticators (that honor goes to Stuart Rothenberg), nor the most telegenic (washingtonpost.com's Chris Cillizza gets the nod there), **but he is surely the most prominent**. On contract with NBC, he was on "Meet the Press" on Sunday and taped segments for the "Today Show" and "NBC Nightly News." He commissions his own poll, and his column appears once a week in the National Journal. A Nexis search finds 873 mentions in the past 60 days for him and his company, the Cook Political Report.¶ And while he's not always on the mark (he admits to having "tread marks on my forehead" after understating the Republican gains in '94) he's close enough that **nobody challenges his forecasts**. "I'm not as much of an expert as he is, so I have to defer to him," said Dick Gephardt, a former House Democratic leader, after Cook's talk to the Piper firm.

#### 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.

#### Bickers-Berry model is flawed - doesn't assume a variety of factors and has limited predictive power

Dolan 8/22/12 (Eric, "Election model with 100% success rate for past 30 years predicts Romney victory," http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2012/08/22/election-model-with-100-success-rate-predicts-romney-victory/)

Although their model correctly predicted all presidential elections since 1980, Bickers and Berry acknowledged some factors not considered by their analysis could swing the election. In addition, changes in the economic health of the country from now until the election will alter the results of the model.¶ “As scholars and pundits well know, each election has unique elements that could lead one or more states to behave in ways in a particular election that the model is unable to correctly predict,” Berry said.¶ Berry and Bickers model did not account for elections before 1980 and — like any model — it is has limited predictive power. But the election model strongly suggests that the economy is the driving force behind a presidential candidate’s success or failure.

#### Obama will win – Intrade says so

Intrade 10/5/12 ("Barack Obama to be re-elected President in 2012," http://www.intrade.com/v4/markets/contract/?contractId=743474)

Barack Obama to be re-elected President in 2012
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#### Intrade is the best political predictor of election results

CNBC 8 ("CNBC Features Intrade - Cashing in on the election," 4/25, http://www.intrade.com/news/news\_256.html)

"It's your money, your vote and... your trade," CNBC's Scott Cohn takes a look at Intrade's, real money, prediction markets that "some political experts swear by."¶The CNBC feature, aired on Monday 25th August 2008, discusses Intrade's ability to predict the outcome of the 2008 election.¶ "Trading volumes are five times higher this 2008 cycle, to-date, than for all of 2004" according to Intrade CEO, John Delaney. Justin Wolfers, of the Wharton School of Business (University of Pennsylvania), comments that small markets "end up yielding very accurate predictions."¶ The Wharton School of Business has found that Intrade has a margin of error of 1-1.5%. This margin of error is approximately half that of comparable Gallup Polls which has been a benchmark of accuracy in predicting the outcome of US presidential elections for many years.¶ Can the Intrade crowd predict the election? Some say volumes are too small, others say it predicted 50 states correctly in 2004 and with over $100m traded on US Politics this election cycle so far "maybe, these virtual crowds really are wise."¶ Absolute accuracy aside, **Intrade seems to predict better than many others** and gives a real-time snapshot of market sentiment 24/7.

### Nuclear Power 2NC

#### 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.

#### Women –

#### A) They oppose nuclear power.

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

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

#### B) They swing the election.

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

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

#### Massive public opposition to nuclear power

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

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

### Nuclear Power – Link Turns the Case

#### 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."

### Nuclear Power – DOD Link

#### 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.

### Small Modular Reactors – Link Turns Case

#### 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.

### Nuclear Power – Expensive

#### Nuclear power is expensive --- unexpected costs and inflation.

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

While the nuclear industry in the United States has seen continued improvement in operating performance over time, it remains uncompetitive with coal and natural gas on price. This cost differential is primarily driven by high capital costs and long construction times, often more than 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, nuclear power plants, on average, wind up costing three times more to build than original estimates suggest. Inflation, especially in the more nuclear-powered 1970s, played some role in the problem of ballooning costs. But when a project takes more than a decade to complete, labor and capital costs can grow in unexpected ways as well.

### DOD Answers

#### 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."

### Magnitsky 2NC

#### 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.

#### START collapse causes extinction

**Collins and Rojansky**, 8/18/**2010** (James – director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, ex-US ambassador to the Russian Federation, and Matthew – deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program, Why Russia Matters, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/08/18/why\_Russia\_matters)

Russia's nukes are still an existential threat. Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons in stockpile and hundreds still on hair-trigger alert aimed at U.S. cities. This threat will not go away on its own; cutting down the arsenal will require direct, bilateral arms control talks between Russia and the United States. New START, the strategic nuclear weapons treaty now up for debate in the Senate, is the latest in a long line of bilateral arms control agreements between the countries dating back to the height of the Cold War. To this day, it remains the only mechanism granting U.S. inspectors access to secret Russian nuclear sites. The original START agreement was essential for reining in the runaway Cold War nuclear buildup, and New START promises to cut deployed strategic arsenals by a further 30 percent from a current limit of 2,200 to 1,550 on each side. Even more, President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, have agreed to a long-term goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. But they can only do that by working together.

# Round 4 vs Houston AR (Wind CFIUS)

## Offcase 1NC

### 1NC

#### Obama will win now 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.

#### 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

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

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

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

#### Obama 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

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a **devastating nuclear attack** on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East **without resorting to nuclear weapons** is a 21st-century nightmare. **All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship** stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### 1NC

**“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.

**“On” means in contact with and links “restrictions” only to energy production**

**Graham 16** (Arthur Butler, “Brief for Appellants – Wilson v. Dorflinger & Sons”, Court of Appeals – State of New York, Reg. 108, Fol. 387, 1916, p. 11-12)

The Standard Dictionary defines the word “on” as follows: “In or into such a position with reference to something, as a vehicle, a table, or a stage, as to be in contact with and supported by it; in a position, state, or condition of adherence; as, he go on before the wagon had fully stopped.”¶ In Webster’s International Dictionary, we find as follows: “on—The General signification of “on” is situation, motivation, motion, or condition with respect to contact or support beneath as (1) at or in contact with, the surface or upper part of a thing, and supported by it; placed or lying in contact with the surface; as, the book lies on the table, which stands on the floor of a house on an island.” It is submitted that an elevator is not operated on streets or on highways, as a car, truck or wagon is operated, and that by the use of the word “on” the Legislature intended to include only those appliances therein enumerated, namely, cars, trucks, and wagons. An elevator is not operated on anything, but is operated in or inside a shaft, and is controlled by guides, which deprive the operator of the power to change the course of the lift from right to left. Clearly the Legislature intended to include in Group 41, only those cars, trucks and wagons whose direction and guidance are controlled by the operator, in whatever direction he may deem advisable.

#### “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 ---**

**1. 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**

**2. Ground --- energy-specific restriction good is core ground --- they steal links to politics, biz con, prices, regulation CPs and other generics --- crushes fairness**

### 1NC

#### Electricity prices are declining

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

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

#### 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 both the economy and military power

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

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

#### 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

#### Text: The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States should grant regulatory waivers that exempt foreign companies investing in wind power from all CFIUS reviews except ones where the only factor is national security. CFIUS should summarize the decision in an annual agency publication in the Federal Register.

#### -- It competes –

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### – It solves –

#### **Waivers solves the whole case and avoids elections**

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

B. Other discretionary policy rationales for waiver in the current administrative climate Administrative discretion, in the form of exceptions and waivers, is a necessary modality of agency decisionmaking in implementing regulations. Recent developments in the nature of regulation and administrative law are likely to increase "the need for a more active and more principled exceptions process in all regula- tory areas.',54 The necessity and likely increased presence of flexibility is not solely attributable to market-based efficiency considerations. Institutional limitations, the historical broadening of regulation's subject matter, decisionmaking costs associated with oversight and judicial review, and adaptability to a rapidly changing economy have also led to a need for **flexibility in the form of waiver or exceptions**. First, administrative remedies for correcting the errors and injustice of universal rules are often institutionally insufficient. Aman draws an analogy between administrative equity and the traditional role of equity courts. The Chancery dispensed justice against the king.'55 Many Chancery cases arose when the petitioner could obtain no effective remedy at common law.'56 Similarly, the need for equity and other forms of administrative discretion arises when a petitioner has no adequate remedy by recourse to the administrative law mechanisms of participation in a rulemaking proceeding or pre- or post-enforcement judicial review. When a petitioner seeks judicial review challenging application of a rule as unreasonable, the probability of winning on the merits is slight.'57 Courts generally consider whether a regulatory program advances the general scope and purpose of a statute, not its individual impact: "courts will not substitute their judgment for that of an administrator.'"58 Because the probabilities of succeeding on the merits are very low, many appellants raise procedural issues designed to delay implementation of a regulation. FERC's PURPA regulations, for example, were delayed for nearly three years as various parties sought review in the D.C. Circuit and, ultimately, the Supreme Court.59 Flexibility in the implementation of regulation would allow regulated entities to **delay application of specific rules** when appropriate to the specific circumstances and thus, if the flexibility is pervasive, may eliminate the need for **costly procedural challenges** to delay application of substantive regulations.' 6 Second, administrative discretion is particularly attractive when an agency's regulatory jurisdiction extends to **broad subject matters or numerous and diverse regulated entities**. Since the 1960s and 1970s, regulatory programs have moved away from the "single industry model," especially in the areas of health, safety, and environmental regulation. Today's regulation is more diffuse with respect to the industries and subject matters regulated.'16 Since PURPA was enacted, for example, FERC, which once regulated relatively homogeneous investor- owned and municipal utilities, has asserted jurisdiction over investment groups and limited partnerships, generating companies (known as "independent power producers"), engineering, operating, and maintenance companies, waste man- agement companies, and project lessees. PURPA's QF scheme has required FERC's staff to address new, unfamiliar technologies. Broad regulatory tasks have led to an increased need for regulatory fine tuning. As Aman observes, "[A]dopting a general rule followed by a series of exceptions that shape the rule as more knowledge is acquired may be the most sensible way to carry out an extraordinarily difficult regulatory task.'162 Third, as the New Deal understanding of delegation to agency-as-expert wanes, there is a growing recognition that agency decisions are not value neutral but rather are pervasively political. 163 With the decline of the agency-as-expert model,64 the breadth and depth of congressional oversight has increased. Congressional oversight, however, makes a waiver process and other discretionary mechanisms **attractive to regulators**, because it is difficult to amend or replace a regulation through the highly visible, broadly participatory process of rulemaking. FERC's initial PURPA rules were the subject of congressional oversight hearings in 1982.165 More recently, FERC's controversial rulemaking to restructure the natural gas industry, Order No. 636, was the subject of a heated oversight hearing in 1992.166 Attempts to revise FERC's PURPA rules in any nontrivial manner would be likely to raise concerns from many in the utility industry, and thus would probably not escape similar congressional scrutiny. A flexible, discretionary regulatory system, which provides for waivers or exceptions, could assist FERC in achieving its regulatory project at low political costs. Fourth, court-imposed requirements on rulemaking procedures make it a less attractive methodology for making policy. Professor Peter Schuck observes: Changes in administrative law and many proposals for reform increasingly favor policy development through rules and more formal, judicial-type rulemaking procedures. If those trends persist, as appears likely, administrative techniques will be needed that encourage flexible accommodations to diverse and complex conditions within an in- creasingly rule governed system. A properly structured exceptions process might ad- dress that need.67 Thus, one reason for increased reliance on discretionary regulatory processes may be the increased burdens on rulemaking: exceptions and waivers, like other adjudi- cative mechanisms, have lower visibility and greater freedom from outside controls, judicial and otherwise, than rulemaking. 168 Professor Richard Pierce, for example, has argued that judicial review has encouraged FERC to use adjudication rather than rulemaking in the electricity context. 169 The administrative flexibility provided by waiver may assist FERC in pursuing its statutory purposes in adjudicative pro- ceedings, free of the burdens that judicial review imposes upon rulemaking. Fifth, regulation by rule may be slow to adapt to rapidly developing technologies and quickly changing circumstances in the global economy. The procedural requirements and political costs of rulemaking make it an unwieldy mechanism for adaptation to rapid change or experimentation with new regulatory policies. FERC, for example, has made few changes to the specific QF criteria contained in its PURPA regulations since their promulgation in 1980, despite sweeping technological changes in the industry. An exceptions process, on the other hand, would provide the **flexibility** to develop new regulatory approaches and experimental techniques in a manner adaptable to market realities. In this sense, the discretionary implementation of regulations provides a viable alternative to the rigidities of command and control regulation.

#### Annual publications avoids every solvency deficit

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

Second, to the extent adjudicative waivers remain a primary vehicle for policymaking, FERC should summarize these proceedings in an **annual publication**. FERC's adjudicative waiver decisions, reported in the FERC reporters, are not systematically indexed in a manner that allows the public to observe how a particular regulation is applied.20' Annual summary and publication would make FERC's waivers more visible to **other regulators** in the executive branch (e.g., DOE, EPA, the White House), congressional oversight committees, regulated constituents, and the general public.22 Increased congressional oversight may lead to explicit statutory standards governing issuance of waivers, or to a statu- tory requirement that FERC use rulemaking to develop waiver standards.

#### The internal net-benefit is APA –

#### CP’s process violates the APA and undermines administrative law --- perm doesn’t solve because it acts in accordance with legislation

**Anthony 92** (Robert A., Foundation Professor of Law – George Mason University School of Law, “Interpretive Rules, Policy Statements, Guidances, Manuals, And The Like -- Should Federal Agencies Use Them To Bind The Public?”, Duke Law Journal, June, 41 Duke L.J. 1311, Lexis)

With one exception, the answer to the question in the title is "no." To use such nonlegislative documents to bind the public violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and dishonors our system of limited government. This is true whether the agency attempts to bind the public as a legal matter or as a practical matter. [1](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n1" \t "_self) An agency may not make binding law except in accordance with the authorities and procedures established by Congress. To make binding law through actions in the nature of rulemaking, the agency must use legislative rules, which ordinarily must be made in accordance with the notice-and-comment procedures specified by section 553 of the APA. [2](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n2" \t "_self)  [\*1313]  The sole category of exceptions -- where an agency may permissibly attempt to make a substantive nonlegislative rulemaking document binding on private parties -- is for interpretive rules. [3](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n3" \t "_self) These are rules that interpret statutory language which has some tangible meaning, rather than empty or vague language like "fair and equitable" or "in the public interest." [4](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n4" \t "_self) An agency may nonlegislatively announce or act upon an interpretation that it intends to enforce in a binding way, so long as it stays within the fair intendment of the statute and does not add substantive content of its own. [5](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n5" \t "_self) Because Congress has already acted legislatively, the agency need not exercise its own delegated legislative authority. Its attempts to enforce an interpretation can be viewed as simply implementing existing positive law previously laid down by Congress. As a  [\*1314]  practical matter, the agency in this way gives the interpretation a binding effect. [6](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n6" \t "_self) The same is true where the agency interprets its own previously promulgated legislative rules. By contrast, when it does not merely interpret, but sets forth onto new substantive ground through rules that it will make binding, the agency must observe the legislative processes laid down by Congress. [7](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n7" \t "_self) That is, when an agency uses rules to set forth new policies that will bind the public, it must promulgate them in the form of legislative rules. The statutory procedures for developing legislative rules serve values that have deep importance for a fair and effective administrative process and indeed for the maintenance of a democratic system of limited government. [8](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n8" \t "_self)  [\*1315]  Except to the extent that they interpret specific statutory or regulatory language, then, nonlegislative rules like policy statements, guidances, manuals and memoranda should not be used to bind the public. [9](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb" \l "n9" \t "_self) While these nonlegislative rules by definition cannot legally bind, agencies often inappropriately issue them with the intent or effect of imposing a practical binding norm upon the regulated or benefited public. Such use of nonlegislative policy documents is the

capital problem addressed by this Article.

#### Its unique --- nonlegislative guidance is limited now --- but the CP spills over

**Kalen 8** (Sam, Visiting Assistant Professor – Penn State University, “The Transformation of Modern Administrative Law: Changing Administrations and Environmental Guidance Documents”, Ecology Law Quarterly, 35 Ecology L.Q. 657, Lexis)

Since 2000, the D.C. Circuit's decisions have become less predictable. In 2000, the court sent a strong message to agencies that increased reliance on guidance documents might prove problematic. It delivered this message in Appalachian Power Co. v. EPA, where the court held that it could review and vacate a CAA guidance document, because the agency had failed to follow APA notice-and-comment rulemaking. [79](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=74ac310076c537f12e8efe5a5d3fc51f&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAA&_md5=93e9632651372cfab6b3ead4cfe76412&focBudTerms=The+phenomenon+we+see+in+this+case+is+familiar.+Congress+passes+a+broadly+&focBudSel=all#n79) One commentator at the time predicted that life after Appalachian Power could prove interesting, as the court suggested that a host of EPA guidance documents might succumb to the same fate. [80](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=74ac310076c537f12e8efe5a5d3fc51f&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAA&_md5=93e9632651372cfab6b3ead4cfe76412&focBudTerms=The+phenomenon+we+see+in+this+case+is+familiar.+Congress+passes+a+broadly+&focBudSel=all#n80) Appalachian Power involved EPA's issuance of one of many guidance documents necessary to help inform the administration of the CAA. In 1992, EPA issued regulations requiring that certain air permits contain requirements for "periodic monitoring" of emissions. [81](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=74ac310076c537f12e8efe5a5d3fc51f&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAA&_md5=93e9632651372cfab6b3ead4cfe76412&focBudTerms=The+phenomenon+we+see+in+this+case+is+familiar.+Congress+passes+a+broadly+&focBudSel=all#n81) The regulations left a number of issues unresolved and created uncertainty about the insertion of periodic monitoring requirements in CAA permits. Released in 1998, EPA's "Periodic Monitoring Guidance" (PMG) document sought to address the ambiguities in  [\*679]  the 1992 regulations. [82](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=74ac310076c537f12e8efe5a5d3fc51f&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAA&_md5=93e9632651372cfab6b3ead4cfe76412&focBudTerms=The+phenomenon+we+see+in+this+case+is+familiar.+Congress+passes+a+broadly+&focBudSel=all#n82) Petitioners argued that EPA had impermissibly attempted to prescribe substantive rules through the guise of a guidance document, which had not been adopted in accordance with notice-and-comment rulemaking. [83](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=74ac310076c537f12e8efe5a5d3fc51f&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAA&_md5=93e9632651372cfab6b3ead4cfe76412&focBudTerms=The+phenomenon+we+see+in+this+case+is+familiar.+Congress+passes+a+broadly+&focBudSel=all#n83) EPA responded by objecting to any challenge, claiming that the court lacked jurisdiction to hear the case because the guidance document was not a final rule. [84](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=74ac310076c537f12e8efe5a5d3fc51f&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAA&_md5=93e9632651372cfab6b3ead4cfe76412&focBudTerms=The+phenomenon+we+see+in+this+case+is+familiar.+Congress+passes+a+broadly+&focBudSel=all#n84) Early in the opinion, Judge Randolph foreshadowed the tenor of the court's decision. Before discussing the merits, he observed:   The phenomenon we see in this case is familiar. Congress passes a broadly worded statute. The agency follows with regulations containing broad language, open-ended phrases, ambiguous standards and the like. Then as years pass, the agency issues circulars or guidance or memoranda, explaining, interpreting, defining and often expanding the commands in the regulations. One guidance document may yield another and then another and so on. Several words in a regulation may spawn hundreds of pages of text as the agency offers more and more detail regarding what its regulations demand of regulated entities. Law is made, without notice and comment, without public participation, and without publication in the Federal Register or the Code of Federal Regulations. [85](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=74ac310076c537f12e8efe5a5d3fc51f&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAA&_md5=93e9632651372cfab6b3ead4cfe76412&focBudTerms=The+phenomenon+we+see+in+this+case+is+familiar.+Congress+passes+a+broadly+&focBudSel=all#n85)

#### Administrative law hamstrings agency regulation of broadband --- CP’s key to expanded access

**Strauss 11** (Peter, Not David Paul, Betts Professor of Law – Columbia Law School, “The APA at 65- Is Reform Needed to Create Jobs, Promote Economic Growth and Reduce Costs?”, Congressional Documents and Publications, 2-28, Lexis)

As you may know, I have for the last forty years been a scholar of Administrative Law at Columbia Law School, now holding the Betts professorship; I am former General Counsel of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; was once a public member of the Administrative Conference of the United States and am now a Senior Fellow of the Conference; and I am a former Chair of the American Bar Association's Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice Section. I am the senior author of one of the leading law school casebooks on administrative law, and have published, along with other books and dozens of law review articles on the subject, a monograph on Administrative Justice in the United States. Much of my work has concerned rulemaking, and that is the aspect of the APA that I want to address here today. June 11 will be its 65th birthday. It is certainly an appropriate time for reassessment. I start with the premise that some, although not all, rulemaking is beneficial, either because it fulfills basic human needs, such as having toilet facilities at work, or because it creates jobs, promotes growth and reduces costs. The issue is finding procedures that permit effective sifting of the wheat from the chaff. And that, in my judgment, warrants some reconsideration of our rulemaking procedures. Years ago, then-Professor Antonin Scalia reacted to the Supreme Court's decision in Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power v. Natural Resources Defense Council, n1, which I had had the privilege of briefing for the United States as General Counsel of the NRC. He had already been Chair of the Administrative Conference of the United States and Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Counsel; he would go on to distinguished careers on the DC Circuit and now on the Supreme Court. The Vermont Yankee's opinion very forcefully held that only Congress, or the agencies themselves, were in a position to elaborate the simple procedures of Section 553. Professor Scalia then foresaw the necessity of revising the one-size-fits-all character of Section 553 informal rulemaking. n2 Since then, both the courts and our Presidents - Republican and Democrat - have added complexities to rulemaking, described in the literature as "ossification." In effect they have created that varying pattern, but it lacks the stability and sense of a thoughtful legislative solution, and has itself imposed costs that both make government inefficient in doing what it should be doing, and invite evasion. As Judge Brett Kavanaugh of the D.C. Circuit recently wrote, Courts have incrementally expanded those APA procedural requirements well beyond what the text provides. And courts simultaneously have grown ... arbitrary-and-capricious review into a far more demanding test. Application of the beefed-up arbitrary-and-capricious test is inevitably if not inherently unpredictable -- so much so that, on occasion, the courts' arbitrary-and-capricious review itself appears arbitrary and capricious. Over time, those ... decisions have gradually transformed rulemaking -- whether regulatory or deregulatory rulemaking -- from the simple and speedy practice contemplated by the APA into a laborious, seemingly never-ending process. The judicially created obstacle course can hinder Executive Branch agencies from rapidly and effectively responding to changing or emerging issues within their authority, such as consumer access to broadband, or effectuating policy or philosophical changes in the Executive's approach to the subject matter at hand. The trend has not been good as a jurisprudential matter, and it continues to have significant practical consequences for the operation of the Federal Government and those affected by federal regulation and deregulation. n3

#### That solves disease spread and bioterrorism

**Mackenzie 3** (John and Peter Yellowlees, Professors of Microbiology and Parasitology – University of Queensland, “Telehealth Responses to Bio-Terrorism and Emerging Infections”, Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare, 9(Suppl. 2), p. 80-81)

The advent in February and March 2003 of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)1–5 on two continents, and its rapid spread by aeroplane travel, has highlighted the issue of emerging diseases. These are defined as new infectious diseases, or reincarnations of old diseases which are increasing in incidence or in geographical distribution. Fig 1 shows examples of emerging viral diseases in South East Asia and the western Pacific. These diseases are of huge economic importance (see Table 1). The cost of the SARS outbreak, for example, amounts to billions of US dollars. Much has been made of the possibility of the use of diseases such as anthrax, bubonic plague and the Ebola virus as weapons of mass destruction. From a health perspective, bioterrorism and its effects are not dissimilar to those of emerging infectious diseases, although they are even harder to predict. Such use of a biological agent could put hundreds of thousands, or possibly millions, of people at risk. Health systems in the past have been set up on a country-bycountry basis, with only the World Health Organization (WHO) taking a global overview. Consequently, there is a lack of collaborative effort between countries, as well as a lack of interconnectedness and technical consistency within broadband communications systems internationally. The example of SARS With any emerging infection, it is crucial to detect the outbreak as soon as possible after the first case, so that there is an early opportunity for control. The WHO has a Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network, which is essentially a network of networks. It represents a partnership of over 100 institutions which can mobilize and pool resources, using a combination of email and Websites, in order to identify emerging infections as early as possible anywhere in the world. Once a new infection has been identified, a WHO field team is sent to the country concerned to provide technical assistance to help manage it as rapidly and efficiently as possible. In the SARS outbreak this network was involved at an early stage and ultimately field teams were sent to five countries to assist. When SARS was detected, additional virtual networks were set up to link groups of experts around the world. These were: (1) A virtual network for SARS aetiology. This involved 13 laboratories in nine countries, daily telephone conferences and a secure Website for data sharing. It led to the identification of the SARS corona virus. (2) A virtual network of SARS clinicians. This involved 50 clinicians in 14 countries in twice-weekly telephone conferences; these focused on identifying cases and developing infection control guidelines. (3) A virtual network of SARS epidemiologists. This involved 32 epidemiologists from 11 institutions in daily telephone conferences and the provision of data on a secure Website to examine public health responses. (4) A SARS modelling group. This was set up to try to predict future directions and options, and involved 10 institutions connecting to a secure Website. (5) The global WHO senior management group. This group met by telephone conference twice a week and oversaw the production of 18 travel recommendations. (6) The communication group. This focused on communication both internally and externally,much of which was via the WHO Website, which received 10 million ‘hits’ per day at one stage. During the SARS epidemic there were 14 press releases, 13 press conferences, numerous interviews and up to 3500 press stories per day. The major lessons learned as a result of the SARS epidemic concerned three main areas5: (1) Communication. Communication was between the WHO and other countries, as well as direct to the public and the media, and used a number of technologies, especially the Internet. Telephone conferencing proved to be difficult, particularly with the large groups of experts involved, as was the organization and scheduling of the various expert groups. (2) Evidence-based action. An efficient alert and response system was set up, to enable rapid sharing of data and information around the world, but evidence was developed ‘on the run’ and somewhat different approaches to the management of SARS were ultimately used in different countries2,3. (3) Global partnerships. It was clear that no country could manage the disease alone, and that all countries needed help and assistance, as well as resources, from elsewhere. The WHO had a unique role, as it had technical, neutral, privileged access to all countries. In the United States, interstate highways comprise only 1% of the total road and street mileage, but carry 21% of the total traffic. They allow rapid transportation, in the same way that we now need to have rapid global information movement. It is necessary to create broadband international health communications expert networks that can be available at the point of need and which have both preventive and treatment focuses to deliver care, and improve health outcomes and safety 6–8. From a personnel perspective, such networks will have to be multidisciplinary, with representation from health and social services, government, and infrastructure and emergency services, with specific groups being set up to manage specific situations such as occurred with SARS. There is a need, however, for them to be organized in advance, for coordination to be improved, and for the people involved to have advance training and understanding of their roles, so that they do not have to be extemporized, in an ad hoc manner, as occurred with the SARS outbreak. Such networks will be able to serve as virtual think tanks, and will be able to review the best available evidence and provide this knowledge to countries that require it. Had these networks been available before the SARS outbreak, for instance, it might have been easier for countries such as China, Hong Kong and Canada to learn more effectively from each other. There would also have been fewer jurisdictional or cross-border issues and potentially better health outcomes for all groups.

#### Retaliation causes nuclear war --- quick containment’s key

**Conley 3** (Lieutenant Colonel Harry W., Chief of the System Analysis Branch – Headquarters Air Combat Command, “Not with Impunity: Assessing US Policy for Retaliating to a Chemical or Biological Attack”, Air & Space Power Journal, Spring, http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj03/spr03/conley.html)

The number of American casualties suffered due to a WMD attack may well be the most important variablein determining the nature of the US reprisal. A key question here is how many Americans would have to be killed to prompt a massive response by the United States. The bombing of marines in Lebanon, the Oklahoma City bombing, and the downing of Pan Am Flight 103 each resulted in a casualty count of roughly the same magnitude (150–300 deaths). Although these events caused anger and a desire for retaliation among the American public, they prompted no serious call for massive or nuclear retaliation. The body count from a single biological attack could easily be one or two orders of magnitude higher than the casualties caused by these events. Using the rule of proportionality as a guide, one could justifiably debate whether the United States should use massive force in responding to an event that resulted in only a few thousand deaths. However, what if the casualty count was around 300,000? Such an unthinkable result from a single CBW incident is not beyond the realm of possibility: “According to the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment, 100 kg of anthrax spores delivered by an efficient aerosol generator on a large urban target would be between two and six times as lethal as a one megaton thermo-nuclear bomb.”46 Would the deaths of 300,000 Americans be enough to trigger a nuclear response? In this case, proportionality does not rule out the use of nuclear weapons. Besides simply the total number of casualties, the types of casualties- predominantly military versus civilian- will also affect the nature and scope of the US reprisal action. Military combat entails known risks, and the emotions resulting from a significant number of military casualties are not likely to be as forceful as they would be if the attack were against civilians. World War II provides perhaps the best examples for the kind of event or circumstance that would have to take place to trigger a nuclear response. A CBW event that produced a shock and death toll roughly equivalent to those arising from the attack on Pearl Harbor might be sufficient to prompt a nuclear retaliation. President Harry Truman’s decision to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki- based upon a calculation that up to one million casualties might be incurred in an invasion of the Japanese homeland47- is an example of the kind of thought process that would have to occur prior to a nuclear response to a CBW event. Victor Utgoff suggests that “if nuclear retaliation is seen at the time to offer the best prospects for suppressing further CB attacks and speeding the defeat of the aggressor, and if the original attacks had caused severe damage that had outraged American or allied publics, nuclear retaliation would be more than just a possibility, whatever promises had been made.”48

## Economy Adv 1NC

### Nat Gas

#### Nat gas prevents wind development

Dumaine 12 -- senior editor-at-large @ CNNMoney (Brian, 4/17/12, "Will gas crowd out wind and solar?" http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/04/17/yergin-gas-solar-wind/?iid=HP\_LN)

Fracking technology has given the U.S. a 100-year supply of cheap natural gas. What's its impact on coal, nuclear, wind, and solar power? Inexpensive natural gas is transforming the competitive economics of electric power generation in the U.S. Coal plants today generate more than 40% of our electricity. Yet coal plant construction is grinding to a halt: first, because of environmental reasons and second, because the economics of natural gas are so compelling. It is being championed by many environmentalists as a good substitute for coal because it is cleaner and emits about 50% less carbon dioxide. Nuclear power now generates 20% of our electricity, but the plants are getting old and will need to be replaced. What will replace them? Only a few nuclear plants are being built in the U.S. right now. The economics of building nuclear are challenging -- it's much more expensive than natural gas. Isn't the worry now that cheap natural gas might also crowd out wind and solar? Yes. The debate is over whether natural gas is a bridge fuel to buy time while renewables develop or whether it will itself be a permanent, major source of electricity. What do you think? Over the past year the debate has moved beyond the idea of gas as a bridge fuel to what gas means to U.S. manufacturing and job creation and how it will make the U.S. more globally competitive as an energy exporter. The President's State of the Union speech was remarkable in the way it wrapped the shale gas boom into his economic policies and job creation. I believe natural gas in the years ahead is going to be the default fuel for new electrical generation. Power demand is going to go up 15% to 20% in the U.S. over this decade because of the increasing electrification of our society -- everything from iPads to electric Nissan Leafs. Utilities will need a predictable source of fuel in volume to meet that demand, and natural gas best fits that description. And that won't make the environmental community happy? Well, natural gas may be a relatively clean hydrocarbon, but it's still a hydrocarbon. So wind and solar will have a hard time competing? Remember that wind and solar account for only 3% of our electric power, whereas natural gas is 23%, and its share will go up fast. Most of that 3% is wind. Natural gas has a new role as the partner of renewables, providing power when the wind is not blowing and the sun is not shining. Will solar scale? Solar is still under 1% of U.S. electric generation, and even though its costs have come down dramatically, they must come down a lot more. Solar is generally much more expensive than coal and natural gas. You have to remember that energy is a huge, capital-intensive business, and it takes a very long time for new technologies to scale. The euphoria that comes out of Silicon Valley when you see how quickly a Twitter or a YouTube can emerge doesn't apply to the energy industry.

### 1NC Trade War D

#### 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.

### 1NC Trade War AC

#### 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.

### **No War 1NC**

#### **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

### Econ – No War

#### 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).

### Econ Resilient

#### -- Economy is resilient

#### Behravesh 06 (Nariman, most accurate economist tracked by USA Today and chief global economist and executive vice president for Global Insight, Newsweek, “The Great Shock Absorber; Good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility have strengthened the global economy's 'immune system.'” 10-15-2006, www.newsweek.com/id/47483)

The U.S. and global economies were able to withstand three body blows in 2005--one of the worst tsunamis on record (which struck at the very end of 2004), one of the worst hurricanes on record and the highest energy prices after Hurricane Katrina--without missing a beat. This resilience was especially remarkable in the case of the United States, which since 2000 has been able to shrug off the biggest stock-market drop since the 1930s, a major terrorist attack, corporate scandals and war. Does this mean that recessions are a relic of the past? No, but recent events do suggest that the global economy's "immune system" is now strong enough to absorb shocks that 25 years ago would probably have triggered a downturn. In fact, over the past two decades, recessions have not disappeared, but have become considerably milder in many parts of the world. What explains this enhanced recession resistance? The answer: a combination of good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility. Since the mid-1980s, central banks worldwide have had great success in taming inflation. This has meant that long-term interest rates are at levels not seen in more than 40 years. A low-inflation and low-interest-rate environment is especially conducive to sustained, robust growth. Moreover, central bankers have avoided some of the policy mistakes of the earlier oil shocks (in the mid-1970s and early 1980s), during which they typically did too much too late, and exacerbated the ensuing recessions. Even more important, in recent years the Fed has been particularly adept at crisis management, aggressively cutting interest rates in response to stock-market crashes, terrorist attacks and weakness in the economy. The benign inflationary picture has also benefited from increasing competitive pressures, both worldwide (thanks to globalization and the rise of Asia as a manufacturing juggernaut) and domestically (thanks to technology and deregulation). Since the late 1970s, the United States, the United Kingdom and a handful of other countries have been especially aggressive in deregulating their financial and industrial sectors. This has greatly increased the flexibility of their economies and reduced their vulnerability to inflationary shocks. Looking ahead, what all this means is that a global or U.S. recession will likely be avoided in 2006, and probably in 2007 as well. Whether the current expansion will be able to break the record set in the 1990s for longevity will depend on the ability of central banks to keep the inflation dragon at bay and to avoid policy mistakes. The prospects look good. Inflation is likely to remain a low-level threat for some time, and Ben Bernanke, the incoming chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, spent much of his academic career studying the past mistakes of the Fed and has vowed not to repeat them. At the same time, no single shock will likely be big enough to derail the expansion. What if oil prices rise to $80 or $90 a barrel? Most estimates suggest that growth would be cut by about 1 percent--not good, but no recession. What if U.S. house prices fall by 5 percent in 2006 (an extreme assumption, given that house prices haven't fallen nationally in any given year during the past four decades)? Economic growth would slow by about 0.5 percent to 1 percent. What about another terrorist attack? Here the scenarios can be pretty scary, but an attack on the order of 9/11 or the Madrid or London bombings would probably have an even smaller impact on overall GDP growth.

## Relations 1NC

### Superficial Friendship 1NC

#### 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.

### 1NC Irreversible

#### 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.

### Emissions Declining 1NC

#### Status quo solves – emissions are declining

Levi 9-25 (Michael, David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment – CFR, “Why Have U.S. Carbon Dioxide Emissions Plummeted?,” Council on Foreign Relations, 2012, http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/09/25/why-have-u-s-carbon-dioxide-emissions-plummeted/)

U.S. carbon dioxide emissions for January-May are down six percent from 2011 to 2012. Headlines have highlighted the fact that emissions from January-March hit a twenty year low. What explains the shift? That question has been the subject of intense debate. John Hanger argues that 77 percent of that decline can be attributed to the shift from coal to gas. The folks over at CO2Scorecard, looking at January-March data, put that number at a more modest 21 percent. These are drastically different figures. What number should we believe? Part of the discrepancy comes from looking at different time periods. January-March emissions were affected more by the warm winter than April-May ones were. That makes sense because January-March is part of the winter. April-May emissions were affected more by rock bottom natural gas prices than January-March ones were. That makes sense because it was April-May when rock bottom (i.e. sub-two-dollars wellhead) natural gas prices prevailed. Let’s focus on the full January-May span, since it’s now the longest period for which we have 2011 and 2012 data, and do the analysis for ourselves. First the basics: Carbon dioxide emissions fell from 2,303 metric tons (Mt) in 2011 to 2,158 Mt in 2012, a drop of 145 Mt. (To keep things simple, the January-May time period is implicit in all this.) The basic story is that emissions from coal consumption plummeted by 132 Mt. Falling oil emissions chipped in another 18 Mt. Natural gas emissions were nearly flat; they were actually down 5 Mt. This would seem to suggest that natural gas played little role in falling emissions. Instead, it appears to suggest, reduced demand for coal is what did the trick. This’s roughly the intuition behind the conclusion from CO2Scorecard that natural gas has played a modest role in the U.S. emissions decline. Hanger contests this by making three basic points. First, he notes, “about 85% (132 of 144 million tons) of the 2012 U.S. Carbon emission decline is a product of falling emissions from coal.” Second, he argues, the decline in emissions from coal are “almost entirely as a result of more gas displacing coal generation this year. Indeed, coal’s electricity generation market share fell from 42% for all of 2011 to 32% in April and 34% in May.” Third, he observes, “Electricity demand is down 2% in the first 5 months of 2012 compared to 2011 so that is a small reason for declining emissions and probably explains about 10% of the 132 million ton decline of coal emissions.” Hanger puts these together with a few other estimates to come to his conclusion that 77 percent of the emissions decline is due to gas.

### No Impact 1NC

#### No impact to warming

Idso and Idso 11 (Craig D., Founder and Chairman of the Board – Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and Sherwood B., President – Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path,” February, http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/ prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf)

As presently constituted, earth’s atmosphere contains just slightly less than 400 ppm of the colorless and odorless gas we call carbon dioxide or CO2. That’s only four-hundredths of one percent. Consequently, even if the air's CO2 concentration was tripled, carbon dioxide would still comprise only a little over one tenth of one percent of the air we breathe, which is far less than what wafted through earth’s atmosphere eons ago, when the planet was a virtual garden place. Nevertheless, a small increase in this minuscule amount of CO2 is frequently predicted to produce a suite of dire environmental consequences, including dangerous global warming, catastrophic sea level rise, reduced agricultural output, and the destruction of many natural ecosystems, as well as dramatic increases in extreme weather phenomena, such as droughts, floods and hurricanes. As strange as it may seem, these frightening future scenarios are derived from a single source of information: the ever-evolving computer-driven climate models that presume to reduce the important physical, chemical and biological processes that combine to determine the state of earth’s climate into a set of mathematical equations out of which their forecasts are produced. But do we really know what all of those complex and interacting processes are? And even if we did -- which we don't -- could we correctly reduce them into manageable computer code so as to produce reliable forecasts 50 or 100 years into the future? Some people answer these questions in the affirmative. However, as may be seen in the body of this report, real-world observations fail to confirm essentially all of the alarming predictions of significant increases in the frequency and severity of droughts, floods and hurricanes that climate models suggest should occur in response to a global warming of the magnitude that was experienced by the earth over the past two centuries as it gradually recovered from the much-lower-than-present temperatures characteristic of the depths of the Little Ice Age. And other observations have shown that the rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations associated with the development of the Industrial Revolution have actually been good for the planet, as they have significantly enhanced the plant productivity and vegetative water use efficiency of earth's natural and agro-ecosystems, leading to a significant "greening of the earth." In the pages that follow, we present this oft-neglected evidence via a review of the pertinent scientific literature. In the case of the biospheric benefits of atmospheric CO2 enrichment, we find that with more CO2 in the air, plants grow bigger and better in almost every conceivable way, and that they do it more efficiently, with respect to their utilization of valuable natural resources, and more effectively, in the face of environmental constraints. And when plants benefit, so do all of the animals and people that depend upon them for their sustenance. Likewise, in the case of climate model inadequacies, we reveal their many shortcomings via a comparison of their "doom and gloom" predictions with real-world observations. And this exercise reveals that even though the world has warmed substantially over the past century or more -- at a rate that is claimed by many to have been unprecedented over the past one to two millennia -- this report demonstrates that none of the environmental catastrophes that are predicted by climate alarmists to be produced by such a warming has ever come to pass. And this fact -- that there have been no significant increases in either the frequency or severity of droughts, floods or hurricanes over the past two centuries or more of global warming -- poses an important question. What should be easier to predict: the effects of global warming on extreme weather events or the effects of elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations on global temperature? The first part of this question should, in principle, be answerable; for it is well defined in terms of the small number of known factors likely to play a role in linking the independent variable (global warming) with the specified weather phenomena (droughts, floods and hurricanes). The latter part of the question, on the other hand, is ill-defined and possibly even unanswerable; for there are many factors -- physical, chemical and biological -- that could well be involved in linking CO2 (or causing it not to be linked) to global temperature. If, then, today's climate models cannot correctly predict what should be relatively easy for them to correctly predict (the effect of global warming on extreme weather events), why should we believe what they say about something infinitely more complex (the effect of a rise in the air’s CO2 content on mean global air temperature)? Clearly, we should pay the models no heed in the matter of future climate -- especially in terms of predictions based on the behavior of a non-meteorological parameter (CO2) -- until they can reproduce the climate of the past, based on the behavior of one of the most basic of all true meteorological parameters (temperature). And even if the models eventually solve this part of the problem, we should still reserve judgment on their forecasts of global warming; for there will yet be a vast gulf between where they will be at that time and where they will have to go to be able to meet the much greater challenge to which they aspire

### No Resource Wars 1NC

#### **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 Renewables

#### 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.

## Waiver CP 2NC

### Perm Do Both – 2NC

#### Links to politics/elections – includes Presidential action to change energy restrictions – anything less or sequenced is severance or intrinsic – voting issue because it destroys all ground.

[OPTIONAL]

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

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

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

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

-perm shows consistency with agency decision 🡪 accountability

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

-voters are dumb

-even if voters are smart, presidents are nifty

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

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

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

### Solvency – General – 2NC/Must Read

#### The practical effect is identical to binding law --- sends a signal of the plan and affected parties will comply

Hunnicutt 99 (James, JD – Boston College Law School, “Another Reason to Reform the Federal Regulatory System: Agencies' Treating Nonlegislative Rules as Binding Law”, Boston College Law Review, December, 41 B.C. L. Rev 153, Lexis)

Rules created without process--interpretative rules, general statements of policy, rules of agency organization and other nonlegislative rules--generally cannot have legally binding effects. [117](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n117" \t "_self) In administrative and judicial proceedings, nonlegislative rules are not treated as law, but as influential agency thought that may factor into a proceeding's outcome. [118](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n118" \t "_self)  
According to the courts, nonlegislative rules cannot be the decisive factor in a court proceeding or enforcement action. [119](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n119" \t "_self) For example, in 1986, in Thomas v. New York, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that a letter written by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency could not have binding legal effects because it had not been subjected to notice-and-comment process. [120](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n120" \t "_self) Several eastern states--including New York, national environmental groups, American citizens owning property in Canada and a Congressman brought suit against Lee Thomas, Administrator of the EPA under President Reagan in the early 1980s, for not revising certain air pollution standards. [121](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n121" \t "_self) Prior to Thomas taking the helm of the EPA, Douglas Costle had been the EPA's Administrator under President Carter. [122](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n122" \t "_self) Days before Reagan took office, Costle wrote a letter to then Secretary of State Edmund Muskie indicating that based on the findings of an official joint American-Canadian commission, he believed pollution emitted by the United States was responsible for causing acid rain in Canada. [123](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n123" \t "_self) According to the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act, if the Administrator of the EPA determines that American air pollution is causing significant harm in Canada, the EPA must order the states causing the acid rain to reduce  [\*172]  air pollution. [124](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n124" \t "_self) Then, those states would be obligated to intensify the regulation of the private parties contributing to air pollution within the states' jurisdictions. [125](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n125" \t "_self) The new Administrator, Thomas, chose to ignore the letter. [126](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n126" \t "_self) Intent on reducing acid rain in Canada, the plaintiffs brought suit, arguing that the letter obliged the EPA to force the generating states to revise their air pollution controls. [127](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n127" \t "_self) The court found that the letter constituted a rule within the meaning of the APA and that it had not been created as a result of any rulemaking process. [128](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n128" \t "_self) The court reasoned that the rule did not fall within any of the § 553(b)(A) exceptions because it affected individual rights and obligations by causing the states to heighten their regulations, which would result in the termination or restriction of numerous utilities and manufacturers. [129](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n129" \t "_self) Because the EPA had not followed the notice-and-comment process to create the rule, the EPA was not required to constrain its discretion by abiding by the letter. [130](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n130" \t "_self) The holding in Thomas evidences the principle that nonlegislative rules cannot have binding legal effects. [131](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n131" \t "_self) Reality, however, may differ from this principle. [132](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n132" \t "_self)   
B. *Agencies May Try to Apply Nonlegislative Rules as Law Against Private Parties*

When agencies treat a nonlegislativerule as law, thoserules will have the *practical effect* of binding law because people tend to acquiesce to that which the government informs them constitutes the law**.** [133](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n133" \t "_self)Most members of the public assume all agency rules constitute legitimate law, so they simply conform to all rules**.** 134By treating nonlegislative**[\*173]** rules as law, agencies can convince the public into following nonlegislative rules**.** [135](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n135" \t "_self)  
Occasionally, agencies rely upon nonlegislative rules for enforcement actions. [136](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n136" \t "_self) For example, in 1989 in United States v. Picciotto, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed a conviction based upon a nonlegislative rule because, by virtue of prescribing unlawful conduct, the rule imposed binding obligations on the public. [137](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n137" \t "_self) In 1981, Concepcion Picciotto began a six year, twenty-four-hour-per-day protest against nuclear war across the street from the White House in LaFayette Park. [138](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n138" \t "_self) In 1988 the Park Service issued an "additional condition" without performing any notice-and-comment procedures. [139](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n139" \t "_self) The additional condition prohibited the storage of property in LaFayette Park beyond that which is reasonably necessary to stage a twenty-four hour protest. [140](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n140" \t "_self) A Park Service police officer arrested Picciotto for violating the additional condition. [141](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n141" \t "_self) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia found her guilty and gave her a ten-day suspended prison sentence and six months unsupervised probation. [142](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n142" \t "_self) The Court of Appeals reversed the conviction, holding that the additional condition was substantive because it imposed obligations enforceable by criminal penalty, even though the Park Service had created it without notice-and-comment. [143](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n143" \t "_self) Although Picciotto won her appeal, this case demonstrates how agencies may create rules without notice-and-comment and treat them as binding law. [144](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n144" \t "_self) Besides initiating or threatening enforcement actions based on nonlegislative rules, agencies often rely on them to grant or deny applications and permits. [145](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n145" \t "_self) Similarly, federal  [\*174]  agencies can utilize nonlegislative rules to influence programs administered by the states. [146](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n146" \t "_self) As the trial court did in Picciotto, courts sometimes agree with the agencies and treat nonlegislative rules as binding law. [147](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n147" \t "_self) For instance, in 1993, in United States v. American National Red Cross, the District Court for the District of Columbia issued an injunction against the Red Cross, as part of a settlement, ordering the Red Cross to conform with all of the FDA's nonlegislative rules regarding blood. [148](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n148" \t "_self) Concerned with the integrity of the blood supply, the FDA passed numerous legislative and nonlegislative rules regarding how blood was to be handled. [149](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n149" \t "_self) Finding that the Red Cross had failed to meet the standards imposed by the FDA, the court specifically differentiated between the FDA's legislative rules and nonlegislative rules, and ordered the Red Cross to abide by both. [150](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n150" \t "_self) Therefore, rules created without notice-and-comment became binding law for the Red Cross. [151](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n151" \t "_self)  [\*175]  C. Analysis of the Legal Effects of Nonlegislative Rules The situation in Red Cross must be avoided because it robs the public of the opportunity to offer input on nonlegislative rules. [152](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n152" \t "_self) Because the Red Cross, the FDA and the court agreed to this settlement, the FDA's nonlegislative rules regarding blood bind the Red Cross, even though the rules create new law, impose legal obligations, have immediate effects, are not necessarily published in the Federal Register and may have significant effects on the public. [153](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n153" \t "_self) Moreover, the public lost the opportunity to participate in the creation of laws that will affect many people, including patients in need of blood transfusions. [154](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n154" \t "_self)  
When courts allow nonlegislative rules to have substantive effects on the public, they undermine the foundation underlying the APA and the notice-and-comment procedures therein. [155](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n155" \t "_self) Nonlegislative rules should not impose obligations or immediate effects on the public, and courts and agencies should strive to avoid using them in such a manner. Too often, nonlegislative rules have a practical binding legal effect because people do not realize those rules are not binding. The parties affected by the rules choose to acquiesce to the rules rather than attract agency attention, they lack the resources to challenge the rules, or they have already fought the rule in court and have given up on the appeals process. [156](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c0ec9a064fe216c19e67ece199b6b99b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=0e45446f6db42a782b549545db19451d" \l "n156" \t "_self)

### A2: Certainty/Uniformity – 2NC

#### This is 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.

#### \*Exemptions add clarity to rules – it’s more predictable

Sellers 84 (Jefferey M., Assistant Professor of Political Science – University of Southern California, “NOTE: Regulatory Values and the Exceptions Process,” Yale Law Journal, April, 93 Yale L.J. 938, Lexis)

Predictability enables regulated parties to adjust their behavior to accord with legal requirements. This value, which originates both from notions of fairness and the desire to promote regulatory objectives, is furthered through clarity and publicity of rules, and through the constancy of rules over time. n48 In current administrative law, requirements such as notice to the public and to specific parties, publication of criteria for decisions, and written records and explanations promote these ends. n49 At first blush, the most predictable rule would seem to be one applied strictly according to its own specific terms. But limited exercise of discretion in special cases; by adhering to the more general expectations inferred from the purposes of the rule or other rules, actually ensures that strict application of a rule will not upset the expectations of regulated parties. n50 An explicit exceptions process, moreover, can clarify an agency's intention to address special cases without any effect on the vast majority of more typical cases. n51 In fact, since an explicit mechanism spares rulemakers from addressing special cases in the rules themselves, it may permit rules that are clearer and easier to follow. n52 If an agency explicitly authorizes discretion in special cases but exercises that discretion in an otherwise dispensatory fashion, the difficulty of predicting what will be a special case persists. The safeguards that characterize an exceptions process mitigate this difficulty by better informing potential applicants to the exceptions process that they are eligible for relief. In addition, since courts are more likely to defer to reasoned, written decisions than to less formalized decisions, n53 an exceptions process helps to [\*950] shield parties from the consequences of unpredictable shifts in policy preference.

## Econ 2NC

### 2NC Nat Gas Wins

#### There’s already oversupply of wind and solar – natural gas still wins out

Hunt 12 -- President of Tech and Creative Labs, more than 30 years experience as a utility executive, state utility regulator and as a strategic energy consultant and for the last 20 years years, he has been a strategic energy strategy consultant serving as global division president for energy analytics and advisory services as Ventyx/Global Energy Advisors; and in Standard & Poor’s Regional and Energy Economics Group; Master’s Degree in Public Administration, University of Kansas (Gary, 7/10/12, "The Importance of Balancing Energy Economics for the Success of Sustainability," http://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/The-Importance-of-Balancing-Energy-Economics-for-the-Success-of-Sustainability.html)

The question is what will replace it? Environmental advocates hope it will be renewable wind and solar. We are certainly building plenty of it. But volatility happens and it does not spare the politically correct. Oversupply of photovoltaic panels and wind turbines from China flood world markets to suction up subsidies and feed in tariff supports to capture market share. Today we have two times more PV supply than demand and PV producers and wind manufacturers are feeling the pain. This market imbalance is rapidly bankrupting the solar and wind producers we are counting on to meet the next wave of growth in the energy business cycle. And then there is this. Despite environment policies opposing fossil fuels, the least cost, best fit, most sustainable alternative to coal is not solar and wind but natural gas fired generation. That is why we are fighting over fracking because low gas prices force renewable energy to compete despite rules jury rigged to favour it.

### 2NC Trade War D

#### No trade war from tariffs – they only protect the solar industry

Haley 12

[George Haley,  Professor of Marketing at the University of New Haven and founding Director of the Center for International Industry Competitiveness, 6/19/12, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/usha-haley/the-case-for-us-tariffs-o_b_1605087.html>]

With the U.S. Commerce Department's preliminary decision in May to impose 31-percent anti-dumping tariffs on Chinese photovoltaic (PV) solar panels, some commentators have warned that this is the first shot in a job-killing trade war with China. Professed fears of a trade war are as predictable as night after day. Fortunately, the hand wringing is largely unnecessary. Prediction of a trade war is largely a dangerous myth. Historically, U.S.-China trade disputes follow a different pattern. In fact, China, while complaining loudly, tends to comply with trade-case findings rather than retaliating in response. Why? **Because Chinese trade-policy makers are rational political players**. They make decisions based on political and economic interests, including jobs and growth. They rarely suffer self-inflicted wounds (or even self-inflicted paper cuts). A trade war with China would hurt the U.S. but would **mortally wound China**. The U.S. market remains central to China's export-led development. In 2011 exports to the U.S. represented 21 percent of China's total exports and 8.3 percent of China's GDP. Conversely, exports to China represented 3.7 percent of the U.S.'s total exports and less than 0.5 percent of U.S. GDP. With European markets collapsing, China's dependence on the United States is increasing. China's solar-manufacturing industry relies especially heavily on foreign markets, including the US. Currently, Chinese solar-panel manufacturing capacity is 32 times greater than domestic consumption. As a result, China exports 95 percent of its production. U.S. anti-dumping tariffs will encourage domestic consumption in China, thereby reducing the growth in China's carbon footprint. China's need to export has led to the recent solar-trade dispute. Over the past seven years China has gone from a non-factor to the world's biggest player in the solar sector. Thanks to Chinese overproduction, prices for solar panels have plummeted. In an industry where prices dropped an average of 10 percent a year, prices suddenly fell 50 percent as Chinese firms jockeyed to grab market share. However, Chinese solar panels may not remain cheap for long. Our research, along with Chinese CEOs' statements, shows that Chinese solar manufacturers will raise prices after driving out U.S. manufacturers. As China's market position grew, American manufacturers suffered. Twelve American manufacturers have had significant layoffs or have shuttered completely. These manufacturing jobs that the U.S. is losing to China pay better and have three times greater ripple effects than installation jobs. Between 2010 and 2011 the U.S. went from a $540-million trade surplus with China in solar products to a $1.6-billion deficit. Chinese solar-panel exports rose nearly 1,000 percent. Simultaneously, Chinese imports of U.S. polysilicon dropped 20 percent as China ramped up domestic production. Under threat, SolarWorld, the largest U.S. solar manufacturer, filed a trade case alleging that the Chinese manufacturers received World-Trade-Organization-illegal subsidies and have sold their cells and panels below cost. Through Commerce's investigation and the U.S. debate, three interesting facts became apparent. First, a distinction exists between WTO-legal subsidies and WTO-illegal subsidies. WTO-legal subsidies include money that any foreign or domestic manufacturer can access, such as money SolarWorld received from the state of Oregon. WTO-illegal subsidies include money for domestic manufacturers, such as the $7 billion identified by the U.S. Department of Energy that went to Wuxi Suntech for exports. Second, the Chinese are not the low-cost manufacturers. Analysis of the U.S. and Chinese PV industry by the Energy Department's National Renewable Energy Laboratory found that the Chinese operate at a 5-percent cost disadvantage, once shipping costs come into the mix. Finally, even with government subsidies, Chinese solar panel firms hemorrhaged cash. For example, earlier this month, LDK Solar received an emergency Rmb2bn loan from state-owned banks to fund operations and keep the firm out of bankruptcy. In fact, Commerce deemed both Trina and Wuxi Suntech uncreditworthy for large portions of the years since 2005. Unsurprisingly, after SolarWorld filed its case, Chinese companies filed their own trade complaints against six U.S. state-level renewable-energy incentive programs. China's Ministry of Commerce is investigating and will announce its findings shortly. But even if China imposes its own tariffs, a trade war will not ensue. The U.S. tariffs may, in fact, signal the beginning of a sustainable solar industry. The tariffs will likely push some bankrupt Chinese firms out of the market. The Commerce decision also gives the U.S. government the opportunity to urge China to end trade-distorting subsidies. In the past, when the U.S. government has threatened actions, China has brought its practices into line with the rules more often than not. Simply put, rather than retreat, Commerce's decision provides a chance for the U.S. government to move forward. As its officials develop policy with a newly assertive China, the U.S. needs to assert its rights under the trade laws, as well. The U.S. enforcing its trade laws does not translate to "starting a trade war." China knows these laws well and also knows that following the rules, rather than reckless retaliation, best serves its interests.

#### This takes out both advantages – means China won’t retaliate with polysilicon restrictions to gut our advantage

#### Retaliation is just tit-for-tat – doesn’t spillover to a larger trade war

Mufson 12 -- Washington Post's energy correspondent (Steven, 5/25/12, "China asks WTO to block U.S. tariffs," http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/2012/05/25/gJQA7rNiqU\_story.html)

The Chinese appeal to the WTO takes aim at the U.S. Commerce Department, which has recently imposed stiff duties on Chinese products. The department has cited Chinese subsidies, especially those funneled through state-owned enterprises, that it says give Chinese firms an edge over American competitors. But U.S. experts said Beijing did not appear intent on triggering an all-out trade war. That would be an unappealing prospect at a time when China’s economy is showing signs of slowing down. Rather than resorting to retaliatory measures, China’s Ministry of Commerce on Friday asked for WTO consultations, the first stage of a formal dispute process. The products covered are worth a total of $7.29 billion, a substantial figure for the companies involved but only a small fraction of the trade between the two nations. “From the broad strategic standpoint, it’s more of the tit-for-tatting that goes on with the U.S. and China in these trade barrier disputes,” said C. Fred Bergsten, head of the Peterson Institute. “I don’t think it’s anything like a trade war. At most, it is a skirmish over products that make up a tiny, tiny share of the trade between the two countries.”

### 2NC Trade War AC

#### You're not the only tariff

Kendall 12 -- Washington Monthly editorial assistant (Brent, 8/26/12, "Backdating of Tariff Fuels Fight Over Chinese Tires," http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444270404577609511581316168.html)

When a federal appeals court late last year struck down some U.S. tariffs on cheap Chinese imports, Congress acted with unusual swiftness. By the spring, a law was in place to nullify the decision and restore tariffs sought by U.S. manufacturers. One feature of the legislation was eye-catching: Congress made part of the law retroactive. The bill granted the Commerce Department new authority to levy tariffs and backdate them to 2006—even though the court had ruled the agency didn't possess that authority at the time. Now the backdating provision has set the stage for litigation that touches on constitutional questions debated since the 1790s and present-day trade disputes between the world's two largest economies. Importers and Chinese producers, supported in some cases by the Chinese government, are arguing that Congress can't rewrite history. "We think this case should be shocking to everyone," says Bryan Ganz, the former head of GPX International Tire Corp. The defunct family-owned U.S. business was hit with the tariffs and prevailed in the appeals court decision. "Once Congress retroactively changed the law, the whole complexion of this case changed," says Mr. Ganz. Mr. Ganz says he has run out of money to fund his case. His law firm, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP, is using funds from other clients including the Chinese government to challenge the constitutionality of the law's retroactive application before the U.S. Court of International Trade in New York, according to a lawyer at the firm. The decision could have a broad impact on tariffs ordered in recent years against roughly two dozen other types of Chinese products, including steel pipe, solar panels, wood flooring and kitchen shelving. The Constitution states plainly that Congress and the states can't enact ex post facto—or after the fact—laws. But the Supreme Court for more than 200 years has said that not all laws with retroactive effect are unconstitutional. The court has been particularly deferential to retroactive laws on civil matters such as national economic policy. "There are cases in which laws may justly, and for the benefit of the community, and also of individuals, relate to a time antecedent to their commencement," Justice Samuel Chase wrote in a seminal 1798 case, Calder v. Bull. Titan International Inc., TWI -0.89% a Quincy, Ill., maker of off-road tires that petitioned for the U.S. tariffs, says Congress acted properly to protect American jobs. Without the tariffs, "you'd have nobody in the U.S. today producing any kind of off-the-road tires," says Titan Chief Executive Maurice "Morry" Taylor Jr. Malden, Mass.-based GPX, which had employed 500 North American workers, filed for bankruptcy after the Commerce Department in 2008 began imposing two types of tariffs on off-road tires the company imported from its Chinese manufacturing plant. While GPX was sold off in pieces, it continued its legal challenge. In particular, it objected to paying countervailing duties that were imposed to offset the alleged unfair advantage of Chinese producers subsidized by their government. GPX said the Commerce Department couldn't apply such duties in a nonmarket economy such as Communist-run China. In December, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit agreed. The win wasn't going to bring GPX back to life, but Mr. Ganz says that he thought he'd at least recoup some of the money the court said GPX shouldn't have had to pay. Instead, he watched as the Obama administration pressed Congress to overturn the ruling, telling Capitol Hill leaders in a letter that a "level playing field" with trading partners was at risk. Both the Bush and Obama administrations have placed emphasis on using the anti-subsidy tariffs against Chinese goods, arguing that the other kind of tariff—the antidumping duty imposed on those who sell products below cost—isn't enough.

## Elections 1NR

### Impact – 2NC

#### DA outweighs –

#### It’s the only existential threat

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

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

#### Obama reelection is critical to a global climate deal

**Geman**, 1/5/**2012** (Ben, Report says global climate deal hinges on Obama reelection, The Hill, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202539-report-global-climate-deal-hinges-on-obama-reelection-)

Prospects for striking a binding global climate deal by 2015 are probably toast if President Obama loses in November. That’s among the conclusions in a wide-ranging, new climate and green energy outlook from banking giant HSBC’s research branch. A major outcome from the United Nations climate talks in December was a plan to craft a deal by 2015 — one that would include big, developing nations such as China — and have it come into force by 2020. But Obama’s main Republican White House rivals are critical of emissions limits and skeptical of climate science. HSBC predicts an international agreement by 2015 is highly unlikely if Obama loses the election. From their research note: [T]he prospects for a new global climate deal in 2015 depend considerably on the election of a pro-climate action president. The election of a President opposed to climate action will not only damage growth prospects for low-carbon solutions in the USA itself, but will make the hard task of negotiating a new global agreement by 2015 almost impossible.

#### 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.”

#### US/Russia relations is the critical internal link to global warming

**Light, Wong and Charap**, 6/30/**2009** (Andrew – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Julian – senior policy analyst at CAP, and Samuel – fellow at CAP, U.S.-Russia Climate and Energy Efficiency Cooperation: A Neglected Challenge, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/neglected\_challenge.html)

The summit between President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev in Moscow on July 6-8 comes in the middle of a packed international schedule of bilateral and multilateral meetings for the United States. on climate change. In the run up to the critical U.N. climate talks in Copenhagen at the end of this year, when the extension or successor to the existing Kyoto Protocol must be agreed upon, it is crucial that the United States and Russia—both major emitters of greenhouse gases and potentially leaders on this crucial issue—explore ways of working together to ensure a positive outcome at these talks. Enhancing cooperation on climate change and energy efficiency should be a major plank of U.S. Russia policy and should be discussed at the highest levels when President Obama meets with President Medvedev next week. Russia, like the United States, is a significant contributor to global warming. If the European Union is disaggregated Russia is the third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide behind the United States and China and still currently ahead of India. More importantly Russian per capita emissions are on the rise, and are projected at this point to approach America’s top rank as per capita emitter by 2030. Russia is also the third-largest consumer of energy and one of the world’s most energy-intensive economies. Making Russia a partner on these issues could be critical in order to **advance a sound global climate change agenda**.

#### 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.

### U – 2NC

#### Obama is going to win now – he still has the lead in the polls but Romney is keeping it close – the next 10 days of political events will determine if Romney can keep the level of support needed to win – that’s Cook

#### Charlie Cook is the foremost expert on American politics

Milbank 10/25/06 (Dana, Wash Post, "When It Comes to Politics, Charlie Cook Has the Prophecy Market Cornered," http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/24/AR2006102401248\_pf.html)

**The pharaoh had Joseph. The Greeks had the Oracle at Delphi. Washington has Charlie Cook.**¶Please tell us, Seer of Future Congresses, how many seats the Democrats will pick up in the House on Election Day.¶ "Twenty to 35," Cook answers.¶ And how about in the Senate, OProphet on the Potomac?¶ "At least four," the man with the crystal ball says. "Most likely five or six."¶ What fate does the seer see for Sen. George Allen (R-Va.)?¶ "He wins ugly, but he wins," Cook divines.¶ And, pray tell, how are the planets aligning for Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.)?¶ "Gone," he decrees.¶ The midterm elections are two weeks away, but the powerful cannot wait that long to learn of the outcome. And so they call in Cook, who, for a fee of $5,000 to $20,000, gives his audiences the (very) early returns.¶ Last week he spoke to pharmaceutical and insurance groups. On Monday, he flew to Las Vegas and back to talk to the American Beverage Association. Later this week it's American Express and a hedge fund in New York and the paper industry in Georgia. Yesterday found Cook at a breakfast with the DLA Piper law firm, lunch with automobile manufacturers and dinner in Boston with a corporate housing group.¶ All are looking for the same thing: next month's election returns. And Cook has them. "Senators Santorum in Pennsylvania and Mike DeWine in Ohio are pretty much done," he told the Piper audience at the Willard hotel. And the lifelines of Sens. Conrad Burns (R-Mont.) and Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.) aren't looking any longer. "I'd be surprised if any of those four can survive," Cook informed the crowd of lobbyists, diplomats and journalists.¶ The firm's representatives treated their visiting sage with great deference. James Blanchard, a former Michigan governor, introduced him as "**a renowned expert**." Former defense secretary Bill Cohen read Cook's credentials to the audience: "**one of the best political handicappers . . . the Picasso of election analysis**."¶ "He's hot," observed Rosemary Freeman, one of the event coordinators.¶ That's not the first description that comes to mind for Cook, who entered the ballroom lugging an overstuffed canvas bag, a torn, padded envelope and an overflowing blue file folder. Chubby and partial to big eyeglasses, he had the tail of his tie tucked into his shirt. He planted his Starbucks venti caffe latte on the head table, where he was joined by the Canadian ambassador and a former NATO secretary general.¶ Cook's well-rehearsed speech includes a reference to his posterior, an allusion to the movie "Young Frankenstein," and a tortured metaphor involving storms and levees to compare the 2006 election to the one in 1994. "The wave is bigger, but there are fewer structures on the beach," he forecast.¶ Cook is not the boldest of election prognosticators (that honor goes to Stuart Rothenberg), nor the most telegenic (washingtonpost.com's Chris Cillizza gets the nod there), **but he is surely the most prominent**. On contract with NBC, he was on "Meet the Press" on Sunday and taped segments for the "Today Show" and "NBC Nightly News." He commissions his own poll, and his column appears once a week in the National Journal. A Nexis search finds 873 mentions in the past 60 days for him and his company, the Cook Political Report.¶ And while he's not always on the mark (he admits to having "tread marks on my forehead" after understating the Republican gains in '94) he's close enough that **nobody challenges his forecasts**. "I'm not as much of an expert as he is, so I have to defer to him," said Dick Gephardt, a former House Democratic leader, after Cook's talk to the Piper firm.

#### Obama will win – Intrade says so

Intrade 10/5/12 ("Barack Obama to be re-elected President in 2012," http://www.intrade.com/v4/markets/contract/?contractId=743474)
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#### Intrade is the best political predictor of election results

CNBC 8 ("CNBC Features Intrade - Cashing in on the election," 4/25, http://www.intrade.com/news/news\_256.html)

"It's your money, your vote and... your trade," CNBC's Scott Cohn takes a look at Intrade's, real money, prediction markets that "some political experts swear by."¶The CNBC feature, aired on Monday 25th August 2008, discusses Intrade's ability to predict the outcome of the 2008 election.¶ "Trading volumes are five times higher this 2008 cycle, to-date, than for all of 2004" according to Intrade CEO, John Delaney. Justin Wolfers, of the Wharton School of Business (University of Pennsylvania), comments that small markets "end up yielding very accurate predictions."¶ The Wharton School of Business has found that Intrade has a margin of error of 1-1.5%. This margin of error is approximately half that of comparable Gallup Polls which has been a benchmark of accuracy in predicting the outcome of US presidential elections for many years.¶ Can the Intrade crowd predict the election? Some say volumes are too small, others say it predicted 50 states correctly in 2004 and with over $100m traded on US Politics this election cycle so far "maybe, these virtual crowds really are wise."¶ Absolute accuracy aside, **Intrade seems to predict better than many others** and gives a real-time snapshot of market sentiment 24/7.

#### 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.

### Link – 2NC

#### 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.

#### 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 Shield – Blame Booster

#### The link only goes one way –

#### A) Negativity bias.

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

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

#### B) Sleeper Effect.

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

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

### Link Booster – Incumbents

#### Link outweighs the turn --- it’s easier to get angry at Obama than excited.

**Blow**, 7/27/**2012** (Charles, Where’s the Outrage?, The New York Times, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/28/opinion/blow-wheres-the-outrage.html>)

Are too many Democratic voters sleepwalking away from our democracy this election cycle, not nearly outraged enough about Big Money’s undue influence and Republican state legislatures changing the voting rules? It seems so. A Gallup poll released this week found that: “Democrats are significantly less likely now (39 percent) than they were in the summers of 2004 and 2008 to say they are ‘more enthusiastic about voting than usual’ in the coming presidential election.” Republicans are more enthusiastic than they were before the last election. Some of that may be the effect of having a Democratic president in office; it’s sometimes easier to marshal anger against an incumbent than excitement for him. Whatever the reason, this lack of enthusiasm at this critical juncture in the election is disturbing for Democrats.

### 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.”

#### Obama gets the blame because of appointments.

**Greene**, March **1997**(Abner S., Associate Professor – Fordham University School of Law, Fidelity In Constitutional Theory: Fidelity As Translation: Discounting Accountability, Fordham Law Review, 65 Fordham L. Rev. 1489, p. Lexis)

It is hard to argue that accountability does not matter to American constitutional law, in both its affirmative and negative aspects. But accountability does not require that constitutional interpretation be tied either to science or politics (present or past) or that the President be at the top of a chain of command over agency policy-making. Constraints both past and present necessarily exist, and are not in danger of escaping. Regarding the past: We should not forget constraints of endogeneity and of reasoning. Judges in our system cannot help but be constrained, in this broad (and, yes, weak) way, by text, structure, and history. Judges live in our system and have been trained in it. And reasoning provides its own constraints. As a descriptive matter, it's not clear that the interpretation of the majestic and vague clauses - free speech, due process, equal protection, to name three - has been constrained in any stronger fashion than that provided by the constraints of endogeneity and reasoning. Regarding the present, and the presidency: Plenty of ballot box accountability remains even regarding independent agencies. They are created, dismantled, funded, and authorized to act through Acts of Congress that the President must either sign or see enacted over his veto. The agency commissioners are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (and must be so reappointed), and the President often has the statutory power to name and remove the agency chair. Further, as a matter of political reality, both executive and independent agencies often seek presidential support, whether the support comes in the form of information or congressional lobbying. 59

### 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.

#### Environmental issues will not swing voters.

**Zabarenko**, 9/5/**2012** (Deborah, A pale green tinge for U.S. presidential campaign, Reuters, p. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/05/us-usa-campaign-environment-idUSBRE8840NJ20120905)

The big question is whether any of their environmental rhetoric will matter when voters go to the polls. Despite withering temperatures and a widespread drought, the race for the White House barely has a tinge of green. "While this year's wild weather has caused alarm, it has so far not raised environmental issues on the public agenda," said Karlyn Bowman, who tracks public opinion at the pro-business American Enterprise Institute. "There's no evidence that it will be a big issue nationally." The environment trails far behind the economy and jobs as a pivotal concern for U.S. voters, which has been the case in the last few presidential elections, Bowman said.

### Jobs

Plan would only create jobs after the election – plus their evidence is in the context of Jobs cut by solar tariff – something they don’t affect

#### 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.

### Energy Policies Key

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 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.

#### Energy will play a huge role in the election.

New York Times, **9/13**/2012 (Fossil Fuel Industry Ads Dominate TV Campaign, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/14/us/politics/fossil-fuel-industry-opens-wallet-to-defeat-obama.html?pagewanted=all>)

The Times analysis shows that ads with energy themes have played an outsized role in the 2012 campaign season, with energy earning more frequent mentions than every other issue except jobs and the economy.

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

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

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

#### Economy is not key --- other issues can outweigh.

**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.

# Round 6 vs MSU GT
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#### Obama will win now 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

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a **devastating nuclear attack** on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East **without resorting to nuclear weapons** is a 21st-century nightmare. **All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship** stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### 1NC

#### Text: the fifty state governments of the United States should substantially increase financial support for fusion energy generation 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)

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.

### 1NC

#### Electricity prices are declining

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

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

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

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

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

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

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

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

#### Econ decline risks extinction

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

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

### 1NC

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

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

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

#### This causes planetary extinction—it divorces our relationship with the natural world and makes ecocide inevitable

Gottlieb 94 (Roger S. Gottlieb – Professor of Humanities at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Brandeis University, “Ethics and Trauma: Levinas, Feminism, and Deep Ecology,” Crosscurrents: A Journal of Religion and Intellectual Life, 1994, Summer, http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm)

Here I will at least begin in agreement with Levinas. As he rejects an ethics proceeding on the basis of self-interest, so I believe the anthropocentric perspectives of conservation or liberal environmentalism cannot take us far enough. Our relations with nonhuman nature are poisoned and not just because we have set up feedback loops that already lead to mass starvations, skyrocketing environmental disease rates, and devastation of natural resources. The problem with ecocide is not just that it hurts human beings. Our uncaring violence also violates the very ground of our being, our natural body, our home. Such violence is done not simply to the other – as if the rainforest, the river, the atmosphere, the species made extinct are totally different from ourselves. Rather, we have crucified ourselves**-in-relation-to-the-other, fracturing a mode of being** in which self and other can no more be conceived as fully in isolation from each other than can a mother and a nursing child. We are that child, and nonhuman nature is that mother. If this image seems too maudlin, let us remember that other lactating women can feed an infant, but we have only one earth mother. What moral stance will be shaped by our personal sense that we are poisoning ourselves, our environment, and so many kindred spirits of the air, water, and forests? To begin, we may see this tragic situation as setting the limits to Levinas's perspective. The other which is nonhuman nature is not simply known by a "trace," nor is it something of which all knowledge is necessarily instrumental. This other is inside us as well as outside us. We prove it with every breath we take, every bit of food we eat, every glass of water we drink. We do not have to find shadowy traces on or in the faces of trees or lakes, topsoil or air: we are made from them. Levinas denies this sense of connection with nature. Our "natural" side represents for him a threat of simple consumption or use of the other, a spontaneous response which must be obliterated by the power of ethics in general (and, for him in particular, Jewish religious law(23) ). A "natural" response lacks discipline; without the capacity to heed the call of the other, unable to sublate the self's egoism. Worship of nature would ultimately result in an "everything-is-permitted" mentality, a close relative of Nazism itself. For Levinas, to think of people as "natural" beings is to assimilate them to a totality, a category or species which makes no room for the kind of individuality required by ethics.(24) He refers to the "elemental" or the "there is" as unmanaged, unaltered, "natural" conditions or forces that are essentially alien to the categories and conditions of moral life.(25) One can only lament that Levinas has read nature -- as to some extent (despite his intentions) he has read selfhood -- through the lens of masculine culture. It is precisely our sense of belonging to nature as system, as interaction, as interdependence, which can provide the basis for an ethics appropriate to the trauma of ecocide. As cultural feminism sought to expand our sense of personal identity to a sense of inter-identification with the human other, so this ecological ethics would expand our personal and species sense of identity into an inter-identification with the natural world. Such a realization can lead us to an ethics appropriate to our time, a dimension of which has come to be known as "deep ecology."(26) For this ethics, we do not begin from the uniqueness of our human selfhood, existing against a taken-for-granted background of earth and sky. Nor is our body somehow irrelevant to ethical relations, with knowledge of it reduced always to tactics of domination. Our knowledge does not assimilate the other to the same, but reveals and furthers the continuing dance of interdependence. And our ethical motivation is neither rationalist system nor individualistic self-interest, but a sense of connection to all of life. The deep ecology sense of self-realization goes beyond the modern Western sense of "self" as an isolated ego striving for hedonistic gratification. . . . . Self, in this sense, is experienced as integrated with the whole of nature.(27) Having gained distance and sophistication of perception [from the development of science and political freedoms] we can turn and recognize who we have been all along. . . . we are our world knowing itself. We can relinquish our separateness. We can come home again -- and participate in our world in a richer, more responsible and poignantly beautiful way.(28) Ecological ways of knowing nature are necessarily participatory. [This] knowledge is ecological and plural, reflecting both the diversity of natural ecosystems and the diversity in cultures that nature-based living gives rise to. The recovery of the feminine principle is based on inclusiveness. It is a recovery in nature, woman and man of creative forms of being and perceiving. In nature it implies seeing nature as a live organism. In woman it implies seeing women as productive and active. Finally, in men the recovery of the feminine principle implies a relocation of action and activity to create life-enhancing, not life-reducing and life-threatening societies.(29) In this context, the knowing ego is not set against a world it seeks to control, but one of which it is a part. To continue the feminist perspective, the mother knows or seeks to know the child's needs. Does it make sense to think of her answering the call of the child in abstraction from such knowledge? Is such knowledge necessarily domination? Or is it essential to a project of care, respect and love, precisely because the knower has an intimate, emotional connection with the known?(30) Our ecological vision locates us in such close relation with our natural home that knowledge of it is knowledge of ourselves. And this is not, contrary to Levinas's fear, reducing the other to the same, but a celebration of a larger, more inclusive, and still complex and articulated self.(31) The noble and terrible burden of Levinas's individuated responsibility for sheer existence gives way to a different dream, a different prayer: Being rock, being gas, being mist, being Mind, Being the mesons traveling among the galaxies with the speed of light, You have come here, my beloved one. . . . You have manifested yourself as trees, as grass, as butterflies, as single-celled beings, and as chrysanthemums; but the eyes with which you looked at me this morning tell me you have never died.(32) In this prayer, we are, quite simply, all in it together. And, although this new ecological Holocaust -- this creation of planet Auschwitz – is under way, it is not yet final. We have time to step back from the brink, to repair our world. But **only if we see that world not as an other** across an irreducible gap of loneliness and unchosen obligation, but as a part of ourselves as we are part of it, to be redeemed not out of duty, but out of love**; neither for our selves nor for the other, but for us all**.

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

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

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

#### We’ll clarify.

#### -- Competes –

#### Tests “resolved”

**AHD 6** (American Heritage Dictionary, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

Resolve TRANSITIVE VERB:1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To cause (a person) to reach a decision. See synonyms at decide. 3. To decide or express by formal vote.

#### And “should”

**AHD** **92** (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language) (4ed, 1992); Pg. 1612

Should—1. Used to express obligation or duty: *You should send her a note*.

#### – Counterplans that test the resolution are key to predictable ground

#### -- Net-beneficial –

#### Environmental Impact Assessments solve the aff and avoid environmental consequences

Gilpin 2k (Dr. Alan, Commissioner of Inquiry for Environment and Planning with the New South Wales Government, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): Cutting Edge for the Twenty-first Century, p. 14-15)

Life cycle EIA is a procedure for evaluating the environmental impacts of a product, process, or activity, throughout its whole life cycle; a vertical exercise running from cradle to grave The main purposes of LEIA are: • to assess the environment effects of the retrieval and consumption of the raw materials and other inputs during the different life cycle phases of a product, process, or activity, including the fate of all pollutants and residuals; • to assess the disposal problem, if any, of the superseded process or activity; • to provide information useful for an aggregated EIA of products, processes and activities, throughout the life cycle; • to evaluate the environmental consequences of alternative processes and design concepts, permitting a comparison between products, processes, and activities. Each phase might be accorded a score on environmental index, for example, for: natural resources, raw materials, land use; emissions to air, water, and soil; noise; manufacturing procedures about economy, energy, work and public safety; waste handling; recycling, and ultimate disposal. A LEIA mends beyond the boundaries of responsibility of the individual company or producer, backwards and forwards, into matters entering the public domain, It goes beyond the realm of private ownership into the full social and resource implications of, say, car manufacture and ownership, including the disposal of car tyres, batteries, and abandoned vehicles. The principle could be applied as readily to household appliances, beverage containers, packaging materials, plants, plastics, steels, fuels, lubricants, detergents, cables, fast food, fertilizers, energy production, and major infrastructure developments.

#### EIA provide open public debate about the environment, providing a key global mechanism

Andrews 6 (Richard N.L, Thomas Willis Lambeth Distinguished Professor at the University of North Carolina, “Learning From History: US Environmental Politics, Policies, and the Common Good,” *Environment* Volume 48, Number 9, November 2006)

Most fundamentally, U.S. consumption of energy and material resources continued virtually unchecked, drawing on an increasingly global economy whose environmental and social costs elsewhere remained largely invisible to most U.S. consumers. As historically poorer countries— China in particular—began to adopt U.S. aspirations for material and energy consumption, the prospect was for continued increases in human impacts on natural processes and ecosystems rather than stabilization or reduction of them. In addition to its impacts on environmental outcomes, the environmental era also left an important political legacy. The distinctive positive element of this legacy was the democratization of information, access, and rights of challenge to governmental decisionmaking affecting the environment. Key examples included the Freedom of Information Act, NEPA's environmental impact statements, and statutory rights to sue both businesses and government agencies to enforce the environmental protection statutes. These policies did not fully or permanently neutralize the influence of entrenched commercial interests, but they did substantially open the process to other stakeholders' values, the full range of relevant information, and far more widespread and transparent public debate. Coupled with the concurrent Internet revolution in public access to information and organizational networks, the environmental era produced a powerful and enduring increase in the public's knowledge and its role in environmental decisions. This increase continues to spread worldwide, notwithstanding the resurgence in corporate power and influence that has also occurred. This political legacy did not, of course, automatically favor groups that identified themselves with the organized environmental protection movement. Environmental advocacy groups pioneered in its development and benefited from its initial successes, but over time these procedures proved equally open to groups representing the interests of property owners against environmental regulations, conservative law groups using the tactics of the "green" groups in pursuit of different outcomes, and even front groups for business interests. Nonetheless, by making all the impacts of proposed decisions more visible to everyone who might be affected, this increase in transparency and access marked one of the distinctive and enduring contributions of the environmental era, to environmental policy and to governance more generally.

#### This prevents planetary extinction from eco-collapse

Andrews 6 (Richard N.L, Thomas Willis Lambeth Distinguished Professor at the University of North Carolina, “Learning From History: US Environmental Politics, Policies, and the Common Good,” *Environment* Volume 48, Number 9, November 2006)

In 2005 the United Nation commissioned Millennium ecosystem assessment reported that over the past 50 years rapid and extensive change in human ecosystems has resulted in a substantial and largely irreversible loss in the diversity of life on Earth. More land has been converted to cropland since 1945 than in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries combined, and water withdrawals from rivers and lakes have doubled since 1960. Since 1750, atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, the major contributor to global warming, has increased, with 60 percent of that increase happening between 1959 and the present. Fifty percent of all the synthetic nitrogen fertilizer ever used has been applied since 1985; flows of biologically available nitrogen in terrestrial ecosystems have doubled since 1960 and may increase by thirds more by 2050. An estimated 10 to 30 percent of all mammal, bird, and amphibian species are currently threatened with extinction. These changes have contributed to substantial gains in human well-being and economic development at growing costs to the essential services that ecosystems provide to human societies; providing food, water, fuel, wood, and fiber, supporting; and regulating natural processes that are necessary for human life and health (nutrient cycling, soil formation, water purification, the climate system, and the control of disease organisms) and providing spiritual and recreational values. These damaging trends are substantially reducing the availability of these services for future use. U.S. environmental policies have been prominent causes of these damaging trends and must be part of any solution. Throughout American history, the United States' dominant policies have been to promote the economic exploitation of natural resources, first nationally and now globally. The United States has not been unique in this: European trade and colonization initiated these trends, and other governments have done likewise. But as the world's largest single market for material and energy resources—at least until 2005, when China surpassed it in total consumption—and a leading exporter of both production technologies and consumption lifestyles, the United States has had a prominent influence, and its policies are essential to any solution.

#### -- Plan drains capital – Energy production without federal environmental review stirs up the environmental lobby – Counterplan solves their link turns

O'Grady 12 (Mary Anastasia, an editor of the Wall Street Journal, M.B.A. in financial management from Pace University, “Obama's Keystone Delay Flouts the Law,” 1-23-12, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577172852629309954.html

Banana republics have trouble attracting capital because of a reputation for arbitrarily changing the rules whenever it suits the populist in power. With last week's decision to block TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline, President Obama stunned investors by demonstrating that he doesn't see anything wrong with the banana republic way of doing things. The administration seems to think that it can use environmental claptrap to convince the American public that it is behaving ethically and legally in denying the TransCanada permit, even after the company has spent $1.9 billion over 40 months carefully adhering to the federal regulatory process. And a lot of Americans will not have the time or inclination to get into the weeds on this issue. Yet what is unseen by the public is likely to be more dangerous to the well-being of the society than what is seen, as the 19th-century journalist and political philosopher Frédéric Bastiat famously warned. In this case, the unseen is the effect that Mr. Obama's unmitigated cynicism and abuse of power is likely to have on investors. Unlike the general public, those who have ready capital to deploy to infrastructure projects like Keystone will fully analyze this decision. Seeing how our president has behaved, they are not likely to come away feeling confident about the rule of law. To understand how Mr. Obama is thumbing his nose at the law, recall the State Department's decision in November to delay permit approval based on a complaint from the state of Nebraska about the pipeline route there. State had already issued three environmental impact statements over three years finding that there would be "no significant impact" on the environment from the pipeline. But as it prepared to issue its final ruling, the environmental lobby descended on the White House with protests. Within days, State announced that a rerouting in Nebraska was necessary, which implied yet another round of environmental impact studies. It was a "green" victory because it meant delaying the permitting at least another three years, not counting the inevitable litigation and notwithstanding State's forecast that it would be done in 15 months. It was an absurd proposition. Keystone XL will run more than 2,000 miles. The disputed segment is about 100 miles and by late November the company had already begun working with Nebraska on a rerouting plan. With some 20,000 new direct construction jobs and more than 100,000 indirect jobs along the pipeline route hanging in the balance, Republicans decided to give Mr. Obama a way out of the problem he faced of having to do another long, drawn-out environmental impact study. They attached a rider to the Dec. 23 payroll-tax bill that instructed the president to rule within 60 days on whether the oil pipeline crossing the U.S. border is in the national interest. In making the determination, the rider said, the president should consider factors like the economy, energy security, foreign policy, employment, trade and even, notably, the environment. For example, Mr. Obama could have said that oil from Canada's oil sands is bad for the global environment. Perhaps that's what he wanted to say. It is, after all, the position of some of his most generous campaign contributors. But with unemployment at 8.5%, Iran threatening to close off the Strait of Hormuz and Hugo Chávez jailing dissidents, denouncing Canadian energy isn't a winning campaign slogan. It may also be discriminatory, and thus a violation, under the North American Free Trade Agreement and U.S. membership in the World Trade Organization. Out of options, Mr. Obama concluded last week that it is not in the national interest to grant the permit because of the State Department's view that further environmental studies are required due to the Nebraska rerouting. It's a nice try. But it directly contravenes the rider, which specifically states that the one thing Mr. Obama need not concern himself about—indeed could not consider—is any new environmental impact studies.

## Development 1NC

### Heg D

#### Heg doesn’t prevent war

**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.

#### Heg doesn’t prevent conflict

Crawford 3 (Timothy W., Professor of Political Science – Boston College, Pivotal Deterrence: Third-Party Statecraft and the Pursuit of Peace, p. 209-210)

*Forward Engagement, Global Leadership, and U.S. Pivotal Deterrence*

As the preponderant power in a globalized and interdependent world, the United States—so we are told—must embrace "forward engagement" and "global leadership." Depending on one's preferred partisan formula, it must either "address problems early before they become crises," or "shape circumstances before crises emerge."9 In these slogans there is a strong whiff of an enduring nostrum. As an early twentieth century writer put it, "the secret of foreign policy" is that "a nation cannot be merely pas­sive ... a nation should in every line take the most vigorous initiative."10 Or, as President George W. Bush put it in September 2002, "In the world that we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of ac­tion."11 Those who trumpet such an activist posture tend only to see peaceful consequences resulting from forward engagement. For them "American power is now the linchpin of stability in every region, from Europe to Asia to the Persian Gulf to Latin America."12 They rarely concede that the strong prospect of U.S. involvement in regional conflicts may not always cause sta­bility but instead cause instability. But the incentives (if not the underlying motives) that lead some to aggress will often be shaped by optimism about outside involvement.13 We should not assume that the forces of globaliza­tion that justify U.S. activism and incline the international community toward intervention do not also play into the strategies of regional adver­saries. It is naive to think that they, with survival at stake, do not gird for war keenly aware of the opportunities as well as dangers posed by inter­vention by the United States or other outside actors. There is thus no reason to assume that forward U.S. engagement will re­inforce regional stability and promote peaceful change. Because the United States may significantly influence the outcome of many conflicts, that po­tential must be seen for what it is; something that, by looming so large, may encourage as well discourage revisionism. If the massive risks of running afoul of U.S. power are a deterrent "shaping" the intentions of some re­gional antagonists, the potential windfall of securing U.S. support will shape the intentions of others. Because the benefits of enlisting U.S. support in a war may be enormous, even the slim chance of doing so may goad a party to act provocatively, become inflexible in negotiations, or otherwise do things that make war likely. In sum, forward U.S. engagement may fuel disintegrative as well as integrative tendencies in world politics and "jiggle loose" as many deadly conflicts as it knits back together.

#### -- Heg is resilient

Wohlforth 7 (William, Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “Unipolar Stability”, Harvard International Review, Spring, http://hir.harvard.edu/articles/1611/3/)

US military forces are stretched thin, its budget and trade deficits are high, and the country continues to finance its profligate ways by borrowing from abroad—notably from the Chinese government. These developments have prompted many analysts to warn that the United States suffers from “imperial overstretch.” And if US power is overstretched now, the argument goes, unipolarity can hardly be sustainable for long. The problem with this argument is that it fails to distinguish between actual and latent power. One must be careful to take into account both the level of resources that can be mobilized and the degree to which a government actually tries to mobilize them. And how much a government asks of its public is partly a function of the severity of the challenges that it faces. Indeed, one can never know for sure what a state is capable of until it has been seriously challenged. Yale historian Paul Kennedy coined the term “imperial overstretch” to describe the situation in which a state’s actual and latent capabilities cannot possibly match its foreign policy commitments. This situation should be contrasted with what might be termed “self-inflicted overstretch”—a situation in which a state lacks the sufficient resources to meet its current foreign policy commitments in the short term, but has untapped latent power and readily available policy choices that it can use to draw on this power. This is arguably the situation that the United States is in today. But the US government has not attempted to extract more resources from its population to meet its foreign policy commitments. Instead, it has moved strongly in the opposite direction by slashing personal and corporate tax rates. Although it is fighting wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and claims to be fighting a global “war” on terrorism, the United States is not acting like a country under intense international pressure. Aside from the volunteer servicemen and women and their families, US citizens have not been asked to make sacrifices for the sake of national prosperity and security. The country could clearly devote a greater proportion of its economy to military spending: today it spends only about 4 percent of its GDP on the military, as compared to 7 to 14 percent during the peak years of the Cold War. It could also spend its military budget more efficiently, shifting resources from expensive weapons systems to boots on the ground. Even more radically, it could reinstitute military conscription, shifting resources from pay and benefits to training and equipping more soldiers. On the economic front, it could raise taxes in a number of ways, notably on fossil fuels, to put its fiscal house back in order. No one knows for sure what would happen if a US president undertook such drastic measures, but there is nothing in economics, political science, or history to suggest that such policies would be any less likely to succeed than China is to continue to grow rapidly for decades. Most of those who study US politics would argue that the likelihood and potential success of such power-generating policies depends on public support, which is a function of the public’s perception of a threat. And as unnerving as terrorism is, there is nothing like the threat of another hostile power rising up in opposition to the United States for mobilizing public support. With **latent power** in the picture, it becomes clear that unipolarity might have more built-in **self-reinforcing mechanisms** than many analysts realize. It is often noted that the rise of a peer competitor to the United States might be thwarted by the counterbalancing actions of neighboring powers. For example, China’s rise might push India and Japan closer to the United States—indeed, this has already happened to some extent. There is also the strong possibility that a peer rival that comes to be seen as a threat would create strong incentives for the United States to end its self-inflicted overstretch and **tap** potentially **large wellsprings of** latent **power**.

### Heg Unsustainable

#### Heg is unsustainable – rising powers, overstretch and loss of economic power

Layne 11 [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 unipolar exit: beyond the Pax Americana”, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 24:2, 149-164, Chetan]

In this article I challenge Brooks and Wohlforth. I show that the unipolar era already is visibly drawing to a close. Three main drivers explain the impending end of the Pax Americana. First, the rise of new great powers—especially China—is transforming the international system from unipolarity to multipolarity. Second, the United States is becoming the poster child for strategic over-extension, or as Paul Kennedy (1987) dubbed it, imperial overstretch. Third, the United States’ relative economic power is declining. In particular, mounting US fiscal problems and the dollar’s increasingly problematic role as the international financial system’s reserve currency are undermining US hegemony. To comprehend why the Pax Americana is ending we need to understand the linkages among these trends, and how each has feedback effects on the others. After examining how these trends undermine the Brooks and Wohlforth argument for unipolar stability and the durability of US hegemony, I conclude by arguing that over the next two decades the Pax Americana’s end presages dramatic changes in international politics—the outlines of which already are visible.

### Resource Wars

#### **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.

#### -- Resources are infinite

Simon 98 (Julian, Professor of Business Administration – University of Maryland and Advisory Board – Acton Institute, “The Ultimate Resource II: People, Materials, and the Environment, <http://www.juliansimon.com/writings/Ultimate_Resource/TINTRO.txt>)

There is an almost insuperable difficulty in the definition of available "copper," "oil," and so on, because there are many different grades of each resource in places that vary in difficulty of extracting the resource, and because (as seen in Table 2-1) the amounts at low concentrations (such as the quantities of metals on the sea bottom and in sea water) are extraordinarily large in contrast to the quantities we usually have in mind (the "proven reserves"). What's more, we constantly create new supplies of resources, in the sense of discovering them where they were thought not to exist. (In the past, the U.S. Geological Survey and others thought that there was no oil in California or Texas. Often, new supplies of a resource come from areas outside the accustomed boundaries of our system, as resources from other continents came to Europe in past centuries and as resources may in the future be brought from the sea or from other planets. New supplies also arise when a resource is created from other materials, just as grain is grown and nuclear fuel is "bred." (Here we must avoid getting hung up on the word "natural," as in "natural resources.")

#### -- Market adjustments solve

National Post 8 (Canada – National Edition, “Don’t Panic”, 4-26, Lexis)

The trouble with doom-and-gloom predictions -- whether they be about oil shortages, food scarcity, water wars or population explosions --is that most are based on the linear extrapolation of short-term trends. If, say, rice prices rise, alarmists assume they will keep rising indefinitely at the same rate -- and then produce scary-looking graphs that show trend lines veering up into the wild-eyed blue yonder. But history shows that human adaptation invariably intervenes --especially in parts of the world that have the benefit of a market economy. Scarcity drives innovations that pull the world back from the brink. Consumers take high prices as their cue to consume less; producers take the same cue to produce more. A new equilibrium is reached, just as college microeconomics textbooks would predict. That's why we aren't losing any sleep over the latest predictions from Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce chief economist Jeffrey Rubin, which were fronted prominently on Friday's National Post. New inventions, new oil discoveries and improvements in existing technologies will conspire to spare us Mr. Rubin's parade of horribles, which include $2.25-a-litre gasoline and tens of thousands of job losses in the auto-making sector. In a report entitled The Age of Scarcity, released on Thursday, Mr. Rubin predicts that by 2012, demand for oil, gas and diesel in the rest of the world will exceed that in OECD countries. As developing nations get richer, they will begin competing with the current industrialized world for diminishing resources. This will drive up the cost of everything from energy to food to computer components. Mr. Rubin predicts this will lead to the biggest economic disruption in North America since the 1973 oil crisis. But that same historical comparison suggests a reason Canadians should be suspicious of this ominous forecast: While the oil shortages of the 1970s displaced millions of assembly-line workers and led to a temporary slowdown of the North American economy, the adaptations they spurred ultimately made industry more efficient and ordinary people more prosperous. North American manufacturing is far more productive and energy-efficient now than it was 30 years ago, as well as producing far less pollution. (Many Canadians under 30, who have been reared on a constant diet of dire environmental claims, may have trouble believing this, but despite the rapid growth of our economy in the last three decades, smog is actually less toxic and our waters less polluted than in 1970.) In an interview with the National Post, Mr. Rubin fell into a common trap: He assumed growth is a zero-sum game, whereby someone must lose ground every time someone else gains it. "I think there will be fewer people on the road in North America in five years than there is right now," Mr. Rubin said on Thursday. "For everybody who's about to get on the road by buying a new Tata or a Chery car in the developing world, someone's going to have to get off the road in this part of the world. There's just not enough gasoline to go around." Anyone tempted to buy into this line of thinking would do well to remember the famous bet between Paul R. Ehrlich, author of the apocalyptic 1968 book The Population Bomb, and economist Julian Simon. Mr. Erlich predicted that by the late 1970s, the world would begin to run out of oil and metals, and that "wide-scale famine caused by declining food production" would cause hundreds of millions of deaths annually. Mr. Simon, on the other hand contended, that "natural resources are not finite in any serious way; they are created by the intellect of man, an always renewable resource." In 1980, he bet Mr. Ehrlich $1,000 that by 1990 a basket of any five commodities of his choosing would cost less than it had 10 years earlier. By the end-is-nigh thinking embraced by Mr. Ehrlich (and, to a lesser extent, Mr. Rubin), he should have won easily. Instead, Mr. Simon won. The five commodities chosen were, after inflation, 40% cheaper in 1990 than they had been a decade before. The same pattern is beginning to unfold in 2008. In just a few short months, rising prices for fuel have prompted the sort of market-driven energy efficiencies and environmental solutions that the green movement has failed to achieve through years of hectoring, regulating and legislating. Full-sized SUV sales have plummeted, home builders are designing smaller, low-consumption houses, airlines and railways are switching to more efficient planes and engines and car makers are scrambling to lighten their models. Thanks to just a 30% increase in pump prices, the automobile sector is likely to raise fleet fuel efficiency more than all the laws demanding higher standards passed in the past 35 years combined. There is no doubt that our society is changing because of the scarcity in food and fuel that Mr. Rubin highlights. But it defies the principles of economics to imagine that such scarcity will persist indefinitely. If there is one trend we can depend on, it is that the law of supply and demand will intervene to blunt the economic shocks that even the most prosperous nations must inevitably face.

## Leadership 1NC

### No Fusion

#### Fusion’s still not feasible, despite advances – there’s no workable reactor design

Ryan, 11 – Masters in Mechanical Engineering, expertise in energy, sustainability, Computer Aided Engineering, renewables technology; Ph.D. in solar energy systems (D.A., “Part 9 – Fusion Power.” http://daryanenergyblog.wordpress.com/ca/part-9-fusion-power/)

There has been considerable progress in fusion research over the last few decades using the Inertial confinement method. JET (Joint European Torus) , using D-T reactions, produced a net positive energy output for some seconds, a major step forward. The current plan now is to take this forward using the ITER magnetic confinement fusion experiment, which is sceduled to come online in 2020. ITER will be capable of sustaining Fusion energy pulses for periods of up to 1,000 seconds, a significant technical step forward it should be said, but still some way from a system capable of running 24/7, and of course doing so commercially. The purpose of ITER is to essentially prove the concept as well as acting as a research tool, which will allow several of the outstanding technical barriers towards a commercial fusion reactor to be overcome. These experiments are expected to continue running until 2035-2040. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iter#Objectives

9.3 Material selection, the options and the challenges

Indeed ITER is in fact two projects rolled into one. ITER in France will work on the reactor, while IFMIF in Japan will focus on the issue of materials research. One of the problems that results from the D-T fusion method is the high neutron flux generated. You will recall the diagram above, showing the D-T reaction. You will note, not only that neutron shooting out but the very high kinetic energy attached to it. The result is that any D-T reactor will have a neutron flux at least 100 times that of a similar sized LWR (at around 1×1018 n/m2-s) or about 14-25 times more than a Fast neutron reactor generates (4 – 7 x1018 n/m2-s) . The goal of IFMIF is to develop some new material capable of withstanding these high neutron fluxes, as well as the high radiant heat loads and yet still give a reasonable service life. The smart money is currently on either Tungsten or Molybdenum (both expensive, brittle and difficult to form) or in all likelihood an alloy of either (or both) and possibly Graphite (fire risk). Of course the critics already have a name for this new material, Unobtainium! As was discussed in the materials section, the sort of material needed to construct a working Fusion reactor, at least one with a decent service life and that’s cheap and easy to put together, simply may not exist. We could, I suspect compromise, use a graphite blanket around the core to reduce neutron fluxes with the rest of the reactor built out of a mix of Tungsten alloys, and where possible, ceramics. However, such a reactor would have a number of draw backs. Some exposed parts that can’t be shielded (it is integral to the design that they be exposed to the core) and would need to be regularly replaced, eating into capacity factors and making for an expensive operation. Alternatively we could simply build our Fusion plants with a short operating life, say 20 years rather than the current 50 years standard at present for the nuclear industry. Unfortunately, this would obviously depreciate the economics of Fusion power. And as it is, building a complex machine out of the materials I’ve suggested isn’t going to be cheap. Worse still, all of that material, particularly the graphite, will now be mildly radioactive and need to be put into ILW storage, with some parts likely requiring HLW storage. So such a plan would mean our Fusion power program producing some quantities of radioactive nuclear wastes, a fraction of what we currently generate yes, but certainly not zero.

### Fusion 1NC Solvency

#### Fusion will never be practical – too many challenges

**Silverstein, 12** – Energy Central Editor (Ken, 4/15. “The Tantalizing Promise And Peril Of Nuclear Fusion.” http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2012/04/15/nuclears-strongest-potential-weapon-fusion/)

But others are more tempered, if not outright cynical about fusion technology. The central question is whether the process can ever yield enough heat to fuse permanently those atoms that are needed to commercialize such power. Here, the argument breaks down two ways: the knowledge and the expense. The National Academy of Sciences is saying that the field is still in its “early stages” and that critical challenges remain. Then there’s the European Parliament’s green movement, which calls ITER funding not just wrongheaded in the aftermath of the Japan’s Fukushima but also a “ticking budgetary time bomb.” “Fusion will never be a practical source because it requires vast resources and technical capital,” adds John Kutsch, executive director of the Thorium Energy Alliance, in a talk with this reporter. “On paper, it looks awesome but when you get down to practicalities, it is beyond our capabilities.”

#### Fusion doesn’t work, will be too expensive, and will take a minimum of decades to develop.

LaMonica, 11 – senior writer covering green tech and cutting-edge technologies for CNET (Martin, 6/29. “A reality check on nuclear fusion at MIT.” http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128\_3-20075206-54/a-reality-check-on-nuclear-fusion-at-mit/)

Even what could be called mainstream fusion techniques still draw skepticism, but it's easy to see why people find it so compelling. The magnetic nuclear fusion studied at MIT uses an abundant energy source (a form of hydrogen found in seawater), power plants would pack a lot of energy in a much smaller footprint than solar or wind, and any radioactive material could be handled relatively easily. The waste from today's nuclear power plants, which split atoms (nuclear fission) to get usable energy, should have storage designed for tens of thousands of years while fusion would need 50-year repositories. But the punchline for nuclear fusion is that it has one big down side: it doesn't work. For Dennis Whyte, professor of nuclear science and engineering at MIT, that's not quite right. Fusion actually occurs at MIT's lab but nobody has been able to do it on a continuous basis. "I would state that we have the scientific and technical readiness to produce electricity on a very short time scale," Whyte said during a presentation. "It would not be economically efficient mostly because we couldn't demonstrate that it would be on all the time, which is essentially a technical argument. And it would cost much more than a (nuclear) fission power plant--it's hard to say exactly but at least a factor of 10 larger." A worldwide research collaboration called ITER with ties to MIT has begun construction of a giant experimental magnetic fusion reactor in the south of France which has a number of technical goals, including sustained fusion and demonstrating the ability to produce more heat than the amount of energy that is put in. The reactor, expected to be about 20 stories high, will be one of the biggest science projects ever and cost an estimated $18 billion over 10 years. Hot, magnetized torus Despite the long time scales for development, nuclear fusion has started to attract the kind of funding start-ups normally get. British Columbia-based General Fusion earlier this year received an investment from by Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos and venture capitalists to demonstrate "magnetized target fusion" where pneumatic pistons larger than people compress plasma--a state of matter similar to a gas--to cause fusion to occur. The end goal of civilian fusion efforts is a power plant that uses the heat from nuclear fusion to make steam which is converted into electricity in a turbine, just as today's power plants do. But rather than burn fossil fuels or split uranium atoms, magnetic-fusion researchers intend to produce energy by fusing two isotopes of hydrogen--deuterium, which has one neutron, and tritium, which has two neutrons. The result is a heavier substance--helium--and a huge release of energy. MIT's research reactor, called Alcator C-Mod, is a doughnut-, or torus-, shaped reactor called a tokamak, which is a Russian acronym for a configuration designed in the Soviet Union. Fusion happens when materials reach the plasma state, where electrons break off from an atom's nucleus, which happens at very high temperatures over 10,000 degrees, Whyte explained. A tokamak uses powerful magnetic fields to confine plasma so that a reaction can take place without damaging the reactor vessel. Applying high temperatures through microwaves delivers the heat to precipitate a reaction. "Eventually it will get hot enough that it will ignite and that's what drives the fusion," Whyte said. Right now, the Plasma Science and Research Center can do this high-temperature fusion at millions of degrees Celsius for a couple of seconds at a time. Tests at Alcator C-Mod, which is just a few feet across at the core, are done continually to collect data on how plasma affects material in the reactor, the temperature and strength of the magnetic field, and properties of the plasma inside. Making even this experimental process operate requires megawatts of power for short bursts, buffered by an on-site alternator, and producing magnetic fields 10,000 times larger than the Earth's to maintain the naturally unstable plasma, according to researchers. Since fusion requires high temperatures, large reactors are needed to minimize heat loss and get to the point where the reaction is self-sustaining, Whyte explained. The ITER tokamak alone, for example, will weigh 23,000 metric tons, or three times the weight of the Eiffel Tower, and have about 1 million components. In our lifetime? Mastering nuclear fusion requires deep understanding of plasma and materials science, but a functioning magnetic-fusion power plant would also require nuclear-power engineering to harness the energy reliably. When deuterium and tritium are fused together, an atom of helium is produced and a neutron is fired off. The kinetic energy from that neutron--"imagine a Ping-Pong ball bouncing around," Whyte said--is the energy source to both generate usable heat and produce tritium. The basic idea of nuclear fusion: two atoms--in this case hydrogen isotopes--fuse to form a new atom, helium, and excess energy. The energy from helium production would be used to heat the fusion process and the neutron carries energy that would be converted into electricity. In a reactor, the plasma would be surrounded by a "blanket" of liquid metal that contains lithium. The neutron from the fusion reaction would blast into the lithium and undergo a nuclear reaction to produce more tritium. The tritium from that reaction would be captured and then "recycled" by feeding it back into the nuclear reactor. At the same time, the large amounts of kinetic energy from liberated neutrons heat the liquid metal blanket. A heat exchanger would circulate water to remove the heat and make steam, which would be used to make electricity. The other energy source for the reaction--deuterium--is found in large amounts in seawater. That, of course, is the theory. Getting to the point where the science is fully under control and engineering ready for working power plants is years away. How far away really depends on the pace of development, but it appears the prevailing view is that it's on the order of decades. The Plasma Science and Fusion Center at MIT, one of many around the world, has an annual budget of about $30 million a year. The multibillion dollar ITER project, meanwhile, has come under fire for escalating costs, according to an NPR report last year.

#### Can’t solve – siting – no one will want SMR’s near them

Andres and Breetz, 11 – senior fellow and chair at the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University; and Doctoral Candidate In The Department Of Political Science At M.I.T. (Richard B. and Hanna L, October. “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications.” Strategic Forum No. 272. http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/SF%20262%20Andres.pdf)

Small reactors used on domestic military bases are likely to face a number of additional siting hurdles. As a distributed energy source, they are likely to face substantial “not-in-my-backyard” battles. Moreover, dispersing a large number of reactors leads to questions about longterm nuclear waste disposal. 27 Arguably, reactors should be relatively safe on domestic military installations, certainly more secure than, for instance, the reactors situated in developing countries or intended for processing tar sands. Nevertheless, no issue involving nuclear energy is simple. Institutional and technical uncertainties—such as the security of sealed modules, the potential and unintended social and environmental consequences, or the design of reliable safeguards—make dispersing reactors across the country challenging. 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, and determining whether Permissive Action Links technology could be used to safeguard them.

### Sci Lead

#### Science leadership fails

Lord and Turekian 7 (Kristin M - Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University, and Vaughan C - Chief international officer, AAAS, “SCIENCE AND SOCIETY: Time for a New Era of Science Diplomacy”, Science Magazine, Vol 315 no 5813 p 769-770, Feb 9th, http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/315/5813/769)

Yet, in an era where international skepticism about U.S. foreign policy abounds, government can only do so much. Ultimately civil society--including scientists and engineers--will need to join in this diplomacy of deeds in order for the new science diplomacy to succeed. The fact that science is, and should remain, outside the realm of politics only makes scientists better suited for this task. How can the U.S. science community contribute to science diplomacy and remind the world that Americans are defined by more than specific U.S. government policies? Individual scientists can contribute by realizing that they are valuable ambassadors of goodwill. They can intensify their global activities and promote greater engagement with counterparts worldwide. They can increase their efforts to invite foreign peers to review scientific articles and papers. Senior U.S. researchers can use their own international networks, including former students and postdocs working outside of the United States, to reach out to junior scientists in other countries, to collaborate with peers, and to promote broader international cooperation. U.S. scientists should make a special effort to engage with scientists from countries where the United States is misunderstood or disliked--not to justify or promote any government policy, but to build bridges and trust. They can engage more with university students and the general public overseas, not just other scientists, and let them know how scientists from all nations make a collective difference in their lives. In so doing, U.S. scientists will make the world a better place, and perhaps improve foreigners' views of America along the way. Scientists can also encourage their universities, research institutions, professional societies, and laboratories to adopt global engagement as a priority. Although a large sum of individual efforts is important, effective global engagement will be most influential if it engages whole organizations as well. Many of the major U.S. scientific and engineering societies already have specific offices or initiatives dedicated to international collaborations. To give just one example, in January AAAS joined the U.S. Department of State, the Kuwaiti government, and a Kuwaiti science NGO to convene a conference in Kuwait City to promote networks of women scientists and engineers in the broader Middle East (see figure above). AAAS has also recently started a pilot program that remotely links U.S. researchers with university-level science students in developing and emerging countries in order to share and discuss seminal papers across a range of scientific disciplines (13). Yet, despite current efforts, scientific organizations can do more. Of course, all this assumes that scientists and engineers are willing to be ambassadors and to participate in the new science diplomacy. Why would they? The answer is threefold. First, while science holds great benefits for diplomacy, diplomacy also benefits science. For instance, in large-scale programs such as International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) ([14](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/315/5813/769#ref14)), scientists from major powers such as China, India, Russia, Korea, Japan, the European Union, and the United States will work together in an unprecedented international agreement to develop fusion energy. Moreover, diplomacy can create opportunities to conduct research in parts of the world critical to scientific advancement. Scientific research ranging from astronomical observation in Australia to archaeological research in Libya depends on broader access, as well as diplomatic support. Second, the health of the U.S. scientific community depends on the continued willingness of foreign scientists and students to come to the United States for study, research, and work. Visa difficulties, combined with a perception that the United States does not welcome foreigners, reduced the number of foreign students coming to the United States after 9/11. This trend is beginning to reverse, but negative perceptions persist and it is important to remain vigilant. The U.S. economy benefits greatly from foreign scientists and science ([15](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/315/5813/769#ref15)).We must ensure that the United States remains attractive and welcoming. Third, scientists are citizens. Like their counterparts outside of the scientific community, many scientists and engineers share concerns about negative perceptions of the United States. The good news is that scientists have some ability to change those perceptions for the better. The Way Forward Who should lead a renewed effort toward science diplomacy? Unfortunately, there is currently no ideal U.S. government agency to lead a sustained effort. Technical agencies, such as the Department of Energy, National Institutes of Health, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration are (not inappropriately) focused on their core missions and interested in international collaboration to the extent it advances those missions. The National Science Foundation has a broader mandate than these agencies, but NSF's goal is to foster basic research. Consequently, its international activities are designed to address specific research questions. The Department of State is designed to focus on diplomacy--but, unfortunately, is not well equipped to engage in science diplomacy. With limited resources for S&T cooperation, limited scientific expertise, and pressure to focus on the day's crises rather than long-term engagement, the department's efforts must be complemented by the work of other agencies. Unless those resources increase dramatically, which we do not believe is likely, the Department of State will need much more support in the area of science diplomacy. It is time for the scientific community to increase its role in diplomacy--and maybe even take the lead. Nongovernmental scientific organizations are more credible, more nimble, and--as honest brokers--in many cases more respected than the U.S. government overseas. They work at the grassroots level on global problems such as energy, clean water, and health. A vigorous new science diplomacy, oriented to foreign citizens as well as their governments, will promote human well-being, will benefit science, and will catalyze public diplomacy. Our country needs a new era of science diplomacy, and we need the commitment of the U.S. science community behind it.

### Disease – General

#### -- No extinction

Gladwell 99 (Malcolm, The New Republic, July 17 and 24, 1995, excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, p. 31-32)

Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adapt a specific strategy but every strategy carries a corresponding cost and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all hut halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability its essential rigidity is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. AIDS is almost invariably lethal because it attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. Viruses are not superhuman. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: as contagious as flue, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the **limitations** of microscopic life forms.

#### -- Disease inevitable

Sky News 8 (“Warning Over Deadly New Diseases”, 7-21, http://news.sky.com/skynews/Home/Health/New-Disease-Emerges-Every-Year-Pandemic-Outbreak-May-Not-Be-Stopped/Article/200807315047567)

In a highly critical new report, the committee said there was an "urgent need" for a better global surveillance system to identify diseases before they infect large numbers of people. It noted that three-quarters of newly-emerging human infections come from animals - but found many are only detected once they have made humans ill. Experts estimate a devastating pandemic outbreak of a new disease such as SARS or the H5N1 strain of flu could claim anything between two and 50 million lives. In evidence to the House of Lords Intergovernmental Organisations Committee inquiry, the Government said there had been no pandemic disease outbreaks since 1968. However, it warned another pandemic outbreak was "inevitable". Committee chairman Lord Soley said: "The last 100 years have seen great advances in public health and disease control through the world, but globalisation and changes in lifestyles are giving rise to new infections and providing opportunities for them to spread rapidly throughout the world.

### Failed States

#### Many countries empirically deny the impact

**Impact Lab 10** (6/21, “The 2010 Failed States Index.” http://www.impactlab.com/2010/06/21/the-2010-failed-states-index/)

Given time and the right circumstances, countries do recover. Sierra Leone and Liberia, for instance, no longer rank among the top 20 failing states, and Colombia has become a stunning success story. Few remember today that the Dominican Republic once vied with its neighbor Haiti for the title of “worst [Caribbean](http://www.impactlab.com/2010/06/21/the-2010-failed-states-index/) basket case.” But the overall story of the Failed States Index is one of wearying constancy, and 2010 is proving to be no different: Crises in Guatemala, [Honduras](http://www.impactlab.com/2010/06/21/the-2010-failed-states-index/), Iran, and Nigeria — among others — threaten to push those unstable countries to the breaking point.

## Prices 2NC

### Turns Clean Tech Investment

#### Econ decline turns clean tech and global warming

Richard 8 (Michael Graham, Environmental Activist and Contributor @ HuffPost, "4 Reasons Why Recession is BAD for the Environment," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-graham-richard/4-reasons-why-recession-i\_b\_133564.html)

As a counter-point to Lloyd's tongue-in-cheek post about 10 Ways the Recession Can Help the Environment, here are some eco-reasons why we should wish a speedy recovery (we won't get into non-green reasons here): Firstly, when squeezed, companies will **reduce their investments** into research & development and green programs. These are usually not short-term profit centers, so that is what's axed first. Some **progress has been made** in the past few years, it would be sad to lose ground now. Secondly, average people, when money is tight, will look for less expensive products (duh). Right now, that usually means that greener products won't make it. Maybe someday if we start taxing "bads" instead of "goods" (pollution, carbon, toxins instead of labor, income, capital gains) the least expensive products will also be the greenest, but right now that's not the case. Thirdly, there's less money going into the stock markets and bank loans are harder to get, which means that many small firms and startups working on the breakthrough green technologies of tomorrow can have trouble getting funds or can even go bankrupt, especially if their clients or backers decide to make cuts. Fourthly, during economic crises, voters want the government to appear to be doing something about the economy (even if it's government that screwed things up in the first place). They'll accept all kinds of measures and laws, including those that **aren't good for the environment**. Massive corn subsidies anyone? Don't even think about progress on global warming...

### Turns Heg

#### Turns leadership

Brzezinski 97 (Zbigniew, Former National Security Advisor – The Grand Chessboard, <http://book-case.kroupnov.ru/pages/library/Grand/part_1.htm>)

America’s economic dynamism provides the **necessary precondition** for the exercise of global primacy. Initially, immediately after World War II, America’s economy stood apart from all others, accounting alone for more than 50 percent of the world’s GNP. The economic recovery of Western Europe and Japan, followed by the wider phenomenon of Asia’s economic dynamism, meant that the American share of global GNP eventually had to shrink from the disproportionately high livels of the immediate postwar era. Nonetheless, by the time the subsequent Cold War had ended, America’s share of global GNP, and more specifically its share of the world’s manufacturing output, had stabilized at about 30 percent, a level that had been the norm for most of this century, apart from those exceptional years immediately after World War II. More important, America has maintained and has even widened its lead in exploiting the latest scientific breakthroughs for military purposes, thereby creating a technologically peerless military establishment, the only one with effective global reach. All the while, is has maintained its strong competitive advantage in the economically decisive information technologies. American mastery in the cutting-edge sectors of tomorrow’s economy suggests that American technological domination is not likely to be undone soon, especially given that in the economically decisive fields, Americans are maintaining or even widening their advantage in productivity over their Western European and Japanese rivals.

### Prices K2 Manufacturing – 2NC

#### We have a unique internal link – economic growth is happening because of manufacturing “rehoring” that’s occurring due to low electricity prices – the plan reverses that trend

Schoenberger 5/31/12 (Robert, Plain Dealer, "Shale gas boom could bring manufacturing jobs back to U.S., economists say," http://www.cleveland.com/shalegas/index.ssf/2012/05/shale\_gas\_boom\_could\_bring\_man.html)

"By 2025, the manufacturing sector alone could save $11.5 billion in energy costs," Robert McCutcheon, an economist with consulting group PwC, said at a manufacturing summit hosted by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. McCutcheon's company, formerly called PriceWaterhouseCoopers, released a study late last year predicting that as many as 1 million new U.S. manufacturing jobs could come from lower-cost energy.¶ "If we save $11.5 billion, that's investment capital that could be redirected elsewhere," McCutcheon added.¶ Cleveland Fed President and Chief Executive Sandra Pianalto said manufacturing businesses have been leading the economic recovery in the United States for the past two years, but she added that job growth hasn't been as strong as profit and sales growth. To add jobs, the sector needs to attract new manufacturers and bring production back to the United States from other countries.¶ That's where shale gas and cheap energy could come in.¶ Pianalto said one steel producer told her recently that energy costs in North America are one-third the cost of European steel plants [reporter's note: an earlier version of this story said U.S. costs were one-tenth of Europe's. Pianalto's office said the Cleveland Fed chief went over her notes and found that one-third was the more accurate figure]. Those costs, coupled with weak demand, has ArcelorMittal expanding in Ohio while it cuts production in Europe. Several other steel plants in the region have also increased production to sell pipeline tubes and other parts to oil and gas companies.¶ Marianne Kah, chief economist for energy company ConocoPhillips, called the ongoing shale boom the "most significant change in the energy industry since the 1940s."¶ Kah said over the past five years, energy companies have learned that most of their early predictions on shale gas were wrong. The companies knew that there were huge reserves of oil and gas trapped within hard rocks that needed to be hydraulically fractured to release that energy, but they vastly overestimated the costs of doing that.¶ Production in Texas and Pennsylvania has produced far more gas, far more cheaply than the industry expected, and gas prices are now near historic lows. Low gas costs have drawn huge interest from chemical companies that convert natural gas into plastics and other materials. In March, Shell Oil said it would build a multi-billion petrochemical refinery near Pittsburgh. Several other chemical plants have announced shale-related expansions.¶ "And these are the very early days. We're likely to learn a lot more about how to optimize this process" and lower production costs in the future, she added.¶ From a competitive standpoint, she said shale is already making the United States a more attractive place to do business. Natural gas prices are lower here than in China, Germany of Great Britain.¶ William Strauss, senior economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, said the boom has meant U.S. electricity prices are the lowest of any industrial nation in the world. Those low energy prices could help the country lure back work sent to Asia over the years where low-cost labor has been the draw. Strauss said labor is still cheaper overseas, but the total production costs can be higher after figuring in energy and the cost to ship goods across the Pacific Ocean.

### A2 Labor Costs Outweigh

#### Despite higher labor costs, companies will move back to the US because of low electricity prices

Krueger 4/26/12 (Alan, Chairman @ Council of Economic Advisers, "Reversing the Middle-Class Jobs Deficit," http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/reversing\_the\_middle-class\_jobs\_deficit.pdf)

I recently visited one of Parkdale Mills’s textile plants in Sanford, NC. Textiles is literally the ¶ world’s oldest manufacturing industry. For decades, American textiles companies have been ¶ under intense competition from lower cost labor abroad. This factory was recently reopened. ¶ Parkdale Mills operates 30 plants in 7 states in the U.S., and does most of its production here. ¶ The company’s CEO, Anderson Warlick, told me that the company has survived by continually ¶ raising productivity. The plant floor is a matrix of buzzing computer-operated machines that ¶ take raw cotton bolls and convert them into enough cotton fabric to make 1 million tee-shirts a ¶ week.¶ Mr. Warlick told me that the factory spends more money on electricity than labor. This is an ¶ example of how the President’s commitment to develop safe domestic energy sources, including ¶ natural gas, dovetails with his manufacturing initiative. The U.S. has among the lowest ¶ electricity costs in the world, and the remarkable fall in natural gas prices resulting from new ¶ extraction techniques has put further downward pressure on electricity prices. When I spoke to Mr. Warlick last week he told me that one of the biggest obstacles he faced was ¶ finding enough workers with the right skills. The company often hires workers who were trained ¶ at local community colleges. ¶ Mr. Warlick also told me something that a lot of CEO’s have been telling us at the White House ¶ – that more and more manufacturing companies are considering shifting their production back to ¶ the U.S. This emerging phenomenon is known as reshoring.

### Nuclear Power – 2NC

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Nuclear power displaces the low prices of natural gas – causes spikes in consumers rate

Niemeyer 3/6/12 (Kyle, science writer for Ars Technica. He has B.S. and M.S. degrees in Aerospace Engineering from Case Western Reserve University, and is currently a Ph.D. candidate focusing on combustion modeling, "Chain reaction: the (slow) revival of US nuclear power," http://arstechnica.com/science/2012/03/chain-reaction-the-slow-revival-of-us-nuclear-power/)

Proponents for greater use of nuclear power often tout its low cost and zero emissions. According to the US Energy Information Administration, electricity from nuclear power will cost 11.39 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) in 2016. By comparison, conventional coal plants would generate electricity at 9.5 cents per kWh and onshore wind at 9.7 cents per kWh. Advanced natural gas plants offer by far the lowest cost at 6.6 cents per kWh.¶ However, it isn’t the cost of electricity that’s the problem. The largest barrier to more nuclear power plants may be the initial cost of construction. According to the report, the capital cost of nuclear plants always escalated over original estimates. The final costs of plants built through 1980—meaning all of them, since only one has been built since 1978—were on average 50 percent higher than comparable coal plants. This even includes retrofits to the coal plants to meet the higher emissions standards of the Clean Air Act.¶ Comparison of electricity costs from nuclear, coal, and gas from different studies.¶ Wikimedia Commons¶ Cost escalation remains an issue. A group of companies announced a two-reactor project in Texas in 2006, with an estimated cost of $5.2 billion. Three years later, the cost was revised to $10 billion, then $13 billion a few weeks later. The final estimate eventually reached $18.2 billion, over three times the original estimate. That's more expensive than an equivalently-sized natural gas plants, which also wouldn’t take nearly as long to build.¶ Considering the increasingly low price of electricity from natural gas, the report emphasized the need for some sort of carbon pricing to make nuclear attractive. Natural gas power plants are beginning to replace coal plants and they emit about half the greenhouse gases. Without a price on carbon dioxide emissions, nuclear power is actually more expensive than coal, oil, or natural gas, due to the massive upfront cost.

### 1NC Not Inevitable – US

#### Nuclear’s too hard to justify – the only plants that will be built before 2020 are already financed

**Lamonica, 8/9/12** – senior writer covering green tech and cutting-edge technologies for CNET (Martin, 8/9. “A Glut of Natural Gas Leaves Nuclear Power Stalled.” http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/)

The nuclear renaissance is in danger of petering out before it has even begun, but not for the reasons most people once thought. Forget safety concerns, or the problem of where to store nuclear waste—the issue is simply cheap, abundant natural gas. General Electric CEO Jeffrey Immelt caused a stir last month when he told the Financial Times that it's "hard to justify nuclear" in light of low natural gas prices. Since GE sells all manner of power generation equipment, including components for nuclear plants, Immelt's comments hold a lot of weight. Cheap natural gas has become the fuel of choice with electric utilities, making building expensive new nuclear plants an increasingly tough sell. The United States is awash in natural gas largely thanks to horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking" technology, which allows drillers to extract gas from shale deposits once considered too difficult to reach. In 2008, gas prices were approaching $13 per million BTUs; prices have now dropped to around $3. When gas prices were climbing, there were about 30 nuclear plant projects in various stages of planning in the United States. Now the Nuclear Energy Institute estimates that, at most, five plants will be built by 2020, and those will only be built thanks to favorable financing terms and the ability to pay for construction from consumers' current utility bills. Two reactors now under construction in Georgia, for example, moved ahead with the aid of an $8.33 billion loan guarantee from the U.S. Department of Energy. What happens after those planned projects is hard to predict. "The question is whether we'll see any new nuclear," says Revis James, the director of generation research and development at the Electric Power Research Institute. "The prospects are not good." Outside the United States, it's a different story. Unconventional sources of natural gas also threaten the expansion of nuclear, although the potential impact is less clear-cut. Around the world, there are 70 plants now under construction, but shale gas also looms as a key factor in planning for the future. Prices for natural gas are already higher in Asia and Europe, and shale gas resources are not as fully developed as they are the United States.

#### NRC ruling means no nuclear expansion in the US – demonstrates the lack of interest in new reactors

Barber, 9/3/12 – chief analyst for generation for Energy Central's Generation Hub (Wayne, “NRC Rejects Nuclear Reactor for Too Much Foreign Owernship.” http://www.energybiz.com/article/12/09/nrc-rejects-nuclear-reactor-too-much-foreign-owernship?quicktabs\_6=2)

A panel for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has ruled against issuing a construction and operating license for a proposed new nuclear reactor in Maryland because it would have too much foreign ownership. A three-judge panel for the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB) issued the ruling Aug. 30 in a case involving the proposed Calvert Cliffs 3 reactor in Lusby, Md., and UniStar Nuclear Operating. The company has been seeking to operate a U.S. Evolutionary Power Reactor that would be located alongside the existing two Calvert Cliffs units at the Calvert County location. The ruling represents a **victory for plant foes**, including Public Citizen, Southern Maryland Cares, Beyond Nuclear and the Nuclear Information Resource Service (NIRS). All those organizations had intervened in the case. The ASLB did give UniStar Nuclear Energy an additional 60 days to secure a new U.S. partner for the plant to replace Constellation Energy, which is now part of Exelon (NYSE: EXC). License opponents argued that the project will be “owned, dominated and controlled by foreign interests,” which is contrary to the Atomic Energy Act. Both UniStar Nuclear Operating and Calvert Cliffs 3 Nuclear Project, LLC are domestic subsidiaries of UniStar Nuclear Energy, which is a Delaware corporation. The sole owner of UniStar is Electricite de France, S.A. (EDF), a French limited company, the ASLB noted in a 29-page decision. Constellation exit fueled ownership issue. The ownership of Calvert Cliffs 3 didn’t become an issue until November 2010. Until then, UniStar was owned in near-equal shares by Baltimore-based Constellation Energy Group and EDF. But in November 2010, applicants informed the NRC that EDF had acquired Constellation’s 50% interest in UniStar, thus making EDF the sole owner. In January 2011, UniStar submitted a plan to NRC seeking to address foreign control issues by setting up a “security committee” of its board of directors, made up of U.S. citizens, who would have exclusive authority “over matters that are required to have U.S. control,” the ASLB said. But in April NRC informed UniStar that this proposal would not solve the foreign control issue. During the past couple of years that UniStar tried without success to attract a new U.S. partner. “Joint Intervenors caution that giving Applicants additional time to find a suitable American partner, and thus to meet the foreign ownership, control, or domination requirements, could lead to an open-ended proceeding,” according to the ASLB. Plant foes have also said that UniStar has been mostly mum about the status of its efforts or any timeframe when a partner might be expected to join up. “Applicants reiterate that they are committed to obtaining a U.S. partner and recognize that a COL for Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 may not be issued until an appropriate U.S. partner is obtained,” the ASLB noted. But the board agreed with the plant opponents in concluding that summary disposition was appropriate on foreign ownership. “The AEA clearly prohibits the NRC from issuing a reactor license to ‘any corporation or other entity if the Commission knows or has reason to believe it is owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government,” according to the board. There is currently **no action plan that UniStar could submit**, regarding management structure, which would be sufficient to negate EDF’s 100% foreign ownership of UniStar. Likewise, the ASLB said the cases UniStar cited to bolster its case involve only NRC approval of “minority owners transferring non-operating licenses to foreign companies through mergers in which the minority owners became wholly-owned subsidiaries of foreign companies.” That’s considerably different than allowing an operating nuclear plant to be wholly owned by a foreign company, ASLB said. “Given the apparent lack of progress in finding potential U.S. partners, the amount of time that has elapsed since Applicants became 100 percent foreign owned, and the current economic climate, we are not willing to grant Applicants an indefinite amount of time to resolve this deficiency because doing so would be counter to the Commission’s policies and regulations,” the ASLB held. “Although we cannot keep this proceeding open indefinitely, we do grant Applicants an additional 60 days from the issuance of this order to notify the Board of any change in the ownership situation sufficient to establish their qualifications to apply for a license from the NRC,” the ASLB said. The board added that ASLB has already had two years to find such a partner. “That UniStar has been unable to find a single U.S. utility to partner with it in this extraordinarily expensive project speaks **volumes about the lack of genuine interest in new nuclear reactors in the U.S**.,” said NIRS Executive Director Michael Mariotte.

### Must Read – A2 Cheap Gas = Cheap Electricity

#### Electricity prices are set up by the most recent supply – the plan supplants as the most recent supply over natural gas.

Fahey 7/11/12 (Jonathan, Associated Press, "Electricity Prices Rise Despite Cheaper Costs For Utility Companies," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/11/electric-prices-rise-despite-cheap-production\_n\_1665946.html)

Even though coal accounts for 38 percent of all power produced in the U.S., natural gas plays an outsized role in determining the price of electricity. The price paid for electricity from the last power plant fired up to meet demand at any given moment is what sets the wholesale price for a given region. And since gas-fired power plants are usually the most expensive, they tend to be fired up last.

## Development 2NC

### 2NC Fusion Fails

#### Commercialization is decades to hundreds of years away

Ryan, 11 – Masters in Mechanical Engineering, expertise in energy, sustainability, Computer Aided Engineering, renewables technology; Ph.D. in solar energy systems (D.A., “Part 9 – Fusion Power.” http://daryanenergyblog.wordpress.com/ca/part-9-fusion-power/)

Another cause for concern is the lengthy timetable towards fusion power. ITER is scheduled to finish operations in 2038 (or more likely the 2040′s at the current pace). As noted, ITER’s goal is merely to prove the concept, not provide a 24/7 operating reactor, never mind a commercially viable one generating electricity. The ITER groups own figures has the design and construction of the follow on DEMO reactor taking place from around 2035-2045. This will be, as the name implies, a demonstration Fusion Reactor unit. While it will run for extended periods it certainly won’t be running on anything like a commercial basis, that will require waiting for PROTO (the first commercial prototype reactor) coming about 10-20 years later. Assuming no hold-ups, either technical or political, to stop or slow down this process (worth noting that the ITER program was held up for 5 years while everyone argued over where ITER was to be built, and indeed its already behind schedule), this puts the first generation of commercial Fusion Reactors as being built around the 2050’s at the earliest and more than likely the 2060’s or even 2070’s if we’re realistic. Indeed its likely even the timetable I’ve outlined above might slip as ITER is now not expected to acheive fully operational status until 2026.

But we cannot wave a magic wand and the world will start sprouting fusion reactors like daisies. Assuming a well supported government campaign of building (which will be dependent on the costs being reasonable, if they are higher the build rate will be slower) then we should hopefully be able to match the maximum ever Fission reactor build rate of 30 GW/yr (or 235 Billion kWh/yr) after a 15-20 year lead time (i.e. time to train everybody, tool factories, built new ones, sort out planning issues, etc.) Unfortunately if you do you’re sums this would have Fusion power just about succeeding in replacing our existing nuclear capacity of around 5% of global energy use sometime around the 2100’s, quite some time away, with a lot of potential showstoppers in between. When presented with the above, Fusion power supporters usually react with indignation and accuse one of “manipulating the figures”. They seem to believe that, cometh the hour, they’ll be given an unlimited budget and unlimited resources to complete roll out of nuclear power at an unrealistically fast schedule – many think the first commercial reactors will be built by the 2050’s. While that is still possible, assuming no hold ups (and as discussed there’s already been a few!), one or two fusion reactors (or even one each in every nation that’s a member of ITER) aren’t going to make a huge difference to the global energy picture, we’d need hundreds or thousands of GWe scale units to achieve that, and it would take a considerable time to build those (decades), especially if they are made out of exotic materials where there is only a very limited manufacturing capacity.

### A2: Fusion – Fusion Prolif Adv

#### No risk of dangerous fusion prolif – supporting facilities can be shut down before weapons grade material is produced

Goldston et al., 9 – Ph.D. in physics (RJ, with A. Glaser and AF Ross. “Proliferation Risks of Fusion Energy: Clandestine Production, Covert Production, and Breakout.” <http://web.mit.edu/fusion-fission/HybridsPubli/Fusion_Proliferation_Risks.pdf>)

In sum, it appears that a time scale of at least 1–2 months would be required to produce one significant quantity of weapon-usable material in a fusion power plant after breakout. This period is dominated by the time required to reconfigure and restart the facility. More analysis is required to refine this estimate, but it gives a sense of the time scale over which the international community would be able to react without concern that significant quantities of fissile material had already been produced. As with the fission breakout scenario, there are political and diplomatic options at this point, but unlike the fission case there is also the option to disable the plant and prevent the production of weapon-usable material. Fusion power plants require many supporting facilities that are non-nuclear in nature, but if deactivated would immediately prevent the power plant from operating. These include the massive power input and power conditioning equipment that provides electricity to the magnets, a very large cryoplant that provides liquid nitrogen and liquid helium to these magnets, and the secondary cooling system that removes heat from the system. Such facilities can be seen in the layout of the ITER site, shown in Figure 4. These are distant from the fusion confinement system itself, and could be disabled without significant risk of nuclear contamination. The fact that this can accomplished before a significant quantity of weapon-usable material is produced represents a qualitative difference from the fission breakout scenario.

### No meltdown and wast

#### Meltdowns don’t cause extinction (empirics)

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

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.

### Ice age

#### The next closest Ice Age cycle is not for at least 30,000 years

IPCC 7 (International Panel on Climate Change, “What Caused the Ice Ages and Other Important Climate Changes Before the Industrial Era?”, 2007, http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\_and\_data/ar4/wg1/en/faq-6-1.html)

Starting with the ice ages that have come and gone in regular cycles for the past nearly three million years, there is strong evidence that these are linked to regular variations in the Earth’s orbit around the Sun, the so-called Milankovitch cycles (Figure 1). These cycles change the amount of solar radiation received at each latitude in each season (but hardly affect the global annual mean), and they can be calculated with astronomical precision. There is still some discussion about how exactly this starts and ends ice ages, but many studies suggest that the amount of summer sunshine on northern continents is crucial: if it drops below a critical value, snow from the past winter does not melt away in summer and an ice sheet starts to grow as more and more snow accumulates. Climate model simulations confirm that an Ice Age can indeed be started in this way, while simple conceptual models have been used to successfully ‘hindcast’ the onset of past glaciations based on the orbital changes. The next large reduction in northern summer insolation, similar to those that started past Ice Ages, is due to begin in 30,000 years.

### Waste

#### -- Environment is resilient

Easterbrook 95 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth, p. 25)

In the aftermath of events such as Love Canal or the Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

#### -- Long time-frame

Kay 1 (Jane, “Study Takes Historical Peek at Plight of Ocean Ecosystems”, San Francisco Chronicle, 7-26, Lexis)

The collapse of ecosystems often occur over a long period. In one example, when Aleut hunters killed the Alaskan sea otter about 2,500 years ago, the population of their natural prey, the sea urchin, grew larger than its normal size. In turn, the urchins grazed down the kelp forests, important habitat for a whole host of ocean life. Then, when fur traders in the 1800s hunted the otters and sea cows almost to extinction, the kelp forests disappeared and didn't start to regenerate until the federal government protected the sea otters in the 20th century. In California, the diversity of spiny lobsters, sheephead fish and abalone kept down the urchin numbers. At present in Alaska, the kelp beds are declining again in areas where killer whales are preying on sea otters. Biologists think the killer whales switched to otters for food because there are fewer seals and sea lions to eat.

#### -- Nature will adapt

Bosselman 7 (Professor of Law Emeritus – Chicago-Kent College of Law, “The New Power Generation: Environmental Law and Electricity Innovation”, New York University Environmental Law Journal, 15 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 1, Lexis)

Ecologists today recognize that disturbance is a natural part of ecological processes. Ecological change caused by disturbance is not only inevitable but, within limits, **necessary** if ecological processes are to be maintained. This current view is a departure from much of the earlier ecological thinking, which assumed that each part of the world had a "climax" condition that in the aggregate created a static "balance of nature." [266](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n266) University of Illinois wildlife law expert Eric Freyfogle summarizes the importance of this change: "Ecologists now realize that the whole concept of community climax is misleading, for climaxes are always tentative and subject to being upset by a wide variety of natural forces, including fire, disease, and weather." [267](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n267) My colleague, Dan Tarlock, has chronicled how the science of "nonequilibrium" ecology emphasizes the important role that disturbance, such as wildfire, flood, or epidemic, plays in ecological processes. [268](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n268) **Things our society has called "disasters" are not external to the ecological system but a vital part of it.** [269](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n269) Disturbance can be seen as an inevitable ecological process and a  [\*50]  stabilizing factor that needs to be understood, [270](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n270) and "efforts to freeze or restore a static, pristine state" of nature are inappropriate "irrespective of whether the motive is to conserve nature, to exploit a resource for economic gain, to sustain recreation, or to facilitate development." [271](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n271)

## Leadership 2NC

### 2NC – Ext. 1

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

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

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

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

is likely to increase.

### Central Asian War

#### -- No great power escalation

Weitz 6 (Richard, Senior Fellow and Associate Director of the Center for Future Security Strategies – Hudson Institute, “Averting a New Great Game in Central Asia”, Washington Quarterly, 29(3), Summer, Lexis)

Concerns about a renewed great game are thus exaggerated. The contest for influence in the region does not directly challenge the vital national interests of China, Russia, or the United States, the most important extraregional countries in Central Asian security affairs. Unless restrained, however, competitive pressures risk impeding opportunities for beneficial cooperation among these countries. The three external great powers have incentives to compete for local allies, energy resources, and military advantage, but they also share substantial interests, especially in reducing terrorism and drug trafficking. If properly aligned, the major multilateral security organizations active in Central Asia could provide opportunities for cooperative diplomacy in a region where bilateral ties traditionally have predominated.

## Election 1NR

### Impact – 2NC

#### DA outweighs –

#### It’s the only existential threat

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

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

### Hegemony 1NC

#### Romney collapses leadership --- causes aggressive counterbalancing and alienates allies.

**Jentleson and Kupchan**, 8/30/**2012** (Bruce – professor of public policy and political science at Duke University, and Charles A. – professor of international affairs at Georgetown University and senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, A Dangerous Mind, Foreign Policy, p. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/30/a_dangerous_mind_mitt_romney?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full>)

It's not just Romney's positions on particular issues, however vague they may be, that are cause for concern. It's his core world view. Guided by a Republican Party virtually devoid of moderate centrists, Romney has embraced a global assessment distorted by ideological excess, pledged to wield power in a way that will leave the nation weakened and isolated, and demonstrated a failure to appreciate the key linkages between strength at home and influence abroad. Romney's view of the changing global landscape rests not on a sober assessment of the world that is emerging, but on the same neoconservative myths that led George W. Bush astray. Like Bush, Romney seems to fixate on the wrong threats -- and dangerously inflate them. He has, for example, identified Russia as America's chief geopolitical foe. But with the Cold War long over, terrorists still planning attacks against Americans, Iran seeking nuclear weapons, and China flexing its muscles, it is a flight of fancy to see Moscow as the nation's top threat. On Afghanistan, Romney regularly bashes Obama for his scheduled withdrawal of U.S. troops -- but without providing a clear rationale for extending the U.S. mission. Absent more capable partners in Afghanistan and cooperation from Pakistan, U.S. forces have limited ability to bring stability. To pretend otherwise is to fritter away American lives and resources. American forces have accomplished their main objective -- dismantling al Qaeda and eliminating Osama bin Laden; it is now up to local parties to find their way to peace. Good statecraft aims at the achievable, not impossible maximums. Romney's worldview also reveals a basic misunderstanding of the role of power in international affairs. The Republican Convention has been one long paean to American Exceptionalism. In speech after speech, Romney and his entourage invoke "leadership" and "resolve" as if all the United States has to do is take a stand and flex its muscles -- others will get in line, get out of the way, or pay the price. The United States unquestionably occupies a unique role in history of which it should be plenty proud, and American security and leadership ultimately rest on the nation's economic strength and military superiority. It's also true that most threats can best be met and problems best be solved if the U.S. plays a leadership role. Leadership, however, is much less about chest-thumping and self-congratulation than building partnerships and taking effective action with like-minded nations. Brute force and national self-confidence certainly have their place, but they can do more to invite resistance than acquiescence unless wielded with care. How the United States deploys its power and influence is key to its success as the world's dominant country. Judicious diplomacy, the fashioning of coalitions, engagement with international institutions -- these are the critical elements of good statecraft. These guidelines will preserve strong relations with traditional allies like Europe, Japan, and Israel. They also need to be applied when dealing with emerging powers like India, Turkey, and Brazil that are seeking partnerships with Washington based on mutuality and respect, not hierarchy and deference. And the Middle East is in the midst of political transformation, defying the neoconservative penchant for putting nations into neat democratic/nondemocratic, secular/Islamist, for us/against us camps. American diplomacy must adjust nimbly to a world in flux. It is worrying that Romney pledges to reinstate a foreign policy of reflexive toughness just four years after Bush's assertive unilateralism left the United States mired in Iraq and estranged from much of the world. In Tampa this week, Senator John McCain put his bellicosity on full display and Secretary Condoleezza Rice glossed over her role in the errant war in Iraq. The Republicans would do better to heed the wisdom of their own Robert Gates, the former defense secretary, who has warned that a president who wants to take the nation into another major war that is not absolutely necessary should "have his head examined." To be sure, Americans don't want a president who is too gun shy. Against bin Laden, in drone attacks on terrorists, in Libya, and in developing a NATO-backed missile defense system, President Obama has shown that he is not. Polls show that only 38 percent of Americans believe Romney would be a good commander-in-chief, indicative of anxiety that he and his team might be too trigger happy.

#### Collapse of leadership results in global nuclear war.

**Kagan 2007** (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

### US/Russian Relations – Impact 2NC

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

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

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

#### Iranian proliferation causes nuclear war

Henry **Sokolsky**, executive director – nonproliferation policy education center, 10/1/**2003**, Policy Review, p. lexis

If nothing is done to shore up U.S. and allied security relations with the Gulf Coordination Council states and with Iraq, Turkey, and Egypt, Iran's acquisition of even a nuclear weapons breakout capability could prompt one or more of these states to try to acquire a nuclear weapons option of their own. Similarly, if the U.S. fails to hold Pyongyang accountable for its violation of the NPT or lets Pyongyang hold on to one or more nuclear weapons while appearing to reward its violation with a new deal--one that heeds North Korea's demand for a nonaggression pact and continued construction of the two light water reactors--South Korea and Japan (and later, perhaps, Taiwan) will have powerful cause to question Washington's security commitment to them and their own pledges to stay non-nuclear. In such a world, Washington's worries would not be limited to gauging the military capabilities of a growing number of hostile, nuclear, or near-nuclear-armed nations. In addition, it would have to gauge the reliability of a growing number of nuclear or near-nuclear friends. Washington might still be able to assemble coalitions, but with more nations like France, with nuclear options of their own, it would be much, much more iffy. The amount of international intrigue such a world would generate would also easily exceed what our diplomats and leaders could manage or track. Rather than worry about using force for fear of producing another Vietnam, Washington and its very closest allies are more likely to grow weary of working closely with others and view military options through the rosy lens of their relatively quick victories in Desert Storm, Kosovo, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Just Cause. This would be a world disturbingly similar to that of 1914 but with one big difference: It would be spring-loaded to go nuclear.

#### Afghanistan collapse results in nuclear war

**Morgan 7** (Stephen J., Political Writer and Former Member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, “Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!?”, 9-23, http://www.freearticlesarchive .com/article/\_Better\_another\_Taliban\_Afghanistan\_\_than\_a\_Taliban\_NUCLEAR\_Pakistan\_\_\_/99961/0/)

However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could no be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

#### Cooperation on nuclear material prevents WMD terrorism --- escalates to global nuclear war

Patrick **Speice**, February, **2006**, 47 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 1427, p. lexis

Second, the economic decline that accompanied the transition to a market economy 36 exacerbated the problem, as the fiscal situation in the former Soviet states, most notably  [\*1437]  Russia, made security programs impossible to fund. 37 Graham Allison summarizes the implications of post-Soviet disorder in Russia: The dramatic changes ... have produced political uncertainty, economic distress, and social dislocation. For tens of millions of Russians, hardship and deprivation are inescapable facts of life... [H]arsh economic conditions can **create incentives for nuclear theft and smuggling**. For people who are poorly housed, poorly fed, and poorly paid (when paid at all), there will be a temptation to do what they can to improve their lives and secure their futures. Russia's nuclear custodians face these pressures as they preside over weapons and materials that are **immensely valuable** to any state or group that covets nuclear weapons. It is not hard to imagine that people leading bleak, uncertain, and difficult lives might find **irresistible** the prospect of wealth and security via the nuclear black market... ... Organizations such as the Russian military and Minatom are now operating in circumstances of great stress. Money is in short supply, paychecks are irregular, living conditions unpleasant ... [D]isorder within Russia and the resulting strains within the military could easily cause a lapse or a **breakdown in the Russian military's guardianship of nuclear weapons**. 38 Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the **confluence of Russian economic decline** and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be **devastating** in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and **retaliate with nuclear weapons**, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially **triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict**. 50 In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger **widespread proliferation** of nuclear weapons. 51 This proliferation will **increase the risk of nuclear attacks** against the United States [\*1440] or its allies by hostile states, 52 as well as **increase the likelihood that regional conflicts** will draw in the United States and **escalate to the use of nuclear weapons**. 53 B. U.S.-Russian Nonproliferation Agreements: Cooperative Threat Reduction Recognizing the risks that accompanied Russia's economic decline and the concomitant inability to adequately secure assembled nuclear weapons and fissile material, the United States deemed it desirable to establish cooperative programs to control the emerging nuclear threat. In December 1991, the U.S. Congress approved, and President George H.W. Bush signed into law, the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991, commonly referred to as the Nunn-Lugar Act. n54 The Act created a framework through which the United States negotiates subsequent CTR agreements with the former Soviet states to provide bilateral assistance through the Department of Defense (DOD) n55 for coping with specific issues related to demilitarization in the post-Cold War world. n56 The United States has signed a number of CTR agreements with several former Soviet [\*1441] states, n57 and the success of these programs in reducing the national security risks of the crumbling former Soviet nuclear infrastructure is universally acknowledged. n58 Given the hazards that accompany activities involving nuclear material, n59 there has been an intense focus on the liability provisions that govern CTR assistance programs. n60

### Obama Win Now/A2 Uniq O/Whelms Link

#### Uniqueness doesn't overwhelm the link - Romney's debate performance fundamentally reshaped the race

Lightman 10/5/12 (David, McClatchy Newspapers, "Mitt Romney's confident debate performance shakes up the race," http://www.freep.com/article/20121005/NEWS15/310050070/Mitt-Romney-s-confident-debate-performance-shakes-up-race)

DENVER -- It's a new race for the White House.¶ Mitt Romney changed the game with his aggressive, confident performance in Wednesday's debate in Denver, erasing the specter of doom that dogged his campaign for weeks.¶ President Barack Obama's forces had hinted that all they needed was one good punch to knock out Romney after the Republican spent the summer and early fall stumbling. Instead, the Romney viewers saw Wednesday was the one his friends say they have long known: the conversational, smart, decent-on-his-feet guy, eager to defend his plans to cut taxes and change government health insurance for future generations.¶ An even cursory dig into the details of those Romney plans -- details that are often elusive -- will continue to give Democrats ammunition against him. Obama also could recover quickly by relentlessly pressing his opponent on the details. Democrats tried hard Thursday to make those points.¶ Obama also can take solace in history, which shows that incumbent presidents often falter in first debates -- see George W. Bush in 2004 or Ronald Reagan in 1984 -- and then come back and win.¶ New energy¶ But a strong performance by a challenger does reshape the race in several ways -- ways that were instantly evident Thursday. Romney made an unscheduled appearance at a conservative conference in Denver, where he got a rousing, standing ovation. People in the crowd pledged that they would work eagerly for a nominee whose conservative credentials they had questioned only weeks ago.

#### 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.

### No Campaign

#### 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.”

### Incentives now

#### Obama has backed way off of nuclear – he knows it’s a political deadweight

Levine, 9/7/12 – contributing editor and former managing editor of Firedoglake, and contributing writer for Truthout (Gregg, “Obama Drops Nuclear from Energy Segment of Convention Speech.” <http://capitoilette.com/2012/09/07/obama-drops-nuclear-from-energy-segment-of-convention-speech/>)

In the wake of Fukushima, where hundreds of thousands of Japanese have been displaced, where tens of thousands are showing elevated radiation exposure, and where thousands of children have thyroid abnormalities, no one can be cavalier about promising a safe harnessing of the atom. And in a world where radioisotopes from the breached reactors continue to turn up in fish and farm products, not only across Japan, but across the northern hemisphere, no one can pretend this is someone else’s problem.¶ Obama and his campaign advisors know all this and more. They know that most industrialized democracies have chosen to shift away from nuclear since the start of the Japanese crisis. They know that populations that have been polled on the matter want to see nuclear power phased out. And they know that in a time of deficit hysteria, nuclear power plants are an economic sinkhole.¶ And so, on a night when the president was promised one of the largest audiences of his entire campaign, he and his team decided that 2012 was not a year to throw a bone to Obama’s nuclear backers. Obama, a consummate politician, made the decision that for his second shot at casting for the future, nuclear power is political deadweight.

### A2: DA Not Intrinsic

#### -- Our disad is intrinsic – the link proves that the plan results in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

#### -- Destroys all ground –

#### A) No disad is intrinsic – “make-up calls” can be crafted to solve any link or impact – even purely reaction-based DAs like Relations can be avoided by having the government cut the offended nation a big check

#### B) Fairness outweighs – logical debate is worthless if the Neg always loses. Fairness protects the forum that makes debate educational

#### -- Moving target – intrinsicness makes the plan conditional – destroys fairness because it's the locus of debate

#### -- Not logical: no single actor can do the plan and other actions. Even Congress is made up of many individual legislators.

#### -- Empirical intrinsicness checks – the Aff can read evidence that Congress will react to the plan by taking action – but not fiat that it occurs

### Link – 2NC

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Women –

#### A) They oppose nuclear power.

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

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

#### B) They swing the election.

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

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

#### Massive public opposition to nuclear power

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

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

### Nuclear Power – Link Turns the Case

#### 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 doesn’t know the difference between fission and fusion**

EC No Date (European Commission – Research and Innovation, “Fusion power: acceptable and affordable”, Accessed 10/7/2012, http://ec.europa.eu/research/energy/euratom/fusion/microscope/socioeconomics/index\_en.htm)

Social acceptability **Public opinion on fusion has been studied** in France, Germany and Spain. During these studies, the response of a local population to the prospect of a large fusion installation has been investigated. Results show that there is a strong association between fusion and fission technology **in the public's mind** and efforts are being made to explain the difference between these two technologies.

### AT: Israeli Strikes (October Surprise)

#### No Israeli strikes before the election --- they will wait for cooperation.

**Harel**, **9/4**/2012 (Amos, Senior U.S. intelligence official: Israel won’t strike Iran before November, Haaretz, p. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/senior-u-s-intelligence-official-israel-won-t-strike-iran-before-november-1.462712>)

There is a growing American assessment that Israel will not attack Iranian nuclear facilities before the U.S. presidential elections on November 6. U.S. House of Representatives Intelligence Committee Chairman Mike Rogers, who visited Israel last week, told a breakfast panel at the Republican National Convention in Tampa, Florida on Tuesday that he believes the Israeli government is likely to wait until after the elections. Rogers said that after his trip, during which he met with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, he’d been left with “no doubt in my mind” that the U.S. election cycle was part of Israel’s calculations. Asked why he thought Israel would wait, Rogers said, “Because I think they believe that maybe after the election they can talk the United States into cooperating.”

### Agency

#### 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."

#### -- DOE action is under the political spotlight – new spending causes controversy

Schabes 96 (David A., Editor – Radwaste Magazine, “Waste Management '96”, Nuclear News, April, Lexis)

Despite all the excellent papers and discussion, something of a pall was cast over WM '96 by the DOE's last-minute decision to pull more than 400 attendees and 100 papers. DOE representative Stephen Cowan endeavored to take the sting out of this blow by emphasizing that the DOE does "very much" support the WM symposia, and acknowledged that "the intangibles are quite significant." Nonetheless, high-intensity political spotlights currently trained on the DOE make it unwise to permit any activity that could be construed as "spending on extras." Cowan also said that the DOE's participation in the WM symposia and other industry conferences would continue to be minimized for the near future. But with 170 exhibitors, 2000 registrants, increased international participation, and several ground-breaking sessions and programs, there is no way to deem WM '96 as having been anything but successful and beneficial to all.

#### -- Obama appointed the DOE head

Biello 8 (David, Associate Editor – Scientific American, “Obama Names Energy Secretary, EPA Chief”, Scientific American, 12-15, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=obama-names-energy-and-environment-team)

As expected, Obama selected New Jersey's former environmental chief Lisa Jackson, 46, as head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the first African-American to head the EPA. Nobel-laureate Stephen Chu, physicist and director of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in California, was chosen as energy secretary. Chu, 60, is a strong proponent of alternative fuels and halting [global warming](http://www.scientificamerican.com/topic.cfm?id=global-warming-and-climate-change)—and will also preside over the debate about whether to usher in a new generation of nuclear power plants in an effort to reduce climate change-causing carbon dioxide emissions.

#### That means he gets the blame

Greene 97 (Abner S., Associate Professor – Fordham University School of Law, “Fidelity In Constitutional Theory: Fidelity As Translation: Discounting Accountability”, Fordham Law Review, March, 65 Fordham L. Rev. 1489, Lexis)

It is hard to argue that accountability does not matter to American constitutional law, in both its affirmative and negative aspects. But accountability does not require that constitutional interpretation be tied either to science or politics (present or past) or that the President be at the top of a chain of command over agency policy-making. Constraints both past and present necessarily exist, and are not in danger of escaping. Regarding the past: We should not forget constraints of endogeneity and of reasoning. Judges in our system cannot help but be constrained, in this broad (and, yes, weak) way, by text, structure, and history. Judges live in our system and have been trained in it. And reasoning provides its own constraints. As a descriptive matter, it's not clear that the interpretation of the majestic and vague clauses - free speech, due process, equal protection, to name three - has been constrained in any stronger fashion than that provided by the constraints of endogeneity and reasoning. Regarding the present, and the presidency: Plenty of ballot box accountability remains even regarding independent agencies. They are created, dismantled, funded, and authorized to act through Acts of Congress that the President must either sign or see enacted over his veto. The agency commissioners are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (and must be so reappointed), and the President often has the statutory power to name and remove the agency chair. Further, as a matter of political reality, both executive and independent agencies often seek presidential support, whether the support comes in the form of information or congressional lobbying. [59](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=f58cac0712387491e5ddf734eb7ab120&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtz-zSkAz&_md5=0bceb63f8f09f8cb57f2d16620da398b#n59)

#### 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."

#### Obama gets the blame because of appointments.

**Greene**, March **1997**(Abner S., Associate Professor – Fordham University School of Law, Fidelity In Constitutional Theory: Fidelity As Translation: Discounting Accountability, Fordham Law Review, 65 Fordham L. Rev. 1489, p. Lexis)

It is hard to argue that accountability does not matter to American constitutional law, in both its affirmative and negative aspects. But accountability does not require that constitutional interpretation be tied either to science or politics (present or past) or that the President be at the top of a chain of command over agency policy-making. Constraints both past and present necessarily exist, and are not in danger of escaping. Regarding the past: We should not forget constraints of endogeneity and of reasoning. Judges in our system cannot help but be constrained, in this broad (and, yes, weak) way, by text, structure, and history. Judges live in our system and have been trained in it. And reasoning provides its own constraints. As a descriptive matter, it's not clear that the interpretation of the majestic and vague clauses - free speech, due process, equal protection, to name three - has been constrained in any stronger fashion than that provided by the constraints of endogeneity and reasoning. Regarding the present, and the presidency: Plenty of ballot box accountability remains even regarding independent agencies. They are created, dismantled, funded, and authorized to act through Acts of Congress that the President must either sign or see enacted over his veto. The agency commissioners are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (and must be so reappointed), and the President often has the statutory power to name and remove the agency chair. Further, as a matter of political reality, both executive and independent agencies often seek presidential support, whether the support comes in the form of information or congressional lobbying. 59

### Magnitsky 2NC

#### 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.

#### START collapse causes extinction

**Collins and Rojansky**, 8/18/**2010** (James – director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, ex-US ambassador to the Russian Federation, and Matthew – deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program, Why Russia Matters, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/08/18/why\_Russia\_matters)

Russia's nukes are still an existential threat. Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons in stockpile and hundreds still on hair-trigger alert aimed at U.S. cities. This threat will not go away on its own; cutting down the arsenal will require direct, bilateral arms control talks between Russia and the United States. New START, the strategic nuclear weapons treaty now up for debate in the Senate, is the latest in a long line of bilateral arms control agreements between the countries dating back to the height of the Cold War. To this day, it remains the only mechanism granting U.S. inspectors access to secret Russian nuclear sites. The original START agreement was essential for reining in the runaway Cold War nuclear buildup, and New START promises to cut deployed strategic arsenals by a further 30 percent from a current limit of 2,200 to 1,550 on each side. Even more, President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, have agreed to a long-term goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. But they can only do that by working together.
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#### Obama will win now 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.

#### Romney will reject Taliban peace talks --- that undermines Afghanistan stability.

**Crowley**, 4/18/**2012** (Michael – senior correspondent at TIME Magazine, Romney’s Radical Position on Afghanistan, Swampland at TIME Magazine, p. http://swampland.time.com/2012/04/18/romneys-radical-position-on-afghanistan/)

In its story today about Mitt Romney’s rather opaque views about Afghanistan, the New York Times mentions, almost in passing, something important that has drawn strangely little attention: Romney opposes talking to the Taliban. That’s a relatively extreme position. For some time now, it’s been widely accepted within the foreign policy establishment that any realistic endgame in Afghanistan will involve some kind of negotiated peace deal with our enemies in Afghanistan. (Hillary Clinton has called the approach, “Fight, talk and build.”) Talks have been underway for months, and while they have been halting, superficial, and at times tragicomic, they’re not very controversial anymore, as this 2011 RAND paper explains: In early 2010, when the [RAND paper's] authors began to participate in exploratory discussions… regarding the possibility of a negotiated peace in Afghanistan, the very concept of talking to the enemy was controversial in official circles and little discussed beyond them. The objective of a negotiated peace has since been firmly embraced by both the Afghan and American governments, supported by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and endorsed by most of Afghanistan’s neighbors. On the main issue that most Americans think about–troop levels and withdrawal deadlines–Romney’s rhetoric suggests mostly subtle differences with Obama. Romney whacks Obama for being too open about his intentions for exiting the country, and implies he’ll listen more closely to the military’s advice, but he doesn’t disavow Obama’s 2014 goal for ending America’s combat role in the country. Rejecting peace talks, by contrast, is a game-changer. It casts into doubt all our assumptions about the war–including that 2014 deadline. “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban,” Romney has said. But we’ve been trying to do that for an awfully long time, with awfully limited results. That’s why even people like George W. Bush’s last national security adviser, Steve Hadley, say things like this: U.S. political leaders, Democrats and Republicans alike, and our military commanders, have consistently argued that the conflict in Afghanistan will not end by military means alone. The elimination of al Qaeda’s safe havens and the establishment of long-term peace and security in Afghanistan and the region — the key U.S. national security objectives — is best assured by a sustainable political settlement that strengthens the Afghan state so that it can assume greater responsibility for addressing the country’s security and economic challenges.

#### Failure to stabilize Afghanistan threatens multiple scenarios of nuclear conflict --- terrorism, Russian aggression, Pakistani break-up and NATO credibility are a few.

**Miller**, March/April **2012** (Paul D. – former director for Afghanistan on the National Security Council staff under Presidents Bush and Obama, assistant professor of the International Security affairs at the National Defense University, director for the Afghanistan-Pakistan program at the college of International Security Affairs, It’s Not just Al-Qaeda: Stability in the Most Dangerous Region, World Affairs Journal, p. http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/it%E2%80%99s-not-just-al-qaeda-stability-most-dangerous-region)

The Afghanistan Study Group, a collection of scholars and former policymakers critical of the current intervention, argued in 2010 that al-Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan and is unlikely to return, even if Afghanistan reverts to chaos or Taliban rule. It argued that three things would have to happen for al-Qaeda to reestablish a safe haven and threaten the United States: “1) the Taliban must seize control of a substantial portion of the country, 2) Al Qaeda must relocate there in strength, and 3) it must build facilities in this new ‘safe haven’ that will allow it to plan and train more effectively than it can today.” Because all three are unlikely to happen, the Study Group argued, al-Qaeda almost certainly will not reestablish a presence in Afghanistan in a way that threatens US security. In fact, none of those three steps are necessary for al-Qaeda to regain its safe haven and threaten America. The group could return to Afghanistan even if the Taliban do not take back control of the country. It could—and probably would—find safe haven there if Afghanistan relapsed into chaos or civil war. Militant groups, including al-Qaeda offshoots, have gravitated toward other failed states, like Somalia and Yemen, but Afghanistan remains especially tempting, **given the network’s familiarity with the terrain and local connections**. Nor does al-Qaeda, which was never numerically overwhelming, need to return to Afghanistan “in strength” to be a threat. Terrorist operations, including the attacks of 2001, are typically planned and carried out by very few people. Al-Qaeda’s resilience, therefore, means that stabilizing Afghanistan is, in fact, necessary even for the most basic US war aims. The international community should not withdraw until there is an Afghan government and Afghan security forces with the will and capacity to deny safe haven without international help. Setting aside the possibility of al-Qaeda’s reemergence, the United States has other important interests in the region as well—notably preventing the Taliban from gaining enough power to destabilize neighboring Pakistan, which, for all its recent defiance, is officially a longstanding American ally. (It signed two mutual defense treaties with the United States in the 1950s, and President Bush designated it a major non-NATO ally in 2004.) State failure in Pakistan brokered by the Taliban could mean regional chaos and a possible loss of control of its nuclear weapons. Preventing such a catastrophe is clearly a vital national interest of the United States and cannot be accomplished with a few drones. Alarmingly, Pakistan is edging toward civil war. A collection of militant Islamist groups, including al-Qaeda, Tehrik-e Taliban Pakistan (TTP), and Tehrik-e Nafaz-e Shariat-e Mohammadi (TNSM), among others, are fighting an insurgency that has **escalated dramatically** since 2007 across Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, and Baluchistan. According to the Brookings Institution’s Pakistan Index, insurgents, militants, and terrorists now regularly launch more than one hundred and fifty attacks per month on Pakistani government, military, and infrastructure targets. In a so far feckless and ineffectual response, Pakistan has deployed nearly one hundred thousand regular army soldiers to its western provinces. At least three thousand soldiers have been killed in combat since 2007, as militants have been able to seize control of whole towns and districts. Tens of thousands of Pakistani civilians and militants—the distinction between them in these areas is not always clear—have been killed in daily terror and counterterror operations. The two insurgencies in Afghanistan and Pakistan are linked. Defeating the Afghan Taliban would give the United States and Pakistan momentum in the fight against the Pakistani Taliban. A Taliban takeover in Afghanistan, on the other hand, will give new strength to the Pakistani insurgency, which would **gain an ally** in Kabul, **safe haven to train and arm and** from which to **launch attacks into Pakistan, and a huge morale boost** in seeing their compatriots win power in a neighboring country. Pakistan’s collapse or fall to the Taliban is (at present) unlikely, but the implications of that scenario are so dire that they cannot be ignored. Even short of a collapse, increasing chaos and instability in Pakistan could give cover for terrorists to increase the intensity and scope of their operations, perhaps even to achieve the cherished goal of stealing a nuclear weapon. Although our war there has at times seemed remote, Afghanistan itself occupies crucial geography. Situated between Iran and Pakistan, bordering China, and within reach of Russia and India, **it sits on a crossroads of Asia’s great powers**. This is why it has, since the nineteenth century, been home to the so-called Great Game—in which the US should continue to be a player. Two other players, Russia and Iran, are aggressive powers seeking to establish hegemony over their neighbors. Iran is seeking to build nuclear weapons, has an elite military organization (the Quds Force) seeking to export its Islamic Revolution, and uses the terror group Hezbollah as a proxy to bully neighboring countries and threaten Israel. Russia under Vladimir Putin is seeking to reestablish its sphere of influence over its near abroad, in pursuit of which it (probably) cyber-attacked Estonia in 2007, invaded Georgia in 2008, and has continued efforts to subvert Ukraine. Iran owned much of Afghan territory centuries ago, and continues to share a similar language, culture, and religion with much of the country. It maintains extensive ties with the Taliban, Afghan warlords, and opposition politicians who might replace the corrupt but Western-oriented Karzai government. Building a stable government in Kabul will be a small step in the larger campaign to limit Tehran’s influence. Russia remains heavily involved in the Central Asian republics. It has worked to oust the United States from the air base at Manas, Kyrgyzstan. It remains interested in the huge energy reserves in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. Russia may be wary of significant involvement in Afghanistan proper, unwilling to repeat the Soviet Union’s epic blunder there. But a US withdrawal from Afghanistan followed by Kabul’s collapse would likely embolden Russia to assert its influence more aggressively elsewhere in Central Asia or Eastern Europe, especially in the Ukraine. A US departure from Afghanistan will also continue to resonate for years to come in the strength and purpose of NATO. Every American president since Harry Truman has affirmed the centrality of the Atlantic Alliance to US national security. The war in Afghanistan under the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), the Alliance’s first out-of-area operation in its sixty-year history, was going poorly until the US troop surge. Even with the limited success that followed, allies have complained that the burden in Afghanistan has been distributed unevenly. Some, like the British, Canadians, and Poles, are fighting a shooting war in Kandahar and Helmand, while others, like the Lithuanians and Germans, are doing peacekeeping in Ghor and Kunduz. The poor command and control—split between four regional centers—left decisionmaking slow and poorly coordinated for much of the war. ISAF’s strategy was only clarified in 2008 and 2009, when Generals David McKiernan and Stanley McChrystal finally developed a more coherent campaign plan with counterinsurgency-appropriate rules of engagement. A bad end in Afghanistan could have dire consequences for the Atlantic Alliance, leaving the organization’s future, and especially its **credibility as a deterrent to Russia, in question**. It would not be irrational for a Russian observer of the war in Afghanistan to conclude that if NATO cannot make tough decisions, field effective fighting forces, or distribute burdens evenly, it cannot defend Europe. The United States and Europe must prevent that outcome by salvaging a credible result to its operations in Afghanistan—one that both **persuades Russia that NATO is still a fighting alliance** and preserves the organization as a pillar of US national security.

### 1NC

#### Text: the fifty state governments of the United States should substantially increase commercial loan guarantees to develop and deploy Integral Fast Reactors for the purpose of energy production 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)

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.

### 1NC

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

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

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

#### This causes planetary extinction—it divorces our relationship with the natural world and makes ecocide inevitable

Gottlieb 94 (Roger S. Gottlieb – Professor of Humanities at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Brandeis University, “Ethics and Trauma: Levinas, Feminism, and Deep Ecology,” Crosscurrents: A Journal of Religion and Intellectual Life, 1994, Summer, http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm)

Here I will at least begin in agreement with Levinas. As he rejects an ethics proceeding on the basis of self-interest, so I believe the anthropocentric perspectives of conservation or liberal environmentalism cannot take us far enough. Our relations with nonhuman nature are poisoned and not just because we have set up feedback loops that already lead to mass starvations, skyrocketing environmental disease rates, and devastation of natural resources. The problem with ecocide is not just that it hurts human beings. Our uncaring violence also violates the very ground of our being, our natural body, our home. Such violence is done not simply to the other – as if the rainforest, the river, the atmosphere, the species made extinct are totally different from ourselves. Rather, we have crucified ourselves**-in-relation-to-the-other, fracturing a mode of being** in which self and other can no more be conceived as fully in isolation from each other than can a mother and a nursing child. We are that child, and nonhuman nature is that mother. If this image seems too maudlin, let us remember that other lactating women can feed an infant, but we have only one earth mother. What moral stance will be shaped by our personal sense that we are poisoning ourselves, our environment, and so many kindred spirits of the air, water, and forests? To begin, we may see this tragic situation as setting the limits to Levinas's perspective. The other which is nonhuman nature is not simply known by a "trace," nor is it something of which all knowledge is necessarily instrumental. This other is inside us as well as outside us. We prove it with every breath we take, every bit of food we eat, every glass of water we drink. We do not have to find shadowy traces on or in the faces of trees or lakes, topsoil or air: we are made from them. Levinas denies this sense of connection with nature. Our "natural" side represents for him a threat of simple consumption or use of the other, a spontaneous response which must be obliterated by the power of ethics in general (and, for him in particular, Jewish religious law(23) ). A "natural" response lacks discipline; without the capacity to heed the call of the other, unable to sublate the self's egoism. Worship of nature would ultimately result in an "everything-is-permitted" mentality, a close relative of Nazism itself. For Levinas, to think of people as "natural" beings is to assimilate them to a totality, a category or species which makes no room for the kind of individuality required by ethics.(24) He refers to the "elemental" or the "there is" as unmanaged, unaltered, "natural" conditions or forces that are essentially alien to the categories and conditions of moral life.(25) One can only lament that Levinas has read nature -- as to some extent (despite his intentions) he has read selfhood -- through the lens of masculine culture. It is precisely our sense of belonging to nature as system, as interaction, as interdependence, which can provide the basis for an ethics appropriate to the trauma of ecocide. As cultural feminism sought to expand our sense of personal identity to a sense of inter-identification with the human other, so this ecological ethics would expand our personal and species sense of identity into an inter-identification with the natural world. Such a realization can lead us to an ethics appropriate to our time, a dimension of which has come to be known as "deep ecology."(26) For this ethics, we do not begin from the uniqueness of our human selfhood, existing against a taken-for-granted background of earth and sky. Nor is our body somehow irrelevant to ethical relations, with knowledge of it reduced always to tactics of domination. Our knowledge does not assimilate the other to the same, but reveals and furthers the continuing dance of interdependence. And our ethical motivation is neither rationalist system nor individualistic self-interest, but a sense of connection to all of life. The deep ecology sense of self-realization goes beyond the modern Western sense of "self" as an isolated ego striving for hedonistic gratification. . . . . Self, in this sense, is experienced as integrated with the whole of nature.(27) Having gained distance and sophistication of perception [from the development of science and political freedoms] we can turn and recognize who we have been all along. . . . we are our world knowing itself. We can relinquish our separateness. We can come home again -- and participate in our world in a richer, more responsible and poignantly beautiful way.(28) Ecological ways of knowing nature are necessarily participatory. [This] knowledge is ecological and plural, reflecting both the diversity of natural ecosystems and the diversity in cultures that nature-based living gives rise to. The recovery of the feminine principle is based on inclusiveness. It is a recovery in nature, woman and man of creative forms of being and perceiving. In nature it implies seeing nature as a live organism. In woman it implies seeing women as productive and active. Finally, in men the recovery of the feminine principle implies a relocation of action and activity to create life-enhancing, not life-reducing and life-threatening societies.(29) In this context, the knowing ego is not set against a world it seeks to control, but one of which it is a part. To continue the feminist perspective, the mother knows or seeks to know the child's needs. Does it make sense to think of her answering the call of the child in abstraction from such knowledge? Is such knowledge necessarily domination? Or is it essential to a project of care, respect and love, precisely because the knower has an intimate, emotional connection with the known?(30) Our ecological vision locates us in such close relation with our natural home that knowledge of it is knowledge of ourselves. And this is not, contrary to Levinas's fear, reducing the other to the same, but a celebration of a larger, more inclusive, and still complex and articulated self.(31) The noble and terrible burden of Levinas's individuated responsibility for sheer existence gives way to a different dream, a different prayer: Being rock, being gas, being mist, being Mind, Being the mesons traveling among the galaxies with the speed of light, You have come here, my beloved one. . . . You have manifested yourself as trees, as grass, as butterflies, as single-celled beings, and as chrysanthemums; but the eyes with which you looked at me this morning tell me you have never died.(32) In this prayer, we are, quite simply, all in it together. And, although this new ecological Holocaust -- this creation of planet Auschwitz – is under way, it is not yet final. We have time to step back from the brink, to repair our world. But **only if we see that world not as an other** across an irreducible gap of loneliness and unchosen obligation, but as a part of ourselves as we are part of it, to be redeemed not out of duty, but out of love**; neither for our selves nor for the other, but for us all**.

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

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

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

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

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

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

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

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

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

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

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

#### 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

#### Funding for the RHIC particle collider is on the chopping block now – cutting funding for the project tanks US science leadership

Matson 8/24/12 (John, Scientific American, "Nuclear Decelerator: Last U.S. Particle Collider on Chopping Block," http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=rhic-jlab-frib-budget-cuts&print=true)

Until recently, the American particle collider was a thriving species spanning a variety of habitats from coast to coast. But now it finds itself on the endangered list.¶ Since 2008 the number of colliders in the U.S. has dwindled from four to one. And the last surviving member of the species, the Relativistic Heavy-Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, N.Y., may soon fall victim **to** the same budgetary blight that has already felled so many other towering scientific facilities. Just last year the U.S. Department of Energy (DoE) phased out the larger Tevatron collider at Fermilab in Illinois, citing fiscal constraints. The increasingly rare breed known as the collider is a particle accelerator in which two beams of high-energy particles intersect to collide head-on inside giant detectors, which allow physicists to sift through the wreckage for short-lived particles or evidence of new physical phenomena.¶ The RHIC collider is one of three major projects now under scrutiny as federal science agencies seek to reconcile their portfolios of physics facilities with tightening budgets. The DoE and the National Science Foundation have requested that a panel of nuclear physicists, chaired by Robert Tribble of Texas A&M University, advise the government on how to get the most science out of limited funds. It appears likely that at least one of the costly projects—either RHIC, the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Virginia or the planned Facility for Rare Isotope Beams (FRIB) in Michigan—will fall victim to the cost-cutting. Any termination would cost hundreds of jobs and affect thousands of scientist users.¶ "The three of these things … they can't all fit within the budgets that the DoE has been told to anticipate for the next five years or so," says Steven Vigdor, associate laboratory director for nuclear and particle physics at Brookhaven. "It's conceivable, but I think it's a long shot, that there's a compromise solution that doesn't involve terminating something."¶ The RHIC collider, with a staff of about 750, could provide the biggest target for cost-cutters. Its operation costs the DoE roughly $170 million annually. But RHIC is also the only facility of the three that is currently in operation, and it seems to be hitting its peak, having recently been upgraded. RHIC rams protons or heavy nuclei from gold, copper or uranium atoms together at nearly light speed to investigate what produces the proton's spin as well as the universe's composition in the earliest instants after the big bang. The high-speed collisions of heavy ions produce a nearly frictionless fluid called a quark–gluon plasma, a hot bouillabaisse of the fundamental particles that form the heart of all atoms. Quark–gluon plasma was first produced at RHIC in 2005, and scientists there are now working to explore at which temperatures the quarks and gluons freeze out from their fluid state into protons and neutrons.¶ Like the other two facilities, RHIC comes highly recommended by nuclear physics advisory groups. A 2012 report by the National Research Council identified the completed RHIC upgrade, and an ongoing upgrade at Jefferson Lab, as strategic investments whose exploitation "should be an essential component of the U.S. nuclear science program for the next decade.**"** The Tribble panel operates under the auspices of the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee (NSAC), which provides guidance to the federal funding agencies. Tribble's subcommittee will meet in Maryland over four days in early September, during which time representatives of the various facilities will have an opportunity to lobby for their projects. "We and the other laboratories are taking this really seriously in the sense of a threat to our continued operation, and for FRIB to their continued construction," Vigdor says.¶ Each of the labs has a unique case to make: A 2007 long-range plan drafted by NSAC, for instance, highlighted the Jefferson Lab upgrade as the top priority for U.S. nuclear physics. That upgrade, which will double the energy of the electron beams in the lab's particle accelerator, is roughly two thirds complete, says Robert McKeown, deputy director for science at Jefferson Lab. And the machine already has seven to 10 years of experiments queued up for when it returns to active service sometime after 2015. The Jefferson accelerator explores several questions relating to the structure of the atomic nucleus, including how the fundamental particles of matter, quarks and gluons are bound up inside protons and neutrons. The lab received about $160 million this year from the DoE, including $50 million in construction funds for the facility upgrade.¶ Unlike Brookhaven, which hosts a number of large experiments, Jefferson Lab would essentially cease to exist if its accelerator were defunded. "We're a single-purpose laboratory," McKeown says. "So the situation would be very different for us if the decision were made not to continue our electron accelerator." Some 700 jobs depend on the lab's continued operation.¶ Michigan State University's planned FRIB (pronounced "eff-rib"), earned the second-highest slot in the 2007 ranking of nuclear physics priorities. The machine would produce on demand a variety of exotic isotopes—often unstable versions of chemical elements with abnormal numbers of neutrons in the nucleus. FRIB would investigate the origins of the elements that constitute our physical world, many of which are born in the cores of stars and in supernova explosions, and could quickly churn out isotopes for medical research and the development of advanced imaging technologies.¶ The facility is still in the design phase, and though the DoE has not issued formal schedule and budget, preliminary estimates peg FRIB as a 10-year project costing more than $600 million. Once built, however, its operations costs would potentially be lower than those of either Jefferson Lab or RHIC, and its staff would be much smaller. "But being the cheapest may not really be germane here," says FRIB project manager Thomas Glasmacher, a nuclear physicist at Michigan State. "It's kind of like comparing apples and eggs or something like that. It's different science, and they're different experiments."¶ In interviews, the three lab representatives took pains not to disparage the other facilities, choosing instead to highlight the upsides of their own respective experiments. "We are all on each other's advisory committees," Glasmacher says. "It's a very small community." All three facilities are highly touted and in high demand—even FRIB, which will not exist for many years under the best of circumstances, already has more than 1,000 scientists signed on to its user group.¶ Shuttering any of those projects will disrupt a field in which, as McKeown puts it, "the U.S. maintains the frontier facilities and has substantial leadership throughout the world." It falls to the Tribble panel to choose which of three unpalatable options is the least so. "I don't envy anybody on the panel," Glasmacher says.

#### Funding for energy incentives cause appropriators to raid the budgets of large science programs like the HRIC

Koisumi 8 (Kei¶ Koizumi¶ , The American Association for the Advancement of Science, April 10¶ th¶ , 200¶ 8¶ , “Department of Energy R&D in the FY2009 Budget”, <http://www.aaas.org/spp/rd/09pch8.htm>)¶

As always,¶ congressional appropriators will tinker with the DOE request and will rearrange the mix of priorities, especially in the energy area¶ where DOE proposals to eliminate several programs are likely to run into resistance, but¶ the overall outcome will hinge on whether Congress will be any more successful than in the past two years in securing more money overall for domestic appropriations. If not, then as in past years, Congress will most likely raid the large Science increase to shore up funding for domestic programs proposed for steep cuts or elimination.

#### US science leadership is vital in solving pressing global issues – energy production, food production, economic development, proliferation, among others

Lempinen 12 (Edward, American Association for the Advancement of Science, "Research and Foreign Policy Experts Visit AAAS to Explore the Future of Science Diplomacy," http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2012/0403roundtable.shtml)

As the 20th century drew to a close, a consensus was emerging in some quarters of the U.S. research and diplomacy communities: Science and technology would be crucial to address the overarching global issues of the 21st century, from energy and food production to economic development, but the U.S. State Department was profoundly lacking in scientific and technological expertise.¶ Fast forward a dozen years into the new century, and the landscape is dramatically different. Starting in 2000 with the appointment of veteran scientist-diplomat Norman P. Neureiter, the post of science and technology adviser to the Secretary of State has become an institution, serving presidential administrations on important foreign policy issues. A corps of scientists and engineers have taken fellowships at State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and dozens have stayed on in permanent positions. And President Barack Obama has embraced a program proposed by U.S. Senator Richard Lugar (R-Indiana), appointing six widely respected researchers as science envoys.¶ E. William Colglazier¶ Those advances, and Neureiter’s considerable contributions to the field, were assessed during a day-long roundtable convened recently by the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy. While the gathering of high-level science and foreign policy leaders found much to celebrate, they acknowledged that the gains could be put at risk by severe budget pressures and Washington’s political polarization. And, they said, the State Department and other nations’ foreign ministries must continue to expand their science capacity and expertise to support substantive, science-based relationships among nations.¶ “Science and technology are such strategic assets in terms of U.S. policy and diplomacy,” said E. William Colglazier, the science and technology adviser to U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. “The United States is perceived by the world as a leader in science and technology, and that means every country wants to engage with us on science and technology.”¶ Alice P. Gast¶ “The whole world is looking to science and technology to improve its situation—to science and technology, and to education,” said Lehigh University President Alice P. Gast, the science envoy to the Central Asia and Caucasus region. “They greatly admire our system of science and technology and education. Scientists are welcomed with open arms around the world.”¶ Because so many global challenges have a science component, and because of the growing interest in international science cooperation, “science diplomacy is becoming a more integral part of foreign policy,” said Vaughan Turekian, the AAAS chief international officer and director of the Center for Science Diplomacy. “It has the potential to open new dimensions both in international relations and in research. And so it’s critical to identify mechanisms and approaches for increasing the capacity of foreign ministries to utilize science and scientists.”¶ The 25 January roundtable was convened at AAAS as a substantive way to celebrate Neureiter’s contributions to the field and to explore emerging issues and challenges. It was organized by Turekian and Tom Wang from the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy, and it featured 32 participants from six countries, including high-ranking officials in the U.S. State Department and their counterparts from other nations. Among them were three of the first four science advisers to the Secretary of State: Neureiter; Colglazier, who served 17 years as executive officer of the National Academy of Sciences; and George H. Atkinson, an internationally known professor of chemistry and optical sciences at the University of Arizona and currently the director of the Institute on Science for Global Policy. (The third science adviser, AAAS Board of Directors Chair Nina V. Fedoroff, was in Saudi Arabia and unable to attend the event.)¶ They met under the Chatham House Rule, which encourages a frank exchange of ideas by assuring that participants will not be identified or quoted. What emerged from the day of discussion was a view that a new generation of science diplomacy is coming into maturity, with advocates at the highest levels of research, education, and government in many nations. But for the idea to develop and prosper, it will need resources, leadership, and engagement of a new generation.¶ The Necessity of Science in U.S. Diplomacy¶ Norman P. Neureiter¶ Trained as a chemist, Neureiter in 1967 became the first American science attaché in Eastern Europe, based at the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw. In the early 1970s, while working in President Richard Nixon's Office of Science and Technology, he helped craft science initiatives with China and the Soviet Union that brought a thaw to the Cold War. He joined AAAS in 2004, and today holds multiple posts: senior adviser to the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy; acting director of the AAAS Center for Science, Technology and Security Policy; and chairman of the senior advisory board to the new online publication Science & Diplomacy.¶ Neureiter’s appointment at the Department of State was, at the time, the culmination of an informal but long-running initiative by AAAS, the National Academies, and others to encourage development of science capacity in U.S. foreign policy.¶ Several speakers at the roundtable credited the late William T. Golden, a pivotal figure in U.S. science policy and at AAAS, with helping persuade policy leaders to bring science expertise into the U.S. foreign policy realm.¶ In 1998, the AAAS Council urged the State Department to take action. And in November that year, an article in the journal Science explored the theme, noting that “transformation” at State “can take place only with protracted commitment by top foreign policy leaders.”¶ The article’s conclusion was sobering: “Should the State Department fail to muster the requisite intellectual and organizational strength to influence and implement policy on S&T-infused international challenges, this primary foreign policy instrument will gradually lose its relevance to major U.S. interests around the world.”¶ In 1999, the National Research Council published “The Pervasive Role of Science, Technology, and Health in Foreign Policy”. The study, paid for by Golden from personal funds, detailed the role of science in a range of foreign policy issues, including innovation, energy, health, agriculture, and nuclear proliferation, among others. Based on its recommendations, Congress and President Bill Clinton created the position of science and technology adviser to the Secretary of State.¶ Less than 12 years have passed, but the landscape has indeed been transformed. Around the world, developing nations recognize the success of countries as diverse as China, India, Brazil, and Rwanda, and they, too, want science and technology to drive economic and human development. And even nations that have deeply strained relations with the United States recognize that its research enterprise, policymaking, and universities are models for an age of innovation. They want engagement. They want partnerships.

## Solvency 1NC

### Costs Outweigh 1NC

#### No spillover -- IFRs too costly and take too long

Makhijani 1 (Arjun, PhD in Engineering, President –Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, “Letters to the Editor” Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, May, 57(3), p. 4-5)

As for IFRs, the 1996 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study cited by Stanford concluded that there were several safety issues that remain to be resolved and that using advanced sodium-cooled reactors for transmutation “would require substantial development, testing, and large-scale demonstration under Nuclear Regulatory Commission safety review and licensing before one could proceed with confidence.” Even if all the technical problems posed by IFRs were to be solved, the **costs of using this technology would be prohibitive**. In the United States alone, IFRs would have to fission roughly 80,000 metric tons of heavy metal (about 99 percent of which is uranium). To transmute this amount of heavy metal over 40 years would require the building of about 2,000 IFRs of 1,000-megawatts capacity each. To manage the worldwide stock of spent fuel (both current and projected) in this way would require roughly four times as many reactors. Even assuming that one IFR reactor was brought on line a week, it would take 150 years to build them. The NAS study also expressed skepticism that the reprocessing technology associated with the IFR could be made as economical as its proponents claim. The IFR requirement of collocating the reprocessing element with the reactor would result in even **higher costs** because of the small scale of collocated plants. NAS's conclusion that there would be a 2 to 7 percent increase in electricity costs was based on low reactor costs and transmutation costs that were “likely to be no less than $50 billion and easily could be over $100 billion” for 600 metric tons of tran-suranics only. If the cost of reprocessing uranium is added, the total cost would increase to $300 billion—$900 billion for the United States alone. It is easy to see why no current transmutation scheme seriously proposes to transmute all the uranium in spent fuel.

### Long Timeframe 1NC

#### IFR’s take too long to build

Green, 10 – national nuclear campaigner for Friends of the Earth and a member of the EnergyScience Coalition, PhD in nuclear engineering (Justin, February. , “NUCLEAR WEAPONS, NUCLEAR POWER & INTEGRAL FAST REACTORS,” <http://foe.org.au/sites/default/files/IFR-FoEA-web-Feb2010.pdf>)

Integral fast reactors (IFRs) are reactors proposed to be fuelled with a metallic alloy of uranium and plutonium, with liquid sodium as the coolant. 'Fast' because they would use unmoderated neutrons (as with¶ the better-known fast breeder reactors). 'Integral because they would operate in conjunction with on-site¶ electrolytic 'pyroprocessing' to separate plutonium and¶ other long-lived radioisotopes and to re-irradiate (both¶ as an additional energy source and to convert longlived waste products into shorter-lived, less problematic wastes). **IFRs don't exist and it is unlikely that they will exist any time soon**. For example, South Korea recently announced its intention to embark on a program to assess the economic and technical viability of IFRs by the year 2028. That's the best part of **two decades** –just to assess the concept. In theory, there's lots to like about the IFR concept – e.g. destroying nuclear waste and fissile (weapons) material and producing electricity in the process. In practice, there's every likelihood they would be problematic. Nuclear engineer Dave Lochbaum from the Union of Concerned Scientists has summed up the dilemma: "The IFR looks good on paper. So good, in fact, that we should leave it on paper. For it only gets ugly in moving from blueprint to backyard."

### Nat Gas Blocks 1NC

#### **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 Workforce 1NC

#### Lack of nuclear workforce capacity kills solvency

**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.”

### Loan Guarantees – 1NC

#### Loan guarantees don’t solve – costs too high

**Slocum, 12** – director of Public Citizen’s Energy Program, expert in issues dealing with regulation and deregulation of energy markets, the impact of mergers and lax regulations over electricity, petroleum, and natural gas, and federal energy legislation (Tyson, 2/3. “We Can't Afford to Expand Nuclear Power.” http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/should-nuclear-power-be-expanded/we-cant-afford-to-expand-nuclear-power)

In recent years, industry-driven legislative efforts—most notably the sweep of incentives for nuclear power in the 2005 Energy Policy Act—have been implemented to jump-start the nuclear industry, but even that mountain of money and regulatory rollbacks can't do the impossible: build a nuclear power plant affordably, safely, or timely and find a solution to the thousands of tons of highly radioactive waste. From loan guarantees to charging ratepayers up front for the cost of construction, to liability protections from Fukushima-style accidents, the industry has been unable to bring a new reactor online. Why? Because even with all this taxpayer help, it's still too costly. Photovoltaic solar this year will break the dollar-per-watt barrier, ushering in a rooftop revolution of cheap, clean, and consumer-owned energy. In addition to turning our buildings into power stations, investing in making our structures more energy-efficient remains the most cost-effective energy investment. Energy-efficiency programs can displace 23 percent of projected demand and provide a huge return for consumers. Charging taxpayers billions of dollars to bring a new reactor online wipes out any incentives to invest in these programs and suppresses local renewable projects that could bring green jobs and advance U.S. leadership in clean energy technology.

## Warming 1NC

### Doesn’t Solve 1NC

#### Doesn’t solve warming

Green 9 (Dr. Jim, Senior Vice President for Resource Development – United Way of the Greater Triangle, “Nuclear Weapons and 'Fourth Generation' Reactors,” Friends of the Earth Australia, July, http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power-weapons/g4nw)

'Integral fast reactors' and other 'fourth generation' nuclear power concepts have been gaining attention, in part because of comments by US climate scientist James Hansen. While not a card-carrying convert, Hansen argues for more research: "We need hard-headed evaluation of how to get rid of long-lived nuclear waste and minimize dangers of proliferation and nuclear accidents. Fourth generation nuclear power seems to have the potential to solve the waste problem and minimize the others." Others are less circumspect, with one advocate of integral fast reactors promoting them as the "holy grail" in the fight against global warming. There are two main problems with these arguments. Firstly, nuclear power could at most make a modest contribution to climate change abatement, mainly because it is used almost exclusively for electricity generation which accounts for about one-quarter of global greenhouse emissions. Doubling global nuclear power output (at the expense of coal) would reduce greenhouse emissions by about 5%. Building six nuclear power reactors in Australia (at the expense of coal) would reduce Australia's emissions by just 4%.

### Transportation Outweighs 1NC

#### Transportation outweighs

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

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

### No Spillover 1NC

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

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

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

### Warming Irreversible 1NC

#### 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.

### No Impact 1NC

#### No impact to warming

Idso and Idso 11 (Craig D., Founder and Chairman of the Board – Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and Sherwood B., President – Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path,” February, http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/ prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf)

As presently constituted, earth’s atmosphere contains just slightly less than 400 ppm of the colorless and odorless gas we call carbon dioxide or CO2. That’s only four-hundredths of one percent. Consequently, even if the air's CO2 concentration was tripled, carbon dioxide would still comprise only a little over one tenth of one percent of the air we breathe, which is far less than what wafted through earth’s atmosphere eons ago, when the planet was a virtual garden place. Nevertheless, a small increase in this minuscule amount of CO2 is frequently predicted to produce a suite of dire environmental consequences, including dangerous global warming, catastrophic sea level rise, reduced agricultural output, and the destruction of many natural ecosystems, as well as dramatic increases in extreme weather phenomena, such as droughts, floods and hurricanes. As strange as it may seem, these frightening future scenarios are derived from a single source of information: the ever-evolving computer-driven climate models that presume to reduce the important physical, chemical and biological processes that combine to determine the state of earth’s climate into a set of mathematical equations out of which their forecasts are produced. But do we really know what all of those complex and interacting processes are? And even if we did -- which we don't -- could we correctly reduce them into manageable computer code so as to produce reliable forecasts 50 or 100 years into the future? Some people answer these questions in the affirmative. However, as may be seen in the body of this report, real-world observations fail to confirm essentially all of the alarming predictions of significant increases in the frequency and severity of droughts, floods and hurricanes that climate models suggest should occur in response to a global warming of the magnitude that was experienced by the earth over the past two centuries as it gradually recovered from the much-lower-than-present temperatures characteristic of the depths of the Little Ice Age. And other observations have shown that the rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations associated with the development of the Industrial Revolution have actually been good for the planet, as they have significantly enhanced the plant productivity and vegetative water use efficiency of earth's natural and agro-ecosystems, leading to a significant "greening of the earth." In the pages that follow, we present this oft-neglected evidence via a review of the pertinent scientific literature. In the case of the biospheric benefits of atmospheric CO2 enrichment, we find that with more CO2 in the air, plants grow bigger and better in almost every conceivable way, and that they do it more efficiently, with respect to their utilization of valuable natural resources, and more effectively, in the face of environmental constraints. And when plants benefit, so do all of the animals and people that depend upon them for their sustenance. Likewise, in the case of climate model inadequacies, we reveal their many shortcomings via a comparison of their "doom and gloom" predictions with real-world observations. And this exercise reveals that even though the world has warmed substantially over the past century or more -- at a rate that is claimed by many to have been unprecedented over the past one to two millennia -- this report demonstrates that none of the environmental catastrophes that are predicted by climate alarmists to be produced by such a warming has ever come to pass. And this fact -- that there have been no significant increases in either the frequency or severity of droughts, floods or hurricanes over the past two centuries or more of global warming -- poses an important question. What should be easier to predict: the effects of global warming on extreme weather events or the effects of elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations on global temperature? The first part of this question should, in principle, be answerable; for it is well defined in terms of the small number of known factors likely to play a role in linking the independent variable (global warming) with the specified weather phenomena (droughts, floods and hurricanes). The latter part of the question, on the other hand, is ill-defined and possibly even unanswerable; for there are many factors -- physical, chemical and biological -- that could well be involved in linking CO2 (or causing it not to be linked) to global temperature. If, then, today's climate models cannot correctly predict what should be relatively easy for them to correctly predict (the effect of global warming on extreme weather events), why should we believe what they say about something infinitely more complex (the effect of a rise in the air’s CO2 content on mean global air temperature)? Clearly, we should pay the models no heed in the matter of future climate -- especially in terms of predictions based on the behavior of a non-meteorological parameter (CO2) -- until they can reproduce the climate of the past, based on the behavior of one of the most basic of all true meteorological parameters (temperature). And even if the models eventually solve this part of the problem, we should still reserve judgment on their forecasts of global warming; for there will yet be a vast gulf between where they will be at that time and where they will have to go to be able to meet the much greater challenge to which they aspire

## Proliferation 1NC

### No Prolif 1NC

#### 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.

### Prolif Turn 1NC

#### Turn – IFRs make every aspect of proliferation easier

Lovins 9 (Amory B., Chair and Chief Scientist – Rocky Mountain Institute, “’New’ Nuclear Reactors: Same Old Story,” Nuclear Monitor 690, 6-26, http://www.nirs.org/factsheets/lovinsonifretc.pdf)

As this becomes evident, other kinds of reactors are being proposed instead--novel designs that claim to solve LWRs’ problems of economics, proliferation, and waste. Even climate-protection pioneer Jim Hansen says these “Generation IV” reactors merit rapid R&D. But on closer examination, the two kinds most often promoted -Integral Fast Reactors (IFRs) and thorium reactors--reveal no economic, environmental, or security rationale, and the thesis is **unsound for any nuclear reactor**. Integrated Fast Reactors (IFRs) The IFR--a pool-type, liquid-sodium cooled fast-neutron reactor plus an ambitious new nuclear fuel cycle--was abandoned in 1994, and General Electric’s S-PRISM design in 2003, due to both proliferation concerns and dismal economics. Federal funding for fast breeder reactors halted in 1983, but in the past few years, enthusiasts got renewed Bush Administration support by portraying the IFR as a solution to proliferation and nuclear waste. It’s neither. Fast reactors were first offered as a way to make more plutonium to augment and ultimately replace scarce uranium. Now that uranium and enrichment are known to get cheaper while reprocessing, cleanup, and nonproliferation get costlier--destroying the economic rationale--IFRs have been reframed as a way to destroy the plutonium (and similar transuranic elements) in long-lived radioactive waste. Two or three redesigned IFRs could in principle fission the plutonium produced by each four LWRs without making more net plutonium. However, most LWRs will have retired before even one commercialsize IFR could be built; LWRs won’t be replaced with more LWRs because they’re grossly uncompetitive; and IFRs with their fuel cycle would cost even more and probably be less reliable. It is feasible today to “burn” plutonium in LWRs, but this isn’t done much because it’s very costly, makes each kg of spent fuel 7x hotter, enhances risks, and makes certain transuranic isotopes that complicate operation. IFRs could do the same thing with similar or greater problems, offering no advantage over LWRs in proliferation resistance, cost, or environment. IFRs’ reprocessing plant, lately reframed a “recycling center,” would be built at or near the reactors, coupling them so neither works without the other. Its novel technology, re-placing solvents and aqueous chemistry with high-temperature pyrometallurgy and electro refining, would incur different but major challenges, greater technical risks and repair problems, and speculative but probably worse economics. (Argonne National Laboratory, the world’s experts on it, contracted to pyroprocess spent fuel from the EBRII--a small IFR-like test reactor shut down in 1994 --by 2035, at a cost DOE estimated in 2006 at approximately 50× today’s cost of fresh LWR fuel.) Reprocessing of any kind makes waste management more difficult and complex, increases the volume and diversity of waste streams, increases by several--to manifold the cost of nuclear fueling, and separates bomb-usable material that can’t be adequately measured or protected. Mainly for this last reason, all U.S. Presidents since Gerald Ford in 1976 (except G.W. Bush in 2006–08) discouraged it. An IFR/pyroprocessing system would give any country immediate access to over a thousand bombs’ **worth of plutonium to fuel it, facilities to recover that plutonium, and experts to separate and fabricate it into bomb cores--hardly a path to a safer world**.

### Russia/US Relations

#### -- Relations resilient

Kortunov 96 (Andrei, Russian Science Foundation, Comparative Strategy, p. 335)

However, surprisingly enough there seemed to be no visible, qualitative deterioration in the relationship in 1995-96. Indeed, at some points it looked as if the relations were sliding into a mini-cold war (e.g., after the notorious Yeltsin-Clinton encounter at Budapest in fall 1994 or when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) started its air strikes against Bosnian Serbs without first consulting Moscow). But, at every juncture, each side was able to bounce back minimizing the negative impact of tensions in particular fields on the overall relationship.

### 1NC No Risk

#### 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:

### Prolif Leadership Fails 1NC

#### 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.

## Prices 2NC

### Turns Warming

#### Econ decline causes countries to backtrack on global warming commitments

Biello 08 (David, Editor for the Scientific American. “Is a Global Recession Good for the Environment?” http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode.cfm?id=is-a-global-recession-good-for-the-08-11-132)

Times are tough when a millionaire oil man can't get a wind farm built. T. Boone Pickens backed off of his much ballyhooed mega-wind project in Texas this week, citing the declining cost of natural gas. Fossil fuel burning power plants are still too good of a deal to bother investing $2 billion into wind turbines. A bear market might seem like a boon for the environment: less overall economic activity, like manufacturing and driving, means less overall pollution. Right? Actually, as the Pickens example proves, global economic downturns take a toll on the environment by restrain economic activity that could improve the situation. But that's not all. Over-farming and drought led to 400,000 square kilometers of prime top soil blowing away in the wind in the 1930s, exacerbating, and exacerbated by, the Great Depression. And the economic crises that crippled the economies of southeast Asia in the 1990s also set in motion a rapid uptick in environmentally damaging pursuits such as illegal logging and cyanide fishing, according to the World Bank. Even as I speak, economic worries have prompted some European countries to begin backpedaling on their commitments to cut back on global warming pollution. So an economic downturn is no friend of the environment. Brother, can you spare a turbine?

### Turns Nuclear Power

#### Econ decline tanks nuke power – undermines necessary investment

Simpson 9 (Fiona, associate director of New York University's Center on International Cooperation, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, "The recession alone won't stop nuclear power's growth," http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-recession-alone-wont-stop-nuclear-powers-growth)

None of the IAEA's projections, however, account for the financial crisis, which may negatively impact the appeal of nuclear energy. Clearly, investors that need credit to build new nuclear plants face a great deal more uncertainty and difficulty securing financing. Such a situation, on the surface, would indicate that nuclear power will be less attractive to investors. The downturn also may reduce electricity demand and thus, potentially, make the need for new power plants less urgent.¶ At the same time, prices for natural gas and oil have fallen from earlier highs, increasing their attractiveness as energy sources (although the price of each has increased recently). Additionally, nuclear power plants have significant "front-loaded" costs, requiring much more investment at the outset than fossil-fuel burning plants, even if nuclear plants may eventually be cheaper to run. In light of the ongoing credit crunch, investors in countries that don't rely on state-owned enterprises may find the economic circumstances simply too difficult to justify an investment in nuclear power--especially if there's reliable (and domestic) access to natural gas, coal, or oil. One also would expect private lenders to shy from nuclear projects--both because they have less money to lend and because of nuclear power's history of cost overruns and delays. Finally, from the point of view of developing countries interested in nuclear power, multilateral development banks, such as the World Bank, tend to prohibit investment in new nuclear projects.

### Turns Russia

#### Econ collapse turns Russian war

Nyquist 5 (J.R., Author and Geopolitical Columnist – Financial Sense Online, "The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash," 2-4, http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0204.html)  
  
Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America's strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the United States from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth's surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet's economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs. But we cannot do this. As one observer recently lamented, "We drank the poison and now we must die."

### Uniqueness

#### 1. Natural gas boom and decreased demand

EIA 8/10/12 ("Today in Energy," http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=7490)

A combination of natural gas prices at 10-year lows and the warmest winter on record led to lower on-peak wholesale electricity prices so far in 2012. On-peak prices fell between 24% and 39% across major wholesale price hubs from January to June of 2012 compared to the same period of 2011 (see map above).¶ Off-peak (nights and weekends) electricity prices were also down for first-half 2012 compared to first-half 2011, although generally less than the declines in on-peak prices over that period (see map below). In contrast to other major power trading locations, off-peak prices in Northern California at CAISO NP15 increased 10% when compared to first-half 2011, mainly because of more nuclear outages this spring and record-breaking hydroelectric output during the spring of 2011. Off-peak prices generally reflect the cost of maintaining output from baseload generators, while on-peak prices reflect the price of generating from intermediate and peak generators throughout a given day.¶ Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, based on SNL Energy.¶ Spot natural gas prices during the first half of 2012 generally fell about 40-50% compared to the same period in 2011 and on some days neared their lowest levels in a decade. Lower natural gas prices led to increasing use of natural gas to generate electricity, contributing to lower wholesale electricity prices, especially for on-peak prices.¶ In 2012, twenty-eight states, mainly in the middle and eastern portions of the United States, reported their highest average daily temperatures for first half of any year during the past 118 years according to information reported by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (see map below). Warm weather at the start of 2012 contributed to reduced demand for both electricity and natural gas to heat homes, and contributed to lower wholesale natural gas and electricity prices.

#### 2. Even if electricity prices rise, it will be small and stable

EIA 9/11/12 ("Short-term energy outlook," http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/steo/report/electricity.cfm)

EIA expects the nominal U.S. residential electricity price will rise by 1.0 percent during 2012 to an average of 11.91 cents per kilowatthour. During 2013, U.S. residential retail electricity prices increase 0.9 percent over the average 2012 price. When measured in real terms, the U.S. residential electricity price declines by an annual average of 0.8 percent in both 2012 and 2013.

#### 3. Most recent EPA decision guarantees low prices

Platts Energy Week 8/27/12 ("Platts Energy Week TV: Analyst Sees $2 drop in U.S. Electricity Prices," http://www.platts.com/PressReleases/2012/082712/No)

A U.S. federal court decision last week striking down the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) attempt at regulating interstate emissions from coal-fired power plants will likely mean electricity prices will drop between $1 and $2 per megawatt hour (MWh) over the next two years, an analyst for Standard & Poor's said Sunday on the all-energy news and talk program Platts Energy Week.

#### 4. Your evidence doesn’t account for inflation – prices are down

ACCCE 12 (American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, "Energy Cost Impacts on American Families,

2001-2012," Feb., http://www.americaspower.org/sites/default/files/Energy\_Cost\_Impacts\_2012\_FINAL.pdf)

Electricity is the bargain among all consumer energy products. Among consumer ¶ energy goods and services, electricity has maintained relatively lower annual ¶ average price increases compared to residential natural gas and gasoline. ¶ Electricity prices have increased by 51% in nominal dollars since 1990, well ¶ below the 72% rate of inflation in the Consumer Price Index. The nominal prices ¶ of residential natural gas and gasoline have nearly doubled and tripled, ¶ respectively, over this period.

### Nuke Power Link

#### High prices of nuclear power means investors will pass on low natural gas prices in order to maximize profit – the costs gets put on taxpayers because of advanced cost recovery

Cooper 3/19/12 (Mark, Senior Fellow for Economic Analysis, Institute for Energy and the Environment - Vermont Law School, "Nuclear Power," http://iowa.sierraclub.org/Nuclear/nuclearhome.htm)

The effort by the Senate Commerce Committee to put a consumer protection band aid over a high caliber bullet hole in the heart of traditional ratepayer protection only makes the absurdity of the early cost recovery for nuclear reactors even more apparent.¶ Because the bill removes nuclear power from “traditional ratemaking principles or traditional cost recovery mechanisms,” consumer bills will increase dramatically. As passed out of Committee:¶ · Mid-American customers will be forced to pay for nuclear reactors long before they produce any electricity with no hope of recovering those prepayments should the reactors not be completed.¶ · The IUB is not allowed to reject the utility-determined level of prepayments because there are less costly alternatives available.¶ · Although the risk of building and operating a nuclear reactor is shifted to ratepayers, the utility is guaranteed a rate of return that will be higher than it earns on other projects.¶ This mismatch of risk and reward gives the utility strong incentives to maximize profits at the expense of ratepayers and strips the Utility Board of the powers necessary to protect ratepayers. Notwithstanding the amendments, the harmful effects identified by the Staff of the Utility Board in the original bill are still in place.¶ · By conferring a special advantage on nuclear, it threatens to distort the utility and regulatory decision making process and gives utilities an incentive to choose investments and make construction decisions that harm ratepayers.¶ · Beyond the initial choice of projects, shifting the risk of nuclear reactor construction onto the backs of ratepayers creates an ongoing problem because it diminishes the incentive to drive a hard bargain with vendors that protects ratepayers or recover costs from joint owners.¶ · By excusing nuclear reactors from rigorous comparative analysis of alternatives, it all but guarantees less costly alternatives will be passed over.¶ · Because nuclear reactors are so risky and impossible to finance in normal capital market, the utilities are pushing for advanced and guaranteed recovery of all costs, but certainty denies regulators the flexibility that is needed in an uncertain and rapidly changing environment and ties the hands of the IUB in its efforts to balance the interest of ratepayers and utility shareholders.¶ · The need to accelerate cost recovery creates severe intergenerational inequities in cost recovery, violating the fundamental principle that those who consume the output of a plant should bear its costs.¶ · Having guaranteed utilities cost recovery on an annual basis, the IUB will be under greater pressure to approve “incremental” additions to cost even when those costs are the result of utility error.¶ In its press release, MidAmerican trumpets the fact that “MidAmerican Energy Iowa’s electric customers have enjoyed stable base electricity rates for 16 years” and takes credit for that accomplishment. It conveniently ignores the important role that traditional ratemaking principles and traditional cost recovery mechanism have played in ensuring utilities deliver least cost power. By excusing the most risky, high cost options available today from those principles, this bill destroys the consumer protections that have produced stable rates in the past. The inevitable result will be that the future rates paid by MidAmerican electricity customers will be higher than they could and should be.

## Solvency 2NC

### Costs Outweigh 2NC

#### No global adoption – Russia and developing countries won’t adopt

Biello, 12 – Scientific American's associate editor for environment and energy (David, 3/21. “Can Fast Reactors Speedily Solve Plutonium Problems?” https://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=fast-reactors-to-consume-plutonium-and-nuclear-waste)

That additional level of transmutation might prove too costly, both in terms of getting the technology licensed to operate in the U.K. and in constructing the reactor itself. Such fast reactors are more expensive than even traditional reactors, such as Westinghouse's new AP-1000 under construction in China and the U.S., which are estimated to cost roughly $7 billion apiece. Conventional light-water reactors can also "consume" plutonium, if need be. "If I was going to try to get rid of 100 tons of plutonium, I'd burn it in a light-water reactor," Cochran says, by making it into the mixed oxide fuels. And "the cheapest thing to do is vitrify it [convert it to glass] and mix it with other nuclear waste." Plus, the U.K. has a poor record in the past with its own experimental fast reactor designs—the Dounreay Fast Reactor and the Prototype Fast Reactor—including multiple sodium leaks. Dounreay also suffered an explosion at its dumping ground for used sodium coolant that may have contributed to radioactive particles from spent fuel turning up on nearby beaches. The Dounreay and Prototype cleanup and decommissioning continue today, despite both having been shut down for decades. Originally, such fast reactors were developed to solve a problem that never panned out: scarcity in the global supply of uranium. The idea was to create fuel within the reactors themselves once fission began, in effect making more than they consumed. But, factoring in inflation, uranium prices remain the same today as they were at the dawn of the nuclear era. "Like all minerals, improvements in the efficiency of extraction and the ability to dig for deeper ores outpaces the depletion of the resource over 100 years or more," Cochran notes. "Economically, fast reactors are not competitive and they're never going to be competitive." "We're not going to run out of uranium," Loewen admits. "Here's a solution for this stuff that's piled up." Ultimately, however, the core problem may be that such new reactors don't eliminate the nuclear waste that has piled up so much as transmute it. Even with a fleet of such fast reactors, nations would nonetheless require an ultimate home for radioactive waste, one reason that a 2010 M.I.T. report on spent nuclear fuel dismissed such fast reactors. Or, as Cochran puts it: "If you want to get rid of milk, don't feed it to cows."

### Nat Gas Blocks 2NC

#### Prefer our evidence – recent trends decisively conclude neg, but their authors always think that the Renaissance is around the corner

Maize 12 (Kennedy, Staff Writer – POWER Magazine, “A Bumpy Road for Nukes,” 8-6, POWERnews, http://www.powermag.com/nuclear/4859.html)

It’s been a rough road for nuclear advocates in the U.S. of late, although nothing seems to dent the Pollyanna armor of the nuclear crowd, always appearing to believe a revival is just over the horizon and headed into view. Here are a few fraught developments for the nuclear business that suggest the positive vision just might be a mirage. \* GE CEO Jeff Immelt in a recent interview with the Financial Times revealed a surprising and somewhat uncharacteristic realism with regard to the company’s nuclear future and that of its partner in radioactivity, Hitachi. In London for the Summer Olympics, Immelt told a reporter for the FT, “It’s really a gas and wind world today. When I talk to the guys who run the oil companies, they say look, they’re finding more gas all the time. It’s just hard to justify nuclear, really hard. Gas is so cheap, and at some point, really, economics rule.” For the nuclear industry, economics has always been the fundamental enemy – not the green-tinged, hairy anti-nuke activists, but the folks with the green eye shades, sharp pencils and, today, even sharper spreadsheets. The nuclear execs long have pursued governments as their bulwark against markets, and that has often worked. Today, as Immelt notes, gas has made the market forces so overwhelming, at least in those places such as the U.S. where gas is astonishingly abundant, that even government likely can’t come to the rescue of nuclear power. Could that have something to do with the abject failure of the 2005 Energy Policy Act’s loan guarantee provisions, which have not worked for renewables any better than they have worked for nukes? Indeed, the threat of gas is at least as potentially toxic for many wind and solar projects as it is for nuclear and coal new build. \* In Georgia, the Southern Company is facing what looks like growing problems with its Vogtle project, which aims for two new nuclear units using the unproven but promising Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design. With its federal loan in jeopardy (Southern says it can go ahead without taxpayer funds) and the project running behind schedule and over budget, the Atlanta-based utility now faces lawsuits brought by the reactor vendor and the construction contractor Shaw Group. The amount in dispute, some $29 million, is tiny compared to the multi-billion-dollar price tag for the project. But it may be revealing of ruptures in the deal. Robert Marritz, an energy lawyer and veteran industry observer, publisher of ElectricityPolicy.com, commented that “the very filing of a lawsuit at this stage of the first nuclear plant construction in decades is stunning, reflecting stresses in a relationship that should, one would think, be contained and resolved rather than boiling over into public view.” Indeed, the parties are also engaged in a larger, perhaps nastier, dispute involving $800 million that has not gotten much public exposure. And that’s real money. \* Moving to California, the long-running saga of Edison International’s San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS, how’s that for an inept acronym?) continues, with little clarity in sight. The plant has been out of service since January as a result of unexpected and still unexplained tube wear in the plant’s steam generators. According to Bloomberg New Energy Finance, the outage is costing the utility about $1.5 million a day just in lost revenue. The cost to the state in jeopardized reliability hasn’t been calculated, although Edison has started up mothballed gas capacity to fill the supply gap. There is no firm date for restart at the nuclear plant. In the meantime, the California Public Utilities Commission is planning a formal investigation of the outage and Edison’s response, but recently decided to delay that until the utility files a legally-required report with the CPUC November 1. CPUC President Mike Peevey is a former executive with the Los Angeles-based utility.

#### Gas destroys nuclear – more predictable, cheaper, and faster

Smith 12 (Rebecca, Staff Writer, “Cheap Natural Gas Unplugs U.S. Nuclear-Power Revival,” 3-15, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304459804577281490129153610.html)

What killed the revival wasn't last year's nuclear accident in Japan, nor was it a soft economy that dented demand for electricity. Rather, a shale-gas boom flooded the U.S. market with cheap natural gas, offering utilities a cheaper, less risky alternative to nuclear technology. "It's killed off new coal and now it's killing off new nuclear," says David Crane, chief executive of NRG Energy Inc., NRG +3.58% a power-generation company based in Princeton, N.J. "Gas has come along at just the right time to upset everything." Across the country, utilities are turning to natural gas to generate electricity, with 258 plants expected to be built from 2011 through 2015, federal statistics indicate. Not only are gas-fired plants faster to build than reactors, they are much less expensive. The U.S. Energy Information Administration says it costs about $978 per kilowatt of capacity to build and fuel a big gas-fired power plant, compared with $5,339 per kilowatt for a nuclear plant. Already, the inexpensive natural gas is putting downward pressure on electricity costs for consumers and businesses. The EIA has forecast that the nation will add 222 gigawatts of generating capacity between 2010 and 2035—equivalent to one-fifth of the current U.S. capacity. The biggest chunk of that addition—58%—will be fired by natural gas, it said, followed by renewable sources, including hydropower, at 31%, then coal at 8% and nuclear power at 4%. "What utility doesn't want cheap fuel?" says Steve Piper, associate director of energy fundamentals at SNL Financial, a research company. He predicts natural gas will remain the "default fuel" for as long as gas production remains high and prices stay low.

### General Framing 2NC

#### View their ev w/ skepticism – nuclear lobby are hacks.

Todhunter 9/14 [Colin, Global Research, Nuclear Power: The Energy of Protest. The Future could be Renewable September 14, 2012 http://www.globalresearch.ca/nuclear-power-the-energy-of-protest-the-future-could-be-renewable/?utm\_source=rss&utm\_medium=rss&utm\_campaign=nuclear-power-the-energy-of-protest-the-future-could-be-renewable]

Proliferation concerns aside, the role that the powerful pro-nuclear lobby plays in shaping the debate about nuclear energy should not be underestimated. The US Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) is described by Dr Helen Caldicott as the propaganda wing for the US nuclear industry, which spends millions of dollars annually to engineer public opinion. The NEI forwards the message that nuclear energy is clean, safe and cheap and in promoting this message has often attacked opponents and targeted legislators and policy makers via ‘independent’ reports, phoney claims and ‘donations’. Journalism Professor Karl Grossman of the State University of New York suggests the misinformation from General Electric and Westinghouse, the ‘Coke and Pepsi’ of the nuclear industry (who will incidentally both benefit enormously from India’s lucrative, multi billion dollar expanding nuclear sector), have made the money put into PR and lobbying by the tobacco companies appear miniscule. Perhaps such a level of spending and propaganda is not surprising because Harvey Wasserman, writer and activist, says this is an industry that can’t solve its waste problems, can’t operate without leaking radiation, can’t pay for itself and can’t get private insurance against terror or error.

### Loan Guarantees Fail

#### They’re factually wrong about loan guarantees – investors still have to pay upfront costs – deters investment

Gale et al 9 (Kelley Michael, Finance Department Chair – Latham & Watkins, “Financing the Nuclear Renaissance: The Benefits and Potential Pitfalls of Federal & State Government Subsidies and the Future of Nuclear Power in California,” Energy Law Journal, Vol. 30, p. 497-552, http://www.felj.org/docs/elj302/19gale-crowell-and-peace.pdf)

Much has been written on the DOE‘s loan guarantee program under the EPAct 2005, particularly in light of the changes to that program for renewable projects under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and as such we will not cover its ―nuts and bolts‖ in great detail. But generally speaking, the federal loan guarantee program applicable to nuclear projects authorizes the DOE to make guarantees of debt service under construction loans for up to eighty percent of the construction costs of new nuclear projects that will (1) avoid or reduce air pollutants and emissions of greenhouse gases, and (2) employ new or significantly improved technology to do so. 61 Several requirements must be met before the DOE can enter into a loan guarantee agreement. First, either an appropriation for the cost of the guarantee must have been made or the DOE must receive full payment for the cost of the guarantee from the developer. 62 Because no money has been appropriated to cover these costs and the DOE has stated it does not intend to seek appropriations to pay these costs for any nuclear projects, 63 it appears that project developers may be responsible for pre-paying the full costs of the loan guarantees, 64 unless the Bingaman legislation discussed below is passed as proposed or similar legislation is enacted. Two components currently make up the cost of the guarantee. The first part is an ―Administrative Cost‖: the DOE must receive fees sufficient to cover applicable administrative expenses for the loan guarantee including the costs of evaluating applications, negotiating and closing loan guarantees, and monitoring the progress of projects. 65 These administrative expenses passed on to the developer include an application fee of $800,000, a facility fee of one half of one percent of the amount guaranteed by the loan guarantee, and a maintenance fee of $200,000–$400,000 per year. 66 Second, the DOE must receive a ―Subsidy Cost‖ for the loan guarantee, which is defined as the net present value of the government‘s expected liability from issuing the guarantee. 67 The Subsidy Cost must be estimated by a developer in an application, but cannot be officially determined until the time the loan guarantee agreement is signed. 68 The administrative costs associated with the program have been criticized as overly burdensome, 69 and the Subsidy Cost remains unquantifiable but decisively enormous. In fact, Standard & Poor‘s recently estimated that the Subsidy Cost for a typical nuclear reactor could be as high as several hundred million dollars. 70 The lack of clarity around how to quantify these costs up front and, as discussed below, the position of the DOE that the Subsidy Cost is not an eligible project cost under the loan guarantee program, make it difficult for developers to arrange investment or interim financing to get them through the development process. 71 Additionally, before entering a loan guarantee, the DOE must determine that (1) ―there is reasonable prospect of repayment of the principal and interest on [the guaranteed debt] by the borrower,‖ (2) the amount guaranteed by the government under the loan guarantee, when combined with other available financing sources, is sufficient to carry out the nuclear construction project, and (3) the DOE possesses a first lien on the assets of the project and other assets pledged as security and its security interest in the project is not subordinate to any other financing for the project. 72 Finally, the loan guarantee obligation must bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private sector for similar Federal government guaranteed obligations of comparable risk and the term of the guarantee cannot exceed the lesser of thirty years or ninety percent of the useful life of the nuclear reactor. 73 These requirements create uncertainties for developers and financiers seeking to understand how the program will work to support the financing of a new nuclear power plant. For instance, it is unclear how government approval of interest rates will work in the context of a deal with multiple debt instruments that each may have different pricing. Setting interest rates in these types of deals is an iterative process of modeling interest rates and testing markets. Further, it is unclear how interest rates will be compared. To our knowledge, there are no ―similar Federal government guaranteed obligations of comparable risk‖ to debt issued for the construction of a nuclear power project. 74

### Loan Guarantees Fail – A2: Lower Costs

#### Loan guarantees fail to lower construction costs

**Brumfiel 7** (Geoff, Senior News Reporter for Nature Business, "Powerful incentives", Nature, Vol 448, August 16 2007, Academic Search Complete)

Safety net The guarantees would provide a major boost for plant construction, says Marilyn Kray, vicepresident for project development at Exelon, a utility based in Chicago, Illinois, and the largest nuclear generator in the nation. They would reassure lenders, and allow utilities to borrow at lower rates. Given the enormous capital costs, he says, “a single interest percentage point is quite significant.” “It would be a very useful incentive to have,” agrees Dimitri Nikas, an energy analyst with Standard & Poor’s, a financial services company in New York. But it might still fail to drive down the costs of construction to a competitive level. The expert labour and technology needed to build such plants is expensive, as is the meticulous regulatory process. The bottom line, Nikas says, is that the incentives may get one or two plants built — but they won’t herald a building boom in nuclear power stations.

## Warming 2NC

### Transportation Outweighs 2NC

#### Can’t solve without reducing transportation emissions – leading cause of warming

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

Through the twenty-first century, on-road transportation is expected to be a leading climate-forcing activity worldwide. Cars and trucks emit almost no sulfates (cooling agents) but are major emitters of carbon dioxide, black carbon, and ozone—all of which cause warming and are detrimental to human health. U.S. on-road transportation is responsible for 40 percent of global on-road climate warming (“radiative forcing” in climate terms). U.S. on-road transportation is projected to have a net radiative forcing of 66 mWm-2 on a twenty-year horizon, as shown in Figure 11. U.S. on-road transportation represents nearly half (41 percent) of global radiative forcing in this sector over a twenty-year timeframe.

### Warming Irreversible 2NC

#### 6 degree warming’s inevitable

AP 9 (Associated Press, Six Degree Temperature Rise by 2100 is Inevitable: UNEP, September 24, <http://www.speedy-fit.co.uk/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=168>)

Earth's temperature is likely to jump six degrees between now and the end of the century even if every country cuts greenhouse gas emissions as proposed, according to a United Nations update. Scientists looked at emission plans from 192 nations and calculated what would happen to global warming. The projections take into account 80 percent emission cuts from the U.S. and Europe by 2050, which are not sure things. The U.S. figure is based on a bill that passed the House of Representatives but is running into resistance in the Senate, where debate has been delayed by health care reform efforts. Carbon dioxide, mostly from the burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil, is the main cause of global warming, trapping the sun's energy in the atmosphere. The world's average temperature has already risen 1.4 degrees since the 19th century. Much of projected rise in temperature is because of developing nations, which aren't talking much about cutting their emissions, scientists said at a United Nations press conference Thursday. China alone adds nearly 2 degrees to the projections. "We are headed toward very serious changes in our planet," said Achim Steiner, head of the U.N.'s environment program, which issued the update on Thursday. The review looked at some 400 peer-reviewed papers on climate over the last three years. Even if the developed world cuts its emissions by 80 percent and the developing world cuts theirs in half by 2050, as some experts propose, the world is still facing a 3-degree increase by the end of the century, said Robert Corell, a prominent U.S. climate scientist who helped oversee the update. Corell said the most likely agreement out of the international climate negotiations in Copenhagen in December still translates into a nearly 5-degree increase in world temperature by the end of the century. European leaders and the Obama White House have set a goal to limit warming to just a couple degrees. The U.N.'s environment program unveiled the update on peer-reviewed climate change science to tell diplomats how hot the planet is getting. The last big report from the Nobel Prize-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change came out more than two years ago and is based on science that is at least three to four years old, Steiner said. Global warming is speeding up, especially in the Arctic, and that means that some top-level science projections from 2007 are already out of date and overly optimistic. Corell, who headed an assessment of warming in the Arctic, said global warming "is accelerating in ways that we are not anticipating." Because Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets are melting far faster than thought, it looks like the seas will rise twice as fast as projected just three years ago, Corell said. He said seas should rise about a foot every 20 to 25 years.

#### Low threshold—less than 2 degrees is sufficient to cause their impacts

Harvey 11 (Fiona, Environment Reporter – Guardian, 11/9, “World headed for irreversible climate change in five years, IEA warns,” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change>)

Climate scientists estimate that global warming of 2C above pre-industrial levels marks the limit of safety, beyond which climate change becomes catastrophic and irreversible. Though such estimates are necessarily imprecise, warming of as little as 1.5C could cause dangerous rises in sea levels and a higher risk of extreme weather – the limit of 2C is now inscribed in international accords, including the partial agreement signed at Copenhagen in 2009, by which the biggest developed and developing countries for the first time agreed to curb their greenhouse gas output.

## Prolif 2NC

### No Prolif 2NC

#### Their authors 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))

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 terror

#### No nuclear terror – operation, cohesion and coordination

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

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

## Elections 1NR

### Nuke Power A2: n/u

#### Obama has backed way off of nuclear – he knows it’s a political deadweight

Levine, 9/7/12 – contributing editor and former managing editor of Firedoglake, and contributing writer for Truthout (Gregg, “Obama Drops Nuclear from Energy Segment of Convention Speech.” <http://capitoilette.com/2012/09/07/obama-drops-nuclear-from-energy-segment-of-convention-speech/>)

In the wake of Fukushima, where hundreds of thousands of Japanese have been displaced, where tens of thousands are showing elevated radiation exposure, and where thousands of children have thyroid abnormalities, no one can be cavalier about promising a safe harnessing of the atom. And in a world where radioisotopes from the breached reactors continue to turn up in fish and farm products, not only across Japan, but across the northern hemisphere, no one can pretend this is someone else’s problem.¶ Obama and his campaign advisors know all this and more. They know that most industrialized democracies have chosen to shift away from nuclear since the start of the Japanese crisis. They know that populations that have been polled on the matter want to see nuclear power phased out. And they know that in a time of deficit hysteria, nuclear power plants are an economic sinkhole.¶ And so, on a night when the president was promised one of the largest audiences of his entire campaign, he and his team decided that 2012 was not a year to throw a bone to Obama’s nuclear backers. Obama, a consummate politician, made the decision that for his second shot at casting for the future, nuclear power is political deadweight.

### Impact – 2NC

#### DA outweighs –

#### Ukraine intervention sparks global nuclear war.

**Kingston**, February **2009** (Brian, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs – CIFP, “Ukraine: A Risk Assessment Report”, p. http://www.carleton.ca/cifp/app/serve.php/1214.pdf)

Russia: Russia seeks to influence the weakened Ukraine, inflaming ethnic-Russian separatism; Crimea declares independence; Ukraine resists, perhaps seeing an external war as a distraction from internal strife; Russia comes to the aid of Crimea/ethnic-Russians resulting in open warfare between Russia and Ukraine. The West: The West also suffers from the global recession, but (perhaps following a period of inward looking protectionism) realizes that it cannot allow Russian success in Ukraine; open hostilities erupt between Russian and NATO forces triggering World War III and the strong possibility of nuclear war, or at least the drawing in of many other countries.

#### Pakistani break-up triggers nuclear war.

**Morgan 2007** (Stephen J., Political Writer and Former Member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, “Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!?”, 9-23, http://www.freearticlesarchive .com/article/\_Better\_another\_Taliban\_Afghanistan\_\_than\_a\_Taliban\_NUCLEAR\_Pakistan\_\_\_/99961/0/)

However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

#### Obama reelection is critical to a global climate deal

**Geman**, 1/5/**2012** (Ben, Report says global climate deal hinges on Obama reelection, The Hill, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202539-report-global-climate-deal-hinges-on-obama-reelection-)

Prospects for striking a binding global climate deal by 2015 are probably toast if President Obama loses in November. That’s among the conclusions in a wide-ranging, new climate and green energy outlook from banking giant HSBC’s research branch. A major outcome from the United Nations climate talks in December was a plan to craft a deal by 2015 — one that would include big, developing nations such as China — and have it come into force by 2020. But Obama’s main Republican White House rivals are critical of emissions limits and skeptical of climate science. HSBC predicts an international agreement by 2015 is highly unlikely if Obama loses the election. From their research note: [T]he prospects for a new global climate deal in 2015 depend considerably on the election of a pro-climate action president. The election of a President opposed to climate action will not only damage growth prospects for low-carbon solutions in the USA itself, but will make the hard task of negotiating a new global agreement by 2015 almost impossible.

#### 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."

#### Re-election key to CTBT --- Romney will resume testing.

**Schneidmiller**, 6/15/**2012** (Chris – editor of Global Security Newswire, National Academies Report is “Grist” for CTBT Debate: Gottemoeller, Global Security Newswire, p. <http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/national-academies-report-grist-ctbt-debate-gottemoeller/>)

President Obama has committed his administration to bringing the ratification matter back to Capitol Hill, though no congressional action is expected before 2013 and would require first a successful re-election bid. Mitt Romney, Obama’s Republican challenger, appears unlikely to break with his GOP predecessors by supporting the accord. His election could mean that an informal moratorium on underground nuclear tests set two decades ago will continue to stand, or perhaps even could open the door to a resumption of trial blasts. The response to the National Academies report from the administration has been affirmative but measured. “We welcome the release of the report by the [National Academies],” Gottemoeller said the following month. “The report, which is by a really esteemed group of experts, is valuable. I think it adds to the grist for informed debate and discussion.” At least one longtime foe of the treaty indicated after the study’s publication that his position had not changed. “I will do anything I can to defeat CTBT,” Senator Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) said at an April 17 event in Washington. Achieving a winning vote on the treaty would require strong leadership starting with President Obama and his Cabinet, aggressive outreach, support from former government officials and military leaders informed on the issue, and open-minded Republicans, issue-watchers said. Obstacles include continued skepticism about the treaty’s merits, deep divisions on Capitol Hill, and GOP assertions that Obama has failed to meet his promises to ensure the upkeep of the nation’s nuclear arsenal. In addition, the Senate that considers test ban ratification might be noticeably less friendly to arms control than the one that approved the New START nuclear arms control deal with Russia in 2010. “So much of this rests on the politics and not the facts,” said Tom Collina, research director at the Arms Control Association. “I think the facts of the case are pretty clear from the [report] and other sources that the test ban treaty … would serve U.S. national security interests,” he said. “Unfortunately, the politics are such that the facts don’t often get to see the light of day.” A Long Wait The United States became the first signatory nation to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on Sept. 24, 1996. Membership has now grown to 183 countries, 157 of which have ratified the pact. Forty-four countries that participated in final negotiations on establishing the treaty while operating nuclear power or research programs -- the “Annex 2” states -- must each secure legislative approval for the accord to enter into force. There are now eight holdouts from that group: China, Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan and the United States. The Clinton administration took the treaty to the Senate in 1997; it sat for two years before going to a vote and being rejected 48-51 on Oct. 13, 1999. Support from two-thirds of the chamber, 67 senators, was required for approval. The situation was far from optimum for CTBT proponents. There were only three days of committee hearings and 18 hours of floor debate ahead of the vote, according to the Arms Control Association. The decision also came less than a year after President Clinton escaped conviction on two impeachment charges. “You had just a tremendously charged partisan environment where, not dissimilar from today, nobody on the other side wanted to give President Clinton a victory on any issue,” Collina said. Supporters saw the treaty as a significant building block in the global nonproliferation regime through a prohibition on explosive testing that is key to determining whether new or modernized nuclear weapons actually function. Others worried about the pact’s effects on U.S. national security. “There were two big issues about the treaty: One was its verifiability and the second was that [senators] weren’t sure about whether the Stockpile Stewardship Program would allow us to maintain a safe and effective arsenal without explosive nuclear testing,” said Gottemoeller, who in 1999 headed nuclear nonproliferation efforts at the Energy Department. Treaty opponents charged that if the United States ratified the pact, Washington’s confidence in its nuclear deterrent would decline while enemy states might quietly move ahead with developing their own arsenals. President George W. Bush made no effort to push the treaty but did not lift the voluntary U.S. suspension of testing put in place in 1992 during his father’s administration. Obama made his intentions known in a 2009 speech in Prague: “To achieve a global ban on nuclear testing, my administration will immediately and aggressively pursue U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. After more than five decades of talks, it is time for the testing of nuclear weapons to finally be banned.” Negotiating the New START nuclear arms control deal with Russia, then shepherding it through the Senate, claimed precedence. The accord, which took effect in February 2011, requires both nations by 2018 to reduce deployed strategic nuclear systems to 1,550 warheads and 700 delivery systems. The administration last year initiated a campaign aimed at informing lawmakers, congressional staff and the public about the treaty -- particularly the technical advances seen since 1999 that would demonstrate that the United States could feel safe in becoming a full CTBT participant. Stockpile stewardship, the scientific program of testing and analysis of today’s nuclear warheads, was only three years old at the time and “very immature,” according to Gottemoeller. The nearly 13 intervening years have offered "a wealth of experience” at the national laboratories, which are now delivering science that can sustain the nuclear arsenal, she told GSN. The U.S. and global means for detecting an illicit nuclear test are also much stronger than in 1999, the official argued. The International Monitoring System, which encompasses more than 300 seismic, radionuclide and other sensor sites operated by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, “was still basically on paper as a system” 13 years ago, the undersecretary said. Today, it is 85 percent complete. The United States, meanwhile, is replacing satellite sensors for identifying nuclear blasts and continues to make other moves to augment national monitoring capacities, Gottemoeller said. Those U.S. capabilities are described in the report as “superior” to the CTBT system. The Obama administration requested the report by the National Academies’ National Research Council as a follow-up to a 2002 analysis by another expert panel. The latest document, by a group of veteran scientists both within and outside of government, addresses only the technical basis for agreeing to forgo future nuclear testing. Among the host of findings: progress on the technical component of the Stockpile Stewardship Program has advanced further than anticipated in the 2002 analysis; seismic sensors can identify subterranean blasts with yields less than 1 kiloton, far less powerful than the weapons dropped on Japan to end World War II; and entry into force would further reduce the potential for secret nuclear testing by allowing for on-site probes of suspicious events. “So long as the nation is fully committed to securing its weapons stockpile and provides sufficient resources for doing so, the U.S. has the technical capabilities to maintain safe, reliable nuclear weapons into the foreseeable future without the need for underground weapons testing,” scientist Ellen Williams, who led the nine-person expert panel, said in provided comments when the document was released on March 30. “In addition, U.S. and international technologies to monitor weapons testing by other countries are significantly better now than they were a decade ago.” There is little chance the report will resolve differences on the treaty. Just hours before the document was made public, Bush administration undersecretary of State for arms control and international security Robert Joseph called the pact “fundamentally flawed, both structurally and conceptually.” Among its weaknesses, he argued during an event in Washington, are a lack of agreed-upon definition for nuclear testing, the requirement should the treaty enter into force for 30 CTBT states to sign off on any on-site inspections, and the absence of an enforcement mechanism for dealing with cheaters. Nations such as China and Russia have not ruled out conducting extremely low-yield blasts that would confer military advantages, even if the United States continues its policy of restraint, Joseph said. The accord text prohibits “any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion,” which is understood to encompass any blast of any yield, the Arms Control Association said in a rejoinder to CTBT critics issued the same day as the National Academies report. Testing is “overwhelmingly efficient” in comparison to the more demanding efforts required to ensure an equal level of nuclear safety and operational surety through stockpile stewardship, said Baker Spring, a national security fellow at the Heritage Foundation. A maintenance program stretching for decades could also produce unforeseen complications, such as having to develop missiles to fit existing warheads rather than design them together “in a more integrated fashion,” he wrote in an analysis published after the expert report was released. Questions also persist about the potential for cheaters to use illicit methods to conduct tests without being detected, according to Spring’s assessment. Ratifying the treaty would mean accepting the United States would never need nuclear weapons able to meet military needs beyond those identified today, Spring added. “Would we ever say that for any other category of weapon? Would we say that we never need a next-generation tactical fighter aircraft?” he told GSN. He argued that military officials would say, “’Not on your life.’ “So I also remain skeptical on that level, as well as the question of stockpile surveillance,” he added. “The point now is the question of how much influence the [National Academies] report will have on the senators who may be asked for a vote. I think the answer to that question is we don’t know,” Spring said. History Repeated? The report itself does not address whether the treaty should be ratified. One of the panelists, former National Nuclear Security Administration chief Linton Brooks, also declined to say whether he believes the document will aid those pressing for legislative approval. “That’s a question the report doesn’t deal with. I think you’ve got to ask the administration what their plans are,” he said during an April conference call with reporters. “I’m gonna take sort of a pass on speculating on exactly how the administration will use it.” The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is among a number of compacts on the radar of the administration and Senate, which are now jousting over the Law of the Sea Treaty. “We hope that CTBT will be the next arms control treaty to come up,” Collina said. It has become accepted wisdom, though, that no official action will occur before 2013. The “knock down, drag out fight” over New START “quite rightly” led the administration to forgo any thought of trying to bring the test ban to the Senate during Obama’s first term, said Kingston Reif, nuclear nonproliferation director at the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation. He said he was “cautiously optimistic” that Obama would request ratification should he be elected to a second term.

### U – 2NC

#### Charlie Cook is the foremost expert on American politics

Milbank 10/25/06 (Dana, Wash Post, "When It Comes to Politics, Charlie Cook Has the Prophecy Market Cornered," http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/24/AR2006102401248\_pf.html)

**The pharaoh had Joseph. The Greeks had the Oracle at Delphi. Washington has Charlie Cook.**¶Please tell us, Seer of Future Congresses, how many seats the Democrats will pick up in the House on Election Day.¶ "Twenty to 35," Cook answers.¶ And how about in the Senate, OProphet on the Potomac?¶ "At least four," the man with the crystal ball says. "Most likely five or six."¶ What fate does the seer see for Sen. George Allen (R-Va.)?¶ "He wins ugly, but he wins," Cook divines.¶ And, pray tell, how are the planets aligning for Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.)?¶ "Gone," he decrees.¶ The midterm elections are two weeks away, but the powerful cannot wait that long to learn of the outcome. And so they call in Cook, who, for a fee of $5,000 to $20,000, gives his audiences the (very) early returns.¶ Last week he spoke to pharmaceutical and insurance groups. On Monday, he flew to Las Vegas and back to talk to the American Beverage Association. Later this week it's American Express and a hedge fund in New York and the paper industry in Georgia. Yesterday found Cook at a breakfast with the DLA Piper law firm, lunch with automobile manufacturers and dinner in Boston with a corporate housing group.¶ All are looking for the same thing: next month's election returns. And Cook has them. "Senators Santorum in Pennsylvania and Mike DeWine in Ohio are pretty much done," he told the Piper audience at the Willard hotel. And the lifelines of Sens. Conrad Burns (R-Mont.) and Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.) aren't looking any longer. "I'd be surprised if any of those four can survive," Cook informed the crowd of lobbyists, diplomats and journalists.¶ The firm's representatives treated their visiting sage with great deference. James Blanchard, a former Michigan governor, introduced him as "**a renowned expert**." Former defense secretary Bill Cohen read Cook's credentials to the audience: "**one of the best political handicappers . . . the Picasso of election analysis**."¶ "He's hot," observed Rosemary Freeman, one of the event coordinators.¶ That's not the first description that comes to mind for Cook, who entered the ballroom lugging an overstuffed canvas bag, a torn, padded envelope and an overflowing blue file folder. Chubby and partial to big eyeglasses, he had the tail of his tie tucked into his shirt. He planted his Starbucks venti caffe latte on the head table, where he was joined by the Canadian ambassador and a former NATO secretary general.¶ Cook's well-rehearsed speech includes a reference to his posterior, an allusion to the movie "Young Frankenstein," and a tortured metaphor involving storms and levees to compare the 2006 election to the one in 1994. "The wave is bigger, but there are fewer structures on the beach," he forecast.¶ Cook is not the boldest of election prognosticators (that honor goes to Stuart Rothenberg), nor the most telegenic (washingtonpost.com's Chris Cillizza gets the nod there), **but he is surely the most prominent**. On contract with NBC, he was on "Meet the Press" on Sunday and taped segments for the "Today Show" and "NBC Nightly News." He commissions his own poll, and his column appears once a week in the National Journal. A Nexis search finds 873 mentions in the past 60 days for him and his company, the Cook Political Report.¶ And while he's not always on the mark (he admits to having "tread marks on my forehead" after understating the Republican gains in '94) he's close enough that **nobody challenges his forecasts**. "I'm not as much of an expert as he is, so I have to defer to him," said Dick Gephardt, a former House Democratic leader, after Cook's talk to the Piper firm.

#### Obama will win – Intrade says so

Intrade 10/5/12 ("Barack Obama to be re-elected President in 2012," http://www.intrade.com/v4/markets/contract/?contractId=743474)
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#### Intrade is the best political predictor of election results

CNBC 8 ("CNBC Features Intrade - Cashing in on the election," 4/25, http://www.intrade.com/news/news\_256.html)

"It's your money, your vote and... your trade," CNBC's Scott Cohn takes a look at Intrade's, real money, prediction markets that "some political experts swear by."¶The CNBC feature, aired on Monday 25th August 2008, discusses Intrade's ability to predict the outcome of the 2008 election.¶ "Trading volumes are five times higher this 2008 cycle, to-date, than for all of 2004" according to Intrade CEO, John Delaney. Justin Wolfers, of the Wharton School of Business (University of Pennsylvania), comments that small markets "end up yielding very accurate predictions."¶ The Wharton School of Business has found that Intrade has a margin of error of 1-1.5%. This margin of error is approximately half that of comparable Gallup Polls which has been a benchmark of accuracy in predicting the outcome of US presidential elections for many years.¶ Can the Intrade crowd predict the election? Some say volumes are too small, others say it predicted 50 states correctly in 2004 and with over $100m traded on US Politics this election cycle so far "maybe, these virtual crowds really are wise."¶ Absolute accuracy aside, **Intrade seems to predict better than many others** and gives a real-time snapshot of market sentiment 24/7.

#### 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.

#### Nate Silver’s model is superior to polls which are volatile.

**Rothschild 2009** (David – Ph. D. candidate in the Department of Business and Public Policy at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, Forecasting Elections: Comparing Prediction Markets, Polls, and Their Biases, Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 73, No. 5, p. 895-916)

Starting in the 2008 Presidential campaign, Nate Silver’s FiveThirtyEight.com revolutionized election forecasting for the general public. Until his website was launched in March of 2008, those interested in predicting election outcomes typically reviewed national polling results that asked a representative cross-section of voters who they would vote for if the election were held that day. Yet, these raw poll numbers are volatile, subject to random sampling error on either side of the true underlying value. For example, on the eve of the 2008 Presidential election, national polls showed Obama’s lead over McCain ranging anywhere from 2 to 11 percentage points. Starting in the 2000 election cycle, poll aggregation organizations made an improvement by publishing less volatile averages of raw polls; the leading poll aggregators, Pollster.com and RealClearPolitics.com, both had ﬁnal averages showing Obama winning by 7.9 percentage points over McCain (the ﬁnal margin was 7.4 percentage points).1 Although an improvement over raw poll numbers, these estimates still succumb to two well-known poll-based biases, especially earlier in the cycle: polls demonstrate larger margins than the election results and they have an anti-incumbency bias (i.e., early leads in polls fade toward Election Day and incumbent party candidates have higher vote shares on Election Day than their poll values in the late summer into the early fall).2 Further, they do not provide a probability of victory. In contrast, FiveThirtyEight aggregates raw poll numbers, debiases them toward expected vote share, and then produces a probability of victory. After FiveThirtyEight’s strong showing in the Presidential primaries, the discussions of political junkies around the country quickly transformed from focusing on the latest polls to the probability of victory.

### Nuclear Power 2NC

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Women –

#### A) They oppose nuclear power.

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

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

#### B) They swing the election.

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

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

#### Massive public opposition to nuclear power

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

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

### Nuclear Power – Link Turns the Case

#### 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."

### Nuclear Power – Expensive

#### Nuclear power is expensive --- unexpected costs and inflation.

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

While the nuclear industry in the United States has seen continued improvement in operating performance over time, it remains uncompetitive with coal and natural gas on price. This cost differential is primarily driven by high capital costs and long construction times, often more than 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, nuclear power plants, on average, wind up costing three times more to build than original estimates suggest. Inflation, especially in the more nuclear-powered 1970s, played some role in the problem of ballooning costs. But when a project takes more than a decade to complete, labor and capital costs can grow in unexpected ways as well.

### Link Shield – Blame Booster

#### The link only goes one way –

#### A) Negativity bias.

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

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

### Link Booster – Incumbents

#### Link outweighs the turn --- it’s easier to get angry at Obama than excited.

**Blow**, 7/27/**2012** (Charles, Where’s the Outrage?, The New York Times, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/28/opinion/blow-wheres-the-outrage.html>)

Are too many Democratic voters sleepwalking away from our democracy this election cycle, not nearly outraged enough about Big Money’s undue influence and Republican state legislatures changing the voting rules? It seems so. A Gallup poll released this week found that: “Democrats are significantly less likely now (39 percent) than they were in the summers of 2004 and 2008 to say they are ‘more enthusiastic about voting than usual’ in the coming presidential election.” Republicans are more enthusiastic than they were before the last election. Some of that may be the effect of having a Democratic president in office; it’s sometimes easier to marshal anger against an incumbent than excitement for him. Whatever the reason, this lack of enthusiasm at this critical juncture in the election is disturbing for Democrats.

### Energy Policies Key

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

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

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

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

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

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

# Doubles vs MaryWash MM

## Offcase 1NC

### 1NC

#### Obama will win now 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.

#### The plan spotlights natural gas as an election issue --- that costs Obama the election.

**Reuters**, 6/27/**2012** (Insight: As Congress looks away, U.S. tiptoes toward exporting a gas bounty, p. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-usa-lng-exports-idUSBRE85Q05820120627>)

In a bitterly divided U.S. political environment, there's at least one thing Republicans and Democrats can agree on: Avoid a public showdown on natural gas exports, arguably the most important energy policy decision in recent memory. While fluctuating gasoline prices, the Keystone pipeline and the fight over fracking steal headlines, the question of how much of the newfound U.S. shale gas bounty should be shared with the rest of the world goes largely without comment or coverage -- despite holding far wider and longer-lasting consequences. The reason is clear: unlike the relatively simple, black-and-white issues that politicians often favor and voters connect to, liquefied natural gas (LNG) is deep, deep gray. It affects a tangled web of constituents, from Big Oil to international allies such as Japan, pits free-trade orthodoxy against the domestic economy, and requires an awkward explanation of why allowing some exports -- inevitably raising U.S. energy prices in the short term, even if at the margin -- may ultimately be better for the country in the long run. All the same, this U.S. president or the next will have to make a tricky decision, and its consequences may only become clear years from now: How much U.S. gas should be sold to other countries if it means boosting prices for consumers at home? "Right now I don't think this issue is getting anywhere near the attention it deserves," said Democratic congressman Edward Markey, one of a small number of politicians actively seeking to rein in energy exports. "Keystone and Solyndra are election-year political sideshows," he said, referring to the bankruptcy of a government-funded solar panel maker. "This is the main event." But lobbyists on both sides of the issue say it suits them best to keep the subject out of the headlines. The gas producers that stand to benefit from higher selling prices see no upside from a public brawl, while many manufacturers who could benefit from continuing low prices shy away from anti-export statements. With Congress unlikely to weigh in, the decision falls to a small, obscure unit of the Energy Department, the Office of Natural Gas Regulatory Activities. The department's statistical branch has been criticized for failing to predict how new drilling techniques would revolutionize the sector, and how quickly the vast stores of unearthed gas would send domestic prices to unsustainable lows. So the natural gas office is now awaiting advice from a second and final report on the economic implications of exports -- a report so sensitive that the government has kept it under wraps, including the identity of the consultants preparing it. SHHHHHHHH, SOFTLY-SOFTLY Not since the liberalization of power markets in the 1980s have politicians had more sway over future energy costs -- or been less willing to grapple publicly with the issue. Only one hearing on LNG exports has been held to date in the Senate, and in the House of Representatives, the Energy and Commerce Committee has no plan to hold hearings at the moment. Markey has struggled to get traction behind legislation that would block gas exports, a measure almost certain to fail to pass through the divided Congress. Few lawmakers openly oppose exports, though even fewer vocally advocate a fully open market that would raise prices at home. The Obama administration has said it will wait until the gas office releases the final economic analysis of LNG exports to make any decision on eight pending applications to sell liquefied natural gas to countries with which the United States has no free-trade agreement -- the most political step of the multiple state and federal approvals needed to send LNG abroad. The report was due out this spring, but in March the administration pushed back the release until later in the year. A White House official said on Monday the report could be released in the next few weeks. Overall, the boom in the energy sector, coupled with a slow recovery in domestic manufacturing, could raise gross domestic product by 2 to 3.3 percent by 2020, according to a recent analysis by Citigroup. But exports could force politicians to play favorites, effectively choosing between energy companies and industry. Democrats, often critical of the oil and gas sector, are wary of getting out in front of an issue that divides even the manufacturers benefitting from low gas prices. Republicans, who favor free trade and support fossil fuel development, are leery of being accused of raising costs for consumers and industry. "No politician wants to be accused of raising end-user prices to add to oil companies' bottom lines," says Kevin Book, an energy analyst at Clearview Energy Partners.

#### 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

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a **devastating nuclear attack** on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East **without resorting to nuclear weapons** is a 21st-century nightmare. **All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship** stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### 1NC

#### A. Interpretation – “Restrictions on energy production” refers to the direct governmental limitations on the recovery of an asset

#### “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.

#### “On” requires direct relation

Dictionary.com (“On,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on)

on   [on, awn] Show IPA

preposition

1. so as to be or remain supported by or suspended from: Put your package down on the table; Hang your coat on the hook.

2. so as to be attached to or unified with: Hang the picture on the wall. Paste the label on the package.

#### “Energy production” includes asset recovery – excludes processing

TPU 94 (Toxic Protection Unit, Division of Environmental Management in North Carolina’s Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources, “Investigation of Bulk Gasoline Terminals at Paw Creek,” 1-18, http://daq.state.nc.us/toxics/studies/Paw\_Creek/Paw\_Creek\_I.pdf)

The terminals at Paw Creek depict an intermediate sector of the petroleum industry. in general, the petroleum industry can be broken down into four basic segments; exploration and production, transportation, reﬁning, and marketing. As shown in Figure 2, petroleum industry operations begin with exploration for sources of crude oil. Production includes recovering the crude oil from the wells and preparing it for transportation to the reﬁnery. The crude oil may be transported to the reﬁnery via pipeline, tankers, barges, rail tank cars or tank trucks. Processing of crude into the various petroleum products through physical separation of crude oil components and chemical conversions takes place at the refinery. Products leaving the reﬁnery are transported to distribution outlets via pipeline, rail, marine vessel, and tank truck. These distribution outlets are called bulk terminals and bulk plants. Terminals and plants store the reﬁned products until distributed to service stations or other large commercial users, usually by tank truck or rail car. North Carolina Administrative Code (NCAC) 15A 213.0927 and Mecklenburg County Air Pollution Control Ordinance (MCAPCO) 2.0927’ defines a bulk gasoline terminal as the breakout tanks of an interstate oil pipeline facility or a gasoline storage facility which usually receives gasoline from refineries primarily by pipeline, ship, or barge; and delivers gasoline to bulk gasoline plants or to commercial or retail accounts primarily by tank truck; and has an average daily throughput fofmore than 20,000gallons of gasoline. Bulk plants are generally those facilities having less than 20,000 gallonsper day throughput. There are no bulk plants at Paw Creek

#### B. Violation – the plan doesn’t reduce a direct governmental limitation on the recovery of natural gas, rather it removes a process that can result in trade restrictions.

#### C. Standards –

#### 1. Limits – any transportation aff becomes topical and the topic functionally becomes the energy trading topic – explodes the number of aff mechanisms and advantages

#### Expanding the definition of “production” past extraction allows for structurally and geographically distinct affirmatives

Schuck 84 (Peter H., Professor of Law – Yale Law School, “Article: When the Exception Becomes the Rule: Regulatory Equity and the Formulation of Energy Policy through an Exceptions Process,” Duke Law Journal, April, 1984 Duke L.J. 163, Lexis)

A. The Petroleum Industry and Federal Regulation. n97 Since the first oil wells were drilled at Titusville, Pennsylvania in 1859, the American oil industry has become the most complex in the world, an extraordinarily intricate network of companies and activities linking crude oil sources and consumer markets, both foreign and domestic. Industry activities fall into four general categories: production (exploration for and removal of crude oil from natural formations); refining (the manufacture of crude into gasoline, motor oil, heating oil, petrochemicals, and other intermediate and end-use products); distribution (physical transportation, storage, handling, and delivery of petroleum [\*201] products); and marketing (sales of approximately 500 refined products to wholesale and retail customers). n98 Different segments of the industry combine the four basic activities in various ways. Approximately fifteen to twenty large, usually multinational companies integrate all four operations. This group (Exxon, Gulf, Texaco, and others -- "the majors" in industry parlance) dominates the industry. In September 1981, for example, the fifteen largest integrated refiners processed nearly 70 percent of all motor gasoline and approximately 55 percent of middle distillates -- a decline in both categories from 1972 but still accounting for the majority of refinery production. Independent refiners, which produce little or none of the crude they refine, processed the remainder. Independent refiners range from small firms, with capacities as low as 10,000 barrels per day (BPD), to large independents, like Ashland Oil, with a capacity as high as 400,000 BPD, rivaling the integrated companies' capacities. Geographically, refiners tend to cluster near port facilities, major markets, or large domestic oil fields. n99 In less densely populated regions, such as the Midwest and Rocky Mountain states, small and independent refiners often process a relatively large proportion of total product.

#### 2. Ground – export restrictions allow them to change where the energy goes which is a distinct location from where the production occurs – they can spike out all of our DAs and CP

#### 3. Effects is a voter – tons of mechanism that are unpredictable, give the aff more ground, and doesn’t mandate new energy.

### 1NC

#### Text: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission should grant regulatory waivers that exempt natural gas liquefaction facilities from authorization restrictions. FERC should summarize the decision in an annual agency publication in the Federal Register.

#### -- It competes –

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### – It solves –

#### Waivers solves the whole case and avoids elections

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

B. Other discretionary policy rationales for waiver in the current administrative climate Administrative discretion, in the form of exceptions and waivers, is a necessary modality of agency decisionmaking in implementing regulations. Recent developments in the nature of regulation and administrative law are likely to increase "the need for a more active and more principled exceptions process in all regula- tory areas.',54 The necessity and likely increased presence of flexibility is not solely attributable to market-based efficiency considerations. Institutional limitations, the historical broadening of regulation's subject matter, decisionmaking costs associated with oversight and judicial review, and adaptability to a rapidly changing economy have also led to a need for flexibility in the form of waiver or exceptions. First, administrative remedies for correcting the errors and injustice of universal rules are often institutionally insufficient. Aman draws an analogy between administrative equity and the traditional role of equity courts. The Chancery dispensed justice against the king.'55 Many Chancery cases arose when the petitioner could obtain no effective remedy at common law.'56 Similarly, the need for equity and other forms of administrative discretion arises when a petitioner has no adequate remedy by recourse to the administrative law mechanisms of participation in a rulemaking proceeding or pre- or post-enforcement judicial review. When a petitioner seeks judicial review challenging application of a rule as unreasonable, the probability of winning on the merits is slight.'57 Courts generally consider whether a regulatory program advances the general scope and purpose of a statute, not its individual impact: "courts will not substitute their judgment for that of an administrator.'"58 Because the probabilities of succeeding on the merits are very low, many appellants raise procedural issues designed to delay implementation of a regulation. FERC's PURPA regulations, for example, were delayed for nearly three years as various parties sought review in the D.C. Circuit and, ultimately, the Supreme Court.59 Flexibility in the implementation of regulation would allow regulated entities to delay application of specific rules when appropriate to the specific circumstances and thus, if the flexibility is pervasive, may eliminate the need for costly procedural challenges to delay application of substantive regulations.' 6 Second, administrative discretion is particularly attractive when an agency's regulatory jurisdiction extends to broad subject matters or numerous and diverse regulated entities. Since the 1960s and 1970s, regulatory programs have moved away from the "single industry model," especially in the areas of health, safety, and environmental regulation. Today's regulation is more diffuse with respect to the industries and subject matters regulated.'16 Since PURPA was enacted, for example, FERC, which once regulated relatively homogeneous investor- owned and municipal utilities, has asserted jurisdiction over investment groups and limited partnerships, generating companies (known as "independent power producers"), engineering, operating, and maintenance companies, waste man- agement companies, and project lessees. PURPA's QF scheme has required FERC's staff to address new, unfamiliar technologies. Broad regulatory tasks have led to an increased need for regulatory fine tuning. As Aman observes, "[A]dopting a general rule followed by a series of exceptions that shape the rule as more knowledge is acquired may be the most sensible way to carry out an extraordinarily difficult regulatory task.'162 Third, as the New Deal understanding of delegation to agency-as-expert wanes, there is a growing recognition that agency decisions are not value neutral but rather are pervasively political. 163 With the decline of the agency-as-expert model,64 the breadth and depth of congressional oversight has increased. Congressional oversight, however, makes a waiver process and other discretionary mechanisms attractive to regulators, because it is difficult to amend or replace a regulation through the highly visible, broadly participatory process of rulemaking. FERC's initial PURPA rules were the subject of congressional oversight hearings in 1982.165 More recently, FERC's controversial rulemaking to restructure the natural gas industry, Order No. 636, was the subject of a heated oversight hearing in 1992.166 Attempts to revise FERC's PURPA rules in any nontrivial manner would be likely to raise concerns from many in the utility industry, and thus would probably not escape similar congressional scrutiny. A flexible, discretionary regulatory system, which provides for waivers or exceptions, could assist FERC in achieving its regulatory project at low political costs. Fourth, court-imposed requirements on rulemaking procedures make it a less attractive methodology for making policy. Professor Peter Schuck observes: Changes in administrative law and many proposals for reform increasingly favor policy development through rules and more formal, judicial-type rulemaking procedures. If those trends persist, as appears likely, administrative techniques will be needed that encourage flexible accommodations to diverse and complex conditions within an in- creasingly rule governed system. A properly structured exceptions process might ad- dress that need.67 Thus, one reason for increased reliance on discretionary regulatory processes may be the increased burdens on rulemaking: exceptions and waivers, like other adjudi- cative mechanisms, have lower visibility and greater freedom from outside controls, judicial and otherwise, than rulemaking. 168 Professor Richard Pierce, for example, has argued that judicial review has encouraged FERC to use adjudication rather than rulemaking in the electricity context. 169 The administrative flexibility provided by waiver may assist FERC in pursuing its statutory purposes in adjudicative pro- ceedings, free of the burdens that judicial review imposes upon rulemaking. Fifth, regulation by rule may be slow to adapt to rapidly developing technologies and quickly changing circumstances in the global economy. The procedural requirements and political costs of rulemaking make it an unwieldy mechanism for adaptation to rapid change or experimentation with new regulatory policies. FERC, for example, has made few changes to the specific QF criteria contained in its PURPA regulations since their promulgation in 1980, despite sweeping technological changes in the industry. An exceptions process, on the other hand, would provide the flexibility to develop new regulatory approaches and experimental techniques in a manner adaptable to market realities. In this sense, the discretionary implementation of regulations provides a viable alternative to the rigidities of command and control regulation.

#### Annual publications avoids every solvency deficit

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

Second, to the extent adjudicative waivers remain a primary vehicle for policymaking, FERC should summarize these proceedings in an annual publication. FERC's adjudicative waiver decisions, reported in the FERC reporters, are not systematically indexed in a manner that allows the public to observe how a particular regulation is applied.20' Annual summary and publication would make FERC's waivers more visible to other regulators in the executive branch (e.g., DOE, EPA, the White House), congressional oversight committees, regulated constituents, and the general public.22 Increased congressional oversight may lead to explicit statutory standards governing issuance of waivers, or to a statu- tory requirement that FERC use rulemaking to develop waiver standards.

**1NC**

**The United States Federal Government should maintain Federal Energy Regulatory Commission authorization restrictions on natural gas liquefaction facilities unless a substantial portion of natural gas producers in the United States agree to a levy on natural gas produced through induced hydraulic fracturing, with the revenues to fund safety and environmental inspections of wells utilizing induced hydraulic fracturing.**

**-- Competes –**

**Tests “resolved”**

**AHD 6** (American Heritage Dictionary, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

Resolve TRANSITIVE VERB:1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To cause (a person) to reach a decision. See synonyms at decide. 3. To decide or express by formal vote.

**And “should”**

**AHD 92** (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language) (4ed, 1992); Pg. 1612

Should—1. Used to express obligation or duty: *You should send her a note*.

**– Counterplans that test the resolution are key to predictable ground**

**-- CP solves the aff and avoids environmental problems with fracking**

**Konrad 12** (Tom, Editor at Alt Energy Stocks, “LNG Exports Would Help the Environment,” 3-12-12,

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/tomkonrad/2012/03/12/lng-exports-would-help-the-environment/2/>)

Hydrofracking for shale gas can be harmful to the environment, especially when it is poorly regulated as it is in much of the United States, and cash-strapped drillers take shortcuts with safety and environmental protection. But if drillers are not going to take shortcuts, they need to be able to afford proper precautions, and **funds need to be made available** for proper oversight of their operations. All of this cannot happen at today’s low extremely low gas prices. If the Sierra Club wants to stop dangerous fracking, they should not be fighting export terminals, they should be working to force the industry to **fund proper oversight**. Perhaps a **levy on natural gas** produced by fracking to fund safety and environmental inspections could be passed as **part of a deal** to allow **LNG export terminals.** Such a deal would be a **win for the environment**, for renewable energy developers, for energy efficiency, and for the Japanese, who are bravely trying to find their way to a nuclear-free future.

**-- Counterplan is necessary for enforcement of fracking regulations – impact is water**

**Lustgarten 12** (Abrahm, ProPublica, “Safety Rules for Fracking Disposal Wells Often Ignored,” 9-20-12, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=safety-rules-for-fracking-disposal-wells-often-ignored>)

The site at Rosharon is what is known as a "Class 2" well. Such wells are subject to looser rules and less scrutiny than others designed for hazardous materials. Had the chemicals the workers were disposing of that day come from a factory or a refinery, it would have been illegal to pour them into that well. But regulatory concessions won by the energy industry over the last three decades made it legal to dump similar substances into the Rosharon site – as long as they came from drilling. Injection wells have proliferated over the last 60 years, in large part because they are the cheapest, most expedient way to manage hundreds of **billions of gallons** of industrial waste generated in the U.S. each year. Yet the dangers of injection are well known: In accidents dating back to the 1960s, toxic materials have bubbled up to the surface or escaped, contaminating aquifers that store supplies of drinking water. There are now more than **150,000** Class 2 wells in 33 states, into which oil and gas drillers have injected at least 10 trillion gallons of fluid. The numbers have increased rapidly in recent years, driven by expanding use of **hydraulic fracturing** to reach previously inaccessible resources. ProPublica analyzed records summarizing more than 220,000 well inspections conducted between late 2007 and late 2010, including more than 194,000 for Class 2 wells. We also reviewed federal audits of state oversight programs, interviewed dozens of experts and explored court documents, case files, and the evolution of underground disposal law over the past 30 years. Our examination shows that, amid growing use of Class 2 wells, fundamental safeguards are sometimes being **ignored or circumvented.** State and federal regulators often do little to confirm what pollutants go into wells for drilling waste. They rely heavily on an honor system in which companies are supposed to report what they are pumping into the earth, whether their wells are structurally sound, and whether they have violated any rules. More than 1,000 times in the three-year period examined, operators pumped waste into Class 2 wells at pressure levels they knew could fracture rock and lead to leaks. In at least 140 cases, companies injected waste illegally or without a permit. In several instances, records show, operators did not meet requirements to identify old or abandoned wells near injection sites until waste flooded back up to the surface, or found ways to cheat on tests meant to make sure wells aren't leaking. The program is basically a **paper tiger**," said Mario Salazar, a former senior technical advisor to the Environmental Protection Agency who worked with its injection regulation program for 25 years. While wells that handle hazardous waste from other industries have been held to increasingly tough standards, Salazar said, Class 2 wells remain a gaping hole in the system. "There are not enough people to look at how these wells are drilled … to witness whether what they tell you they will do is in fact what they are doing." Thanks in part to legislative measures and rulemaking dating back to the late 1970s, material from oil and gas drilling is defined as nonhazardous, no matter what it contains. **Oversight** of Class 2 wells is often relegated to **overstretched, understaffed** state oil and gas agencies, which have to balance encouraging energy production with protecting the environment. In some areas, **funding** for enforcement has dropped even as drilling activity has surged, leading to more wells and more waste overseen by fewer inspectors. "Class 2 wells constitute a serious problem," said John Apps, a leading geoscientist and injection expert who works with the U.S. Department of Energy's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. "The **risk to water**? I think it'**s high**, partially because of the enormous number of these wells and the fact that they are not regulated with the same degree of conscientiousness."

**-- Extinction**

**Marlow 1** (Maude, Spring) National Chairperson of the Council of Canadians and IFG Committee on the Globalization of Water. “BLUE GOLD: The Global Water Crisis and the Commodification of the World's Water Supply,” http://www.ratical.org/co-globalize/BlueGold.pdf.

Perhaps the most devastating analysis of the global water crisis comes from hydrological engineer Michal Kravèík and his team of scientists at the Slovakia non-governmental organization (NGO) People and Water. Kravèík, who has a distinguished career with the Slovak Academy of Sciences, has studied the effect of urbanization, industrial agriculture, deforestation, dam construction, and infrastructure and paving on water systems in Slovakia and surrounding countries and has come up with an alarming finding. Destroying water's natural habitat not only creates a supply crisis for people and animals, it also dramatically diminishes the amount of **available fresh water** on the planet. Kravèík describes the hydrologic cycle of a drop of water. It must first evaporate from a plant, earth surface, swamp, river, lake or the sea, then fall back down to earth as precipitation. If the drop of water falls back onto a forest, lake, blade of grass, meadow or field, it cooperates with nature to return to the hydrologic cycle. "Right of domicile of a drop is one of the basic rights, a more serious right than human rights," says Kravèík. However, if the earth's surface is paved over, denuded of forests and meadows, and drained of natural springs and creeks, the drop will not form part of river basins and continental watersheds, where it is needed by people and animals, but head out to sea, where it will be stored. It is like rain falling onto a huge roof, or umbrella; everything underneath stays dry and the water runs off to the perimeter. The consequent reduction in continental **water basins** results in reduced water evaporation from the earth's surface, and becomes a net loss, while the seas begin to rise. In Slovakia, the scientists found, for every 1 percent of roofing, paving, car parks and highways constructed, water supplies decrease in volume by more than 100 billion meters per year. Kravèík issues a dire warning about the growing number of what he calls the earth's "hot stains"—places already drained of water. The "drying out" of the earth will cause massive global warming, with the attendant extremes in weather: drought, decreased protection from the atmosphere, increased solar radiation, decreased biodiversity, melting of the polar icecaps, submersion of vast territories, massive continental desertification and, eventually, "**global collapse."**

**Avoids elections**

**Dlouhy**, 4/16/**2012** (Jennifer, Environmentalists challenge natural gas export plans, Fuel Fix, p. http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/04/16/environmentalists-challenge-natural-gas-export-plans/)

**Environmentalists are challenging** Freeport LNG’s bid to export **natural gas** from a facility in Texas — the latest attempt to undercut a push by more than a half dozen companies to send the fossil fuel overseas. The move by the Sierra Club came in the form of a formal protest lodged with the Energy Department, which is considering a request by Freeport LNG and other firms for licenses to export liquefied natural gas. Texas-based companies, such as Cheniere Energy and Freeport LNG, are eager to take advantage of the glut of natural gas produced in the U.S., using horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing techniques that allow the fossil fuel to be freed from dense shale rock formations. But the Sierra Club wants the federal government to put the brakes on those plans, amid concerns about air pollution and potential **water contamination** from **hydraulic fracturing**. The group has challenged other LNG export plans and asked top Obama administration officials to require a broader review of the **environmental consequences** of the likely surge in natural gas drilling that would result from selling the fuel overseas.

## Solvency 1NC

**Solvency: 1NC**

#### Accurate reading of their solvency author indicates that FERC is clearing away regulations now

Sullivan 12 (Sean, “Attorney: LNG Exporters Should Avoid Links to Gas Reserves,” SNL Daily Gas Report, 9-7-12, <http://www.downstreamtoday.com/news/article.aspx?a_id=37169>)

An attorney said decisions by the U.S. Department of Energy and FERC to grant approvals to the Cheniere Energy Inc. Sabine Pass Liquefaction Project have removed major economic and environmental objections from the path of proposed U.S. LNG export projects, but he warned that perils remain. "There is a tension in the two processes between the environmental analysis [mostly under FERC] and the economic analysis [mostly under DOE]," Erik Swenson, a partner with Fulbright & Jaworski LLP, said in an Aug. 31 interview. As a hypothetical example, Swenson said an LNG export applicant might be tempted to tie its project to a particular source of natural gas - such as a shale field that would not otherwise be tapped - because it might help on the DOE side. It could show that the project would add gas to the U.S. supply and help lower prices, which could demonstrate that the project does not harm the public interest as defined in the Natural Gas Act. However, Swenson said, the April 16 FERC order on the Sabine Pass project showed that it might be a bad idea for an export applicant to tie itself to a specific source of gas because it would then be an easier target for environmental groups. FERC rejected the Sierra Club argument that the project would lead to more shale gas production and a greater environmental impact, saying the connection was speculative and impossible to measure. In a report published Aug. 9, Swenson and his team said the grounds on which FERC based its decision seem to apply to most LNG export terminals in the U.S. To be safe, Swenson recommended that developers avoid filing applications that link their projects to specific gas resources unless there are benefits that offset the environmental vulnerabilities of such claims. The economic issues will receive clarification after the DOE releases the second of two studies on the economic impact of U.S. LNG exports. The department has said it plans to issue the study at the end of summer. "The government has cleared away the generic issues," Swenson said. "My guess is that's what the purpose of these studies are: to not make every applicant climb that same hill and demonstrate what the overall effect of LNG exports is going to be on the U.S. economy as a whole. Applicants will be left to explain if there are any impacts on local areas" or possibly regional impacts. LNG export developers and their attorneys are waiting for the second DOE study, said Swenson, who together with partner Lisa Tonery leads a practice that represents numerous LNG export projects, including one proposed by Excelerate Energy LP. Swenson said his firm has a number of clients with projects that have not yet been introduced that he could not talk about, and he suspected that other firms were in a similar position. In other words, besides the export projects on file at the DOE and FERC, more are in works. "We've had some talks in the past with the DOE staff about what we were going to need to put in our own studies to demonstrate that a particular [non-free-trade-agreement country] export application was not contrary to the public interest," Swenson said. He noted that the Cheniere application was supported by many experts. "We haven't received any guidance as to how to proceed on future applications. Mainly we've been told to hang on and wait to see what's in the study." In their report, Swenson and his team said FERC's rejection of the Sierra Club challenge was well-reasoned and a positive development for LNG terminal developers. "Allowing exports doesn't mean you have to have light or heavy regulation with fracking," he said. "I think people that are concerned with fracking really should be focusing on fracking" and not fighting fracking through the export review processes, he added. The Sierra Club has prepared documents to fight natural gas development as part of its campaign against the fuel and has used them to fight gas pipelines and now export projects. "They've got some canned attacks prepared, and they might as well see if they can get some traction on them," Swenson said. "I guess it makes sense [from their point of view], but you could take that fracking argument anywhere: Don't let people heat their houses with natural gas because it creates demand for natural gas. Every time you turn the light on, you create demand for energy." At some point, the regulators have to create a ring around fracking, he said, and not bring the issue into everything else.

**Shale doesn’t solve exports regardless of supply – Industry inexperience**

**Lundgren 12** (Kari, “U.S. Shale Gas Exports Face Hurdles, Former Exxon CEO Says,” 2-10-12,

<http://mb50.wordpress.com/category/geopolitics/energy-geopolitics/lng/page/6/>

Politicians including Democrats Senator Ron Wyden of Oregon and Representative Edward Markey of Massachusetts have said exports may raise domestic gas prices. In allowing exports, the U.S. may be “trading away the enormous economic advantage of having large, low-cost domestic natural gas supply,” Wyden said in an e-mailed statement on Jan. 6. “It’s **going to be a little while** before people are really confident that there is going to be a sufficient amount of gas for 30 years to support the construction of an **LNG plant**,” said Raymond, who stepped down in 2005. “I’m frankly not sure that we have enough **experience with shale gas** to make the kind of judgment you’d have to make.” Global Supply Some gas-industry players are confident the U.S. will become a major exporter. BG Group Plc (BG/) said yesterday that the U.S. will be able to supply about 9 percent of global liquefied natural-gas output by the end of the decade. The U.K.’s third- largest gas producer said the U.S. will have the capacity to export about 45 metric million tons of LNG a year from 2020. Rising production of natural gas has driven down prices and is leading owners of import terminals to explore exports. Cheniere Energy Inc. has proposed a liquefaction facility at its Sabine Pass terminal, which would be the first new North American export project since 1969. BG has a preliminary agreement to take gas from Sabine Pass. The cost of building an LNG (LNG) terminal runs to billions of dollars. Cheniere’s Sabine Pass terminal will have a capacity of 9 million tons a year. Construction costs at projects underway in Australia, have reached $4,000 a ton of capacity, according to analysts at Sanford C. Bernstein & Co. ‘Huge Investments’ “If you build any LNG, from a producer’s point of view, you can only do that from an economic point of view if you’re assured that you have a **long-term competitive supply** because these are huge investments,” Raymond said. Exxon, the world’s largest energy company by market value, is pursuing shale exploration in Argentina, Poland and the U.S. The company said earlier this month that two exploratory wells drilled in a Polish shale formation last year weren’t commercially viable. The gas discovered failed to flow in sufficient quantities Texas-based Exxon said Feb. 1.

**Long-term solvency – 2016 at best**

**The Wall Street Transcript 12** (“U.S. Energy Independence: A Strategic Portfolio,” 9-6-12,

<http://seekingalpha.com/article/851091-u-s-energy-independence-a-strategic-portfolio>)

The increase in supply will continue to come from the "fracking" of extensive shale formations all over the continental U.S. Since there are currently a grand total of **zero LNG export terminals** in the lower 48 states, the export of significant amounts of liquefied natural gas from the U.S. will not become a reality until **2016 at the earliest**. Simply put, the natgas found within the U.S. is going to **stay here**. The equity values of the domestic producers of natural gas have dropped dramatically as the ever increasing supply of this commodity has driven prices to historic lows. Interestingly, the pipelines that deliver natgas to the electricity utilities that use it are enjoying new growth prospects. Similar to railroads in the 19th century, these "midstream" pipeline companies are deriving the benefit from being the intermediary between the increase in natural gas supply with the increase in demand from electrical generation utilities.

#### Liquefaction in the US is too expensive

**Brenner 10** (Noah, “US 'may become shale gas exporter',” 10-22-12, Upstream, the International Oil and Gas News Source, <http://www.upstreamonline.com/live/article233502.ece>)

“At the moment I don’t think it’s competitive,” Jon Harris, head of BG’s US upstream business, told Upstream on the sidelines of the Word Trade Group’s E&P Technology Summit. But in the future, as technology brings down the cost of shale production, the equation could change, he said. “That’s the $64 million question,” he said. BG Group was the largest importer of liquefied natural gas into the US but has since changed its strategy and taken upstream positions in Marcellus and Haynesville/Bossier plays. Before the US public might accept the idea of sending energy abroad, the gas industry would have to do a better job of explaining to the public how much gas is available in the US and that gas export would not hurt US energy security, Harris said. While siting an industrial-scale **liquefaction facility** in the US could prove as difficult, if not more so, than siting an **LNG import facility**, Harris said liquefaction could be expedited by building it at the existing import terminals. Those terminals already have much of the in infrastructure needed to handle large volumes of gas and are located in deep-water ports that can accommodate LNG tankers. One Statoil executive said he believed **costs would continue to prove too high for US LNG** to compete in the global marketplace. While noting that you “never say never” Stephen Bull, commercial director for Statoil’s Marcellus shale assets, said he thought it unlikely that US gas could compete with low-cost production from places like Qatar. Rather than pursue the **costly liquefaction process**, he said there was greater potential in trying to increase the US gas market by encouraging use for electricity and, in the long-term future, transportation. Currently there are no liquefaction facilities in the Lower 48, but in recent years companies like ConocoPhillips and Chevron have applied for, and in some cases received, permits to re-export foreign-sourced LNG through US terminals. The arrangement allows those facilities to act as storage and transit hubs while LNG players chase the best market price.

## SCS Advantage 1NC

**China: 1NC**

**China expanding domestic reserves – no import need**

**Yang 12** (Catherine T. Yang, National Geographic News, “China Drills Into Shale Gas, Targeting Huge Reserves Amid Challenges,” 8-8-12, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/08/120808-china-shale-gas/>)

Now a new chapter in Chongqing's history is being written, as hydraulic fracturing rigs assembled this summer in this undulating landscape to drill into one of China's first shale gas exploration sites. (Related Pictures: "A Rare Look Inside China's Energy Machine") Technology to force natural gas from its underground source rock, shale, has transformed the energy picture of the United States in the past six years, and China—sitting on reserves some 50 percent larger than those of the U.S.—has taken note. Hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, is a made-in-the-U.S.A. process that China aims to import. (Related Interactive: "Breaking Fuel From the Rock") On June 9, state-owned oil giant Sinopec started drilling the first of nine planned shale gas wells in Chongqing, expecting by year's end to produce 11 billion to 18 billion cubic feet (300 to 500 million cubic meters) of natural gas—about the amount China consumes in a single day. It's a small start, but China's **ambitions are large**; by 2020, the nation's goal is for shale gas to provide 6 percent of its massive energy needs. (Related Quiz: "What You Don't Know About Natural Gas") Because natural gas generates electricity with half the carbon dioxide emissions of coal, China's primary power source, the hope is that shale development, if it is done in an environmentally sound manner, will help pave the way to a cleaner energy future for the world's number one greenhouse gas producer. "Clean, rapid shale gas development in China would reduce global emissions," says Julio Friedmann, chief energy technologist at the U.S. Department of Energy's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, which has been working with the Chinese on environmentally sound fracking practices. But challenges lie ahead in China's effort to replicate the U.S. shale gas revolution. Early indications are that China's shale geology is different. And above ground, China lacks the extensive pipeline network that has enabled the United States to so quickly bring its new natural gas bounty to market. A daunting issue is whether water-intensive energy development can flourish in China given the strains the nation already faces on water and irrigation-dependent agriculture. Even though there are more questions at this point than answers, China is determined to move ahead. "China now realizes it has incredible opportunity to find another major fuel source other than coal," says Albert Lin, chief executive of EmberClear, an Alberta, Canada-based energy project developer that is a partner of China's largest power producer, China Huaneng Group.

**Canada will be able to underprice the US for gas to Asia**

**Hulbert 12** (Matthew, Senior Researcher at the Clingendael International Energy Programme (CIEP) in The Hague, The Netherlands, B.A. in history and politics from Durham University and an Mphil in international relations from Cambridge University, Forbes Contributor, “Why America Can Make or Break A New Global Gas World,” 8-5-12,

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/08/05/why-america-can-make-or-break-a-new-global-gas-world/>)

It sounds complex stuff, but between this Qatari-Russia intrigue, rests the same debate: can producers continue to sell gas at oil indexed prices, or do they have to shift towards gas prices based on gas fundamentals? Even if Russia and Qatar conspire to pull the European and Asia strings for now, of the 330bcm of LNG gas globally shipped, 25% of it is now done so on a genuinely spot basis. With another prospective 250mt/y of LNG potentially coming to market over the next decade from every point on the compass – Nigeria, Angola, Israel, PNG, Mozambique, Equatorial Guinea, you name it – LNG growth should continue to erode old market rules towards and structures. That proposition becomes even more compelling when you consider that North America promises to be one of the largest **export markets** of all. Unsurprisingly American players all have one market in mind at this stage: Asia. That categorically **applies to Canada**, where Shell, PetroChina, Kogas and Mitsubishi are lining up 12mt/y exports from **British Colombia** for Asian markets. That follows export licenses already agreed for BG Group, and Apache through Kitimat LNG as well as the Alaskan North Slope plumping for LNG to monetise its 35tcf of proven reserves. As the latest Nexen deal between Toronto and Beijing attests, Canada has zero doubt that selling 30mt/y of stranded gas to Asia is the **only option** it has on the table to 2020; it is not like it can place LNG into its neighbouring but saturated US market.

### Contracts Now

#### India already has natural gas contracts with US companies

WSJ 9-27 [“Gail India Makes First Shale Gas Asset Buy With U.S. Deal”, September 27th, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204138204576599982561160822.html, Chetan] \*\* GAIL = Gas Authority of India Ltd

NEW DELHI - GAIL (India) Ltd. said Thursday it has bought a 20% stake in a U.S. shale gas asset, its first such purchase, as the state-run utility seeks to gain expertise of an increasingly important fuel source ahead of India's plans to auction shale gas blocks. India's largest gas transmission company by volume follows private-sector explorer Reliance Industries Ltd., which last year acquired stakes in Marcellus and Eagle shale assets in the U.S. A wave of multibillion-dollar deals has swept the North American shale oil-and-gas sector in the past few years as energy companies seek to boost their hydrocarbon reserves. The GAIL transaction comes at a time when India is striving to acquire energy assets abroad while also looking to tap unconventional fuel sources at home. India plans to launch its first auction round for shale gas exploration blocks by end-December, the upstream regulator said in March. GAIL said it will pay $95 million for the stake in Houston-based Carrizo Oil & Gas Inc.'s CRZO +0.16% Eagle Shale Ford acreage via wholly owned unit GAIL Global (USA) Inc. The amount comprises an upfront cash payment of $63.7 million and $31.3 million linked to Carrizo's future drilling and development costs. The company will also invest about $300 million in the asset over five years, it said, adding that the unit will fund a major part of the investments from its earnings. "This transaction represents a major step in GAIL's efforts to establish its presence in North America," GAIL chairman B.C. Tripathi said. "As the next logical step, GAIL Global will consider expanding its business portfolio in the North American market by pursuing various upstream and midstream opportunities, including liquefied natural gas export to India." A decline in production of gas in India is driving demand for imported LNG, boosting earnings of companies such as Petronet LNG Ltd. and GAIL, which import the super-cooled fuel. GAIL plans to establish a trading desk in Singapore as east Asia emerges as a big LNG market. GAIL said its joint venture with Carrizo will drill an additional 139 wells in the shale acreage, which is producing 2,350 barrels of oil equivalent a day. GAIL will get 470 barrels of oil equivalent a day as its share. "GAIL and Carrizo shall also work together in exploring shale gas opportunities in India and other countries outside of the U.S.," Tripathi said.

#### Conflict inevitable – Vietnamese contract with India lasts another 2 years

NGA 12 [Natural Gas Asia, “Vietnam Offers to Extend India's Contract for Gas Block in South China Sea”, July 17th, 2012, http://www.naturalgasasia.com/vietnam-offers-to-extend-indias-contract-for-gas-block-in-south-china-sea, Chetan] \*\* OVL = ONGC Videsh Limited (Indian NG Company)

Vietnam has offered to extend India's contract for a gas block in the South China Sea for two more years, raising the prospect of India getting embroiled in the territorial disputes of that region with China, Times of India has reported. The said Block 128 falls within the overlapping claims of China and Vietnam. Beijing has recently heightened tension by getting its energy major, CNOOC, to give out several blocks for exploration in the same. Times of India report said that India's OVL had decided to get out of Block 128 in June after their surveys showed that there was little prospect of gas in that area. However, with Vietnam running into political problems with China over sovereignty, Hanoi decided to extend India's presence in the area as a hedging tactic. Now, OVL has two years to scout for gas in a place, where competing territorial claims between China and Vietnam might complicate issues for India, despite India's long-standing presence in the region, the report said.

### Paracel D: 1NC

#### No US intervention in the Paracels – international organizations check escalation

Guan 99 (Ang Cheng, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies “The South China Sea Dispute Re-visited,” August 1999, http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/WorkingPapers/WP04.pdf)

The US position regarding the South China Sea disputes has been very consistent throughout. In the wake of the Paracel clash in January 1974, the US State Department said that the South China Sea disputes were “for the claimants to settle among themselves”. 23 In his annual report to Congress, then US Defence Secretary Harold Brown hardly mentioned the South China Sea except in the context of Soviet interests in Cam Ranh Bay and Danang, and how that would complicate “the task of the seventh fleet in helping to defend Japan’s lines of communications”. 24 This was also the case with Admiral William J. Crowe, then Commander-in-Chief, US Pacific Command, in an interview in 1984. His concern was with the growing Soviet presence in Cam Ranh Bay and how that gave the Russians the ability to interdict the sea lines of communication in the South China Sea. 25 Since 1990, the US Department of Defence (DOD) has delivered four reports to Congress regarding US policy towards East Asia. The first entitled, “A Strategic Framework for the Asia-Pacific Rim: Looking Towards the 21 st Century”, was submitted in April 1990. The report was crafted during the period which saw the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. The study paid particular emphasis to the situation in Northeast Asia, which despite the end of the Cold War, was still unstable and volatile. There was hardly any mention of the South China Sea except that one of the US wartime objectives for East Asia was to maintain the security of the lines of communication (LOCs) throughout the Pacific. 26 In an interview in Malaysia in October 1991, Admiral Charles Larson, then Commander-in-Chief, US Pacific Command, made the following points regarding the Spratlys: (a) The US maintained a non-committal stand as there was no interest for the US to intervene; (b) It was a regional issue and the US had no contingency plan to go to the Spratlys in the event of a conflict; (c) It would be up to the countries concerned to work together and regional groupings (such as ASEAN) to find a solution; (d) The US preferred that the claimants resolve the issue through political channels rather than by military means; and (e) If China and Vietnam became hostile in asserting their claims, the US might work with ASEAN, the Soviet Union and other nations under the auspices of the United Nations to ensure that the aggressor followed accepted international behaviour. 27

### No Aggression

#### Chinese leadership transition doesn’t cause aggression – minimal PLA influence over the CCP

Forbes 10 [“Overhaul Coming To China's Leadership”, September 20th, 2010, http://www.forbes.com/sites/investor/2010/09/20/overhaul-coming-to-chinas-leadership/7/, Chetan]

The rising current of military power in the Chinese system could manifest in any number of ways. Sources tell STRATFOR that military officers who retire sooner than civilian leaders may start to take up civilian positions in the ministries or elsewhere in the state bureaucracy. Nevertheless, the overall arc of recent Chinese history has reinforced the model of civilian leadership over the military. The Communist Party retains control of the CMC, the central and provincial bureaucracies, the state-owned corporations and banks, mass organizations and most of the media. Moreover, there does not appear to be a single military strongman who could lead a significant challenge to civilian leadership. So while the military’s sway is undoubtedly rising, and the upcoming civilian leadership could get caught in stalemate over policy, the military is not in a position to seize power. Rather, it is maneuvering to gain more influence within the system, adding another element of intrigue to the already tense bargaining structure that defines elite politics in China. But despite possible military-civilian frictions, the PLA will seek to preserve the regime, and to manage or suppress internal or external forces that could jeopardize that goal.

### No Conflict

#### No South China Sea conflict – countries will work together

**Gupta 11** [Rukmani Gupta is an Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, “South China Sea Conflict? No Way”, October 23rd, 2011, http://the-diplomat.com/2011/10/23/south-china-sea-conflict-no-way/1/, Chetan]

These suggestions to recalibrate Indian policy towards the South China Sea and its relationship with Vietnam are premature at best. **Despite the rhetoric**, **conflict in the South China Sea may** well **not be inevitable. If the history of dialogue between the parties is any indication, then current tensions are likely to result in forward movement**. In the aftermath of statements by the United States, and skirmishes over fishing vessels, ASEAN and **China agreed upon** the Guidelines on the Implementation of **the Declaration on the Conduct** of Parties **in the South China Sea** at the Bali Summit **in July 2010.** And **recent tensions may well prod the parties towards a more binding code of conduct**. This isn’t to suggest that **territorial claims** and sovereignty issues will be resolved, but certainly they **can become more manageable to prevent military conflict. There’s** a **common interest in making the disputes more manageable**, essentially because, nationalistic rhetoric notwithstanding, **the parties** to the dispute **recognize that there are real material benefits at stake. A disruption of maritime trade** through the South China Sea **would entail economic losses** – and not only for the littoral states. No party to the dispute, including China, has thus far challenged the principle of freedom of navigation for global trade through the South China Sea. The states of the region are signatories to the UNCLOS, which provides that ‘Coastal States have sovereign rights in a 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ) with respect to natural resources and certain economic activities, and exercise jurisdiction over marine science research and environmental protection’ but that ‘All other States have freedom of navigation and over flight in the EEZ, as well as freedom to lay submarine cables and pipelines.’ **The prospect of threats** to SLOCS thus **seems somewhat exaggerated.**

#### -- South China Seas are stable – China lacks capability and interdependence checks

Rosenberg 9 (David, Professor of Political Science – Middlebury College and Research Fellow at the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies – Australian National University, “Dire Straits: Competing Security Priorities in the South China Sea”, The Asia-Pacific Journal, 3-20, http://japanfocus.org/-David-Rosenberg/1773)

From the Taiwan Strait to the Strait of Malacca, security concerns are growing around the South China Sea. While the Bush Administration sees a resurgent Chinese military threat across the Taiwan Strait and a terrorist threat in the Strait of Malacca, many countries between the Straits are more concerned about security for their maritime resources from the threats of competitors, traffickers, poachers, and pirates. Security Concerns in the South China Sea Several recent statements and appointments highlight the current Bush administration view of China's threat to Taiwan. Porter Goss, director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, warned that improved Chinese capabilities not only threaten Taiwan but also U.S. forces in the (western Pacific) region. U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld worried that the Chinese navy was building some amphibious landing ships for possible use across the Taiwan Strait. The appointment of combative neoconservative John Bolton as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations sends a clear and ominous signal: formerly a paid consultant to the Taiwanese government, Bolton has advocated Taiwan's independence and its full U.N. membership. Then, in February 2005, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and their Japanese counterparts announced a significant alteration in the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance by identifying security in the Taiwan Strait as a "common strategic objective." Has there been any big shift in the balance of power around the Taiwan Strait that warrants this U.S. response? The Chinese defense budget has grown by double-digit increases for the past fourteen years. This year it's up by 12 percent. But that is not significantly faster than the Chinese economy as a whole is growing. China is modernizing its defenses -- adding anti-ship missiles to aircraft, acquiring AWACS-airborne early warning and control systems, guided missile destroyers and frigates. However, its power projection capabilities are limited. It lacks any long-range amphibious capability or support infrastructure to supply forces over long distances for a protracted period. It also lacks heavy cargo-carrying aircraft, comprehensive air defenses, seaworthy ships, and aircraft carriers. Given the current state of Chinese equipment and training, the Chinese have no capability to pursue an expansionist maritime policy in the Taiwan Strait or the South China Sea. [1] By contrast, the U.S. has overwhelming military superiority and an expansive network of military bases across the Asia-Pacific. The U.S. Pacific Fleet is the world's largest naval command, including approximately 190 ships, about 1,400 Navy and Marine Corps aircraft and 35 shore installations. Over 300,000 Navy, Army, Air Force, Marine Corps, Special Operations, and Intelligence military personnel are integrated under the unified command of PACOM, the U.S. Pacific Command. What are China's strategic goals between the Straits? China's Defense White Paper of 2002 emphasizes the importance of pursuing peaceful external relations initiatives through multilateral, cooperative approaches to promote domestic development. The most recent Defense White Paper, published in December of 2004, reiterates this priority. More important than statements of good intentions, however, China has taken significant steps to implement this goal. It was evident in the Framework Agreement on ASEAN-China Comprehensive Economic Cooperation, negotiated in November 2002. That led to the agreement signed in November 2004 to implement an ASEAN-China Free Trade Area (FTA) by 2010. Following the 10th Summit Meeting of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), in Vientiane, Laos in November 2004, Beijing held its own summit with ASEAN leaders (ASEAN Plus One) and then joined Japan and the Republic of Korea in discussions with ASEAN leaders (ASEAN Plus Three, or APT). Beijing had earlier in November hosted the first Security Policy Conference of the ASEAN Regional Forum. It featured an anti-piracy drill and a workshop on countering terrorism. Regional Economic and Financial Agreements Regional economic agreements were the main achievements of these meetings. However, the ASEAN Plus Three sessions identified other areas for cooperation, including deeper cooperation in investment and finance, expanded security dialogue and cooperation, expanded cultural exchanges, and periodic progress reviews. Perhaps the most dramatic developments have occurred in regional financial cooperation. Finance ministers of the ASEAN+3 countries have launched an Asian Bond Markets Initiative and the regional central bankers group set up two Asian Bond Funds in early 2005. These are key steps in addressing one of the major weaknesses in the region's development as indicated by the currency and financial crisis that struck large parts of the region in 1997: the heavy reliance by firms on short-term bank loans for financing. As Jennifer Amyx notes, many countries in East Asia maintain high savings rates but, because of the absence of stable long-term debt markets, the savings deposited into local banks tended to be funneled out to international financial centers and then back into the region as short-term foreign currency loans. This situation creates a problem referred to as a "double mismatch" -- that is, a mismatch between debt maturities (short-term borrowing for long-term investments) and the denomination of this debt (in foreign rather than local currencies). [2] The ASEAN+3 finance ministers had earlier set up a network of bilateral currency swaps to permit a country beset by a speculative attack to draw on reserves of other nations. The program -- the Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI) -- went into effect at the end of 2003. Japan, with the largest reserves in the region, led negotiations over swap arrangements and will play the role of arbitrator for currency loans. China, another potential lender with substantial reserves in excess of potential needs, also lent its support to the CMI. Widespread participation by ASEAN Plus Three members in these initiatives encourages smooth financial liberalization processes and thereby bolsters regional stability. It also reinforces the efforts of various working groups to improve transparency and information dissemination and to strengthen settlement systems and regulatory reforms. China's shift to a more proactive position on regional financial cooperation has greatly facilitated these recent financial developments. As a result, interdependence between the Chinese economy and other economies in the region has deepened significantly in recent years. Today, trade by ASEAN member nations with China far exceeds trade conducted within the ASEAN grouping, while China is predicted to soon overtake the United States as Japan's top trading partner. Levels of investment in China by countries in the region are also extremely high. The worst case scenario is not Chinese domination but a Chinese meltdown, as many regional monetary authorities are quick to note.

### Econ D

#### 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).

## Warming 1NC

**Warming: 1NC**

**Natural gas prices will rise – sustainable for producers**

**Finger 12** (Richard, Forbes Contributor, “We're Headed To $8 Natural Gas,” 7-22-12,

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/richardfinger/2012/07/22/were-headed-to-8-00-natural-gas/>)

The British Thermal Unit (btu) equivalent of one barrel of oil equals six thousand cubic feet of natural gas. Therefore if gas at $3.00 per mcf were to be at energy parity with oil, then oil would sell for $18.00. But WTI sells at $90 bbl. So gas must get more expensive or oil will get cheaper. As the gas rig count dwindles and evidence mounts that at least some of the shale plays are depleting much faster than projected, the result has been the aforementioned much lower than normal stockpile injection rates. With the disparity between oil and gas prices at such extremes, all available capital will continue to flow into drilling for gas liquids and oil. Some of the remaining dry gas drilling is probably just to maintain lease rights. Newton’s 3rd Law of Thermodynamics says for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Natural Gas at $13.28 is too high and the April price of $1.89 is too low. The rubber band is becoming stretched in the direction of tight supply. It’s too cheap to drill for, so supplies will further dwindle until inexorably the shortage occurs and prices spike irrationally higher. That time is sooner than later. We had an abnormally warm 2011-12 winter season in the US which sank home heating gas demand to extremely low levels. Was it because of an El Nino effect or did global warming play the pivotal role? Or, most likely, it is a confluence of several factors. Whatever the cause, the jet streams carrying the traditional cold temperatures and accompanying snowstorms didn’t reach south as far and as often as usual. Conversely, Europe had an abnormally cold winter last season suggested causes being the abstruse North Atlantic Oscillation Index, low solar activity and attendant low sunspot numbers and associated solar magnetic flux. You understand, right. Natural Gas prices have spent all of 2012 below $3.00. Just the past three trading days, perhaps starting to reflect the fundamentals discussed herein, have seen spot prices nudge above the $3.00 level. So combine 13 year low gas rig counts, declining production levels with resultant ultralow storage injections, shut in gas production, faster than anticipated shale well declines, persistent switching from oil and coal to cheaper and cleaner gas alternatives…..Then consider unending hotter than normal summer temperatures, continued greater than normal nuclear plant outages, a hurricane or two that knocks out Gulf of Mexico natural gas production for a week or two, and a La Nina induced cold winter…….any one of these can light the fuse that pushes the tenuous supply/demand balance into cardiac arrest. That’s the chain and it’s going to lead us to **$8.00** mcf **natural gas** by the approaching winter.

**Hedging solves natural gas market**

**AP 12** (Associated Press, “Drillers cut natural gas production as prices drop,” The Wall Street Journal, 2-12-12,

<http://online.wsj.com/article/AP3e0b9812cd1c44829710ea9dba98efec.html>)

Experts say the companies have ways to cushion the low prices. It's called **hedging**, and business people have used such tools for hundreds if not thousands of years, said Sara Moeller, a professor of business at the University of Pittsburgh. "When you put a hedge on, you're **lock**ing **in** one of your prices, because you're happy with that price," said Moeller, who has also worked as a commodities trader. For example, Houston-based Cabot Oil & Gas Corp. said last month that it received **$5.17** per thousand cubic feet of natural gas on some hedged deliveries in the final quarter of 2011. Yet the market price at the time was **$3.18** per thousand cubic feet. Moeller said such deals are possible because large consumers of commodities also want to reduce price swings, such as utility companies. Locking in prices limits their exposure to sudden jumps. It's done by a simple, registered trade on stock exchanges. People essentially buy and sell the hedges, setting varying prices for different points in the future.

#### Exports won’t increase domestic natural gas prices -

**Falk 12** (Jeff, associate director of national media relations at Rice University, “Rice study: Future increases in US natural gas exports and domestic prices may not be as large as thought,” 8-15-12, <http://news.rice.edu/2012/08/15/rice-study-future-increases-in-us-natural-gas-exports-and-domestic-prices-may-not-be-as-large-as-thought/>)

HOUSTON – (Aug. 15, 2012) – Amid policy debate over potential liquefied natural gas (LNG) exports from the United States, a new paper from Rice University’s Baker Institute for Public Policy predicts the long-term volume of exports from the U.S. will not likely be very large. The paper also argues that the impact on U.S. **domestic natural** **gas prices will not be large** if exports are allowed by the U.S government. Significant changes in the global gas market in the past decade, particularly the emergence of shale in North America, have dramatically altered the global outlook for LNG markets and fueled the commercial aspirations of firms seeking to seize the apparent profit opportunity offered by exports. The altered outlook has also raised the concern that allowing exports from the U.S. will force prices up and negatively impact industrial activity and household budgets. The paper, “U.S. LNG Exports: Truth and Consequence,” was authored by Kenneth Medlock, the Baker Institute’s James A. Baker III and Susan G. Baker Fellow in Energy and Resource Economics and an adjunct professor and lecturer in Rice’s Department of Economics. “The lens that has been offered policymakers to address the question of U.S. LNG exports is inappropriate because it assumes a level of exports without accounting for the international market reaction,” Medlock said. “The question before policymakers is one of licensing a capability, not licensing a fixed volume. Therefore, this issue must be viewed in the context of international trade if informed policy decisions are to be made.” Previous studies on the impact of U.S. LNG exports on domestic prices have assumed a particular volume of LNG exports from the U.S. when assessing the domestic price impact, but they did not allow for domestic and international **market interactions**. This is a serious flaw, said Medlock, because market interactions will influence price movements and trade volume. “The bottom line is that certification of LNG exports **will not** likely produce a large domestic price impact, although the entities involved may be exposed to significant commercial risk,” Medlock said. “As the story plays out, the international gas market will evolve into something dramatically different from what it is today.”

**Warming is slowing – ocean currents**

**Science Daily 8** (“Will Global Warming Take A Short Break? Improved Climate Predictions Suggest A Reduced Warming Trend During The Next 10 Years”, 5-5, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/05/080502113749.htm)

To date climate change projections, as published in the last IPCC report, only considered changes in future atmospheric composition. This strategy is appropriate for long-term changes in climate such as predictions for the end of the century. However, in order to predict short-term developments over the next decade, models need additional information on natural climate variations, in particular associated with **ocean currents**. Lack of sufficient data has hampered such predictions in the past. Scientists at IFM-GEOMAR and from the MPI for Meteorology have developed a method to derive ocean currents from measurements of sea surface temperature (SST). The latter are available in good quality and global coverage at least for the past 50 years. With this additional information, natural decadal climate variations, which are superimposed on the long-term anthropogenic warming trend, can be predicted. The improved predictions suggest that global **warming will weaken** slightly during the **following 10 years.** “Just to make things clear: we are not stating that anthropogenic climate change won’t be as bad as previously thought”, explains Prof. Mojib Latif from IFM-GEOMAR. “What we are saying is that on top of the warming trend there is a long-periodic oscillation that will probably lead to a to a **lower temperature increase** than we would expect from the current trend during the next years”, adds Latif. “That is like driving from the coast to a mountainous area and crossing some hills and valleys before you reach the top”, explains Dr. Johann Jungclaus from the MPI for Meteorology. “In some years trends of both phenomena, the anthropogenic climate change and the natural decadal variation will add leading to a much stronger temperature rise.”

**-- Plan causes warming— extraction releases methane**

**Romm 11** (Joe, Senior Fellow at American Progress, editor of Climate Progress, assistant secretary of energy for energy efficiency and renewable energy in 1997, Ph.D. in physics from MIT, “Natural Gas Bombshell: Switching From Coal to Gas Increases Warming for Decades, Has Minimal Benefit Even in 2100,” 9-9-11 <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2011/09/09/315845/natural-gas-switching-from-coal-to-gas-increases-warming-for-decades/>)

A key finding of the NCAR study is: In summary, our results show that the substitution of gas for coal as an energy source results **in increased** rather than decreased **global warming** for many decades — out to the mid 22nd century for the 10% leakage case. This is in accord with Hayhoe et al. (2002) and with the less well established claims of Howarth et al. (2011) who base their analysis on Global Warming Potentials rather than direct modeling of the climate…. The most important result, however, in accord with the above authors, is that, unless leakage rates for new methane can be kept below 2%, substituting gas for coal is not an effective means for reducing the magnitude of future climate change. What is the leakage rate for methane? Well, as I’ve written, we don’t know exactly because the gas companies won’t release all of their data. We do know that total life-cycle leakage and fugitive emissions from extraction, production, transport, and consumption is higher for shale gas than conventional gas. The controversial — but peer-reviewed — paper by Cornell’s Robert Howarth, which I wrote about here, seeks to quantify the impact of the leakage from the **best available data**. It **concluded**: Natural gas is composed largely of methane, and 3.6% to 7.9% of the methane from shale-gas production escapes to the atmosphere in venting and leaks over the life-time of a well. These methane emissions are at least 30% more than and perhaps more than twice as great as those from conventional gas. The higher emissions from shale gas occur at the time wells are hydraulically fractured — as methane escapes from flow-back return fluids — and during drill out following the fracturing. Methane is a **powerful greenhouse gas**, with a global warming potential that is far greater than that of carbon dioxide, particularly over the time horizon of the first few decades following emission.

**-- CO2 doesn’t cause warming**

**Lewis 7** (Richard, Institute of Economic Affairs, “Global Warming False Alarms”,

www.globalwarminghype.com/upld-book403pdf\_.pdf)

The cornerstone of the global warming theory is that the CO2 content of the atmosphere in the pre-industrial period at 280 parts per million by volume (ppmv) was over 25 per cent lower than the 370 ppmv of today. It has however been claimed by Professor Zbignieuw  Jaworowski of Warsaw University, who has been involved in glacier studies for 40 years,  that the figure for the 19th  century is wrong. It is based on the analysis of greenhouse gases  in ice cores from Greenland and Antarctica. The flaws in this evidence, he says, are as follows: First there are chemical and physical processes, which have taken place within the  ice cores which decrease the concentrations of all greenhouse gases they contain. It appears  that there are leaks of these gases from the ice cores into the drilling liquid used in the  boreholes and through cracks in the ice sheeting into the atmosphere. Second, there has been **manipulation of** the **data** and **biased interpretation** of it. In any case meticulous analysis of the abundant 19th  century measurements of CO2 shows that its average atmospheric concentration before 1900 was 335 ppmv. Further recent work on tree leaves,  the frequency of the pores in the skin of which provide an accurate means of measuring  CO2 density in the atmosphere on a scale of centuries, show that the concentration nearly  10,000 years ago was 348 ppmv, or about the same as in 1987. A study by Dutch scientists  of Holocene era deposits in Denmark, (to which Professor Jaworowski referred in his  statement to the US Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transport) thus  discredited the much–touted ice core estimates. The authors of it stated bluntly “Our results  contradict the concept of relatively stabilised Holocene CO2 concentrations of 270 to 280 ppmv until the industrial revolution”. . Their **tree leaf studies** confirm earlier criticism of the  ice core research and demolish the very basis of the global warming case. To put the whole matter in a long-term context it is worth pointing out that fifty million years ago the CO2 concentration of 2000 ppmv was almost **six times higher** than it is today but the air  temperature was only 1.5 degrees higher.

**Natural gas cannot solve warming – lock-in, carbon emissions**

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

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

### Transportation Outweighs 1NC

#### Transportation outweighs

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

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

### Warming Irreversible 1NC

#### 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.

### No Impact 1NC

#### No impact to warming

Idso and Idso 11 (Craig D., Founder and Chairman of the Board – Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and Sherwood B., President – Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path,” February, http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/ prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf)

As presently constituted, earth’s atmosphere contains just slightly less than 400 ppm of the colorless and odorless gas we call carbon dioxide or CO2. That’s only four-hundredths of one percent. Consequently, even if the air's CO2 concentration was tripled, carbon dioxide would still comprise only a little over one tenth of one percent of the air we breathe, which is far less than what wafted through earth’s atmosphere eons ago, when the planet was a virtual garden place. Nevertheless, a small increase in this minuscule amount of CO2 is frequently predicted to produce a suite of dire environmental consequences, including dangerous global warming, catastrophic sea level rise, reduced agricultural output, and the destruction of many natural ecosystems, as well as dramatic increases in extreme weather phenomena, such as droughts, floods and hurricanes. As strange as it may seem, these frightening future scenarios are derived from a single source of information: the ever-evolving computer-driven climate models that presume to reduce the important physical, chemical and biological processes that combine to determine the state of earth’s climate into a set of mathematical equations out of which their forecasts are produced. But do we really know what all of those complex and interacting processes are? And even if we did -- which we don't -- could we correctly reduce them into manageable computer code so as to produce reliable forecasts 50 or 100 years into the future? Some people answer these questions in the affirmative. However, as may be seen in the body of this report, real-world observations fail to confirm essentially all of the alarming predictions of significant increases in the frequency and severity of droughts, floods and hurricanes that climate models suggest should occur in response to a global warming of the magnitude that was experienced by the earth over the past two centuries as it gradually recovered from the much-lower-than-present temperatures characteristic of the depths of the Little Ice Age. And other observations have shown that the rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations associated with the development of the Industrial Revolution have actually been good for the planet, as they have significantly enhanced the plant productivity and vegetative water use efficiency of earth's natural and agro-ecosystems, leading to a significant "greening of the earth." In the pages that follow, we present this oft-neglected evidence via a review of the pertinent scientific literature. In the case of the biospheric benefits of atmospheric CO2 enrichment, we find that with more CO2 in the air, plants grow bigger and better in almost every conceivable way, and that they do it more efficiently, with respect to their utilization of valuable natural resources, and more effectively, in the face of environmental constraints. And when plants benefit, so do all of the animals and people that depend upon them for their sustenance. Likewise, in the case of climate model inadequacies, we reveal their many shortcomings via a comparison of their "doom and gloom" predictions with real-world observations. And this exercise reveals that even though the world has warmed substantially over the past century or more -- at a rate that is claimed by many to have been unprecedented over the past one to two millennia -- this report demonstrates that none of the environmental catastrophes that are predicted by climate alarmists to be produced by such a warming has ever come to pass. And this fact -- that there have been no significant increases in either the frequency or severity of droughts, floods or hurricanes over the past two centuries or more of global warming -- poses an important question. What should be easier to predict: the effects of global warming on extreme weather events or the effects of elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations on global temperature? The first part of this question should, in principle, be answerable; for it is well defined in terms of the small number of known factors likely to play a role in linking the independent variable (global warming) with the specified weather phenomena (droughts, floods and hurricanes). The latter part of the question, on the other hand, is ill-defined and possibly even unanswerable; for there are many factors -- physical, chemical and biological -- that could well be involved in linking CO2 (or causing it not to be linked) to global temperature. If, then, today's climate models cannot correctly predict what should be relatively easy for them to correctly predict (the effect of global warming on extreme weather events), why should we believe what they say about something infinitely more complex (the effect of a rise in the air’s CO2 content on mean global air temperature)? Clearly, we should pay the models no heed in the matter of future climate -- especially in terms of predictions based on the behavior of a non-meteorological parameter (CO2) -- until they can reproduce the climate of the past, based on the behavior of one of the most basic of all true meteorological parameters (temperature). And even if the models eventually solve this part of the problem, we should still reserve judgment on their forecasts of global warming; for there will yet be a vast gulf between where they will be at that time and where they will have to go to be able to meet the much greater challenge to which they aspire

### Renewables

#### Shale gas is unsustainable and renewables will remain competitive – the plan keeps prices low– that destroys renewable contracts

Harris 12 (Richard, “Could Cheap Gas Slow Growth Of Renewable Energy?” NPR, 2-12, http://www.npr.org/2012/02/02/146297284/could-cheap-gas-slow-growth-of-renewable-energy)

Reducing Political Will For Renewables?

What really worries her isn't natural gas — it's politics**.** Wind could lose a huge tax break at the end of this year**.** And that would have a much more dramatic effect than low natural gas prices. "You'll see very low numbers" for new wind installations if the federal production tax credit expires," Bode says. "In fact, I think EIA [the U.S. Energy Information Administration] projects almost zero for 2013." The solar industry's subsidies run for several more years, so they are not in that bind, at least not yet. But Trevor Houser, an energy analyst at the Rhodium Group, says these tax credits and other incentives like state renewable standards are key if renewables are to grow and mature during the natural-gas glut. "Long-term renewable deployment in the U.S. is going to depend primarily on policy," Houser says. "Is there enough concern about environmental consequences to put in place incentives for renewable energy?" That partly depends on how much of a premium people and companies will be willing to pay for cleaner energy**.** Right now, with natural gas so cheap, that premium is fairly substantial. "If those prices hang around for another three or four years**,** then I think you'll definitely see reduced political will for renewable energy deployment, " Houser says. "But we don't expect prices that low to hang around that long**,** because low prices are in many ways self-correcting." Gas is so cheap now that companies that produce it are struggling to make a profit**.** So Houser expects prices to move up**.** That will help close the price gap between gas and renewable energy**.**

### 1NC – Not Anthropogenic

#### CO2 is not the one cause for climate change – solar radiation and ocean interactions are ignored

Patterson 11 [Norman Paterson is a Professional Engineer and Consulting Geophysicist with 60 years’ experience in Mineral and Environmental Geophysics. He obtained his Ph. D in Geophysics at the University of Toronto in 1955, and was elected Fellow, Royal Society of Canada in 1977. “Global Warming: A Critique of the Anthropogenic Model and its Consequences”, Geoscience Canada - Volume 38, Number 1, March 2011, Chetan]

WHAT CAUSES WARMING? It is likely that the cyclical warming and cooling of the earth results from a number of different causes, none of which, taken alone, is dominant enough to be entirely responsible. The more important ones are solar changes (including both irradiance and magnetic field effects), atmosphere–ocean interaction (including both multidecadal climatic oscillations and unforced internal variability), and greenhouse gases. All of these factors have been discussed by IPCC, but the first two have been dismissed as negligible in comparison with the greenhouse-gas effect and man’s contribution to it through anthropogenic CO2 . It is claimed (e.g. Revelle and Suess 1957) that the particular infrared absorption bands of CO2 provide it with a special ability to absorb and reradiate the sun’s longer wavelength radiation, causing warming of the troposphere and an increase in high-altitude (cirrus) cloud, further amplifying the heating process. Detailed arguments against this conclusion can be found in Spencer et al. (2007) and Gerlich and Tscheuschner (2009). These scientists point out (among other arguments, which include the logarithmic decrease in absorptive power of CO2 at increasing concentrations), that clouds have poor ability to emit radiation and that the transfer of heat from the atmosphere to a warmer body (the earth) defies the Second Law of Thermodynamics. They argue that the Plank and Stefan-Boltzman equations used in calculations of radiative heat transfer cannot be applied to gases in the atmosphere because of the highly complex multi-body nature of the problem. Veizer (2005) explains that, to play a significant role, CO2 requires an amplifier, in this case water vapour. He concludes that water vapour plays the dominant role in global warming and that solar effects are the driver, rather than CO2 . A comprehensive critique of the greenhouse gas theory is provided by Hutton (2009).

#### Negative feedbacks check runaway warming -

#### A. Water Vapor

Sweger 11 [Dr. Daniel M. Sweger, AB (Physics, Duke University, 1965) and Ph.D. (Solid State Physics, American University, 1974) has been a research scientist at NIST, where he was active in a variety of research areas, including cryogenic thermometry, solid state and nuclear physics, and molecular spectroscop, “ Earth’s Climate Engine Exploring the Dynamics of Earth’s Climate”, March 17th, 2011, http://junksciencearchive.com/Greenhouse/Earth-s\_Climate\_Engine.pdf, Chetan]

The role of water vapor in determining surface temperatures is ultimately a dominant one. During daylight hours it moderates the sun’s energy, at night it acts like a blanket to slow the loss of heat, and carries energy from the warm parts of the earth to the cold. Compared to that, if carbon dioxide has an effect, it must be negligible. It is also clear from the data presented above that water vapor acts with a negative feedback. The data clearly shows that the relationship between the amount of water vapor in the air and temperature is negative; that is, the higher the amount of water vapor in the atmosphere the lower the surface temperature. In that regard, it almost acts as a thermostat. As the air cools as a result of an increasing moisture content in the atmosphere, there is a decrease in the amount of water vapor produced by evaporation. Eventually this decrease of the level of water vapor being introduced into the atmosphere results in a decrease in moisture content. At this point more sunlight reaches the earth’s surface resulting in higher temperatures and increasing evaporation. In the positive feedback mechanism as proposed by the global warming proponents this behavior would be reversed. Then the data would show a positive relationship between moisture content and temperature. But it does not.

#### B. Sulfate aerosols

Hausfather 8 – Zeke, Regular Contributor to the Yale Forum on Climate Change, June 24th, [“COMMON CLIMATE MISCONCEPTIONS Why Reducing Sulfate Aerosol Emissions Complicates Efforts to Moderate Climate Change” The Yale Forum on Climate Change and the Media, http://yaleclimatemediaforum.org/ccm/0608\_sulphate\_aerosol\_emissions.htm]

With all the attention surrounding carbon dioxide these days, it is easy to forget that there are a number of other important natural and human-driven factors ("forcings" in climate circles) that influence Earth's climate. Among the most important of these are sulfate aerosols, microscopic particles smaller than a millionth of a meter suspended in the air. Sulfate aerosols are produced primarily from sulphur dioxide (SO2) emitted during the combustion of fossil fuels. Along with ozone precursors, they are primary causes of acid rain and of lung irritation and ground-level haze or smog in polluted areas. Sulfate aerosols also have a strong cooling effect on Earth, both through their ability to scatter incoming light and because of their propensity to increase cloud formation and reflectivity. Among the most significant changes in climate change modeling between the 2001 IPCC Third Assessment Report (TAR) and the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) in 2007 was a revision of the expected trajectory of human-induced sulfate aerosol emissions. In the earlier report, scientists assumed that aerosols would increase in rough proportional to economic growth. The authors of the 2007 report realized that emissions of aerosols, which have direct and immediate negative health effects to those in the area surrounding their emission, will likely be targeted for reductions as countries like China and India become wealthier. This emissions reduction would mirror a similar process that occurred in Europe and the United States. Sulfate aerosols are the most significant substance in a category of aerosols tending to help cool the climate. Aerosols decrease radiative forcing in two ways: through direct aerosol effects as a result of an increased scattering and absorption of incoming solar radiation, and through indirect effects resulting from their ability to serve as cloud condensation nuclei. An increased number of cloud condensation nuclei have a number of different effects: they increase the reflectivity of clouds by making them denser and giving them higher liquid water content, they increase the height of clouds, and they increase cloud lifetime. Figure One, below, shows the major climate forcings over the past 120 years. The major positive forcings include CO2 at 1.66 watts per meter squared (W m-2), methane (CH4) at 0.46 W m-2, nitrous oxide (N2O) at 0.16 W m-2, and various halocarbons (CFCs, HCFCs, etc.) at 0.34 W m-2. Aerosol direct effects account for -0.5 ± 0.4 W m-2 negative forcing, with SO2 comprising -0.4 W m-2. Indirect effects are around -0.7 W m-2, with a large uncertainty range of -1.8 to -0.3 W m-2. Aerosols are the primary reason why Earth is still at around 380 parts per million CO2-equivilent (CO2e), rather than the 460 ppm CO2e projected if all the positive forcings were added together. Conveniently enough, aerosols pretty much cancel out the warming from all the non-CO2 greenhouse gases. 0608\_ccm\_Fig1.jpg - 31186 Bytes Figure One. Radiative forcing of major climate factors over the past 123 years. Figure from Hansen et al 2005. There are a number of different projections for sulfate aerosol emissions over the next century based on assumptions regarding the rate of economic growth, population growth, and technological development. Figure Two, below, shows an aggregation of all models of anthropogenic sulfate emissions used in the most recent IPCC report. Specific scenarios vary widely, but the median value across all models results by the year 2100 in sulfate aerosol emissions of 35 million metric tons, roughly one half of current emissions. 0608\_ccm\_Fig2.jpg - 55341 Bytes Figure Two. Projections of future aerosol emissions for SRES (Special Report on Emissions Scenarios) and post-SRES scenarios. Figure from the third working group of the latest IPCC report. A reduction of anthropogenic SO2 of around 50 percent worldwide over the next century, as projected in the most recent IPCC report, would result in a significant warming effect on the global climate. Sulfates are extremely short-lived particles, and emission reductions would have immediate effects on radiative forcing. A 50 percent reduction in sulfate aerosol emissions would reduce by half their current radiative forcing of -0.83 W m-2. This change in forcings would increase global temperatures by roughly 0.36 degrees C (.64 F) relative to a scenario where aerosol emissions remain constant. Figure three below shows the practical implications of a reduction in aerosols in the next century. If current greenhouse gas concentrations remain constant at current levels, scientists project about 1.34 degrees C (2.41 F) warming relative to pre-industrial temperatures by the end of the century (the world has already warmed 0.74 degrees C (1.33 F) in the past century, and 0.60 degrees C (1.08F) additional warming is in the pipeline as a result of Earth's thermal inertia). A reduction of anthropogenic atmospheric sulfate aerosols by 50 percent means that 1.34 degrees C (2.41 F) warming suddenly becomes 1.70 degrees C (3.06 F). Constant 2005 GHG Concentrations Constant SO2 1.34 degrees C (2.41 F) Reduced SO2 1.70 degrees C (3.06 F) Figure Three. Based on a simple calculation of radiative forcings of the current atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases at equilibrium, assuming a climate sensitivity of roughly 0.87 degrees K. Also assuming that anthropogenic SO2 represent only 72 percent of total atmospheric SO2 flux and that the indirect aerosol effects of SO2 account for around 62 percent of total indirect aerosol forcing, or -0.43 W m-2

## Topicality 2NC

### A2: WM – Restriction

#### Here’s specific evidence about their aff – DOE presumptively approves exports and are allowed until proven otherwise – THAT’S NOT A RESTRICTION

Dunn 10 (Alan M. Dunn, Esq. Amy S. Dwyer, Esq. Elizabeth A. Argenti, Esq. Stewart and Stewart, “A Review of International Trade-Related Legal Obligations and Policy Considerations Governing U.S. Export Licenses for Liquefied Natural Gas,” 8-23-10, http://www.cheniereenergypartners.com/lng\_documents/application\_exhibits.pdf)

U.S. LAW AND POLICY REQUIRE THE DOE TO APPROVE AN EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATION ABSENT RECORD EVIDENCE THAT THE PROPOSED EXPORT WILL NOT BE CONSISTENT WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST A. U.S. Law Governing Consideration of Export License Applications Requires Their Approval Unless They Are Shown to Be Inconsistent with the Public Interest 1. U.S. Statutes Support Exportation of Natural Gas U.S. laws directly relating to the regulation of exports of natural gas provide for export approval so long as they are determined to be in the public interest. The Natural Gas Act of 1938 requires that all proposed exports of natural gas 2 from the United States must be approved by the government. It further states that such applications shall be granted unless the government finds that the proposed export will not be consistent with the public interest. Specifically, 15 U.S.C. § 717b(a) states: (a) Mandatory authorization order After six months from June 21, 1938, no person shall export any natural gas from the United States to a foreign country or import any natural gas from a foreign country without first having secured an order of the Commission authorizing it to do so. The Commission shall issue such order upon application, unless, after opportunity for hearing, it finds that the proposed exportation or importation will not be consistent with the public interest. The Commission may by its order grant such application, in whole or in part, with such modification and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may find necessary or appropriate, and may from time to time, after opportunity for hearing, and for good cause shown, make such supplemental order in the premises as it may find necessary or appropriate. The Department of Energy (“DOE”) has interpreted this provision as providing a presumption of approval for exports of natural gas, but this presumption can be rebutted with specific evidence showing that the exports would be inconsistent with the public interest. 3 Accordingly, unless opponents can show that the proposed exports of natural gas would be inconsistent with the public interest, the export application must be granted. 4

#### -- Indirect effects are not restrictions

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. 167)

49 Measures having the **indirect effect** of limiting the ease of acquiring **foreign exchange do not amount to restrictions** (forms or applications to be filled in). The limitation may consist for instance in compulsory waiting periods for exchange.

#### That excludes financial barriers

Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison 99 (LLP, “V. LAW FIRMS AND ASSOCIATIONS,” *CALIFORNIA LEGAL ETHICS*, http://www.law.cornell.edu/ethics/ca/narr/CA\_NARR\_5.HTM)

Addressing the scope of the term "restrict" in CRPC 1-500, the California Supreme Court held that, while an outright prohibition of future representation would violate CRPC 1-500, "[a]n agreement that assesses a reasonable cost against a partner who chooses to compete with his or her former partners does not restrict" a lawyer from practicing law in the sense contemplated by CRPC 1-500 because (i) a reasonable cost assessed against a departing lawyer would not discourage the lawyer from representing those clients who wished to continue using his or her services, and (ii) "[t]he traditional view of the law firm as a stable institution with an assured future is now challenged by an awareness that even the largest and most prestigious firms are fragile economic units" that require compensation from a departing partner in order to maintain stability. Howard v. Babcock (1993) 6 Cal.4th 409, 420, 424, 25 Cal.Rptr.2d 80, 863 P.2d 150. Rather, a reasonable cost merely "attaches an economic consequence to a departing partner's unrestricted choice to pursue a particular kind of practice." Howard v. Babcock (1993) 6 Cal.4th 409, 419, 25 Cal.Rptr.2d 80, 863 P.2d 150; L.A. Op. 1995-450 (partnership agreement that imposes only reasonable costs on a departing partner is enforceable).

#### That explodes limits – here’s a list

SCI 62 (Supreme Court of India, “THE AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORT (RAJASTHAN) LTD. Vs. THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS (And Connected Appeals),” 1962 AIR 1406, 1963 SCR (1) 491, 9-4, http://indiankanoon.org/doc/304499/)

The third view held by Shah, J., was that the freedom contemplated was freedom of trade, commerce and intercourse in ill their varied aspects inclusive of all activities which constitute commercial intercourse and not merely restrictions on the movement aspect. He said : "The guarantee of freedom of trade and commerce is not addressed merely against prohibitions, complete or partial; it is addressed to tariffs, licensing, marketing regulations, price-control, nationalization, economic or social planning, discriminatory tariffs, compulsory appropriation of goods, freezing or stand-still orders and similar other impediments operating directly and immediately on the freedom of commercial intercourse as well. Every sequence in the series of operations which constitutes trade or commerce is an act of trade or commerce and burdens or impediments imposed on any such step **are restrictions** on the freedom of trade commerce and intercourse. What is guaranteed is freedom in its widest amplitude-freedom from prohibition, control, burden or impediment in commercial intercourse." (p. 874.)

#### There’s a precise distinction between export and production restrictions

Shih 9 Wen-chen Shih is an associate professor of law in the Department of International Trade at National Chengchi University, Taiwan. "ARTICLE: Energy Security, GATT/WTO, and Regional Agreements" Natural Resources Journal Spring, 2009 Natural Resources Journal 49 Nat. Resources J. 433 lexis

Such an argument has been questioned by others. Broome cautions that a material distinction remains between export restrictions and production restrictions. n91 He argues that oil in its natural state--oil still in the ground--cannot be characterized as a "product" within the meaning of Article XI, as it has not gone through a production process. n92 Only oil in commerce--oil that is extracted and produced for consumption can be regarded as falling under the GATT jurisdiction. n93 Therefore, only when OPEC countries restrict the quantity of oil in commerce made available for export to foreign consumers could they then violate Article XI:1. n94 He further points out that, while the jurisprudence tends to interpret Article XI:1 broadly, absurd and unintended consequences could arise if the panel or the Appellate Body does not pay attention to such differences; when a WTO Member took some measure to reduce domestic production in a particular industry, any WTO Member could complain that the country was violating Article XI:1 by influencing prices via supply restrictions. n95 In other words, "any measure that prevents an industry from operating at maximum capacity might constitute an export restriction." n96 Broome, thus, concludes that the production quotas maintained by OPEC countries should not constitute quantitative restrictions that contravene Article XI:1. n97

#### Precise definitions are a prerequisite to effective policymaking.

Hosseus and Pal 97 (Daniel Hosseus, School of Public Administration at Carleton University, & Leslie A. Pal, Professor of Public Policy and Administration at Carleton University, Canadian Public Policy, Volume 23, Number 4, “Anatomy of a Policy Area: The Case of Shipping,” p. 399-400)

Do policy analysts really know what they are talking about? For example, how do we know the difference between transportation policy and agricultural policy, or between environmental policy and social policy? Pigeon-holing is probably one of the most fundamental aspects of any policy analysis, and yet also one of the least examined. Policy analysis and policy development clearly cannot occur without some implicit boundaries and categories that define a policy field. Wildavsky thought of “public policies as divided into sectors” and used a spatial metaphor to argue that these sectors could be “densely rather than lightly packed” (1979, p. 64). In practice, while there may be deductive principles that help define a policy field (e.g., transportation policy self-evidently is about moving people and things through space), most analysts rely on conventional understandings of core legislation and instruments (e.g., transportation policy is largely defined by legislation with the word transportation in it). When policy fields are stable or “lightly packed,” this conventional approach works reasonably well. As turbulence increases and as fields get more crowded and overlapped, however, the need for precision and more systematic definitions increases. Major changes in policy can have “second- and third-order consequences that impair or change institutions, patterns, and arrangements” in unanticipated ways (Dror 1971, p. 65). Policies are intimately linked: changing one will often affect another. To understand what we are doing, we need in the first instance to know with what we are working. Taking Wildavsky’s metaphor a step further, we need to inventory the existing “policy space.” For example, the Canadian government has recently begun a review of the Canada Shipping Act. The century-old act is archaic in structure and content, yet constitutes the core of the current policy framework for Canada’s shipping industry. Over the years, the Shipping Act has spawned a plethora of regulations and guidelines, and is referenced by other laws. Any overhaul of the Canada Shipping Act will have ramifications for all these laws, regulations, and guidelines. A systematic, comprehensive, and empirical inventory of the policy space would seem to be a useful prerequisite for an overhaul of core legislation such as the Canada Shipping Act. Moreover, a generic inventory methodology could be applied across policy fields in any single jurisdiction, and across the same policy field in different jurisdictions, to allow more precise comparisons of policy profiles. A careful inventory of a policy space should make for better policy analysis, policy making, and policy management, as well as a better general understanding of a policy area.

### A2: WM – Financial Incentive

#### “Financial incentives” require disbursement of public funds – excludes indirect incentives and non-financial incentives

Webb 93 (Dr. Kernaghan, Associate Professor of Law and Business – Ryerson University's Ted Rogers School of Management, Adjunct Research Professor – School of Public Policy and Administration and Department of Law –Carleton University, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives,” Alta Law Review, 31 Alta L. Rev 501-535, Hein Online, p.505-6)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean **disbursements\*\* of public funds** or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures."' Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies."' In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (**eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant**, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.2' Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.2- And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration. **By limiting the definition of financial incentives** to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effects which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,3 **are excluded** from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both **more manageable and more particular**. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### Their author agrees – the plan is a regulatory incentive, not financial

EIA 1(Energy Information Administration, “Incentives, Mandates, and Government Programs for Promoting Renewable Energy,” February 2001, <http://www.eia.gov/ftproot/renewables/06282000.pdf>)

The intended effect of a financial incentive is to increase the production or consumption of the good or service over what it otherwise would have been without the incentive.Examples of financial incentives are: tax credits, production payments, trust funds, and low-cost loans. Research and development is included as a support program because its effect is to decrease cost, thus enhancing the commercial viability of the good(s) provided.

Regulatory mandates include both actions required by legislation and regulatory agencies (Federal or State). Examples of regulatory mandates are: requiring utilities to purchase power from nonutilities and requiring the incorporation of environmental impacts and other social costs in energy planning (full cost pricing). Another example is a requirement for a minimum percentage of generation from renewable energy sources (viz., a "renewable portfolio standard," or, RPS). Regulatory mandates and financial incentives can produce similar results, but regulatory mandates generally **require no expenditures or loss of revenue by the Government**.

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

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**.

### A2: WM – Production

#### Here’s the text of their restriction – it EXPLICITLY doesn’t apply to production

Natural Gas Act (Natural Gas Act of 1938, 15 U.S.C. 717 et seq, Title 15. Commerce and Trade, Chapter 15B. Natural Gas)

(b) Transactions to which provisions of 15 USCS §§ 717 et seq. applicable. The provisions of this Act [15 USCS §§ 717 et seq.] shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other use, and to natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, and to the importation or exportation of natural gas in foreign commerce and to persons engaged in such importation or exportation, but shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas.

#### The definition of “natural gas production” EXCLUDES LNG

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

Production

Fuels

Fuels can be produced in a large diversity of ways: deep mine for coal, offshore platform for oil, forest for fuelwood, etc.

The production of primary fossil fuels is usually measured **close to the point of extraction** from the reserves. The quantities produced should be those measured when the fuels are in a marketable state. Any quantities which are not saved for use or sale should be excluded from the production figure. For example, some of the gases extracted from a gas or oil field may be returned to the field to maintain pressure (reinjected gas), flared or released into the atmosphere (vented gas). The remaining gases may **then be processed** to remove some of the heavier gases (natural gas liquids). The **production of marketable natural gas should be measured or calculated only after the reinjected gas, waste gas and the natural gas liquids have been removed** (see chapter on natural gas).

#### Their definition says that liquefaction of natural gas is a “processing loss” not part of production

EIA ‘6(Energy Information Administration Glossary of Terms, 2006, http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm?id=D, accessed 8-14-12)

Dry natural gas production: The process of producing consumer-grade natural gas. Natural gas withdrawn from reservoirs is reduced by volumes used at the production (lease) site and by processing losses. Volumes used at the production site include (1) the volume returned to reservoirs in cycling, repressuring of oil reservoirs, and conservation operations; and (2) gas vented and flared. Processing losses include (1) nonhydrocarbon gases (e.g., water vapor, carbon dioxide, helium, hydrogen sulfide, and nitrogen) removed from the gas stream; and (2) gas converted to liquid form, such as lease condensate and plant liquids. Volumes of dry gas withdrawn from gas storage reservoirs are not considered part of production. Dry natural gas production equals marketed production less extraction loss.

### Contextual Definitions Bad

#### They also explode limits – reducing population density becomes an aff

DOE 8 (Department of Energy, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, “20% Wind Energy by 2030,” July, http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy08osti/41869.pdf)

In the next 10 years, the U.S. offshore wind market could play a more significant role in bringing new power generation online in selected regions of the country where electricity prices are higher than average, **population density restricts power plant installations**, shallow water sites are available, state governments have passed aggressive RPS requirements, and coastal communities support this energy option.

## Election 1NR

### Impact – 2NC

#### Obama reelection is critical to a global climate deal

**Geman**, 1/5/**2012** (Ben, Report says global climate deal hinges on Obama reelection, The Hill, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202539-report-global-climate-deal-hinges-on-obama-reelection-)

Prospects for striking a binding global climate deal by 2015 are probably toast if President Obama loses in November. That’s among the conclusions in a wide-ranging, new climate and green energy outlook from banking giant HSBC’s research branch. A major outcome from the United Nations climate talks in December was a plan to craft a deal by 2015 — one that would include big, developing nations such as China — and have it come into force by 2020. But Obama’s main Republican White House rivals are critical of emissions limits and skeptical of climate science. HSBC predicts an international agreement by 2015 is highly unlikely if Obama loses the election. From their research note: [T]he prospects for a new global climate deal in 2015 depend considerably on the election of a pro-climate action president. The election of a President opposed to climate action will not only damage growth prospects for low-carbon solutions in the USA itself, but will make the hard task of negotiating a new global agreement by 2015 almost impossible.

#### US/Russia relations is the critical internal link to global warming

**Light, Wong and Charap**, 6/30/**2009** (Andrew – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Julian – senior policy analyst at CAP, and Samuel – fellow at CAP, U.S.-Russia Climate and Energy Efficiency Cooperation: A Neglected Challenge, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/neglected\_challenge.html)

The summit between President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev in Moscow on July 6-8 comes in the middle of a packed international schedule of bilateral and multilateral meetings for the United States. on climate change. In the run up to the critical U.N. climate talks in Copenhagen at the end of this year, when the extension or successor to the existing Kyoto Protocol must be agreed upon, it is crucial that the United States and Russia—both major emitters of greenhouse gases and potentially leaders on this crucial issue—explore ways of working together to ensure a positive outcome at these talks. Enhancing cooperation on climate change and energy efficiency should be a major plank of U.S. Russia policy and should be discussed at the highest levels when President Obama meets with President Medvedev next week. Russia, like the United States, is a significant contributor to global warming. If the European Union is disaggregated Russia is the third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide behind the United States and China and still currently ahead of India. More importantly Russian per capita emissions are on the rise, and are projected at this point to approach America’s top rank as per capita emitter by 2030. Russia is also the third-largest consumer of energy and one of the world’s most energy-intensive economies. Making Russia a partner on these issues could be critical in order to **advance a sound global climate change agenda**.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 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.

#### Obama re-election means allowing natural gas exports

Alic 10/7/12 (Jen, "Drowning in Natural Gas: Is the Answer Exports?," http://oilprice.com/Energy/Natural-Gas/Drowning-in-Natural-Gas-Is-the-Answer-Exports.html)

Amid these fears, the Energy Department is stalling. Or more to the point, the Obama administration is stalling, unwilling to make a controversial decision on exports ahead of the November vote. The stalling tactic involves a lengthy analysis of how exports would affect the US economy—an analysis which appears to be undertaken by Cheniere itself. The analysis will be ready, conveniently, at the year’s end. This in itself is a signal that exports will likely go ahead, just not until after elections.¶

### U – 2NC

#### Obama will win – the next 10 days are key for Romney – new issues will shake up the race and provide the certainty needed for Romney to maintain the political support and attacks necessary to win – that’s Cook

#### Perfer Cook

Milbank 10/25/06 (Dana, Wash Post, "When It Comes to Politics, Charlie Cook Has the Prophecy Market Cornered," http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/24/AR2006102401248\_pf.html)

**The pharaoh had Joseph. The Greeks had the Oracle at Delphi. Washington has Charlie Cook.**¶Please tell us, Seer of Future Congresses, how many seats the Democrats will pick up in the House on Election Day.¶ "Twenty to 35," Cook answers.¶ And how about in the Senate, OProphet on the Potomac?¶ "At least four," the man with the crystal ball says. "Most likely five or six."¶ What fate does the seer see for Sen. George Allen (R-Va.)?¶ "He wins ugly, but he wins," Cook divines.¶ And, pray tell, how are the planets aligning for Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.)?¶ "Gone," he decrees.¶ The midterm elections are two weeks away, but the powerful cannot wait that long to learn of the outcome. And so they call in Cook, who, for a fee of $5,000 to $20,000, gives his audiences the (very) early returns.¶ Last week he spoke to pharmaceutical and insurance groups. On Monday, he flew to Las Vegas and back to talk to the American Beverage Association. Later this week it's American Express and a hedge fund in New York and the paper industry in Georgia. Yesterday found Cook at a breakfast with the DLA Piper law firm, lunch with automobile manufacturers and dinner in Boston with a corporate housing group.¶ All are looking for the same thing: next month's election returns. And Cook has them. "Senators Santorum in Pennsylvania and Mike DeWine in Ohio are pretty much done," he told the Piper audience at the Willard hotel. And the lifelines of Sens. Conrad Burns (R-Mont.) and Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.) aren't looking any longer. "I'd be surprised if any of those four can survive," Cook informed the crowd of lobbyists, diplomats and journalists.¶ The firm's representatives treated their visiting sage with great deference. James Blanchard, a former Michigan governor, introduced him as "**a renowned expert**." Former defense secretary Bill Cohen read Cook's credentials to the audience: "**one of the best political handicappers . . . the Picasso of election analysis**."¶ "He's hot," observed Rosemary Freeman, one of the event coordinators.¶ That's not the first description that comes to mind for Cook, who entered the ballroom lugging an overstuffed canvas bag, a torn, padded envelope and an overflowing blue file folder. Chubby and partial to big eyeglasses, he had the tail of his tie tucked into his shirt. He planted his Starbucks venti caffe latte on the head table, where he was joined by the Canadian ambassador and a former NATO secretary general.¶ Cook's well-rehearsed speech includes a reference to his posterior, an allusion to the movie "Young Frankenstein," and a tortured metaphor involving storms and levees to compare the 2006 election to the one in 1994. "The wave is bigger, but there are fewer structures on the beach," he forecast.¶ Cook is not the boldest of election prognosticators (that honor goes to Stuart Rothenberg), nor the most telegenic (washingtonpost.com's Chris Cillizza gets the nod there), **but he is surely the most prominent**. On contract with NBC, he was on "Meet the Press" on Sunday and taped segments for the "Today Show" and "NBC Nightly News." He commissions his own poll, and his column appears once a week in the National Journal. A Nexis search finds 873 mentions in the past 60 days for him and his company, the Cook Political Report.¶ And while he's not always on the mark (he admits to having "tread marks on my forehead" after understating the Republican gains in '94) he's close enough that **nobody challenges his forecasts**. "I'm not as much of an expert as he is, so I have to defer to him," said Dick Gephardt, a former House Democratic leader, after Cook's talk to the Piper firm.

#### Obama will win – Intrade says so

Intrade 10/5/12 ("Barack Obama to be re-elected President in 2012," http://www.intrade.com/v4/markets/contract/?contractId=743474)

Barack Obama to be re-elected President in 2012
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#### Intrade is the best political predictor of election results

CNBC 8 ("CNBC Features Intrade - Cashing in on the election," 4/25, http://www.intrade.com/news/news\_256.html)

"It's your money, your vote and... your trade," CNBC's Scott Cohn takes a look at Intrade's, real money, prediction markets that "some political experts swear by."¶The CNBC feature, aired on Monday 25th August 2008, discusses Intrade's ability to predict the outcome of the 2008 election.¶ "Trading volumes are five times higher this 2008 cycle, to-date, than for all of 2004" according to Intrade CEO, John Delaney. Justin Wolfers, of the Wharton School of Business (University of Pennsylvania), comments that small markets "end up yielding very accurate predictions."¶ The Wharton School of Business has found that Intrade has a margin of error of 1-1.5%. This margin of error is approximately half that of comparable Gallup Polls which has been a benchmark of accuracy in predicting the outcome of US presidential elections for many years.¶ Can the Intrade crowd predict the election? Some say volumes are too small, others say it predicted 50 states correctly in 2004 and with over $100m traded on US Politics this election cycle so far "maybe, these virtual crowds really are wise."¶ Absolute accuracy aside, **Intrade seems to predict better than many others** and gives a real-time snapshot of market sentiment 24/7.

#### Obama has the edge in the Electoral College.

**Dionne**, **10/7**/2012 (E.J., Romney failing at Electoral College, Columbia Daily Tribune, p. http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/2012/oct/07/romney-failing-at-electoral-college/)

Instead, we have what National Journal political writer Ron Brownstein has aptly dubbed the "blue wall" because Democrats now have more states reliably in their corner than the Republicans do. Since 1992, Democrats have never received fewer than 251 electoral votes. In the same period, Republicans averaged just less than 167 electoral votes in the three elections they lost. Obama starts with a bigger electoral vote base and thus has more paths to victory than Romney. There are ample grounds for wariness of sweeping structural explanations in politics. A case can be made that Obama is doing well in the swing states for reasons having more to do with the campaign than with any wall. The president and his allied super PAC have simply been more focused and disciplined than the comparable Romney efforts. Bill Burton, one of the maestros behind Priorities USA Action, the main pro-Obama group, argues that various entities advertising on Romney's behalf have put forth a cacophony of themes and messages that have yet to cohere into a strong, persuasive argument. Yet broader trends in American politics are making the blue wall thicker. As John Judis and Ruy Teixeira argued in their prescient 2002 book, "The Emerging Democratic Majority," Republicans were becoming increasingly a party of older, white Americans at the very moment when the country was becoming much more diverse. Romney's hard line on immigration, which has left him with an anemic share of the Latino vote, has deepened his predicament. It's no wonder he tried to soften his stance on the DREAM Act in an interview with The Denver Post. Faced with their weakness among blacks and Latinos, whose share of the vote is steadily growing, Republicans need to win something on the order of 60 percent of all white votes to get to a majority. And this is difficult because significant groups of white voters, notably the overlapping groups of younger voters and professional and technical workers, have been driven away from the GOP in part by its social conservatism. This problem is aggravated by the Democrats' strength, especially pronounced this year, among women.

#### Obama is ahead --- electoral college votes.

**Horsley**, **10/7**/2012 (David – teaches English at West Texas A&M University, Horsley: 1 debate doesn’t win election, Amarillo Globe News, p. http://amarillo.com/opinion/opinion-columnist/weekly-opinion-columnist/2012-10-07/horsley-1-debate-doesnt-win-election)

In another sense, the debate might not matter in the bigger picture either, because Obama probably will win the election for one simple reason: he’ll get more electoral votes. The magic number is 270, and Obama appears to have a lock on that number. I say this because the most accurate indicator of how this election will go is a meta-analysis by Nate Silver of the New York Times. Silver has shown an uncanny accuracy in predicting election outcomes since he started analyzing demographic and voter patterns and blogging the results, first anonymously in 2007, then on a website launched in 2008 called The 538 (from the number of total electoral college votes). In the 2008 presidential election, The 538’s statistical model correctly predicted the outcome in every state except Indiana and a sliver of Nebraska. It nailed every one of the 36 Senate races. In the 2010 midterm elections, The 538 got 34 out of 36 Senate seats correct and 36 of 37 governor’s races. At the time of this writing, The 538 has Obama ahead, 321 electoral votes to 216. Though Silver advises caution with these numbers, a 100-point spread is a lot. Mitt’s the underdog with a remarkable tendency to say unbelievably dumb things and stick stubbornly to them before finally retracting them. It’s still Obama’s election to lose.

#### Obama is winning the fundamentals --- but the plan can change that.

**ABC News**, **10/7**/2012 (30 Days Out: Fundamentals Still Favor Obama, p. http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/30-days-fundamentals-favor-obama/story?id=17414910#.UHJ8e02HJ2C)

And, at this point, the fundamentals favor Obama. 1) Voters are feeling (somewhat) better about the economy and direction of the country. BLS Conspiracy theorists take note: Americans were feeling better about the state of the economy and Obama's handling of it before the jobs report came out. This is not to say that Americans think the economy is rockin'. Or that the president is doing a tremendous job of putting it back on solid footing. But, they don't think the economy is as bad today as it was a year ago. And, a small -- but growing number -- think it's getting better. On Friday, the Bloomberg Consumer Comfort Index reported that consumer confidence had climbed for a sixth straight week, the "longest such stretch since early 2006." The latest NBC/Wall Street Journal poll found that 44 percent of Americans thought the economy will get better over the next year – the highest percentage since the fall of 2009, and six points better than the fall of 2008. A year ago, a whopping 77 percent of Americans polled by ABC News/Washington Post said that the country was headed in the wrong direction. Today, that number has dropped 18 points to 60 percent. So, while a majority of Americans still aren't happy with the way things are going in the country, it is a smaller majority than it was last fall. Furthermore, the pollster.com trend line shows that since early August there has been a steady increase in the percentage of Americans who think things are headed in the right direction and a steady decrease in the number who see it as off track. 2) Despite frustration with Obama, Romney is not seen as better able to handle the economy. A majority of voters continue to disapprove of the job Obama is doing on the economy. But, they are less disappointed in him than they used to be. And, they don't see Romney as able to do any better. The latest ABC News/Washington Post poll showed 47 percent approved and 52 percent disapproved of the job the president was doing on the economy. That is the strongest the president has been on this question since the summer of 2010 and a 10 point improvement since last fall. Meanwhile, voters' confidence that Romney will do a better job on the economy has dropped significantly between August and September. Back in August, Romney had a seven point lead on the question of who'd do a better job on the economy. Today, Romney and Obama are tied. Gallup showed a similar trend between August and September. 3) Electoral map is shrinking, not expanding. Despite earlier predictions by the Romney campaign that they would be competitive in traditionally blue states like Michigan, Minnesota and Pennsylvania, they are putting no serious effort into any of them. Moreover, the Paul Ryan pick gave Romney only a short-lived bounce in Wisconsin. The latest polls in the Badger State show Obama with a healthy advantage in the state. This has left Romney has a very narrow path to 270, and no room for error. If Romney loses Ohio and Wisconsin, he would have no choice but to win almost every single other battleground state to win. 4) Romney's image problem. Thanks to the efforts of millions of dollars of negative advertising over the summer by Obama and his allies, and little to no effort by Romney to rebut them, Romney entered the fall campaign with more people feeling unfavorably toward him than favorably. Voters see Obama as better able to understand the economic problems of regular people and more in tune with the concerns of the middle class. 5) The Money Gap Obama's $181 million haul last month is impressive. More important, however, is the fact that his campaign has been smart in how they spend it. As the New York Times reported last week, the Obama team has been able to stretch their dollars further thanks to a sophisticated ad buying strategy. This has meant that even as Republicans (Romney plus the outside independent groups supporting him) have outspent the Democrats (Obama plus his independent group allies) by more than $40 million on TV ads since April, Obama and his allies have run 35,000 more ads. Outside groups have to pay a higher rate for ads than the campaigns do. This means that these groups have to spend a lot more money to get the same number of ads on the air. Despite Obama's structural advantages, this race is far from over. Economic enthusiasm/anxiety is impacted by more than unemployment statistics or the value of the stock market. Partisanship matters too. Over the course of September, the Gallup consumer confidence found that while both independents and Democrats felt more optimistic about the economy, Republicans felt less so. The Bloomberg Survey found the uptick in confidence this month to be bi-partisan, but they also found that independents felt the "most bleak" about the state of the economy.

### Energy Policies Key

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 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.

#### Energy will play a huge role in the election.

New York Times, **9/13**/2012 (Fossil Fuel Industry Ads Dominate TV Campaign, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/14/us/politics/fossil-fuel-industry-opens-wallet-to-defeat-obama.html?pagewanted=all>)

The Times analysis shows that ads with energy themes have played an outsized role in the 2012 campaign season, with energy earning more frequent mentions than every other issue except jobs and the economy

### A2: No Percieve

#### 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.”

### Export Gas Link Wall 2NC

#### The plan costs Obama the election --- it spotlights natural gas which alienates the Democratic base and hurts gas prices. That’s the 1NC Reuters 2012 evidence.

#### The plan is political suicide – it alienates Obama’s main constituencies.

**Dlouhy**, 7/14/**2012** (Jennifer A. Exporting natural gas spurs concerns, San Francisco Gate, p. <http://www.sfgate.com/business/article/Exporting-natural-gas-a-dilemma-for-U-S-3707334.php>)

The drilling boom that has led to a glut of natural gas and sent prices to 10-year lows is causing a quandary for the Obama administration, which is struggling to decide whether — and how much — the United States should share the bounty with foreign countries. Although the Energy Department recently approved Houston-based Cheniere Energy's plans to begin exporting liquefied natural gas from its Sabine Pass terminal in southwestern Louisiana, the government has put off decisions on similar applications from at least seven other companies. Administration officials say they'll make those decisions after they get the results of a study commissioned by the Energy Department on how allowing companies to sell U.S.-produced natural gas overseas would affect prices for American consumers. The study is due out later this summer. “We want analysis to drive decisions,” White House energy adviser Heather Zichal said at a recent forum. The administration supports domestic natural gas and isn't opposed to exports, she said, but also is committed to “protecting American consumers and making sure we're sending the right signal to industry and the manufacturing sector.” The dilemma is politically treacherous in an election year and a struggling economy. Although the U.S. already exports some natural gas, mostly by pipelines to Mexico and Canada, the flurry of proposals to liquefy natural gas for tanker shipment and sell it to foreign consumers would mean a big jump in exports. Applications filed with the Energy Department could put the U.S. on track to export about 16 billion cubic feet of liquefied natural gas each day — nearly a quarter of U.S. daily production last year. But few expect all those proposals to win federal approval, and it could be years before construction is finished on even those projects that win the green light. Experts at consulting company IHS CERA say the realistic potential market for exports from the U.S. and Canada is 4 billion to 5 billion cubic feet per day by 2020. An Energy Information Administration report released in January concluded that exporting natural gas would cause prices to climb in the U.S. According to the agency, consumers' electricity bills would increase by 1 percent to 3 percent from 2015 to 2035, and industrial prices would climb 9 percent to 28 percent. Unlike crude, which is a globally traded commodity, natural gas is traded on nonintegrated markets, resulting in huge price variations in different places. The prospect of selling natural gas in Asian and European markets at five times its price in the U.S. is enough to make most domestic producers giddy. Energy companies and analysts have argued that current U.S. natural gas prices are unsustainable. Gas closed Monday at $2.8010 per 1,000 cubic feet in trading on the New York Mercantile Exchange. The opposing argument is that exports could cause prices to spike, sending electricity bills upward and jeopardizing a resurgence in domestic manufacturing tied to abundant, cheap natural gas. Manufacturers that use natural gas to fuel their plants and as a building block to make other products were hit hard over the past two decades by volatile swings in prices, which last peaked over $15 in 2005. Because any position risks alienating important constituencies — energy producers and manufacturers as well as rank-and-file voters — few elected officials are pushing the issue.

#### Plan kills support with environmentalists

**Dlouhy**, 4/16/**2012** (Jennifer, Environmentalists challenge natural gas export plans, Fuel Fix, p. http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/04/16/environmentalists-challenge-natural-gas-export-plans/)

Environmentalists are challenging Freeport LNG’s bid to export natural gas from a facility in Texas — the latest attempt to undercut a push by more than a half dozen companies to send the fossil fuel overseas. The move by the Sierra Club came in the form of a formal protest lodged with the Energy Department, which is considering a request by Freeport LNG and other firms for licenses to export liquefied natural gas. Texas-based companies, such as Cheniere Energy and Freeport LNG, are eager to take advantage of the glut of natural gas produced in the U.S., using horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing techniques that allow the fossil fuel to be freed from dense shale rock formations. But the Sierra Club wants the federal government to put the brakes on those plans, amid concerns about air pollution and potential water contamination from hydraulic fracturing. The group has challenged other LNG export plans and asked top Obama administration officials to require a broader review of the environmental consequences of the likely surge in natural gas drilling that would result from selling the fuel overseas.

#### Environmentalists backlash swings the election --- it puts Romney over the top.

**Lehrer**, 6/11/**2012** (Eli – President of R Street, How Mitt Romney Can Win the Environmental Vote, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/eli-lehrer/post_3484_b_1583319.html>)

Mitt Romney just had an awesome week but, unless he and attracts new groups to the Republican coalition, it still seems he won't win the November election. If he wants to win, he'll need to broaden his base. One reasonably easy way he can do that is by attracting gay and lesbian voters and the other is by attracting environmentalists. Since it seems hugely unlikely he'd make the policy flip-flop he'll need to get the gay vote, environmentalists may be his best bet for broadening the base without sacrificing a single stated principles. A bit on Romney's great week first and why it probably won't deliver the election. Wisconsin governor Scott Walker just survived a recall attempt, President Obama claimed (bizarrely) that "the private sector is doing fine," after bad job numbers raised questions about his stewardship of the economy, and Ron Paul's son, Rand, even endorsed him. In fact, it's difficult to think of a better turn of events for Romney's campaign. That said, barring a full-scale recession between now and the election, I'd still put money on Obama to win: Romney hasn't led in the polls since last September. Quite simply, Obama will likely be able to make up for a decidedly lackluster domestic economic record by relying on a few genuine foreign policy successes, the power of the incumbency, and a mobilized base. Since the (few) positives in Obama's record and the incumbency are unalterable, the Romney camp can only win by shaving parts of Obama's base. And environmentalists are one place big place where it could work. Stanford University researchers have found that about 38 million Americans care a lot about the environment and might vote on it. Assuming that environmental voters turn out at roughly the same rate as other citizens who can vote, this means that somewhere between 15 and 19 percent of the electorate will vote partly on environmental issues. Although there's no current, detailed polling, it's likely that Obama currently stands to get around 75 percent of this group -- taking 50 percent of it would probably be enough to put Romney over the top. So how can he do it?

**Even a small shift in base turnout triggers the link.**

**Zogby**, 5/3/**2012** (John – columnist for Forbes and founder of the Zogby Poll, What Obama Needs to Be Re-Elected, Forbes, p. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnzogby/2012/05/30/what-obama-needs-to-be-re-elected/>)

As we get closer to Election Day, the unaffiliated and undecided sliver of the electorate will be scrutinized ad naseum. Estimates of $1 billion may be spent on advertising, much of it trying to convince less than 10% of voters that Barack Obama or Mitt Romney will be the worse choice for President. But in our **hyper-polarized electorate**, the **more decisive factor** will be turn out from voters who would be expected to choose one party over the other. We already see both Obama and Romney concentrating on their **respective base voters**. That’s why Obama has come out for same-sex marriage and hammered Republicans about holding down interest rates on student loans. Meanwhile, Romney has yet to make any overt moves to the middle for fear of losing support from conservatives. As you will read below, **small percentage decreases** in turnout of base voters can account for **millions** of votes. Romney and Obama are tied in the national average of polls, so **every vote will matter**. My Washington Times/JZ Analytics polling has the two within one point. While it’s way too soon to make predictions about outcome or turnout, we can develop some models of turnout from various core groups, and how each may impact the outcome. These projections will be my benchmark for further analysis moving toward Election Day. For now, I’ll stay with the national popular vote and not individual states. That will come later as I do more Washington Times/JZ Analytics polling. It’s also important to note the overlap among voting groups I will be looking at, which will be greater between some groups than others.

### Colorado

#### Colorado not key

**Stokols**, 7/3/**2012** (Eli, RNC: Colorado “important” but not a must-win for Romney, KDVR, p. http://kdvr.com/2012/07/03/rnc-colorado-important-but-not-a-must-win-for-romney/)

This kind of activity roughly 120 days prior to Election Day is an indication of how important Colorado may be in the battle to reach 270 electoral votes.

“Four years ago, you probably wouldn’t see this kind of activity this early in the cycle,” Rick Wiley, the RNC’s Political Director, told FOX31 Denver on Tuesday. “We’re building upon what we built in 2010 and I think we’re right where we need to be right now.” Colorado isn’t only one of 10 or 11 swing states that will likely decide November’s presidential election, it’s also a state where voters don’t wait until the last minute to make up their mind. “This is a huge absentee, early-vote state,” Wiley said. “Eighty percent of voters will vote before Election Day. So everything is kind of accellerated. There’s a huge volunteer component right now that goes into this.” Even in an age of SuperPACS, both campaigns believe grassroots volunteers and a strong ground game can tip states in their favor. “Right now, our volunteers are identifying our target voters,” Wiley said. “Then, the next phase is going after them.” In Colorado and Nevada, both states with growing Latino populations, the RNC has Hispanic coordinators on the ground targeting Latino voters, who, according to polls, favor President Obama over Romney by nearly a 3-to-1 margin. Republicans, however, are chipping away, unwilling to cede such a large voting bloc to Obama. “We’re in the game and that’s where we need to be.” But if the Latino vote turns Colorado blue on Election Night, Mitt Romney can still win the presidency — at least Wiley thinks so. “There are a variety of paths to 270, but this is an important state,” he said. “The West is much different than the East or the Midwest, but it’s important.”

### A2: Ohio

#### Ohio is not a must win --- other states can open up. National trends matter more than swing states.

**Bernstein**, 7/8/**2012** (Jonathan – political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post blogs Plum Line and PostPartisan, Five myths about swing states, Tampa Bay Times, p. <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/five-myths-about-swing-states/1239046>)

You'll hear plenty of similar pronouncements every election season. The Republicans have never won without Ohio, therefore they can't win without Ohio. Or: There is a "blue wall" of states that the Democrats have captured consistently since 1992, so the party has a built-in minimum in the electoral college. That could mean that any poll showing a strong Republican tilt in one of those states indicates that Obama is doomed — or that Gov. Scott Walker's recall victory in "blue wall" Wisconsin shows that Democrats are in trouble. Forget all these "rules." When Republicans won three consecutive presidential elections in the 1980s, pundits became convinced that the GOP had an electoral college lock. That view lasted exactly as long as the party's national vote lead did; as soon as Bill Clinton took the national lead in 1992, it turned out that some of the Republican "lock" states were swingers after all. Sure, if Romney wins Democratic California, he's going to win the election, but that's because if Romney wins California, he's going to be in the process of a huge national landslide. The United States has national elections, and what matters almost every time is the national results. Yes, a candidate must find 270 electoral votes in order to win. But in most years, the electoral college margin will be much larger than the popular vote difference. And the rare times, such as in 2000, when the popular vote is very close, it's not possible to guess in advance which states will be the one or two that really make a difference. So the campaigns will put their resources into those states they expect to be close, because it certainly doesn't hurt, but our elections are much more national than our obsession with swing states implies.

### Switch

#### The election isn't over - one-fifth of the electorate can still change their minds

Thiessen 10/1/12 (Mark, fellow with the American Enterprise Institute, Wash Post, "Like Reagan, Romney can still win," http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/like-reagan-romney-can-still-win/2012/10/01/01776f94-0bcb-11e2-bb5e-492c0d30bff6\_story.html)

The electorate may be similarly volatile today. A recent ABC News poll found that 22 percent of the electorate is “persuadable” — both anxious about how their preferred candidate would perform as president and interested in finding out more about the other candidate. Among independents, the number of persuadable voters is even higher — 26 percent. In other words, the election could swing dramatically in the closing weeks and even the final days — and it could swing in either direction. According to ABC, persuadable voters “include essentially equal number of Barack Obama’s and Mitt Romney’s supporters.”

#### The election isn't over - there are still enough undecideds to swing the campaign

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

Scott Rasmussen’s weekly newspaper column notes that “debates rarely have a major impact on a campaign, but a small shift could be decisive in a race as close as this one.” He adds, “Roughly five percent of all voters are still uncommitted to either candidate. Another 10% indicate they could change their minds. That's more than enough to change the race from a slight Obama advantage to a slight Romney edge.”

### Magnitsky 2NC

#### 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.

#### START collapse causes extinction

**Collins and Rojansky**, 8/18/**2010** (James – director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, ex-US ambassador to the Russian Federation, and Matthew – deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program, Why Russia Matters, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/08/18/why\_Russia\_matters)

Russia's nukes are still an existential threat. Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons in stockpile and hundreds still on hair-trigger alert aimed at U.S. cities. This threat will not go away on its own; cutting down the arsenal will require direct, bilateral arms control talks between Russia and the United States. New START, the strategic nuclear weapons treaty now up for debate in the Senate, is the latest in a long line of bilateral arms control agreements between the countries dating back to the height of the Cold War. To this day, it remains the only mechanism granting U.S. inspectors access to secret Russian nuclear sites. The original START agreement was essential for reining in the runaway Cold War nuclear buildup, and New START promises to cut deployed strategic arsenals by a further 30 percent from a current limit of 2,200 to 1,550 on each side. Even more, President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, have agreed to a long-term goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. But they can only do that by working together.