#### Topicality

#### A. Definitions

1. **Substantially means 90%**

WORDS & PHRASES citing Auclair v Riley 2000, p. no page. (DRGCL/A44) N.H. 1949. -The Word "substantially" as used in provision of Unemployment Compensation Act that experience rating of an employer may transferred to' an employing unit which acquires the organization, -trade, or business, or "substantially" all of the assets thereof, is 'an elastic term which does not include a. definite, fixed amount of percentage, and the transfer does not have to be 100 per cent but cannot be less than 90 per cent in the ordinary situation. R.L c. 218, § 6, subd. F, as added by Laws 1945, c. 138, § 16.-Auclair Transp. v. Riley, 69 A.2d 861, 96 N.H. l.-Tax347.1.

1. **Restriction means a limiting factor**

American Heritage Dictionary 09(<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/restriction>

Something that restricts; a regulation or limitation.

1. **ON means creating OPPOSITION**

Merriam Webster 12ON—used as a function word to indicate the object of collision, opposition, or hostile action <bumped my head *on* a limb> <an attack *on* religion> <pulled a gun *on* me>

#### Energy production is the extraction of primary energy forms and is distinct from consumption

Sagar, Oliver, and Chikkatur 06

[Ambuj Sagar is a senior research associate in the Science, Technology, and Public Policy program at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Honyan He Oliver is a research fellow in the Science, Technology, and Public Policy program at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Ananth Chikkatur is a research fellow in the Science, Technology, and Public Policy program at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. “ARTICLE: Climate Change, Energy, and Developing Countries” 7 Vt. J. Envtl. L. 1]

n1 The energy sector encompasses activities relating to the production, conversion, and use of energy. Energy production includes the extraction of primary energy forms such as coal, oil, and natural gas, or growing biomass for energy uses. Energy conversion pertains to the transformation of energy into more useful forms: this includes the refining of petroleum to yield products such as gasoline and diesel; the combustion of coal in power plants to yield electricity; the production of alcohol from biomass, etc. Energy end-use encompasses the final use of energy forms in industrial, residential, commercial, transportation and other end-uses.

B. Violation – The Affirmative removes restrictions on energy consumption not production.

C. Standards –

1. **Ground – the affirmative allows for more consumption in which there are millions of ways we can consume energy, which opens the floodgates to different affirmatives.**
2. **Limits – there are thousands of ways we could remove restrictions on production, so it makes it impossible for the negative to prepare for all the different consumption manners.**
3. **Grammatical Precision – the resolution asks the US to reduce restrictions ON energy production NOT on energy consumption.**
4. **Extra T – part of their affirmative is outside of the topic which uniquely hurts our ability to debate them because our topic specifc arguments like Ks and CPs may solve for 2/3 of the plan, but the rest of the plan is either residual offense or unpredictable.**
5. **Topicality is a Voter for Fairness and Education**

#### Politics

#### Obama will win – majority of polls, statistical backing

American Political Science Association 9-19, 2012 “8 Of 13 Election Forecasts Predict Obama Wins 2012 Popular Vote” Sacramento Bee, Online

Several forecast models developed by prominent political scientists predict President Obama will win the popular vote in the 2012 US presidential election, with 8 of 13 polls giving Barack Obama the edge over Mitt Romney. Nevertheless, it will be extremely close with the average of all forecast models predicting Obama will receive 50.2% of the two-party popular vote. For comparison, in 2008, Obama received 53.7% of the two-party popular vote. Five of the 13 models predict a modest to close popular-vote plurality for Barack Obama, though three of these are on the cusp of predicting a tossup; five predict a modest to close popular vote victory for Mitt Romney; and three regard the election as a tossup. The forecasts range from predicting a 53.8% vote for Obama to a 53.1% vote for Romney. All of the predictions appear in an election-themed symposium in the October issue of PS: Political Science and Politics, a journal of the American Political Science Association (APSA). The forecasts are based on different combinations of statistical and historical data and differ in their complexity and how far in advance their predictions were made. The earliest forecast was made 299 days in advance while the latest was made 57 days before the election. Together, these forecasts use a range of approaches and indicators that are critical to understanding national electoral processes and the dynamics at work in US presidential elections.

#### Public Opposes Nuclear Energy

CNN 11 (“CNN Poll: Public says yes to nuclear energy but no to new plants,” Online, 3/22/11, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2011/03/22/cnn-poll-public-says-yes-to-nuclear-energy-but-no-to-new-plants/ Accessed 9/14/12 [TR])

The survey indicates that 53 percent of the public opposes building more nuclear power plants in the U.S., up six points from last year. Forty-six percent support the construction of new plants. What about the existing nuclear power plans in the country?¶ Sixty-eight percent say continue to operate all of them, with 27 percent saying that some should be shut down and one in ten calling for all of the plants to be closed.¶ According to the poll, 28 percent say domestic nuclear power plants are very safe, with just over half saying they are somewhat safe and one in five saying they are not safe.¶ The numbers drop for plants located in earthquake zones or near oceans. Twelve percent consider plants in those locations very safe, with 42 percent calling them somewhat safe and 45 percent say they are not safe. But two-thirds say they are confident in the federal government's ability to handle a nuclear power plant crisis here in the U.S., with one-third saying authorities would not be able to deal with a nuclear power plant severely damaged by an accident or natural disaster, similar to what happened in Japan.¶ While a majority approve using nuclear power to produce energy, public opinion on nuclear energy has some negatives as well as positives.¶ "Despite assurances from public officials, most Americans say that it is likely that a dangerous amount of radiation from the damaged nuclear power plants in Japan will eventually reach the United States," adds Holland. "Plus, six in ten would find a nuclear plant in their community unacceptable. And 57 percent say that the U.S. should rely less on nuclear power for its future energy needs.

#### Obama loss causes Republican led war with Iran- Oil shocks and middle east war

Curiel 2010 (Jonathan Curiel, respected journalist, taught as Fulbright Scholar at Punjab University in Lahore, Pakistan, researched at Oxford as a Reuters Foundation Fellow, “What just might happen if Obama loses in 2012,” Jonathan Curiel’s blog, google)

War in Iran: The Republicans’ ascension marks the return of chickenhawk diplomacy. Instead of the Obama administration’s reasoned approach to Iran, the new administration relies on all-or-nothing antagonism, leading to the third Gulf War in two decades. What ensues are thousands of new military deaths, a dangerously destabilized Middle East, and an oil crisis that shocks Western economies for years. As in Afghanistan and Iraq, the U.S. tries to shepherd in a friendlier government, but now all three countries – connected geographically, religiously and historically – become the world’s leading front for insurgency against the United States.

#### Nuclear war

Preble 2007 (Christopher Preble, director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, June 26, 2007, “Bargaining with Tehran,” CATO)

Many Iranian nuclear facilities have been hardened against attack, with some buried under as much as 18 meters — 59 feet — of rock and concrete. Since our most effective conventional "bunker–busters" can only penetrate 6 meters — 20 feet — underground, the U.S. military might have to resort to low–yield nuclear weapons to bust the bunkers. Also, because many of the facilities are located in or near major population centers, bombing would result in significant civilian casualties. Whether an attack used nuclear or conventional munitions, it probably would lead to a wider war. Iranian leaders probably would conclude that the survival of the regime was at stake, and they would have no incentive to hold anything back. They could retaliate in several ways. Although Iranian–sponsored terrorist attacks against the United States itself are unlikely, they cannot be ruled out entirely.

**Heidegger**

**Energy policy only concerns itself with the systematic ordering of nature upon a standing reserve for future exploitation**

**Schalow 2006** (Frank Schalow, Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of New Orleans. *The Incarnality of Being: The Earth, Animals, and the Body in Heidegger’s Thought*, pg. 96-97)

Can we classify Heidegger as an ecologist, or even as a protoecologist? This query should give us occasion to pause--as Zimmerman has recently emphasized-if only for the fact that most of his thinking predated the environmental movement, as least it was pioneered in the United States.10 It might be more accurate to say that Heidegger's thinking begins the enactment of Western thought, and Western civilization, coming into its own, the adherence of thought to the guidance of enowning as such. This "turning in enowning" opens the way to articulate a "paradigm shift" whose development corresponds to what we today call the "ecological movement."ll We can thereby call into question (1) our relation to the earth rather than assume it as the totality of nature at our disposal, and (2) the human capacity for dwelling rather than accept the fact that nature must conform to the ends-means continuum of instrumentality by which we fulfill our needs and desires. But what makes Heidegger's thought stand out is its ability to distinguish the historical changes that allow the ecological movement to emerge as a movement, namely, the detection of a crisis emerging on a global scale. Through the historical dislocation of the turning in enowning, the question of being reverts into the question of technology. The question of technology considers not just the specific development of machinery but addresses machination as such, and, indeed, the scope of its unfolding, the globalization of a corresponding threat to the environment. In "Seminar in Le Thor 1969," Heidegger aptly describes this dynamic of enframing: Now the further that modern technology unfolds, the more does objectivity transform into standing reservedness (into a holding-atone's- disposal). . . . Hence the **energy politics** and the politics of agriculture, which indeed no longer have anything to do with things, but rather with **the systematic order of a space within a general planning, directed towards future exploitations. Everything (beings as a whole) from the outset arranges itself in the horizon of utility, the dominance, or better yet, the orderability of what is to be seized**.

In constructing nature as a resource to be harnessed and utilized as a tool, the affirmative enframes the debate within the bounds of a technological ontology that reduces both human beings and nature to a raw material to be used. This thought process results in a re-entrenching of affirmative harms as all solvency is co-opted by the drive to dominate nature intrinsic to western metaphysics.
Ross, Professor at Queen’s University, 2007 (Andrew Peter, “Rethinking Environmental Responsibility: Heidegger, Profound Boredom and the Alterity of Nature”, September) SVK

To be clear, though this type of experience might be described positively as an “emergence from anonymity”, it should be noted that there is still a sense in which this transformation continues to happen within the boundaries of technology. In particular, it should be noted as a point of clarification that the transformation of natural beings from ready-to-hand into present-at-hand does not draw them outside of the Gestell: the technological enframing of nature does not simply disclose beings as ready-to-hand. More specifically—and more problematically—the lens of technology discloses nature (and all beings) as pure resource—a stock or supply of energy, whether or not such beings are disclosed as tools within particular projects. In this sense the difference between the disclosure of beings as ready-to-hand and present-at-hand should not be thought of as the difference between a technological and non-technological encounter with nature. While the breakdown of the worldhood may transform the disclosure of those natural beings that are encountered as ready-to-hand tools into present-at-hand objects, this only occurs to the extent that they can no longer be viewed as an appropriately functioning resource—nature appears, even in the disclosure of itself as present-at-hand, as a resource. Thus, it should be kept in mind that whatever significance the experience of equipmental breakdown holds for this project, it does not simply consist in the transformation from the ready-to-hand into the present-at-hand. Rather than analyze the significance of experiencing nature as present-at-hand, I wish to emphasize the significance of nature appearing in its ownness or whatness—the being they possess independently from us and our practises. The significance of nature appearing in its ownness is two-fold. First, by disclosing natural beings in their ownness, the equipmental breakdown offers what we might think of as a “glimpse” of primordial nature. More specifically, the equipmental breakdown may not reveal natural beings to be self-blossoming or self-emergent; there is a certain sense in which their withdrawal from the world of work offers Dasein a glimpse of their self-withdrawing, self-concealing nature. Bruce Foltz, for example, uses this point to argue that even within the experience of nature as ready-to-hand, the notion of nature as self- withholding and self-withdrawing is present—even if tacitly and unthematically (43). More specifically, Foltz argues that because beings must “withdraw” and become “unobtrusive” in order to be encountered as tools, the experience of natural beings as self-withholding, self- withdrawing entities underlies our most pragmatic encounters with nature (43). Following Foltz’s line of reasoning, it can be noted that the equipmental breakdown not only brings to light the ownness of whatever natural being is at hand, it simultaneously brings to light its ability for self- concealment and self-withdrawal. By bringing these latter qualities to light, the equipmental breakdown highlights the features that constitute natural beings’ more primordial essence. In other words, by drawing attention to the way in which nature is capable of self-withdrawal and self-concealing, the experience of equipmental breakdown offers a glimmer of primordial nature. The second point of significance can be explained by noting what the occlusion of nature’s sense of ownness entails. By occluding the whatness of nature, its ability for self-withdraw and self-concealment, the Gestell essentially deprives us of the ability to encounter nature in anything other than a violent manner. If we cannot see the forest as anything more than a supply of cellulose, the river as anything more than a power source, or the animal as anything other than a flesh machine, then such beings can only show up as being available for manipulation and exploitation. When nature appears solely as a collection of resourceful beings, there are no inherent limitations that might curb their manipulation and exploitation as resources.

Loss of human self assertion would be worse than nuclear omnicide

Zimmerman, Professor of Philosophy @ Tulane, 1994 (Michael, Contesting Earth’s Future, p 119-120) SVK

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

The alternative is a break from calculative thought through meditation

Best and Nocella, Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Texas at El Paso, 2006(Steven and Anthony, Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth, p. 82-84, Google Books) SVK

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.

**CASE**

**Warming**

#### Nuclear is Not Feasible for a Laundry list of reasons

Oliver Tickell, 2012 (Oliver Tickell Writer and Ecologist, August 20th, 2012,<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/20/world-need-nuclear-power-climate-crisis>)

So this is the question: **does the world need nuclear power for us to solve the climate crisis**, as Monbiot claims? To borrow a second thought, this time from Margaret Thatcher, must we accept that there is no alternative? Let's look at the figures. In 2010 the world demand for primary energy was equivalent to 12,000 million tonnes of oil (Mtoe), 87% of which was provided by oil, gas and coal. Nuclear power contributed a gross 626 Mtoe, about 5% of the total, while renewables accounted for 935 Mtoe, almost 8%. **To solve the climate problem, the world must not only reverse the trend of increasing carbon emissions over the next few decades, but bring them down to less than they are now. So can nuclear power do it?** Assume a 2% growth in primary energy demand per year over the next 35 years, and that demand will double to some 24,000 Mtoe. **Rely on nuclear power to accommodate all the growth, and knock out 4,000 Mtoe-worth of coal, and it will have to produce 16,000 Mtoe of energy per year – a 25-fold increase on its current level.** **Today the world has 440 operational nuclear reactors, so 25 times more means 11,000 reactors.** To have these in 35 years means building, on average, about one a day. Or in an exponential growth scenario, the world would need to sustain an annual increase of 8% per year in the number of operational nuclear reactors for 35 years. Given that nuclear power generation has flatlined over the last decade, and has sharply declined in the last few years, **that looks like a tall order**. There are currently plans for about 200 new nuclear reactors around the world, mainly in China, the Middle East and the USA. But **few observers expect all of these to be built, since the economics of nuclear power are unattractive to private investors, owing to high construction cost, long lead time, electricity price uncertainty, political hazard and long-term liabilities.**

#### Nuclear power production speeds up warming

Caldicott 6 (Helen, President, Nuclear Policy Research Institute, “Nuclear power is not the answer”, p.4)

What exactly is nuclear power? It is a very expensive, sophisticated, and dangerous way to boil water. Uranium fuel rods are placed in water in a reactor core, they reach critical mass, and they produce vast quantities of heat, which boils the water. Steam is directed through pipes to turn a turbine, which generates electricity. The scientists who were involved in the Manhattan Project creating nuclear weapons developed a way to harness nuclear energy to generate electricity. Because their guilt was so great, they were determined to use their ghastly new invention to help the human race. Nuclear fission harnessed “atoms for peace,” and the nuclear PR industry proclaimed that nuclear power would provide an endless supply of electcitiy – referred to as “sunshine units” – that would be good for the environment and “too cheap to meter.” They were wrong. Although a nuclear power plant itself releases no carbon dioxide, the production of nuclear electricity depends upon a vast, complex, and hidden industrial infrastructure that is never featured by the nuclear industry in its propaganda, but that actually releases a large amount of carbon dioxide as well as other global warming gases. One is led to believe that the nuclear reactor stands alone, an autonomous creator of energy. In fact, the vast infrastrcutre necessary to create nuclear energy, called the nuclear fuel cycle, is a prodigious user of fossil fuel and coal. The production of carbon dioxide (CO2) is one measurement that indicates the amount of energy used in the production of the nuclear fuel cycle. Most of the energy used to create nuclear energy – to mine uranium ore for fuel, to crush and mill the ore, to enrich the uranium, to create the concrete and steel for the reacotr, and to store the thermally and radioactively hot nuclear waste – comes from the consumption of fossil fuels, that is coal or oil. When these materials are burned to produce energy, they form CO2 (reflecting coal and oil’s origins in ancient trees and other organic carboniferous material laid down under the earth’s crust millions of years ago). For each ton of carbon burned, 3.7 tons of CO2 gas added to the atmosphere, and thisis the source of today’s global warming.

#### NUCLEAR POWER GENERATION RELEASES MASSIVE AMOUNTS OF RADIATION INTO THE ENVIRONMENT

**TEXAS RADIATION ONLINE 2004** [http://www.radtexas.org/ “Nothing Clean About Nuclear Energy Production” accessed 9/29/04 //uwyo-blp]

It doesn't take an accident for a nuclear power plant to release radioactivity into our air, water and soil. During everyday routine operation, federal regulations permit these radioactive releases. Radioactive water is allowed to be released into the environment containing "permissible" levels of contamination. Permissible does **not** mean safe. Detectors at reactors are set to allow contaminated water to be released, unfiltered. if below "permissible" legal levels. Some contaminated water is intentionally removed from the reactor vessel to reduce the amount of the radioactive and corrosive chemicals that damage valves and pipes. The water is filtered and then either recycled back into the cooling system or released into the environment. A typical 1000-megawatt pressurized-water reactor (with a cooling tower) takes in 20,000 gallons of river, lake or ocean water per minute for cooling, circulates it through a 50-mile maze of pipes, returns 5,000 gallons per minute to the same body of water, and releases the remainder to the atmosphere as vapor. A 1000-megawatt reactor without a cooling tower such as those in Texas, takes in even more water- as much as one-half million gallons per minute. The discharge water is contaminated with radioactive elements in amounts that are not precisely known. Accurate, economically-feasible filtering and monitoring technologies do not exist for some of the major reactor by-products.

#### No catastrophic warming and its not human caused- past temperatures were hotter and we didn’t cause them nor die from them

Idso, Carter and Singer 2011 [Craig D. Ph.D Chairman for the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Robert M. Ph.D Adjunct Research Fellow James Cook University, S. Fred Ph.D President of Science and Environmental Policy Project, Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report” Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf

Evidence of a Medieval Warm Period (MWP) approximately 1,000 years ago, when there was about 28 percent less CO2 in the atmosphere than there is currently, would show there is nothing unusual, unnatural, or unprecedented about recent temperatures. Such evidence is now overwhelming.  New evidence not reported in NIPCC-1 finds the Medieval Warm Period occurred in North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Antarctica, and the Northern Hemisphere. Despite this evidence, Mann et al. (2009) continue to understate the true level of warming during the MWP by cherry-picking proxy and instrumental records.  Research from locations around the world reveals a significant period of elevated air temperatures that immediately preceded the Little Ice Age, during a time that has come to be known as the Little Medieval Warm Period.  Recent reconstructions of climate history find the human influence does not stand out relative to other, natural causes of climate change. While global warming theory and models predict polar areas would warm most rapidly, the warming of Greenland was 33 percent greater in magnitude in 1919–1932 than it was in 1994–2007, and Antarctica cooled during the second half of the twentieth century.  Perlwitz et al. (2009) reported ―a decade-long decline (1998–2007) in globally averaged temperatures from the record heat of 1998‖ and noted U.S. temperatures in 2008 ―not only declined from near-record warmth of prior years, but were in fact colder than the official 30-year reference climatology … and further were the coldest since at least 1996.‖  New research disputes IPCC‘s claim that it has ferreted out all significant influences of the world‘s many and diverse urban heat islands from the temperature databases they use to portray the supposedly unprecedented warming of the past few decades.

#### CO2 doesn’t cause warming

Jaworowski 2010 [Zbigniew, Ph. D., M.D., D.Sc., has researched the atmospheric pollution of glaciers and CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere for many years, and is the author of numerous publications on climate change. He serves as the Polish representative in the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, and is a member of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) January 15, “‘Global Warming’: A Lie Aimed At Destroying Civilization” EIR Science and Technology http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles\_2010/Jaworowski\_interview.pdf]

As you can see, there is no connection between CO2 , which has been under such fierce attack, and climate change. Indeed, more than 500 million years ago, according to the geological record, CO2 was present at 23 times the levels we now have in the atmosphere, and yet, half a billion years ago, the land was covered by glaciers. Climate change depends on many factors, and now we are fighting against only one factor, CO2 , which happens to be negligible.

#### SMRs are not a solution for global warming

Makhijani & Boyd 2010 (IEER Institute of energy and environmental research <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf>) JA

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

#### SMRs are not the answer to the energy crisis.

Riches 2012 (Nuclear free by 2045, “The (False?) Promise of Small Modular Reactors” http://nf2045.blogspot.com/2012/02/false-promise-of-small-modular-reactors.html ) JA

In 2011, American author Reese Palley wrote The Answer: Why Only Inherently Safe Mini-Nuclear Power Plants Can Save Our World, in which he presents a powerful argument that all alternatives except these new SMRs (Small Modular Reactors, or mini nukes) offer false hope as solutions to the energy crisis. The argument for these SMRs has some severe weaknesses, but Palley must be credited with having written some excellent prose that provides a brutally frank description of how bad our energy predicament is.

#### High oil prices are driving Russian economic growth

MLA 12

(4/20, Meat & Livestock Australia, “High oil prices drive Russian economy,” <http://www.mla.com.au/Prices-and-markets/Market-news/High-oil-prices-drive-Russian-economy>, Accessed: 7/11/12, GJV)

The Russian economy is expected to grow by 4% in 2012, according to the latest International Monetary Fund (IMF) World Economic Outlook. This is an upward revision of 0.7% on the IMF’s January forecast, largely reflecting the outlook for a continuation of high oil prices. Russia is the world’s second largest oil producer and consequently is heavily reliant upon oil revenues for economic growth. Although growth prospects for Russia remain strong, the most prominent risk for the region, according to the IMF, is an escalation of the European debt crisis. The Euro area accounts for a large proportion of Russian exports, with a slowdown in the Euro zone likely to directly impact on export earnings. Of more concern, according to the IMF, would be a decrease in the price of oil brought about by a slowdown in the Euro zone and the wider global economy.

#### There is a substitution effect between nuclear and oil prices

Lee and Chiu 10

(Chien-Chiang, Yi-Bun – University Kaohsiung Taiwan;“Oilprices, nuclear energy consumption, and economic growth: New evidence using a heterogeneous panel analysis”; Energy Policy Volume 39, Issue 4, April 2011, Pages 2111–2120) BHB

This paper applies panel data analysis to examine the short-run dynamics and long-run equilibrium relationships among nuclear energy consumption, oilprices, oil consumption, and economic growth for developed countries covering the period 1971–2006. The panel cointegration results show that in the long run, oilprices have a positive impact on nuclear energy consumption, suggesting the existence of the substitution relationship between nuclear energy and oil. The long-run elasticity of nuclear energy with respect to real income is approximately 0.89, and real income has a greater impact on nuclear energy than do oilprices in the long run. Furthermore, the panel causality results find evidence of unidirectional causality running from oilprices and economic growth to nuclear energy consumption in the long run, while there is no causality between nuclear energy consumption and economic growth in the short run.

**Incentives for nuclear power lowers oil prices – trades off**US Fed News 8 (5/6/08. “SKYROCKETING GAS PRICES HIGHLIGHT NEED TO USE AMERICAN RESOURCES” <http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=08d0fc06b2da1455085f3578e4de428d&docnum=6&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAl&_md5=f4756b7493583c302d5375ed8a4b39a8>)
 Despite promises of a "commonsense plan" to lower gas prices, the Democrats have failed to act on the number one issue affecting Kentuckians' pocketbooks since taking over the Majority in Congress. Our country must invest in alternative energy sources in order to reduce our energy dependence and lower fuel costs. It is time Congress works in a bipartisan manner to create a balanced energy solution that promotes conservation efforts and increases energy production on our own soil. Speaker Nancy Pelosi has rejected commonsense solutions that increase production in America and use our own resources. The law of supply and demand is a staple of economics. It is commonsense that when we increase domestic supply, gas prices will fall. I have voted for and supported a number of proposals that would do just that. For example, the No More Excuses Energy Act (H.R. 3089) would encourage new refinery construction, allow for environmentally responsible exploration of the [Arctic National Wildlife Refuge](http://shop.ebay.com/i.html?_nkw=arctic+national+wildlife+refuge) (ANWR) and the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS), and provide tax incentives to encourage the construction of new nuclear power plants.

#### Downfall of the oil industry collapses the Russian economy

Dashevsky 11 (Steven, Managing Director of Dashevsky & Partners (Investment Firm), Adviser to Dean, Moscow School of Management May 24th, http://rt.com/business/news/russia-economy-oil-rpice/)

RT: High oil prices have helped Russia’s budget but is the country too dependent on energy exports? SD: “Well the dependence has declined greatly in recent years, but I think the sad truth remains that, to a very significant degree, Russia’s budget revenues and overall fiscal health is still very dependent on the level of oil prices.” RT: How does the energy sector shape the Russian investment climate? SD: “Well, there are many ways how the events happening in the oil and gas sector influence what is happening in the broader economy. On the one hand this is the biggest source of cash flow generation in the country, so in a sense it’s the biggest source of investment funds, both for the companies, and for the government and also because oil companies invest very significant amounts of money every year, so the ability of Russian oil companies to spend money affects really the entire Russian economy – from transport companies to oil service companies to catering companies to local airlines – so it is still, despite the significant efforts to diversify the economy, it’s a very important source of investment funds.That’s kind of one angle, and another angle is what is happening in the Russian oil and gas sector, since it is the biggest sector in the economy, affects the general investment climate, from the kind of sentiment perspective.So, when something good happens like potentially was going to happen, BP-Rosneft deal, or if there are good events happening, new fields are being developed, new pipelines are being brought on-stream, that gives investor additional confidence that the economy is progressing very well, and people are investing money in it, and the whole country is open for business.Vice versa, if things are not going well, if deals are breaking up, if instead of going to work people going to courts against each other, that clearly creates a big drag on the investors sentiment for all of the Russian economy, not just oil and gas.”

#### Russian Econ collapse Impact – Laundry List

Oliker and Paley 2002, Olga Oliker and Tanya Charlick-Paley, RAND Corporation Project Air Force, “Assessing Russia’s Decline,” www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1442/

Continuing trends toward military, political, economic, and social decline in Russia threaten the interests of the United States and its allies. Moscow's capacity to govern is called into question by increasing crime and corruption (and by political and economic regionalization). Both the military nuclear arsenal and the civilian nuclear power sector present risks of materials theft or diversion, as well as of tragic accident. An increasingly aging and ailing population bodes ill for Russia's future. Reversing the country's economic decline and rebuilding an effective military have proven difficult for the financially strapped government. While improvements, especially in the economic realm, are now evident, their sustainability is far from certain. The future development of these trends is critical to U.S. interests. Nuclear material from Russia could fall into the hands of terrorists-organized crime in Russia is part of a multinational network with links to global and local terror. Russia is a major oil and gas producer and transit state, and the U.S. government has identified energy interests as key to national security. A humanitarian crisis in Russia could threaten U.S. allies with refugee flows, environmental crisis, or conflict spillover. In many scenarios, it seems likely that the United States would respond. If so, the U.S. Air Force is certain to be called upon for transportation and perhaps military missions in a very demanding environment.