# AFF EVIDENCE ROUND 1

## 2ac Topicality

##### Restriction’ should not be defined narrowly – should include regulations, conditions, and limitations on action

Mexican Ministry of Economy March 2012 “Other Appellant Submission of Mexico” UNITED STATES – CERTAIN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELLING REQUIREMENTS http://www.economia.gob.mx/files/comunidad\_negocios/comercio\_exterior/solucion\_controversias/EDO.EDO/ORGANIZACION%20MUNDIAL%20DE%20COMERCIO/Participaci%C3%B3n%20de%20M%C3%A9xico%20como%20reclamante/EU\_COOL/20COMUNICACIONDELOTROAPELANTEDEMEXICO.pdf

52. The ordinary meaning of “restrictive” is “imposing restrictions”63 “[i]mplying, conveying or expressing restriction or limitation” and “[h]aving the nature or effect of a restriction; imposing a restriction.”64 The term “restriction” is defined as “the act or an instance of restricting; the state of being restricted”65 and as “[a] thing which restricts someone or something, a limitation on action, a limiting condition or regulation.”66 The term “restrict” is defined as “confine, bound, limit”.67 53. The meaning of “restriction” has been elaborated upon in jurisprudence concerning other WTO provisions. The term “restriction” should not be given a narrow meaning.68 A “disguised restriction” in the context of Article XX of the GATT 1994 has been interpreted to include “disguised discrimination in international trade”.69 In the context of Article XI and other non-discrimination provisions of the GATT 1994, it has been found that GATT disciplines on the use of restrictions are not meant to protect “trade flows”, but rather the “competitive opportunities of imported products”.70 In Argentina – Hides and Leather, the Panel found that in determining whether a measure makes effective a restriction in the context of Article I, II, III and XI:1 of the GATT 1994 the focus is on the competitive opportunities of imported products, not the trade effects. That panel considered that the complaining party claiming the existence of a restriction need not prove actual trade effects

## 2ac Counterplan

##### Loan guarantees institutionalize inefficiency and doom their project

**Spencer 10** [Domestic Policy Subcommittee Of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee Tuesday, April 20, 2010 Jack Spencer, Senior Research Fellow, Nuclear Energy Policy, Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, khirn]

Limited loan guarantees can help overcome some near-term financing obstacles, but they are subsidies. If not used prudently, **they will only act to prop up non-competitive industries.** Furthermore, **if they are not accompanied by policy reforms, they would simply magnify the uncertainty**, and thus the risk to taxpayers, caused by the underlying policies that make private financing difficult to attain in the first place. Tolerable to a Degree The clean energy loan guarantee program, under which the nuclear program resides, was created in 2005 to help move new clean energy sources toward market viability. A limited loan guarantee program that allowed industry and government to share risk while working through some remaining issues (such as waste disposal and unpredictable regulation) is appropriate. Expansive loan guarantee programs, however, are fraught with problems. At a minimum, they create taxpayer liabilities, give recipients preferential treatment, and distort capital markets. Further, depending on how they are structured, they can remove incentives to decrease costs, stifle innovation, suppress private-sector financing solutions, perpetuate regulatory inefficiency, and encourage government dependence. President Obama's expansion would transform the limited program into a much broader one that threatens to **institutionalize the inefficiencies** that subsidies create. Most basically, the program diminishes the incentive to reform problematic regulations and policies, such as the prolonged and unpredictable permitting process, because the loan guarantee protects investors against the risk posed by those policies. Instead of providing a near-term transition from an unstable past to a viable future during which policy reforms would take place, the expanded loan guarantee program would simply perpetuate the systemic inefficiencies and risk that gave rise to the need for the subsidy in the first place.

##### Loan guarantees distort capital markets - undermine the economy overall by distorting private investment. Government loans incentivize investors not to evaluate projects because of the government’s backing – this undermines higher quality projects and is exactly what Flyvbjerg describes

**de Rugy, 12** – senior fellow of the Mercatus Center at George Mason University (Veronique, “A Guarantee for Failure: Government Lending Under Sec. 1705”, 7/18, [http://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/de-Rugy-Testimony.pdf)//DH](http://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/de-Rugy-Testimony.pdf)/DH)

Loan guarantee programs can also have an impact on the economy beyond their cost to taxpayers because malinvestment—the misallocation of capital and labor—may result. In theory, banks lend money to the projects that represent the greatest likelihood of success, in terms of loan repayment, profits, and economic growth. However, since there isn’t an infinite amount of capital available at a given interest rate, loan guarantee programs could redirect resources from politically neutral projects to politically motivated ones. Think about it this way: When the government reduces a lender’s exposure to fund a project it wouldn’t have funded otherwise, it reduces the amount of money available for projects that would have been viable without subsidies.

This government involvement can distort the market’s signals further. For instance, the data shows that private investors tend to congregate toward government guarantee projects, regardless of the merits of the projects. This takes capital away from unsubsidized projects that have a more viable business plan and a better probability of success without subsidies. As the GAO noted, “Guarantees would make projects [the federal government] assists financially more attractive to private capital than conservation projects not backed by federal guarantees. Thus both its loans and its guarantees will siphon private capital away.” 26

## 2ac Disad

##### Romney will win because Obama’s approval ratings are too low – makes their impacts inevitable

**Talgo, 9/16/12 –** commentator for Neon Tommy, a Los Angeles-based news source sponsored by the Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism covering breaking news (Tyler, “Why Romney Will Win The Election” <http://www.neontommy.com/news/2012/09/why-romney-will-win-election>)

Given the post-convention polling bounces, some may give Obama the advantage at this stage of the race, although the bounces are subsiding. For example, new NBC/WSJ polls of three swing states have Obama leading Romney by 49 to 44 percent in Florida and Virginia, and by 50 to 43 percent in Ohio. However, when we take a closer look at the numbers, a different story is revealed. In the Florida and Virginia polls, Democrats were oversampled by 5 percent, and in Ohio they were oversampled by 10 percent. Not convinced? Here’s another fact: recent CBS/NYT/Quinnipiac polls oversampled Democrats by nine percent in Florida and by eight percent in Ohio. The Florida poll had Obama at 51 percent and Romney at 45 percent, and the Ohio poll had Obama at 50 percent and Romney at 44 percent; so, both leads were smaller than the oversampling gap. If you ask me, the advantage here clearly goes to Romney; and, believe me, these are not the only examples.

All of this is revealed in the context of a time in which Republicans are much more enthusiastic than Democrats. Last month the number of Americans who consider themselves Republicans was the highest ever recorded since 2002 at 37.6 percent, compared to only 33.3 percent who consider themselves Democrats.

So, assuming that all else is equal, what does it mean when a national poll says something like 47 percent for Obama and 44 percent for Romney, or vise versa? The nature of the missing 10 percent is one of the most important factors that come to play in all presidential reelection campaigns. Historically, the final results in an election are almost always worse than polling suggests for an incumbent president. If you took the undecided vote, according to Gallup, from every general election since 1964 that featured an incumbent president seeking reelection, 89 percent of it went to the president’s challenger. You can bet that the Obama camp understands that a 47-44 poll in its favor is not good news at all. This is why it’s virtually unheard-of for an incumbent president to win reelection when he's polling below 50 percent.

##### The debates and labor statistics will determine the election

**Lombardo, 9/12**/12 - Global CEO, StrategyOne (Steve, “Why This Election Comes Down to Two Days in October,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-why-this\_b\_1877815.html)

Several national polls released this week show that President Obama received a small but meaningful bounce after the conventions. The bounce -- in the 3-5 point range -- is within the median for convention bounces since 1964. The problem for Republicans is that Romney got no bounce from his convention. In fact, his vote share likely shrunk a point or two in the last two weeks. While the Republican convention may have strengthened Romney's position with the base, it did little to expand his coalition. The momentum from "You didn't build that" has been halted. ¶ However, we see nothing in the data yet to suggest this is anything but a dead heat. For all the hand wringing over the GOP convention and the Romney campaign they are in a dead heat with an incumbent President with 55 days to go. When you look at likely voters in key swing states, this thing is truly 50/50. ¶ Here is our take as of 12 a.m. EST: ¶ The murder of Ambassador Stevens and the unrest in Libya will thrust both candidates into the foreign policy fray. It will be very interesting to see how each handles the coming hours and days and how much the media -- and ultimately voters -- focuses on the issue.¶ Look for a higher level of advertising spend from the Romney campaign in key battleground states over the next two weeks. History has shown that the candidate who is clearly in the lead by mid to late September will likely be the winner in November. That doesn't mean things can't change in October -- they can. But sentiment will start to firm up in the next two weeks. The Romney campaign has a $60 million cash-on-hand advantage, and they should use it now. Team Obama defined Romney in the spring using their cash advantage; the Romney campaign should not wait until October. They need to change the dynamic before October 1.¶ The two biggest dates of the campaign are October 3rd and October 5th. The first debate will be held on Wednesday, October 3rd at the University of Denver at 9 p.m. EST. For three reasons this will be far and away the most important debate:¶ It is the first and therefore, unless there is a major blunder, is likely to be the one that sets the image of Romney in stone.¶ We really do not believe that the other two will matter if Romney has a poor debate performance here. Romney has to win this debate pure and simple.¶ This one is purely on domestic policy, i.e. the economy. If Romney can't win this one, he is unlikely to win the other two, barring a miscue by the President.¶ On October 5th at 8:30 a.m. EST the Bureau of Labor Statistics will release the September unemployment numbers. This will be the most impactful announcement of the campaign. If the unemployment rate goes up it could be devastating for the president's reelection chances. Similarly, if it goes down -- especially if it goes below 8 percent -- it may pretty much secure an Obama victory in November.¶

##### Gridlock inevitable with any election outcome

Curry, 9/11/12 - NBC News national affairs writer (Tom, NBC Politics, “Romney election could create new scenario for EPA and coal,” <http://nbcpolitics.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/09/11/13807749-romney-election-could-create-new-scenario-for-epa-and-coal?lite>)

Whether Mitt Romney or Barack Obama wins the presidential election, a congressional impasse in 2013 seems likely. That’s because under most conceivable election scenarios – with Romney or Obama in the White House, and with either Democrats maintaining their Senate majority, or the Republicans taking it – the minority party could use the filibuster threat to block proposals it opposed.

##### No matter who wins the election congress will stay deadlocked and business as usual will prevent any major policy change

McManus 8/23/12 (Doyle – Columnist for the LA Times, “The political forecast? Grim”, The Los Angeles Times, August 23 2012, Lexis) AC

There are plenty of things not to like about this year's presidential campaign, including how nasty and negative a mud fight it's become, with both sides engaging in shameless distortion.¶ But here's the worst thing about this presidential campaign: No matter what happens on election day, there's little hope of a good outcome.¶ For most of the last four years, Washington has been mired in political gridlock, deadlocked between Republicans who want to slash government and keep taxes low and Democrats who are willing to trim government a bit but also want to raise taxes on the affluent.¶ That deadlock has sent us careening toward one fiscal cliff after another. It's made it virtually impossible for Congress to do anything more ambitious than writing short-term spending bills that merely kick the can down the road.¶ One purpose of elections is to break that kind of deadlock and send politicians a message about what direction voters want them to go. That's what happened in 2008, when President Obama won a mandate to pursue his vision of an activist government -- and again in 2010, when voters decided that Obama had gone too far and handed the House of Representatives to Republicans.¶ But this year? It's unlikely voters will deliver a clear message.¶ The presidential polls have been balanced around the 50% mark for months. Strategists in both parties say the outcome is likely to be a squeaker. The morning after election day, the winner, whoever he is, will declare that voters have given him a ringing mandate to do whatever he promised -- but it won't be true. Polls show that on most of the major issues the candidates are arguing about -- tax rates, the size of government, the repeal of Obama's healthcare plan -- the public is divided.¶ Even worse, Congress is likely to remain deadlocked as well. The most recent forecast by Charlie Cook, the dean of congressional election soothsayers, suggests that the Senate will end up around 50-50, too close for either party to control with ease. In the House of Representatives, Cook projects that Democrats could gain as many as eight seats, but that's far short of the 25 they need to take control away from Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio).¶ In the absence of a clear-cut victory for either side, we face two possible scenarios.¶ In one outcome, Obama narrowly wins reelection and spends at least two years wrestling with truculent conservatives in the House, who will be determined to stand in his way as never before.¶ In the other, Romney narrowly wins election and spends at least two years wrestling with truculent conservatives in the House, who will interpret his election as a popular mandate for a tea party program whether it is or not. He could have a Democratic Senate to wrestle with as well.¶ The almost inevitable result? More gridlock. Neither Obama nor Romney has much of a track record negotiating with wily legislators. Obama tried to work out a fiscal "grand bargain" with Boehner last year, but the effort collapsed in a flurry of finger-pointing that made both men look weak. Romney's single term as governor of Massachusetts produced one major piece of legislation, his 2006 healthcare law, but he has since renounced that kind of bipartisanship. Many of his other proposals went nowhere because he had a CEO's aversion to bargaining with the state Legislature, according to "The Real Romney," a biography by Boston Globe reporters Michael Kranish and Scott Helman.¶ Could anything change these doleful projections?¶ If either party wins a landslide and a genuine mandate, sure. Or if Obama emerges from the campaign with a new set of Clintonesque negotiating skills. Or if the militants of the tea party are chastened by a narrow Republican presidential win and a loss in the Senate. But none of those things seems likely -- especially a chastened tea party.¶ Polls show that most voters don't want a rigidly ideological government of either left or right; they want practical problem-solving somewhere in the center, even if they aren't sure where that center should be. When the Pew Research Center asked voters this year if they wanted "political leaders who are willing to make compromises in order to get the job done," a whopping 80% said yes -- including 68% of Republicans.¶ But the rules of American politics are stacked against centrists and compromisers these days. Obama won in 2008 partly by promising a post-partisan agenda, but his own liberal instincts and the opposition of Republicans got in the way; he's not making that promise anymore. And Romney never made it.¶ In a discussion among voters sponsored by the Annenberg Public Policy Center this month, a group of suburban Milwaukee women -- one of the potential swing groups in this election -- sounded disappointed in both presidential candidates and in the political system as a whole.¶ "In 2008 ... I was real into it, but this year I'm not really into it," said Michelle Wilke, 38, an electrical assembly worker who was laid off from her job at Harley-Davidson in 2009. "I just have a feeling that no matter what happens, it's not going to change."¶ She's probably right.

##### Doesn’t matter – jobs outweigh

Mike Shedlock, 7-31-2012; registered investment advisor representative for SitkaPacific Capital Management, “Is global trade about to collapse? Where are oil prices headed? A chat with Mish Shedlock by James Stafford” http://energybulletin.net/stories/2012-07-31/global-trade-about-collapse-where-are-oil-prices-headed-chat-mish-shedlock

Oilprice.com: You just mentioned that we don’t know who the next president is going to be and sticking to this topic how big an impact do you see energy prices having on this year's presidential elections? Mish: I don’t think energy prices are what's on people's minds. What's on people's minds right now are jobs. Oil prices have kind of stabilized and in the very short-term they are likely to stay stable unless there are some dramatic results in the Mid-East or a dramatic slowdown in the US economy. Both are possible, but a major US slowdown is arguably more likely. Regardless, I think energy prices are going to be a minor election issue.

**No extinction**

**O’Neill 4** O’Neill 8/19/2004 [Brendan, “Weapons of Minimum Destruction” http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CA694.htm]

David C Rapoport*,* professor of political science at University of California, Los Angeles and editor of the Journal of Terrorism and Political Violence, has examined what he calls 'easily available evidence' relating to the historic use of chemical and biological weapons. He found something surprising - such weapons do not cause mass destruction. Indeed, whether used by states, terror groups or dispersed in industrial accidents, they tend to be far less destructive than conventional weapons. 'If we stopped speculating about things that might happen in the future and looked instead at what has happened in the past, we'd see that our fears about WMD are misplaced', he says. Yet such fears remain widespread. Post-9/11, American and British leaders have issued dire warnings about terrorists getting hold of WMD and causing mass murder and mayhem. President George W Bush has spoken of terrorists who, 'if they ever gained weapons of mass destruction', would 'kill hundreds of thousands, without hesitation and without mercy' (1). The British government has spent £28million on stockpiling millions of smallpox vaccines, even though there's no evidence that terrorists have got access to smallpox, which was eradicated as a natural disease in the 1970s and now exists only in two high-security labs in America and Russia (2). In 2002, British nurses became the first in the world to get training in how to deal with the victims of bioterrorism (3). The UK Home Office's 22-page pamphlet on how to survive a terror attack, published last month, included tips on what to do in the event of a 'chemical, biological or radiological attack' ('Move away from the immediate source of danger', it usefully advised). Spine-chilling books such as Plague Wars: A True Story of Biological Warfare, The New Face of Terrorism: Threats From Weapons of Mass Destruction and The Survival Guide: What to Do in a Biological, Chemical or Nuclear Emergency speculate over what kind of horrors WMD might wreak. TV docudramas, meanwhile, explore how Britain might cope with a smallpox assault and what would happen if London were 'dirty nuked' (4). The term 'weapons of mass destruction' refers to three types of weapons: nuclear, chemical and biological. A chemical weapon is any weapon that uses a manufactured chemical, such as sarin, mustard gas or hydrogen cyanide, to kill or injure. A biological weapon uses bacteria or viruses, such as smallpox or anthrax, to cause destruction - inducing sickness and disease as a means of undermining enemy forces or inflicting civilian casualties. We find such weapons repulsive, because of the horrible way in which the victims convulse and die - but they appear to be less 'destructive' than conventional weapons. 'We know that nukes are massively destructive, there is a lot of evidence for that', says Rapoport. But when it comes to chemical and biological weapons, 'the evidence suggests that we should call them "weapons of minimum destruction", not mass destruction', he says. Chemical weapons have most commonly been used by states, in military warfare. Rapoport explored various state uses of chemicals over the past hundred years: both sides used them in the First World War; Italy deployed chemicals against the Ethiopians in the 1930s; the Japanese used chemicals against the Chinese in the 1930s and again in the Second World War; Egypt and Libya used them in the Yemen and Chad in the postwar period; most recently, Saddam Hussein's Iraq used chemical weapons, first in the war against Iran (1980-1988) and then against its own Kurdish population at the tail-end of the Iran-Iraq war. In each instance, says Rapoport, chemical weapons were used more in desperation than from a position of strength or a desire to cause mass destruction. 'The evidence is that states rarely use them even when they have them', he has written. 'Only when a military stalemate has developed, which belligerents who have become desperate want to break, are they used.' (5) As to whether such use of chemicals was effective, Rapoport says that at best it blunted an offensive - but this very rarely, if ever, translated into a decisive strategic shift in the war, because the original stalemate continued after the chemical weapons had been deployed. He points to the example of Iraq. The Baathists used chemicals against Iran when that nasty trench-fought war had reached yet another stalemate. As Efraim Karsh argues in his paper 'The Iran-Iraq War: A Military Analysis': 'Iraq employed [chemical weapons] only in vital segments of the front and only when it saw no other way to check Iranian offensives. Chemical weapons had a negligible impact on the war, limited to tactical rather than strategic [effects].' (6) According to Rapoport, this 'negligible' impact of chemical weapons on the direction of a war is reflected in the disparity between the numbers of casualties caused by chemicals and the numbers caused by conventional weapons. It is estimated that the use of gas in the Iran-Iraq war killed 5,000 - but the Iranian side suffered around 600,000 dead in total, meaning that gas killed less than one per cent. The deadliest use of gas occurred in the First World War but, as Rapoport points out, it still only accounted for five per cent of casualties. Studying the amount of gas used by both sides from1914-1918 relative to the number of fatalities gas caused, Rapoport has written: 'It took a ton of gas in that war to achieve a single enemy fatality. Wind and sun regularly dissipated the lethality of the gases. Furthermore, those gassed were 10 to 12 times as likely to recover than those casualties produced by traditional weapons.' (7) Indeed, Rapoport discovered that some earlier documenters of the First World War had a vastly different assessment of chemical weapons than we have today - they considered the use of such weapons to be preferable to bombs and guns, because chemicals caused fewer fatalities. One wrote: 'Instead of being the most horrible form of warfare, it is the most humane, because it disables far more than it kills, ie, it has a low fatality ratio.' (8) 'Imagine that', says Rapoport, 'WMD being referred to as more humane'. He says that the contrast between such assessments and today's fears shows that actually looking at the evidence has benefits, allowing 'you to see things more rationally'. According to Rapoport, even Saddam's use of gas against the Kurds of Halabja in 1988 - the most recent use by a state of chemical weapons and the most commonly cited as evidence of the dangers of 'rogue states' getting their hands on WMD - does not show that unconventional weapons are more destructive than conventional ones. Of course the attack on Halabja was horrific, but he points out that the circumstances surrounding the assault remain unclear. 'The estimates of how many were killed vary greatly', he tells me. 'Some say 400, others say 5,000, others say more than 5,000. The fighter planes that attacked the civilians used conventional as well as unconventional weapons; I have seen no study which explores how many were killed by chemicals and how many were killed by firepower. We all find these attacks repulsive, but the death toll may actually have been greater if conventional bombs only were used. We know that conventional weapons can be more destructive.' Rapoport says that terrorist use of chemical and biological weapons is similar to state use - in that it is rare and, in terms of causing mass destruction, not very effective. He cites the work of journalist and author John Parachini, who says that over the past 25 years only four significant attempts by terrorists to use WMD have been recorded. The most effective WMD-attack by a non-state group, from a military perspective, was carried out by the Tamil Tigers of Sri Lanka in 1990. They used chlorine gas against Sri Lankan soldiers guarding a fort, injuring over 60 soldiers but killing none. The Tamil Tigers' use of chemicals angered their support base, when some of the chlorine drifted back into Tamil territory - confirming Rapoport's view that one problem with using unpredictable and unwieldy chemical and biological weapons over conventional weapons is that the cost can be as great 'to the attacker as to the attacked'. The Tigers have not used WMD since.

##### The plan is key to self-sufficient forward operating bases

Ackerman, 11 [Spencer, February 18th, Latest Pentagon Brainstorm: Nuke-Powered War Bases, Wired. Com. http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/02/nuke-bases/]

Buried within Darpa’s 2012 budget request under the innocuous name of “Small Rugged Reactor Technologies” is a $10 million proposal to fuel wartime Forward Operating Bases with nuclear power. It springs from an admirable impulse: to reduce the need for troops or contractors to truck down roads littered with bombs to get power onto the base. It’s time, Darpa figures, for a “self-sufficient” FOB.¶ Only one problem. “The only known technology that has potential to address the power needs of the envisioned self-sufficient FOB,” the pitch reads, “is a nuclear-fuel reactor.” Now, bases could mitigate their energy consumption, like the [solar-powered Marine company](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/01/afghanistans-green-marines-cut-fuel-use-by-90-percent/) in Helmand Province, but that’s not enough of a game-changer for Darpa. Being self-sufficient is the goal; and that requires going nuclear; and that requires … other things.¶ To fit on a FOB, which can be anywhere from Bagram Air Field’s [eight square miles](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/08/u-s-afghan-mega-base/) to dusty collections of wooden shacks and concertina wire, the reactor would have to be “well below the scale of the smallest reactors that are being developed for domestic energy production,” Darpa acknowledges.¶ That’s not impossible, says Christine Parthemore, an energy expert at the Center for a New American Security. The Japanese and the South Africans have been working on miniature nuclear power plants for the better part of a decade; Bill Gates has [partnered with Toshiba](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8582692.stm) to build mini-nuke sites. (Although it’s not the most auspicious sign that one prominent startup for modular reactors [suspended its operations](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/nuclear-startup-nuscale-suspends-operation/) after growing cash-light last month.) Those small sites typically use uranium enriched to about 2 percent. “It would be really, really difficult to divert the fuel” for a bomb “unless you really knew what you were doing,” Parthemore says.¶ But Darpa doesn’t want to take that chance. Only “non-proliferable fuels (i.e., fuels other than enriched uranium or plutonium) and reactor designs that are fundamentally safe will be required of reactors that may be deployed to regions where hos tile acts may compromise operations.”¶ Sensible, sure. But it limits your options: outside of uranium or plutonium, [thorium](http://www.wired.com/magazine/2009/12/ff_new_nukes/) is the only remaining source for generating nuclear fuel. The Indians and now the Chinese have experimented with thorium for their nuclear programs, but, alas, “no one has ever successfully found a way” to build a functioning thorium reactor, Parthemore says, “in a safe and economical manner.”

Solves effective peacekeeping

Mosher et al., 8 (David E., Senior Policy Analyst @ RAND, Green Warriors: Army Environmental Considerations for Contingency Operations from Planning Through Post-Conflict, RAND)

The environment may also be important during the post-conflict phase of an operation,9 or even before combat operations end. Providing clean water, managing sewage, or providing irrigation water can be important for convincing the local populace to support the U.S. mission **and not an insurgency**, according to some commanders.10 Although these are not traditional Army missions, they can have an important effect on the outcome of an operation, from both a military and a political perspective. Addressing legacy problems can also help **a new government develop legitimacy and can enable U.S. forces to withdraw from the country sooner.** Indeed, many of the goals of stability operations defined in the 2006 edition of JP 3.0, Joint Operations, can have environmental components. Operational effectiveness can be hampered by poor environmental practices or helped by good ones. Logistics requirements and costs can be reduced by good practices, for instance, applying technologies to **reduce operational requirements for petroleum, oil,** and lubricants (POL) or field water treatment systems, or reducing acute threats to soldier health. Good environmental practices can also reduce the resources that must be diverted to address environmental issues. Commanders may also want to reduce or prevent liabilities, either financial or diplomatic. Good environmental awareness and practices during contingency operations can reduce the financial liabilities the Army and the United States may face. On more than one occasion in recent operations, contractors have removed hazardous wastes from base camps and, without Army knowledge, dumped them along the side of a road or in other inappropriate locations, sometimes to avoid disposing of them properly or to sell the drums that hold the wastes. These actions have created cleanup costs for the Army that are many times higher than the original price of the contract. In other cases, the Army has had to spend large sums to remediate serious preexisting environmental contamination at base camps, expenses that could have been avoided if the base camps had been located elsewhere. Financial liabilities can also arise from claims brought by U.S. soldiers who believe they were exposed to hazardous substances, as the Army’s past experiences with Agent Orange and Gulf War Illness illustrate. 11 Members of the local populace may also bring claims against the Army for environmentally related damage, draining funds that could be more effectively used for reconstruction or stabilization activities. Inadequate attention to environmental issues can also create diplomatic liabilities. Illegal dumping by contractors and poor waste management practices by soldiers have caused immediate diplomatic problems with host nations whose support has been critical. Long-term diplomatic problems from environmental problems can also emerge years after an operation is over. Perhaps most important are the environmental issues that can affect U.S. national objectives, those strategic political and economic objectives that U.S. leaders established when they committed forces to the contingency operation in the first place. One such national objective may be winning and maintaining support of the local populace. Although environmental conditions may be poor and national environmental laws may be weak or nonexistent, our research indicates that locals often care deeply about the environment, which can be critical to their survival, livelihood, and well-being. Vital environmental issues can include access to clean drinking water, effective sewage systems, and viable farmland (see Box 1.1). Restoring or building these basic infrastructures is often essential for the economic and social development necessary for stability. To the extent that such projects improve cooperation with locals, they can lower security risks, improve intel- ligence, and speed reconstruction. National objectives that have environmental components also include preserving natural resources that have important economic value (such as oil fields or fisheries) and even preserving cultural resources that are a matter of national, regional, religious, or cultural pride. If long-term stability of a country is a mission objective, sustainability and the long-term health of nbatural systems, including watersheds, forests, ecosystems, biodiversity, and farmlands, are also important. Local customs and practices can take the place of laws, and therefore military leaders, when designing plans and conducting operations, should understand how the local people interact with their environment. The environmental components of national objectives are often seen as falling outside the normal conception of the military mission. Because they have little to do with combat operations or military objectives, they are often not taken into consideration during the Army’s planning, training, or operations. Yet ignoring these broader political objectives **can lead to failure**, as Prussian military writer Carl von Clausewitz warned.12 Thus, the environmental dimensions of national objectives should be carefully considered. The manner in which the military conducts its operations can affect environmental outcomes upon which the success of the overall mission may depend. There is some evidence that national objectives such as stabilizing societies after conflict are now being emphasized at the Army’s combat training centers, but the degree to which environmental considerations are included is unclear.

**Global nuclear war**

Dean 95 [Jonathan, former ambassador to NATO, The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, p. google]

IN ANY EVENT, in a world of interconnecting COMMUNICATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL, TRADE, AND FINANCIAL LINKS, the United States, a leading industrial trading country that needs access to raw materials and markets, usually ends up paying in one way or another when a major regional conflict erupts. IN PRACTICAL TERMS, it is impossible for the United States to avoid some degree of involvement when major regional conflicts break out. FOR 200 YEARS, THE UNITED STATES HAS BEEN URGING LIBERTY, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, FREE MARKET VALUES, VOLUNTARY MUTUAL AID AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY ON THE OUTSIDE WORLD. THE UNITED STATES IS THE SOLE SURVIVING WORLD-CLASS POWER, WITH MILITARY STRENGTH AND GNP FAR LARGER THAN ANY OTHER COUNTRY. AS A RESULT, when large-scale conflict erupts, the United States cannot avoid being called on for help, as it was in Somalia, Bosnia, Rwanda, and Haiti. For the United States to seek to stand aside or to respond only weakly in such cases is to risk damage to its credibility AND WORLDWIDE INFLUENCE. PRESIDENT CLINTON JUSTIFIED THE NATO BOMBING OF SERBIAN POSITIONS IN BOSNIA AND THE U.S. INVASION OF HAITI BY SAYING THAT THE CREDIBILITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE U.S. WAS AT STAKE, AS IT WAS. IT IS TRUE THAT PAST ADMINISTRATIONS USED SIMILAR ARGUMENTS TO JUSTIFY CONTINUED U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM LONG AFTER IT WOULD HAVE BEEN WISE TO WITHDRAW. NONETHELESS, WHEN THE COLLECTIVE DISAPPOINTMENT OF WORLD OPINION OVER THE BEHAVIOR OF THE UNITED STATES (OR OF ANY MAJOR COUNTRY) BECOMES INTENSE AND ENDURING, IT BEGINS TO UNDERMINE THE INTERNATIONAL PRESTIGE AND STANDING OF THE ENTIRE NATION CONSIDERABLE DIMINUTION OF U.S. STATURE AND INFLUENCE HAS ALREADY TAKEN PLACE OVER THE PAST FOUR OR FIVE YEARS IN CONNECTION WITH FALTERING U.S. POLICIES TOWARD BOSNIA, SOMALIA, AND RWANDA. FORTUNATELY, AMERICANS ARE NOT SPARTANS, ROMANS OR PRUSSIANS-SELF-DISCIPLINED MILITARISTIC PEOPLES WHO CONSIDERED IT A MATTER OF NATIONAL PRIDE NOT TO RECOIL FROM CONFLICT BECAUSE OF CASUALTIES AMONG THEIR FORCES. HOWEVER, IF THE TRENDS CONTINUE THAT UNDERLIE THE PUBLIC OUTRAGE THAT FOLLOWED THE DEATH OF U.S. SERVICEMEN IN SOMALIA, AND U.S. ADMINISTRATIONS CONTINUE TO ABSTAIN FROM PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES BECAUSE THEY COULD ENTAIL CASUALTIES, THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT LONG REMAIN A WORLD POWER. If U.S. national prestige declines further under conditions like these, the U.S. capacity to constructively influence the course of events without the use of force will decrease. And when force must be used, the United States may have to use more of it to be effective. EXPERTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD EXPECT GROWING POPULATION PRESSURES AND INCREASING ENVIRONMENTAL STRESS TO DEVELOP OVER THE COMING DECADES INTO INTENSE, FAR-REACHING SOCIAL UNREST AND REGIONAL CONFLICT. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS THE SOLUTION, HOWEVER SLOW AND UNCERTAIN IT MAY BE IN COMING. BUT the world also needs effective regional conflict-prevention procedures. Left on its own, regional violence can lead to **confrontation** and even **war between the great powers**, including the United States, AS MIGHT OCCUR, FOR EXAMPLE, in the event of conflict between Ukraine and Russia or between China and its neighbors. IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, unchecked regional violence and the fear of further violence will lead **more states to develop nuclear weapons**. IN PAST DECADES, this process occurred in Israel, South Africa, India, Pakistan, IRAQ, and PRESUMABLY, IN North Korea. A world with 20 or 30 nuclear weapon states would not only make a more effective global security system impossible, it would lead the present nuclear weapon states to modernize and increase their weapons-and it would markedly increase the vulnerability of the United States to direct attack. Instead of SHRUGGING AT HUMAN FALLIBILITY, accepting war as inevitable, AND REACTING AFTER IT HAPPENS, U.S. policy should aim at establishing an international peacekeeping system that can head off an increasing number of conflicts. CONSEQUENCES IF THIS REASONING IS ACCEPTED, THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD DECIDE ON AND PUBLICLY DECLARE AN EXPLICIT LONG-TERM POLICY OF JOINING WITH OTHER COUNTRIES IN SEEKING A GRADUAL LOWERING OF THE LEVEL OF ARMED CONFLICT IN THE WORLD THROUGH PREVENTING A GROWING PROPORTION OF POTENTIAL WARS AND CURTAILING WARS WHEN THEY DO OCCUR. This goal would be achieved by building an increasingly effective worldwide network of regional conflict-prevention and peacekeeping organizations headed by a more effective United Nations.

## 2ac Disad

##### Thorium expansion inevitable – the only relevant question is who will lead the process

**Martin, 12** [May 8th, Richard, A contributing editor for Wired since 2002, he has written about energy, for Time, Fortune, The Atlantic, and the Asian Wall Street Journal, editorial director for Pike Research, the leading cleantech research and analysis firm, former Technology Producer for ABCNews.com, Technology Editor for The Industry Standard (2000-2001), and Editor-at- Large for Information Week (2005-2008), recipient of the “Excellence in Feature Writing" Award from the Society for Professional Journalists and the White Award for Investigative Reporting, Educated at Yale and the University of Hong Kong, , “SuperFuel: Thorium, the Green Energy Source for the Future”, ISBN 978—0»230-116474]

IT IS, OF COURSE, NOT THAT SIMPLE. I came to realize fairly soon that the tone of the Energy from Thorium forum—geeky, high minded, theoretical, and naive—characterized the thorium movement as a whole. It seemed clear that a small band group of advocates, however committed, had little chance of influencing national energy policy or turning the giant battleship of the nuclear industry. “The nuclear industry has zero incentive to shift to a new fuel cycle,” Charlie Hess told me. A long-time executive at the architectural engineering firm Burns & Roe, Hess spent 30 years building and operating nuclear plants. Although he is a prototypical member of the nuclearati, he is an advocate of alternative nuclear power, including thorium-based reactors, and a critic of the nuke-power establishment. Fuel costs for uranium reactors are less than half a cent per kilowatthour. “They spend more on security guards than they do on fuel,” Hess told me. “Frankly they don’t care.” That was made clear to me by John Rowe, the CEO of Exelon, the country’s number one producer of nuclear power, when I pulled him aside after a speech at a National Press Club luncheon in Washington, DC. When I asked about the possibility of shifting to thorium as a primary nuclear fuel, he assured me that there “will be alternatives across the entire fuel cycle.” But inexpensive uranium works just fine for Exelon, which has a market capitalization (the total value of its outstanding shares) of $28 billion and made $18.6 billion in revenue in 2010. If it’s not broke, don’t fix it—and nuclear tycoons like John Rowe have convinced themselves that the nuclear power industry is not broken. From the perspective of his office suite, that’s certainly true: Rowe made $10.3 million in 2010, and between 2006 and 2011, his compensation totaled $153.9 million. Uranium reactors have been good to nuclear power executives. Rowe’s dismissive attitude embodies the obstacles that face the thorium movement, which is composed of outsiders. “Look, the nuclear industry in the U.S. is very conservative,” Ambassador Thomas Graham told me. “I can see interest here in the U.S. gradually developing. But it’s not going to happen here first.” Graham, a longtime diplomat and opponent of nuclear proliferation who served as President Bill Clinton’s special representative for arms control, now chairs the board of Lightbridge, a company based in McLean, Virginia, that is developing solid fuel thorium rods for conventional reactors. While Graham foresees the use of thorium in the American nuclear power industry at some point, “the initial deployments,” he said, “are going to be abroad.” Abroad. In the three years I’ve been covering the thorium movement, almost every conversation has at some point included that stipulation. The United States, which dropped the first atomic bomb on Japan at the conclusion of World War II, pioneered nuclear power, built the first commercial power reactors, and invented the liquid-core reactor and first proved that thorium could be used in power-generating reactors, is, barring some unforeseen and unlikely shift in energy policy, almost certainly destined to be a laggard in the worldwide thorium revolution. France is the world’s largest producer of nuclear power and supplier of uranium for reactors. Eighty percent of its electricity comes from nuclear power, and the energy giant Areva has an active thorium R&D program and is investigating the possibility of building Liquid fluoride thorium reactors by 2032. The Laboratoire de Physique Subatomique et de Cosmologie in Grenoble is the only facility in the world that has the resources and backing needed to actually develop a commercial LFTR by 2022. The Rei nuclear research institute in the Czech Republic is a leader in the development of MSRs and is investigating the possibility of fueling MSRs with thorium, according to the institute’s director.6 Norway, which has an estimated 180,000 tons of thorium reserves, is embarking on an ambitious long-term nuclear power program that includes the construction of thorium-fueled reactors. In Brazil, which has the world’s second-largest thorium reserves and began research into thorium power in the 1960s, R&D efforts have recently begun again to develop thorium-fueled solid fuel reactors. By far the most active thorium power programs, however, are in Asia, particularly in the emerging economic superpowers of India and China. In February 2011, China officially announced that it will start a program to develop a thorium-fueled molten salt nuclear reactor, taking a crucial step toward replacing coal with nuclear power as a primary energy source. The program was announced at the annual conference in Shanghai of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and is headed by Jiang Mianheng, son of the former Chinese president Jiang Zemin and the holder of a Ph.D. in electrical engineering from Drexel University. The People’s Republic has no intention of falling behind in the race for the next great energy source. The world’s most ambitious thorium power program, though, is in India, which has the world’s largest thorium reserves. India exploded its first nuclear weapon in 1974 in defiance of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and it has always viewed nuclear energy — in both warheads and power reactors, as a key element of national sovereignty. The country has embarked on a three-phase program to build as many as 60 reactors, converting them to run on thorium before 2032. I will detail the Indian and Chinese programs in chapter 7 and the implications for the United States in the conclusion. Here it is enough to quote the 2011 film The Ides of March, in which the progressive presidential candidate, played by George Clooney, declares, “Either we’re going to lead the world or we’re going to bury our heads in the sand.” The question of thorium is not whether it will become a major source of energy—it will—but when—and where and who will lead the way.

##### global nuclear power expansion is inevitable and will be based on uranium– the most comprehensive source proves

**Amano, 12** [Yukiyo, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, International Status and Prospects for Nuclear Power 2012, <http://www.iaea.org/About/Policy/GC/GC56/GC56InfDocuments/English/gc56inf-6_en.pdf>]

C.2. Prospects in Countries considering the Introduction of Nuclear Power 41. Since the mid-2000s, developing countries have expressed a new or renewed interest in nuclear power. While the Fukushima Daiichi accident caused some countries to change their positions and some to take a ‘wait and see’ approach, interest continued among countries considering or planning for nuclear power introduction. 42. Table C-2 shows the number of countries at different stages of nuclear power consideration or development. Sometimes referred to as ‘nuclear newcomers’, some countries, such as Bangladesh, Egypt and Vietnam, have in fact been planning for nuclear power for some time. Others, such as Poland, are reviving the nuclear power option after plans had been curtailed when governments and public opinion changed. Countries such as Jordan and Uruguay are considering or planning for nuclear power for the first time. What they have in common is that they are all considering, planning or starting nuclear power programmes, and have not connected a first nuclear power plant to the grid. TABLE C-1. Positions of countries with operating nuclear power plants plus Lithuania Category Number of countries New unit(s) under construction with more planned/proposed 11 New unit(s) under construction but the policy for more units is not established 2 No units under construction but with plans/proposals for building new unit(s) 10 No units under construction, and currently no plans/policy for building new units 4 Firm policy not to build new units and/or for closure of existing units 4 TABLE C-2. Positions of countries without operating nuclear power plants8 Description of group Number of Countries 2012 Number of Countries 2010 Number of Countries 2008 Considering a nuclear programme to meet identified energy needs with a strong indication of intention to proceed 14 14 14 Active preparation for a possible nuclear power programme with no final decision 6 7 7 Decided to introduce nuclear power and started preparing the appropriate infrastructure 6 10 5 New nuclear power plant ordered 3 2 0 New nuclear power plant under construction 0 1 1 43. Of the 29 countries considering or planning for nuclear power in 2012, 10 are from the Asia and the Pacific region, 10 are from the Africa region, 7 are in Europe (mostly Eastern Europe) and 2 are in Latin America8 Two additional groups were included in previous editions of this publication but not in this edition because they did not add substantially to an understanding of the rising expectations for nuclear power among developing countries. One group included countries that were not planning to introduce nuclear power but were interested in considering the associated issues, but it proved difficult to characterize trends and there were wide fluctuations in the numbers from year to year. A second group included countries where an invitation to bid to supply a nuclear power plant had been prepared, but this proved problematic because of countries that were choosing to order plants through direct bilateral agreements rather than through bids. GOV/INF/2012/12-GC(56)/INF/6 Page 10 44. Even after the Fukushima Daichii accident, some countries have taken concrete steps toward nuclear power introduction. In the United Arab Emirates (UAE), in 2011, the Emirates Nuclear Energy Corporation invited bids for uranium, conversion and enrichment for the fuel for the UAE’s first reactors. In Turkey, the project company Akkuyu Nukleer Santral Elektrik Uretim filed applications for construction permits and a power generation licence. Belarus signed a contract with the Russian Federation for the construction of two reactors, and Bangladesh signed an intergovernmental agreement with the Russian Federation, also for two reactors. Vietnam signed a loan agreement with the Russian Federation regarding financing of its first nuclear power plant and announced its intention to undertake a similar agreement with Japan. 45. The Islamic Republic of Iran began commissioning of its first nuclear power plant at Bushehr in September 2011, which marked the commissioning of the first nuclear power plant in a ‘newcomer’ country in 15 years. 46. The rate at which new countries joined the list of countries operating nuclear power plants was fairly steady through the early 1980s as shown in Fig. C-1. Until the addition of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 2011, only three countries had connected their first nuclear power plants to the grid in the post-Chernobyl era — China, Mexico and Romania. The countries now planning for their first nuclear power plants are doing so after an experience gap of 15 years. Of the countries considering or planning for their first nuclear plant, 9 have explicitly expressed target dates for the first operation before 2030. FIG. C-1. Number of countries operating, or having operated, nuclear power plants. Source IAEA (PRIS) 47. Overall, Tables C-1 and C-2 are consistent with trends reflected in the Agency’s low and high projections described below, i.e. there remains substantial uncertainty in projections about nuclear power, and the growth in the use of nuclear power is projected to be driven more by expansion in established nuclear power countries than by countries starting nuclear power programmes. The 9 countries that have explicitly expressed target dates for the first operation before 2030 lie between the 7 countries in the Agency’s low projection that would connect their first plant by 2030 and the 16 countries that would do so in the high projection. GOV/INF/2012/12-GC(56)/INF/6 Page 11 C.3. Potential Drivers for the Introduction of Nuclear Power 48. The key factors that have driven rising interest in nuclear power since about 2005, and the increase in construction starts shown in Fig. B-1, have not changed with the Fukushima Daiichi accident: growing energy demand, especially for electricity; volatile fossil fuel prices; environmental pressures and energy security concerns.

**Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, economic concerns, and nuclear security**

**Graham 2007** (Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html, WEA)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

**NATO resilient**

**Hendrickson 2007** – political science professor at the University of Eastern Illinois (Ryan, Parameters, 37.1, “The miscalculation of NATO’s death”, EBSCO, WEA)

Besides these three major crises, the NATO allies faced serious political differences during the ColdWar over European defense spending levels, the Vietnam War, Germany’s Ostpolitik foreign policy approach, the Soviet Union’s invasion of Afghanistan, the American military invasions of Grenada and Panama, the deployment of new American cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe, and the United States’ Strategic Defense Initiative, among a host of issues.24 Many of these differences evolved around how to confront the external enemy and were not tertiary to alliance interests; rather these issues hit at NATO’s political core; its raison d’être. Thus, it is a stretch to be nostalgic about NATO’s “commonly” shared vision during the Cold War. NATO’s history is replete with profound transatlantic differences and internal debates, which the allies overcame. Recent analysts have failed to recognize NATO’s history of discord, and how the alliance adapted to quite profound internal crises, much like it is attempting to do today. While there is no guarantee that NATO will fully overcome its current diplomatic challenges, NATO’s ability to successfully address transatlantic discord suggests a pattern of dispute resolution and effective adaptation.

**NATO impacts outdated—no longer key**

**Schmidt 07** John R. Schmidt is the senior analyst for Europe in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research at the Department of State, served as director of the NATO office at the State Department and as director for NATO affairs at the National Security Council, “Last Alliance Standing? NATO after 9/11,” Washington Quarterly, Winter, 2007

The real problem is that the United States does not really know what it wants from NATO. It continues to perceive the alliance through what is essentially a Cold War prism, as the key mechanism through which the United States attempts to project influence in Europe. The successes of the NATO enlargement process, which addressed genuine security concerns among newly freed former Communist states, and of NATO involvement in the Balkans have only helped to sustain this perception. Current U.S. efforts to give NATO a more global reach also reflect the same perception of NATO preeminence, with the alliance moving out from its European core to embrace the wider world. It is undeniably a grand vision, but it is also clearly at odds with reality. The notion of giving pride of place to a military alliance made sense during the Cold War, but it does not make sense today when the most critical threats are more varied and diffuse. NATO is of limited use as a diplomatic actor, which is why the United States has never really used it in this capacity. Other vehicles and partners are preferred for U.S. diplomatic activity, the EU increasingly among them, and this is unlikely to change. Even in the military sphere, NATO is no longer the primary instrument of choice and has at best only a circumscribed, if still important, role to play.

**Peacekeeping is key to prevent Balkan war**

Crane, 2(Conrad, “Facing the Hydra: Mainiting Strategic Balance While Pursuing a Global War Against Terrorism,” Strategic Studies Institute)

Consequently, one result of the global war on terrorism **will undoubtedly be to increase American involvement in peace operations** such as those in the Balkans. At the same time, there is no sign that current peacekeeping missions can go away without adverse strategic impacts. Understanding this reality, the QDR Report states that “these long-standing commitments will, in effect, become part of the U.S. forward deterrent posture.”22 Unless soldiers continue to perform security and nation-building tasks in the Balkans, the recent increases in ethnic violence can **easily escalate again into full-scale war.**23 The Bush administration has reassured NATO allies that the United States will not prematurely pull out of these Balkan missions, although Rumsfeld has proposed reductions of all peacekeepers in Bosnia “because the police work there has begun to strain armies needed to fight terrorism.”24 He would also like to withdraw American troops from the multinational observer force in the Sinai Peninsula.25 These peace operations remain very important for **regional stability**. Even while the Army initiates new operations against terrorism, it should be wary of any calls to endanger these peacekeeping missions to provide resources for the new war. Even before September 11, however, Army force structure was under severe strains from the demands of peace operations. SSCs are particularly hard on certain active duty “high demand/low density” units in the Quartermaster and Transportation branches. Recent deployments have revealed additional significant shortfalls in Civil Affairs personnel and intelligence capabilities. Extensions of the Balkan missions have highlighted more inadequacies in the total available number of a variety of other combat support (CS) and combat service support 7 (CSS) units that are distributed between AC and RC. Excessive deployments for SSCs have also had a severe impact on Reserve and National Guard units not accustomed to such use.26 In addition, their availability for support functions and active duty rotations will be severely curtailed by the demands of force protection and homeland security. Future Army missions like those in Bosnia and Kosovo should not be accepted lightly. However, there will be times—even in the midst of the war against terrorism— when national interests will require humanitarian assistance, nation-building, and secure peace operations that **only American military forces can provide**. Effective and efficient “peace-building” efforts must **remain an important element** of any national security strategy. The current situation in Afghanistan highlights again that post-conflict societies can become breeding grounds for crime and terrorism if some sort of order is not imposed. Influential members of Congress have already called for American peacekeepers there, and major newspapers— irrespective of their political inclinations—are advocating a significant U.S. role in nation-building. One project they have proposed is the reconstruction of Afghanistan’s “ring road,” which is so vital to the restoration of trade. This task, especially in such a precarious security environment, is perfectly suited to the capabilities of the U.S. Army and its engineers.27 To prevent peacekeeping assignments from **dragging on** and tying up scarce assets, the Army and supporting agencies must become better at nation-building. Though the Bush administration, as well as the Army leadership, remain reluctant to accept such a mission, long-term solutions to create a more stable world will require the United States to perform it. Only the Army—not the Air Force, Navy, or Marines—can really do it in an environment of questionable security. Success in stabilization operations and strategic success in the war against terrorism will **be closely linked** because of the cause-effect relationship that 8 exists between them. The Army should be daunted by—and prepare for—the responsibilities it might assume to help stabilize and rebuild Afghanistan and other countries after bin Laden and his supporters are rooted out. This effort should be accompanied by the development of appropriate doctrine for such peace-building missions. Though the U.S. burden in these operations can be lessened by relying as much as possible on allied participation, there is no substitute for the presence of ground forces from the most powerful nation in the world to reassure friends, sustain coalitions, and deter potential adversaries. If stability in a region such as the Balkans is determined to be a vital American interest, then it cannot be allowed to **return to chaos** because of the distractions of the war on terrorism

##### Balkans instability causes world war

Paris, 2 (Rolan, Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at University of Colorado, Political Science Quarterly “Kosovo and the metaphor war,” Volume 117)

Since the early part of the twentieth century, when instability in the Balkans drew in the great powers and provided the spark that ignited World War I, the region has been widely known as a powderkeg. In 1947 for instance member of the International Cour of Justice noted that the Balkans had been so often described the “powder-keg of Europe”51 Today, the term continues to be attached to the region’s politics, conuring up memories of the origins of World War I.52 The meaning of the powderkey metaphor is straightforward: The Balkans can explode at any time, and the resulting conflagration can spread to the rest of Europe; preventing such an explosion is vital to the continent’s, and perhaps even American, security. When Clinton described Kosovo as a powderkeg, he warned that the Kosovo conflict might spill over not only to surrounding Balkan states, but to Europe as a whole; and he insinuated that the United States could be compelled to fight in such a pan-European conflict, just as it did in the World Wars I and II. “As we approach the next century,” he stated on 12 October, during a discussion of the Kosovo situation, “we must never forget one of the most indelible lessons of this one we’re about to leave-that America has a direct stake in keeping the peace in Europe before isolated acts of violence turn into large-scale wars.”53 The translation, if you want to make sure American boys will not have to fight another world war, then support me in my efforts to extinguish the smoldering fire in the Balkan powderkeg, before it is too late.

## 2ac COUNTERPLAN

##### Only congressional action solves – 1ac Cannarra says exclusive staturory authority rests with them – they are the only actor that can directly fund the NRC and create certainty necessary for investment

##### Only congressional action solves – overcomes external resistance

Farley, 07 [Peter, “Cleaner Nuclear Power?”, <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/409099/cleaner-nuclear-power/>]

Nuclear watchdogs say that Thorium Power's technology has real potential. Moreover, they say that the legislation is needed. It would force the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which regulates the nuclear industry, to create new offices at the agencies to study thorium-fuel options and promote their use abroad. Advertisement http://sync.mathtag.com/sync/img?type=sync&mt_exid=20&redir=http%3a%2f%2fdis.criteo.com%2fpump%2fmatch.aspx%3fc%3d2%26uid%3d%5bMM_UUID%5d "It makes a lot of sense in my view," says Thomas Cochran, director of the nuclear program at the [Natural Resources Defense Council](http://www.nrdc.org/), in Washington. He says that congressional action is needed to overcome resistance within the DOE to exploring thorium.

##### Congress is key to nuclear power leeadership

Fertel, 05 - Senior Vice President And Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute (Marvin, CQ Congressional Testimony, “NUCLEAR POWER'S PLACE IN A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY,” 4/28, lexis) //DH

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the federal government's nuclear energy programs, and to maintain America's leadership in nuclear technology development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation. Such efforts have provided a dramatic contribution to global security, as evidenced by the U.S.-Russian nonproliferation agreement to recycle weapons-grade material from Russia for use in American reactors. Currently, more than 50 percent of U.S. nuclear power plant fuel depends on converted Russian warhead material. Nowhere is continued congressional oversight more important than with DOE's program to manage the used nuclear fuel from our nuclear power plants. Continued progress toward a federal used nuclear fuel repository is necessary to support nuclear energy's vital role in a comprehensive national energy policy and to support the remediation of DOE defense sites. Since enactment of the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, DOE's federal repository program has repeatedly overcome challenges, and challenges remain before the Yucca Mountain facility can begin operation. But as we address these issues, it is important to keep the overall progress of the program in context. There is international scientific consensus that a deep geologic repository is the best solution for long-term disposition of used military and commercial nuclear power plant fuel and high-level radioactive byproducts. The Bush administration and Congress, with bipartisan support, affirmed the suitability of Yucca Mountain for a repository in 2002. Over the past three years, the Energy Department and its contractors have made considerable progress providing yet greater confirmation that this is the correct course of action and that Yucca Mountain is an appropriate site for a national repository. --During the past year, federal courts have rejected significant legal challenges by the state of Nevada and others to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the 2002 Yucca Mountain site suitability determination. These challenges questioned the constitutionality of the Yucca Mountain Development Act and DOE's repository system, which incorporates both natural and engineered barriers to contain radioactive material safely. In the coming year, Congress will play an essential role in keeping this program on schedule, by taking the steps necessary to provide increased funding for the project in fiscal 2006 and in future years. Meeting DOE's schedule for initial repository operation requires certainty in funding for the program. This is particularly critical in view of projected annual expenditures that will exceed $1 billion beginning in fiscal 2007. Meeting these budget requirements calls for a change in how Congress provides funds to the project from monies collected for the Nuclear Waste Fund. The history of Yucca Mountain funding is evidence that the current funding approach must be modified. Consumer fees (including interest) committed to the Nuclear Waste Fund since its f6rmation in 1983 total more than $24 billion. Consumers are projected to pay between $750 million to $800 million to the fund each year, based on electricity generated at the nation's 103 reactors. This is more than $2 million per day. Although about $8 billion has been used for the program, the balance in the fund is nearly $17 billion. In each of the past several years, there has been a gap between the annual fees paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants and disbursements from the fund for use by DOE at Yucca Mountain. Since the fund was first established, billions of dollars paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants to the Nuclear Waste Fund-intended solely for the federal government's used fuel program-in effect have been used to decrease budget deficits or increase surpluses. The industry believes that Congress should change the funding mechanism for Yucca Mountain so that payments to the Nuclear Waste Fund can be used only for the project and be excluded from traditional congressional budget caps. Although the program should remain subject to congressional oversight, Yucca Mountain appropriations should not compete each year for funding with unrelated programs when Congress directed a dedicated funding stream for the project. The industry also believes that it is appropriate and necessary to consider an alternative perspective on the Yucca Mountain project. This alternative would include an extended period for monitoring operation of the repository for up to 300 years after spent fuel is first placed underground. The industry believes that this approach would provide ongoing assurance and greater confidence that the repository is performing as designed, that public safety is assured, and that the environment is protected. It would also permit DOE to apply evolving innovative technologies at the repository. Through this approach, a scientific monitoring program would identify additional scientific information that can be used in repository performance models. The project then could update the models, and make modifications in design and operations as appropriate. Congressional committees like this one can help ensure that DOE does not lose sight of its responsibility for used nuclear fuel management and disposal, as stated by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. The industry fully supports the fundamental need for a repository so that used nuclear fuel and the byproducts of the nation's nuclear weapons program are securely managed in an underground, specially designed facility. World-class science has demonstrated that Yucca Mountain is the best site for that facility. A public works project of this magnitude will inevitably face challenges. Yet, none is insurmountable. DOE and its contractors have made significant progress on the project and will continue to do so as the project enters the licensing phase. Congressional oversight also can play a key role in maintaining and encouraging the stability of the NRC's regulatory process. Such stability is essential for our 103 operating nuclear plants and equally critical in licensing new nuclear power plants. Congress played a key role several years ago in encouraging the NRC to move toward a new oversight process for the nation's nuclear plants, based on quantitative performance indicators and safety significance. Today's reactor oversight process is designed to focus industry and NRC resources on equipment, components and operational issues that have the greatest importance to, and impact on, safety. The NRC and the industry have worked hard to identify and implement realistic security requirements at nuclear power plants. In the three-and-a-half years since 9/11, the NRC has issued a series of requirements to increase security and enhance training for security programs. The industry complied-fully and rapidly. In the days and months following Sept. 11, quick action was required. Orders that implemented needed changes quickly were necessary. Now, we should return to the orderly process of regulating through regulations. The industry has spent more than $1 billion enhancing security since September 2001. We've identified and fixed vulnerabilities. Today, the industry is at the practical limit of what private industry can do to secure our facilities against the terrorist threat. NRC Chairman Nils Diaz and other commissioners have said that the industry has achieved just about everything that can be reasonably achieved by a civilian force. The industry now needs a transition period to stabilize the new security requirements. We need time to incorporate these dramatic changes into our operations and emergency planning programs and to train our employees to the high standards of our industry-and to the appropriately high expectations of the NRC. Both industry and the NRC need congressional oversight to support and encourage this kind of stability. CONCLUSION Electricity generated by America's nuclear power plants over the past half-century has played a key part in our nation's growth and prosperity. Nuclear power produces over 20 percent of the electricity used in the United States today without producing air pollution. As our energy demands continue to grow in years to come, nuclear power should play an even greater role in meeting our energy and environmental needs. The nuclear energy industry is operating its reactors safely and efficiently. The industry is striving to produce more electricity from existing plants. The industry is also developing more efficient, next-generation reactors and exploring ways to build them more cost-effectively. The public sector, including the oversight committees of the U.S. Congress, can help maintain the conditions that ensure Americans will continue to reap the benefits of our operating plants, and create the conditions that will spur investment in America's energy infrastructure, including new nuclear power plants. One important step is passage of comprehensive energy legislation that recognizes nuclear energy's contributions to meeting our growing energy demands, ensuring our nation's energy security and protecting our environment. Equally important, however, is the need to ensure effective and efficient implementation of existing laws, like the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and to provide federal agencies with the resources and oversight necessary to discharge their statutory responsibilities in the most efficient way possible. The commercial nuclear power sector was born in the United States, and nations around the world continue to look to this nation for leadership in this technology and in the issues associated with nuclear power. Our ability to influence critical international policies in areas like nuclear nonproliferation, for example, depends on our ability to maintain a leadership role in prudent deployment, use and regulation of nuclear energy technologies here at home, in the United States, and on our ability to manage the technological and policy challenges-like waste management-that arise with all advanced technologies.

# AFF EVIDENCE ROUND 3

## 2ac round 3

**2) Breaks down cooperation –**

**The rise of the rest is inevitable, but absolute US power makes the transition safe---the alt is transition wars**

Walton 7 Lecturer in International Relations and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading in Reading, England, 07 [Dale C, “geopolitics and the great powers in the twenty-first century”, http://books.google.com/books?id=AQLTD1R-47AC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_navlinks\_s#v=onepage&q=&f=false

Although international political conditions will differ enormously in the coming decades from those of the middle 1940’s, it would be grossly irresponsible for the United States to shrug off its burdens of great power status and return to the slumber that it once enjoyed. Almost certainly, if the United States had refused to take an active role in European politics in the middle of the twentieth century, a world would have emerged in which American values would not have flourished and even their survival on the North American continent would have been profoundly threatened. America’s refusal to play a substantial role in the great power struggles of this century would have similarly deleterious effects. Importantly, if the United States withdraws to its hemisphere a third world war is far more likely. In a meta region full of young rising powers the presence of a strategically mature superpower can be expected to have a stabilizing effect; the enormous military resources possessed by America compels would be aggressors to consider carefully before launching a strategic adventure. Even more chillingly, as noted above, it is possible that the multipolar system could become sufficiently unbalanced that it would collapse, with a power such as China building a coalition that would allow it ultimately to emerge as the master of eastern Eurasia and the greatest power in the world. nited States is the “court of last resort” protecting against such an eventuality. The latter possibility does not contradict the above argument that us unipolarity is unsustainable - as an extra Eurasian power lacking the ruthlessness to destroy potential great power competitors preventatively, Washington simply cannot sustain unipolarity indefinitely. Nonetheless, while **the** emerging **multipolar** **system** appears robust it **should receive “care and feeding**” – otherwise it is vulnerable to grossly unbalanced events such as the creation of a very aggressive coalition dedicated to achieving Eurasian hegemony and willing if necessary to fight a third world war t o achieve it. Most likely such a coalition would not be able to simply bully its way to hegemony; it probably would have to fight, the results being a war enormously costly in blood, perhaps even one that would **dwarf World War II** in its price. If the aggressive coalition won, in turn, the multipolar system would be destroyed and the United States would face a competitor far more powerful than itself , and in all likelihood a world in which **democracy and personal liberty would be in eclipse**. In any case it is a geopolitical imperative for the United States that no power or coalition attains hegemony in Eastern Eurasia, much less that an explicitly hostile state or coalition succeeds in doing so. If the United States is to guard its national interests in this century, **it is vital that it ensures** the **transition** from unipolarity **to multipolarity occurs in a**s **gentle** a **manner** as possible. In this capacity, it is important to understand that the United States is in long term relative decline, but, at the same time to acknowledge that it has very great military, financial and diplomatic resources at its disposal. If Washington deploys these resources wisely it can maximize its security over the long term and **minimize the probability of a great power war.**

**We’re on the brink – timeframe outweighs**

**Blechman 9** [Barry M., Co-Founder and a Distinguished Fellow at The Henry L. Stimson Center, “Nuclear Proliferation: Avoiding a Pandemic,” http://www.stimson.org/pub.cfm?id=680]

There is serious risk that the international agreements and processes that have kept the number of nations armed with nuclear weapons fairly low are breaking down. Over the past ten years, three nations joined the six previously declared nuclear powers and a tenth is in the offing. Unless strong actions are taken during the first 18 months of the administration, we could see a world of twenty or even thirty nuclear-armed states by the 2020s. Meeting this challenge requires specific, near-term steps to shore up the current regime plus bold actions to move eventually to a world completely free of nuclear weapons. The Context The US and other nations became seriously concerned about nuclear proliferation following China’s test of a nuclear device in 1964. In the years that followed, they erected the existing anti-proliferation regime -- the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) – its backbone; the Nuclear Suppliers Group to restrict trade in nuclear materials and dual-use items; and its regulatory organization – the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Today, all three components are in jeopardy. The Non-Proliferation Treaty has never been accepted universally. Three nuclear weapon states -- India, Israel, and Pakistan -- are not signatories. The Treaty also has notable flaws, demonstrated by North Korea’s swift withdrawal from the Treaty, removal of IAEA safeguards on its civilian nuclear facility, and quick building and testing of a nuclear device. Moreover, after 40 years, the NPT’s central tenet, a promise by China, France, UK, US, and the USSR to eventually eliminate their nuclear weapons in exchange for a pledge by all other countries not to seek weapon capabilities, is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain. At the 2000 and 2005 Review Conferences and in a preparatory meeting for the 2010 Conference, the tensions between the two classes of countries were difficult to manage and little, if anything, was accomplished. The Nuclear Suppliers Group, meanwhile, is challenged by the US-India Agreement on Civil Nuclear Cooperation. This agreement requires the US to seek an exception to the NSG rule prohibiting non-NPT signatory states from trading in nuclear and dual-use materials. Such an exception was granted in September for the US and India; if accepted by the US Congress, there is little reason to think that additional exceptions might not be granted for, say, Russia and Iran or China and Pakistan.   Finally, the IAEA is relatively weak, poorly resourced, and sometimes ignored. One NPT signatory, Iran, has been cited repeatedly for violating IAEA rules but only after years have sanctions begun to be applied and they appear to be too weak to change Iranian behavior -- demonstrating how countries can attain a virtual nuclear weapon status while remaining a signatory of the NPT. A broader problem is that IAEA inspectors can only visit declared nuclear facilities. As of May 30, 2008, the Additional Protocol, which would permit challenge inspections of sites chosen by the IAEA, had not yet been put into effect for most of the NPT signatories, including the United States. Finally, if proliferation begins to accelerate, countries that are competent in nuclear technologies, but which have refrained from building a weapons program, could well join the bandwagon. These proliferators might include Brazil, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Ukraine, and others.   Where to Start Re-state the goal of nuclear disarmament at every opportunity During the campaign, both sides stated their support for the goal of nuclear disarmament. Strongly reaffirming this commitment as president would set the stage for success in various negotiations. Emphasizing the disarmament goal in the State of the Union and at other high-profile opportunities will encourage public support. Bring the Six Nation Talks with North Korea to a successful conclusion The United Staes will need China's help to keep the pressure on Pyongyang to fulfill its commitments and to ease concerns about its uranium enrichment program and nuclear exports. It will also need to work with South Korea, Japan, and the Congress to be sure there are sufficient carots for North Korea to see benefit in continuing to cooperate. Persuade Iran to contain its uranium enrichment program short of a weapons capability Getting Iran to contain its uranium enrichment short of a weapons capability is even more important. It requires the US to become a full participant in the talks, not just an interested by-stander, and a promise of simultaneous concessions on our part - not just a partial lifting of sanctions, but also some movement on one or more of the baskets of goodies mentioned in last year's Paris Agreement. Over the longer term, a serious effort to place all nations' nuclear fuel cycles under multinational controls will be essential (see below.) Organize a meeting with Russia early to discuss nuclear matters In the context of improvements in the US-Russia relationship overall, it may be possible to reach early agreements on extension of the START I verification provisions and on modification of the MOscow Treaty to reduce the number of operationally deloyed nuclear warhead and to define more precisely the rules for counting such weapons. Moscow will demand as a quid-pro-quo that we agree to forego the planned missile defense site in Eastern Europe, which is a good idea in any event for technical reasons. Over the longer term, you should begin discussions of more ambitious steps to reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons, combined with steps to incorporate Russia in any missile defense program. Begin talks with China China has resisted a nuclear dialogue for years but perhaps may now be ready to begin informal discussions. The start of talks with China on nuclear issues would ease pressures in Japan to go nuclear. Prepare for the NPT PrepCon (May 2009) and Review Conference (June 2010) These conferences require thinking outside traditional lines to come up with bold initiatives that the US and other nuclear weapon states might embrace.   One issue is how to break the ten-year impass in the Committee on Disaramament on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treay (FMCT). China has linked that issue with discussions of a treaty to prohibit weapons in space. One idea would be to agree to discuss "rules of the road for space operations" in exchange for the beginnings of serious work on FMCT. A second issue is a shift from national fuel cycles to placing all nations' fuel cycles under multi-national organizations, perhaps public/private partnerships that would control the materials from mining through the removal of spent fuel from power reactors and safeguard them from diversion while in reactors. A third and crucial issue is the possibility of beginning discussions with key nuclear weapon states for a treaty to eliminate all nucearl weapons, from all nations, by a date certain. Nothing would strengthen the hands of the nuclear weapon states at the 2010 NPT Review Conferenceas much as the announcement that they were beginning such talks. What’s on the Line   The world has been spared the detonation of a nuclear device in anger for more than 60 years. It’s not clear that this remarkable restraint can be sustained indefinitely, particularly in the event of wide-spread proliferation. The East-West conflict during the Cold War was an abstract, ideological struggle. Even then, we came perilously close to nuclear exchanges during the Berlin Crises in the 1950s, the Cuba Crisis in 1962, and at several other times. If nuclear weapons come into the hands of nations with histories of hatred and warfare and on-going disputes, deterrence becomes a far more risky proposition and the likelihood of nuclear warfare far greater. Just think of nuclear weapons in the hands of Israel and Iran in the context of a war between Israel and Hezbollah and Syria in Lebanon. Alternatively, think how unstable Northeast Asia might become if China, Japan, Korea, and Russia all have nuclear weapons. Moreover, every additional nuclear weapon state means a greater risk that nuclear devices come into the hands of terrorist organizations. America’s security depends on the next administration placing the highest priority on reining in the nuclear danger.

##### Prolif collapses alliances

Kroenig, 12 [May 26th, Matthew Kroenig: Assistant Professor of Government, Georgetown University and Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have A Future? Prepared for the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, <http://www.npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1182&tid=30>]

Undermines alliances: The spread of nuclear weapons also complicates U.S. alliance relationships. Washington uses the promise of military protection as a way to cement its alliance structures. U.S. allies depend on America’s protection, giving Washington influence over allied states’ foreign policies. Historically, the United States has offered, and threatened to retract, the security guarantee carrot to prevent allied states from acting contrary to its interests. As nuclear weapons spread, however, alliances held together by promises of military protection are undermined in two ways. First, U.S. allies may doubt the credibility of Washington’s commitments to provide a military defense against nuclear-armed states, leading them to weaken ties with their patron. As Charles de Gaulle famously asked about the U.S. commitment to defend France from the Soviet Union during the Cold War, would Washington be willing to trade New York for Paris? Similarly, if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, U.S. partners in the Middle East, such as Israel and Gulf States, will question Washington’s resolve to defend them from Iran. After all, if the United States proves unwilling to use force to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, would it really be willing to fight a war against a nuclear-armed Iran? Qatar, for example, already appears to be hedging its bets, loosening ties to Washington and warming to Tehran. Second, nuclear proliferation could encourage client states to acquire nuclear weapons themselves, giving them greater security independence and making them less dependable allies. According to many scholars, the acquisition of the force de frappe was instrumental in permitting the French Fifth Republic under President Charles de Gualle to pursue a foreign policy path independent from Washington at NATO.[[1]](#footnote-1)[68] Similarly, it is possible that Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and other regional states will acquire independent nuclear capabilities to counter Iran’s nuclear arsenal, greatly destabilizing an already unstable region and threatening Washington’s ability to influence regional dynamics.

##### Only scenario for nuclear war

**Ross**, **1999** (Winter 1998/1999, Douglas – professor of political science at Simon Fraser University, Canada’s functional isolationism and the future of weapons of mass destruction, International Journal, p. lexis)

Thus, an easily accessible tax base has long been available for spending much more on international security than recent governments have been willing to contemplate. Negotiating the landmines ban, discouraging trade in small arms, promoting the United Nations arms register are all worthwhile, popular activities that polish the national self-image. But they should all be supplements to, not substitutes for, a proportionately equitable commitment of resources to the management and prevention of international conflict – and thus the containment of the WMD threat. Future American governments will not ‘police the world’ alone. For almost fifty years the Soviet threat compelled disproportionate military expenditures and sacrifice by the United States. That world is gone. Only by enmeshing the capabilities of the United States and other leading powers in a co-operative security management regime where the burdens are widely shared does the world community have any plausible hope of avoiding warfare involving nuclear or other WMD.

The aff controls the only scenario for conflict escalation – the k doesn’t access a war impact

**Kaufman, 09**[Stuart J, professor of political science and international relations at the university of Delaware, “ Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” Security Studies 18:3, 400 – 434]

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs only if these factors are harnessed. Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence. A virtue of this symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why ethnic peace is more common than ethnonationalist war. Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

##### Every study of credible social theories concludes consequentialism is good---Scientific studies of biology, evolution, and psychology prove

**Greene 2010** – Joshua, Associate Professor of Social science in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University (The Secret Joke of Kant’s Soul published in Moral Psychology: Historical and Contemporary Readings, accessed: www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~lchang/material/Evolutionary/Developmental/Greene-KantSoul.pdf)

What turn-of-the-millennium science is telling us is that human moral judgment is not a pristine rational enterprise, that our moral judgments are driven by a hodgepodge of emotional dispositions, which themselves were shaped by a hodgepodge of evolutionary forces, both biological and cultural. Because of this, it is exceedingly unlikely that there is any rationally coherent normative moral theory that can accommodate our moral intuitions. Moreover, anyone who claims to have such a theory, or even part of one, almost certainly doesn't. Instead, what that person probably has is a moral rationalization. It seems then, that we have somehow crossed the infamous "is"-"ought" divide. How did this happen? Didn't Hume (Hume, 1978) and Moore (Moore, 1966) warn us against trying to derive an "ought" from and "is?" How did we go from descriptive scientific theories concerning moral psychology to skepticism about a whole class of normative moral theories? The answer is that we did not, as Hume and Moore anticipated, attempt to derive an "ought" from and "is." That is, our method has been inductive rather than deductive. We have inferred on the basis of the available evidence that the phenomenon of rationalist deontological philosophy is best explained as a rationalization of evolved emotional intuition (Harman, 1977). Missing the Deontological Point I suspect that rationalist deontologists will remain unmoved by the arguments presented here. Instead, I suspect, they will insist that I have simply misunderstood what Kant and like-minded deontologists are all about. Deontology, they will say, isn't about this intuition or that intuition. It's not defined by its normative differences with consequentialism. Rather, deontology is about taking humanity seriously. Above all else, it's about respect for persons. It's about treating others as fellow rational creatures rather than as mere objects, about acting for reasons rational beings can share. And so on (Korsgaard, 1996a; Korsgaard, 1996b). This is, no doubt, how many deontologists see deontology. But this insider's view, as I've suggested, may be misleading. The problem, more specifically, is that it defines deontology in terms of values that are not distinctively deontological, though they may appear to be from the inside. Consider the following analogy with religion. When one asks a religious person to explain the essence of his religion, one often gets an answer like this: "It's about love, really. It's about looking out for other people, looking beyond oneself. It's about community, being part of something larger than oneself." This sort of answer accurately captures the phenomenology of many people's religion, but it's nevertheless inadequate for distinguishing religion from other things. This is because many, if not most, non-religious people aspire to love deeply, look out for other people, avoid self-absorption, have a sense of a community, and be connected to things larger than themselves. In other words, secular humanists and atheists can assent to most of what many religious people think religion is all about. From a secular humanist's point of view, in contrast, what's distinctive about religion is its commitment to the existence of supernatural entities as well as formal religious institutions and doctrines. And they're right. These things really do distinguish religious from non-religious practices, though they may appear to be secondary to many people operating from within a religious point of view. In the same way, I believe that most of the standard deontological/Kantian self-characterizatons fail to distinguish deontology from other approaches to ethics. (See also Kagan (Kagan, 1997, pp. 70-78.) on the difficulty of defining deontology.) It seems to me that consequentialists, as much as anyone else, have respect for persons, are against treating people as mere objects, wish to act for reasons that rational creatures can share, etc. A consequentialist respects other persons, and refrains from treating them as mere objects, by counting every person's well-being in the decision-making process. Likewise, a consequentialist attempts to act according to reasons that rational creatures can share by acting according to principles that give equal weight to everyone's interests, i.e. that are impartial. This is not to say that consequentialists and deontologists don't differ. They do. It's just that the real differences may not be what deontologists often take them to be. What, then, distinguishes deontology from other kinds of moral thought? A good strategy for answering this question is to start with concrete disagreements between deontologists and others (such as consequentialists) and then work backward in search of deeper principles. This is what I've attempted to do with the trolley and footbridge cases, and other instances in which deontologists and consequentialists disagree. If you ask a deontologically-minded person why it's wrong to push someone in front of speeding trolley in order to save five others, you will get characteristically deontological answers. Some will be tautological: "Because it's murder!" Others will be more sophisticated: "The ends don't justify the means." "You have to respect people's rights." But, as we know, these answers don't really explain anything, because if you give the same people (on different occasions) the trolley case or the loop case (See above), they'll make the opposite judgment, even though their initial explanation concerning the footbridge case applies equally well to one or both of these cases. Talk about rights, respect for persons, and reasons we can share are natural attempts to explain, in "cognitive" terms, what we feel when we find ourselves having emotionally driven intuitions that are odds with the cold calculus of consequentialism. Although these explanations are inevitably incomplete, there seems to be "something deeply right" about them because they give voice to powerful moral emotions. But, as with many religious people's accounts of what's essential to religion, they don't really explain what's distinctive about the philosophy in question.

##### Positivism is the necessary epistemology for studying IR—the alternative creates epistemological anarchy and destroys empirical analysis

Brown, 2011 (Vernon, Cardiff U, “The Reflectivist Critique of Positivist IR Theory”, http://www.e-

ir.info/?p=7328)

There is a great deal of support for the positivist approach in IR despite the critiques presented above. As the survey by Maliniak et al. showed, seventy percent of American IR scholars still consider themselves as positivists with a number of the rest not yet reflectivist. This is significant as the United States is still considered to be the major force in IR scholarship. There are many reasons for this continued success of positivism in IR, the majority of which have to do with either the continued reliance on empirical methods or the failure of many reflectivists, especially the post-modernists, to offer any suggestions to fill the epistemological void left by their passing. David Houghton (2008, p.118) addresses both of these by writing that despite their critique, reflectivists continue to use empirical, observational methods and that is not possible to be anything but positivist because, as he writes, ‘truth claims about the world have to come from somewhere’. He also suggests that reflectivists are essentially engaging in what can only be perceived as a negative exercise since by continually deconstructing theories one will eventually be left with nothing that is considered a legitimate theory. Another issue raised in response to the reflectivist critique focuses on the pluralism which scholars have called for in the face of epistemological relativism. Lapid (1989, p.249) warns that such pluralism, ‘If adopted uncritically or taken to its logical conclusion, [can] deteriorate into a condition of epistemological anarchy under which almost any position can legitimately claim equal hearing’, and that in such a state it would become nearly impossible to distinguish theoretical proliferation from theoretical growth. Positivism defends itself by claiming that scholarship is inherently observational, therefore empirical, and that if reflectivism is followed to its logical endpoint there would be no legitimate theories left because they would have been either deconstructed or created without a means of testing their legitimacy. Conclusion: The critique of positivism by the reflectivists is fundamentally an epistemological one. Each side can and does make compelling arguments showing the strength of their position. While it is important to acknowledge the positivists’ attempts to ground the discipline in a naturalist, scientific area there is still the obvious fact that the assumptions on which their epistemology is based are too easily deconstructed when they attempt to explain phenomena and make predictions in the socially constructed world which IR purports to study. As Milja Kurki (2009, p.442) suggests, positivism fails to acknowledge the possibility that all theories are at some level ‘politically and socially contextualized’. This creates the possibility for positivist theories to create predictions that are fundamentally flawed as they have failed to take into account the context within which their facts are constructed. This in turn allows the reflectivist theorists to deconstruct the predictions due to misunderstandings that arise from the lack of context in the positivists’ predictions. The question of what positivism has to say in a socially constructed and interpreted world is still an important one, however, since the study of IR is still in many ways observational and therefore empirical. There is also the valid claim that in the face of the possible anarchical pluralism or lack of legitimate theories left by reflectivist critiques there needs to be some sense of scientific and theoretical grounding, and that positivism provides that very thing. In the end, reflectivism performs a valuable service in widening the range of legitimate research that is possible by IR scholars and allowing such research to take into account the understanding that the issues studied are birthed by social conventions. There still must be, however, some framework within this study to prevent the anarchy that could follow in the wake of reflectivism and while positivism is in no ways perfect, or even close to it, it still provides such a framework that if made to be self-reflective and continually evolving, could provide the stability needed.

Thorium is necessarily a reversal of an authoritarian nuclear power regime and an embrace of a non-weaponized regime – thorium was rejected in 1939 due to its benign nature – the plan is a key to access their alternative

Puplava, 11 [President, Chief Investment Strategist at PFS Group,” Kirk Sorensen States Thorium a Million Times More Energy Dense than Fossil Fuels“ <http://www.financialsense.com/contributors/james-j-puplava/kirk-sorensen-thorium-a-million-times-more-energy-dense-than-fossil-fuels>]

Kirk: (2:14) Yeah, I’d be happy to talk about that, and forgive me for maybe getting into a little bit of history, I love history, but it helps tounderstand why these things happened**.** You know, thorium and uranium were both discovered as elements in the late 1800s. And nobody really thought there was anything special out them until Marie Curie discovered that they were radioactive. And again, nobody understood what that meant. But in 1939, as you mentioned, the process of nuclear fission was first discovered by a chemist named Otto Hahn in Germany. And it was a totally new idea that you could actually split an atom release all this energy. And because this was discovered right at the beginning of World War II the obvious question was, can we use this to make an explosive? And that was the origin of the Manhattan project. They looked at uranium and uranium has two isotopes. One of which is uranium 235 and that is naturally fissile, you don’t have to do anything to it to make it fission. So that was the beginning of one kind of effort in the Manhattan project to manufacture a weapon. And then uranium 238, which was much more common, they found that they could bombarded it with neutrons and create a new element, plutonium, that was also fissile, and you could potentially use it for a nuclear explosive. So that was another line that was taken. And then they looked to thorium and said well could we try the same technique with thorium, and found that, yes, you could bombard thorium with a neutron and create uranium 233 and it was also fissile and could potentially form explosives. But there were certain severe drawbacks in the practicality of trying to use uranium 233 as a weapon. And so the attention focused overwhelmingly on separating the uranium isotopes and on converting some of that uranium into plutonium. Those were two directions that were taken during the Manhattan Project. And they resulted in the Hiroshima bomb, which was a uranium 235 bomb and the Nagasaki bomb, which was a plutonium bomb. After the war was over, the overwhelming concern of the US Atomic Energy Commission was to replenish our stockpile of nuclear weapons, which after Nagasaki, was depleted. We didn't have any more weapons, and that was one of the biggest security secrets in the United States at that time. We had to replenish that supply and so all the effort was put into creating materials intended for weapons. And because uranium and plutonium had shown themselves to be more amenable to that type of work than thorium, the work on thorium was neglected. It was only as we moved into the ‘50s that the idea of making electrical power from nuclear energy began to take prominence, and so because the uranium plutonium technologies were more understood, and considered a safer bet, that was where the bulk of the effort in the earlier atomic power program went, was to uranium and plutonium. Although at that time there was a small and beginning effort to investigate thorium, which as in turns out, has some very superior properties when your goal is to make nuclear power rather than to make nuclear weapons.

##### laws are on the books now that ensure the preservation of status quo technology – USFG deployment of Thorium catalyzes a tech transition across the country

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

In the United States, it is the responsibility of industry to design, construct, and operate commercial nuclear power plants. However, DOE has statutory authority under the Atomic Energy Act to promote and support nuclear energy technologies for commercial applications. In general, appropriate government roles include researching high-potential technologies beyond the investment horizon of industry and also reducing the technical risks of new technologies. In the case of new commercial reactor designs, potential areas of NE involvement could include: Enabling new technologies to be inserted into emerging and future designs by providing access to unique laboratory resources for new technology development and, where appropriate, demonstration. • Working through the laboratories and universities to provide unique expertise and facilities to industry for R&D in the areas of: o Innovative concepts and advanced technologies. o Fundamental phenomena and performance data. o Advanced modeling and simulation capabilities. APRIL 2010 22 34 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP o New technology testing and, if appropriate, demonstration. o Advanced manufacturing methods. Representative R&D activities that support each of the roles stated above are presented below. The level of DOE investment relative to industry investment will vary across the spectrum of these activities, with a generally increasing trend in DOE investment for longer-term activities. Finally, there is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaborations with other nations through multilateral and bilateral agreements including the Generation IV International Forum, which is investigating multiple advanced reactor concepts. DOE is also a participant in OECD/NEA and IAEA initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems.

##### Prolif threats real

**Harvey 01** (Frank P., a member of a the Canadian International Council, “National Missile Defence Revisited, Again a Reply to David Mutimer,” International Journal, Vol. 56, No. 2 (Spring, 2001), pp. 347-360, Canadian International Council)

**'Before any argument** supporting NMD **can be taken seriously**, there-fore, **we must accept that a "rogue** state **threat" exists'** (p 340). I couldn't agree more. But this is perhaps the most fascinating of all of Mutimer s assertions because he himself acknowledges the 'facts' of the rogue state threat - and I thought only proponents shared the burden of proving the case for NMD. Consider the following quotes: • The rogue state needs, therefore, to be seen for what it was: the creation of the United States military to justify its claim on resources ... The rogue state, however, is a myth. [It] is not mythical in the sense that it is not real, but rather in the sense that it has been vested with a totemic importance by the United States' (p 344) (emphasis added). • 'Rogues are the enemies that make high levels of military spending legitimate. They are not a lie told by knowing capitalists in an instrumental fashion to hoodwink Congress into passing over-inflated budgets (p 345, n 24) (emphasis added). I am not arguing that the United States fabricated evidence, but rather that it produced a particular frame within which to interpret that evidence' (p 345) (emphasis added). • 'The imagined nature of threats does not mean that there is no real danger or that nothing need ever be done about risks' (p 345). • 'The issue, therefore, is not the evidence but rather how the "facts" are "evidence" of a particular form of threat labelled "proliferation" by actors labelled "rogue"' (p 344, n22). • 'There is, therefore, no need for me to engage in a discussion of the evidence of proliferation assembled, for example, in the Rumsfeld Report to bolster the case for NMD. At issue are not "the facts" but the ways in which those facts are assembled and the interpretation that is given to them' (p 344, n 22). Mutimer s honesty is refreshing but not surprising. **Ballistic missile** proliferation is difficult to deny. **It is a 'real' security threat**, driven by technological progress, the spread of scientific knowledge related to these weapons systems, diminishing costs, ongoing regional security threats in the Middle East and Asia, and, most importantly, time.

Alt doens’t solve prolif - means case is a DA to the alt  
Huntley – Program Director at the Liu Institute for Global Studies – ‘7 Wade, Nuclear Nonproliferation: Time for New Thinking?, March

Despite its rejection of these premises, the Bush Administration’s alternative nonproliferation paradigm can play a role in helping the material and normative dimensions of the NPT regime adapt effectively to the second nuclear era. In its current articulation, the alternative paradigm is too messianic and self-serving to function as an effective nonproliferation foundation. But its generic recognition of the political dimension of nuclear proliferation is overdue. In a more rigorously developed form, this perspective can function as an essential adjunct to the prevailing paradigm’s narrower focus on limiting material capabilities and upholding technical non- discrimination. Drawing on more nuanced understandings of the political and social dimensions of the causes and consequences of proliferation is particularly vital in responding to the emerging conditions of the second nuclear age, in which **abstract strategy matters less** and the broader **threat-making** and symbolic values of nuclear weapons possession **matter more**. Increasing acceptance of and reliance on nuclear threat-making deepens the insinuation of nuclear capabilities into the fabric of international relations in each of the material/security, domestic politics and normative/symbolic domains. Arms control, nonproliferation and the ideal of eventual disarmament require reversing this permeation, which in turn requires elevating conditions of global governance – at both national and international levels – above the mean dictates of anarchy. The prerequisite is both material and normative: good governance means good institutions, but the necessity of consensual acceptance means good institutions cannot be imposed by fiat. The task is necessarily a long one; there are no crusading quick fixes. The United States, as the globe’s preeminent power, can lead this task. But this must be leadership through broad and genuine consensus, not convenient and coerced “coalitions of the willing.” The Bush Administration is not wrong to orient US policy around a vision for a better world. But America’s global friends – and even its adversaries – have vital and necessary roles to play in directing that vision toward more consensual and normatively satisfying aspirations. Then they must join in its quest as well. That would not be a bad measure of “responsibility.

**We outweigh and turn the K—prolif increases international inequality and suffering**

**Lyman 95** – CFR Senior Fellow in Africa Policy Studies (Princeton, The Real Story of the NPT Negotiations, http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/npt/news/950427-389021.htm, AG)

The prospect is chilling. There may be many things wrong with the present treaty, and much that should be fixed. But certainly, the problems of "inequality," lack of security for non-nuclear states, and pressures for further disarmament would not be ameliorated by having the number of nuclear states go from five to ten, or twenty, and for international norms and mechanisms to disappear. I am horrified to see the NPT described as an "apartheid treaty," as if the spread of nuclear weapons was some desirable good to be enjoyed by everyone. **It is in fact the poorer (or more responsible) nations, who cannot or will not spend the billions of dollars to acquire nuclear weapons, that are most threatened by neighbors who would.**

**Non-proliferation isn’t discriminatory**

**Graham 94** – former director, US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (Thomas, 9/13, http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/acda/speeches/graham/spnp94gr.htm, AG)

Some charge that the NPT is discriminatory, because it recognizes five nuclear powers while prohibiting the acquisition of nuclear weapons by other states. While the NPT reflects the reality that five nuclear-weapon states existed in 1968, it does not legitimize the permanent possession of nuclear weapons. Far from it. Rather, the NPT regime creates a system of shared obligations among its parties: while non-nuclear-weapon states promise not to acquire nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapon states promise to undertake measures to reduce and eliminate their nuclear arsenals. In fact, the NPT is the only global treaty that requires all its parties to pursue measures related to cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament. For the nuclear-weapon states, this provision is clearly aimed at their nuclear arsenals. For its part, the United States has undertaken massive reductions in its nuclear arsenal both as a result of the START I and II treaties as well as unilateral measures and bilateral agreements. In addition, President Clinton called in May of this year for the progressive reduction and elimination of all weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The U.S. is currently destroying approximately 2000 nuclear weapons a year, which is as fast as is technically possible. In addition, I note that yesterday, at the Y-12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, the IAEA commenced application of safeguards on approximately ten tons of highly enriched uranium (HEU), thereby fulfilling the pledge that President Clinton made last September that the U.S. would make available for application of IAEA safeguards HEU and plutonium removed from the U.S. nuclear deterrent. The U.S. anticipates placing additional material under IAEA safeguards, with the initial quantity of plutonium to come under safeguards before the end of the year. All of these initiatives demonstrate unmistakably that the U.S. is serious about its commitments under article VI of the NPT.

##### Discussion of technical nuclear strategy is inevitable - their attempts to silence nuclear discourse doesn't solve the problem, it just makes it invisible - this prevents critical response

Chaloupka '92 William Chaloupka, Professor of Political Science at Colorado State University, Knowing Nukes: The Politics and Culture of the Atom, 1992, p. 9-10

Both Derrida’s insight and Schwenger’s anecdote invite the opening of a whole realm of oppositional activity, of which only a few examples now exist. The premise of this genre (“speaking unspeakables”), as Derrida claims, may have been best realized before the nuclear era, in the literary texts of Mallarmé, Kafka, or Joyce. But there have been contemporary attempts that nuclear criticism could address.26 One could imagine a comparison, for example, of two highly publicized television films of the Reagan era, “The Day After” and the right-wing response to it, “Amer¬ika.” The level and ferocity of the response suggest that “The Day After” broke a taboo. “Amerika” charges weakness, appeasement, and even col¬laboration, but these charges so completely miss their target that we search for a better interpretation. Perhaps “The Day After” transgressed in a special way, and the only available way of responding was the arcane code of anticommunism. The actual taboo it broke, it broke by speaking at all. At the same time, the activity of finding new ways to read (literary or cinematic) texts about nukes must relate to the broader project of empowering responses if such activity is to fit within the antinuclear schema I am discussing. Leaping over hypothetical psychological diagnoses to speak politically, such a development is not so hard to imagine. “Speaking the unspeakable” has never been a happy entry into activism. Nuclear opponents have adopted any number of rhetorical strategies for overcoming this obstacle. They argue that this “unspeakability” denotes an importance so huge that we must dissolve the reticence and disgust that is our “first reaction.” Or, alternatively, they dissolve their political position into a therapeutic one, implying that the contemporary citizen would be healthier and less conflicted if she would admit and confront the nuclear demon. In either case, the political use of unspeakability produces a paradoxical stance at odds with the naturalism of the survivalist, species-interest position. This unacknowledged (unacknowledgeable) taste for paradox goes even a step further. Having bound themselves in multiple, endlessly and effortlessly proliferating dilemmas, nuclear opponents then announce that it is their goal to impose the condition of “unspeakability” on nuclear managers. The solution to the paradox of nuclear strategy is to silence strategists, such as Caspar Weinberger, who dare to speak of limited nuclear war. This enforced silence has long since ceased to be uncomfortable for nuclear managers, who now clearly understand that their control will proceed more satisfactorily when it is invisible. Opponents, then, have undertaken the odd project of enforcing unspeakability, on the one hand, while also seeking to make nukes visible, thus making them controversial—a topic of conversation.27 Such strategies have a validity, as I will discuss in a later chapter, but it is not necessarily the validity the opponents promote. Just making the artifacts of nuclearism visible isn’t enough; they don’t speak for themselves. These artifacts—whether warheads or power plants—surely offer little help out of the paradox of unspeakability that both veils and unveils them, and all the while also seems to expect a solution. Finding nukes not only “speakable” but “fabulously textual,” nuclear criticism can respond to this odd political situation in part because many more strategic approaches become possible once we move the response to paradox out of an ‘‘unspeakable discourse’’ and into a textual or literary context.

##### Their alt is political grandstanding- no progress towards disarmament will occur until we alter the security calculations that drive weapons development

DR. LAWRENCE SCHEINMAN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR NONPROLIFERATION AND REGIONAL ARMS CONTROL, 3-13-96 http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/acda/speeches/schein/scheiott.htm

The 1995 NPT Conference decisions reflect the strong interest on the part of NPT non-nuclear-weapon states to see greater progress made toward full implementation of NPT Article VI and, in particular, the achievement of nuclear disarmament. Following the 1995 NPT Conference, the small minority of countries (both within and without the NPT regime) that were not satisfied with the NPT Conference outcome began to agitate publicly for those measures not agreed by the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference. They began selectively to reinterpret the Conference decisions and to demand the establishment of certain arms control measures. In a direct challenge to the agenda set forth at the 1995 NPT Conference, these states have called for creation of linkage between important and internationally agreed initiatives, such as a FMCT, and rhetorical and unagreed initiatives, such as creating a time-bound framework for nuclear disarmament. The actions of these few states, including some not party to the NPT, belie the very real cooperative atmosphere that resulted in the agreement to the 1995 NPT Conference decisions as well as the growing de-emphasis on "bloc politics" in favor of national or regional security perspectives. Their actions have undermined efforts to move forward constructively on important arms control initiatives, including the CTBT and FMCT. It has also run counter to stated interest in continuing the constructive dialogue that flourished during the 1995 NPT Conference process. If continued progress is to be made toward mutually shared arms control objectives, such as those outlined in the "Principles and Objectives" decision, it will be essential for these few states to stand down from the kind of approach that has characterized their participation in the arms control debate over the past eight months. Allow me, if you will, to take this point a bit further. Disarmament on demand or timetable disarmament is not a tenable proposition -- rather, it is political grandstanding that blocks out of consideration whether and to what extent the security environment in which disarmament is to take place is conducive to such measures. We live today, and will for some time to come, in a period of transition between a world anchored on two relatively well disciplined superpower alliances which defined the international security order, and a future that is unknown and difficult to map with confidence and which is more likely than not to be characterized by forms of complex multipolarity in which local, regional and transnationalist forces weigh heavily. Building down one security order requires a commensurate building up of alternative orders if stability is to be safeguarded. The goal of the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons must take this consideration into account. What is critically important at this stage is to engage in a process that moves us inexorably toward that goal but avoids the error of generating expectations that cannot be met, thus feeding the flames of disillusionment and frustration and reinforcing those who would argue against changing the nuclear status quo. This debate over nuclear disarmament presents a continuous challenge, and one that is not easily addressed. The insistence on the part of non-nuclear weapon states for "disarmament on demand" must be reconciled with the reality that achievement of nuclear disarmament will not happen unless and until the international security situation evolves to the point where, in effect, nuclear weapons can be written out of our national security doctrine and strategies. Certainly the international security situation has changed dramatically from the days of the Cold War; U.S. strategic doctrine has evolved in response to this changed security environment and, as we announced in completing our Nuclear Posture Review, nuclear weapons today play a smaller role in U.S. military planning than at any time in the past. The reality, however, is that while much improved, the security situation today continues to present significant threats to the United States and its allies, and to global stability overall.Many states appear unwilling to accept the fact that, in spite of the commitment of the United States and other nuclear weapon states to the elimination of nuclear weapons -- commitments that have been repeatedly reaffirmed and reinforced through the continued progress in nuclear arms reduction -- nuclear disarmament cannot and will not be achieved overnight. Our long experience illustrates the fact that nuclear arms reduction and elimination is a tedious process -- necessarily so. Like it or not, the fact is that the implementation schedule for START I and II -- agreements that already have been negotiated -- will take many years to fulfill. Without getting into a detailed discussion of what this audience already well knows concerning U.S.-Russian nuclear arms control and disarmament measures, let me just say that now that the U.S. Senate has provided its advice and consent to START II our primary concern is achieving consent to ratification by the Russian Duma. Following this, we intend to work with Russia on the deactivation of START II forces. During their September 1994 summit meeting, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin committed to consider further reductions of, and limitations on, remaining nuclear forces once START II was ratified. In the meantime, implementation of START I is running several years ahead of schedule.

##### Regional proximity to adversaries- not racism- drives our concern for new proliferants

Grey, Prof. of poli sci Univ. of Reading, The Second Nuclear Age 1999

Active defense in the nuclear era would have had great difficulty working against say, “the Soviet threat” of the 1980-1985 vintage, but that tactical judgment cannot hold vis-à-vis regional missile threats today and tomorrow. Because the United States could not have limited damage usefully in the context of a Soviet missile attack in 1970 or 1980 (if that is true), it does not follow that the (ballistic and cruise) missile threat posed by regional powers, not excluding China, could not be defeated early in the twenty-first century. There is no technically compelling connection between claims from the early `980’s that the (Soviet) missile assault will always get through and parallel claims today that BMD will not work in the future. Although there can never be any absolute guarantees, it is as certain as anything can be in this friction-fraught realm that a multitiered US BMD architecture would defeat militarily any missile menace from regional powers. Nonetheless, there are particular tactical problems posed by regional foes that would stress BMD competencies. Regional nuclear wars will register short times of flight for missiles dispatched to strike targets in theater. Short ranges translate as minimal, potentially even subminimal, reaction times even for optimally alert and well-positioned active defenses. Almost regardless of the degree of technical sophistication of the defense, short-range ballistic missiles and some medium range ballistic missiles could pose a genuinely intractable challenge to the defense. That limiting thought aside, BMD today and tomorrow can pose a politically and militarily lethal menace to the suasive power of missile threats.

**Even if consumerism was the cause of environmental destruction – renouncing it gives up on innovation and causes extinction**

**Land, 10/30**/09 – PhD, philosopher and economist at the Thunen Institute in Bollewick. (Rainer, “A New Paradigm: The New Deal of the 1930s,” http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2009/10/30/18627196.php)

Renouncing on economic development would not be a way out because it would sanction the status quo. The environmental problems existing today and unsolvable without another type of industry will continue and cause the death of today’s humanity. Renouncing on economic development would mean renouncing on the future technologies with which environmental destruction could be avoided and environmental problems at least partly repaired.

Renouncing on growth urged again and again would also not be a solution. The current path of population growth will lead to a stabilization of the world population at nine to ten billion people by 2050 (currently seven billion). Renouncing on increased production of food, consumer goods and services meant less and less had to be consumed per capital year after year. Thus people of developed countries must lose more and more so people in the third world can win. At the end everyone suffers distress. The only alternative is a new combination of development and growth, an economic development where growing production goes along with declining resource consumption (energy, raw materials and emissions) and environmentally compatible industry arises.

Renouncing on development and renouncing on growth would be fatal like growth without development or development without growth. The alternative is another path of economic development, growth based on another principle of economic development and invention and extension of a new type of industry. If such a change of direction occurs, a greater investment boom and development push would occur than the boom after the Second World War that led to the genesis of Fordist participation capitalism.

**Industrialization is inevitable globally – expanding economic opportunity solves extinction**

**Barker, 2k** – electrical engineer, and manager of corporate communications for the Electric Power Research Institute and former industrial economist and staff author at SRI International and as a commercial research analyst at USX Corporation (Brent, “Technology and the Quest for Sustainability.” EPRI Journal, Summer, infotrac)

From a social standpoint, accelerating productivity is not an option but rather an imperative for the future. It is necessary in order to provide the wealth for environmental sustainability, to support an aging population in the industrialized world, and to provide an economic ladder for developing nations.

The second area of opportunity for technology lies in its potential to help stabilize global population at 10-12 billion sometime in the twenty-first century, possibly as early as 2075. The key is economics. Global communications, from television to movies to the Internet, have brought an image of the comfortable life of the developed world into the homes of the poorest people, firing their own aspirations for a better quality of life, either through economic development in their own country or through emigration to other countries. If we in the developed world can make the basic tools of prosperity--infrastructure, health care, education, and law--more accessible and affordable, recent history suggests that the cultural drivers for producing large families will be tempered, relatively quickly and without coercion.

But the task is enormous. The physical prerequisites for prosperity in the global economy are electricity and communications. Today, there are more than 2 billion people living without electricity, or commercial energy in any form, in the very countries where some 5 billion people will be added in the next 50 years. If for no other reason than our enlightened self-interest, we should strive for universal access to electricity, communications, and educational opportunity. We have little choice, because the fate of the developed world is inextricably bound up in the economic and demographic fate of the developing world.

A third, related opportunity for technology is in decoupling population growth from land use and, more broadly, decoupling economic growth from natural resource consumption through recycling, end-use efficiency, and industrial ecology. Decoupling population from land use is well under way. According to Grubler, from 1700 to 1850 nearly 2 hectares of land (5 acres) were needed to support every child born in North America, while in the more crowded and cultivated regions of Europe and Asia only 0.5 hectare (1.2 acres) and 0.2 hectare (0.5 acre) were needed, respectively. During the past century, the amount of land needed per additional child has been dropping in all areas of the world, with Europe and North America experiencing the fastest decreases. Both crossed the "zero threshold" in the past few decades, meaning that no additional land is needed to support additional children and that land requirements will continue to decrease in the future.

One can postulate that the pattern of returning land to nature will continue to spread throughout the world, eventually stemming and then reversing the current onslaught on the great rain forests. Time is critical if vast tracts are to be saved from being laid bare, and success will largely depend on how rapidly economic opportunities expand for those now trapped in subsistence and frontier farming. In concept, the potential for returning land to nature is enormous. Futurist and scholar Jesse Ausubel of the Rockefeller University calculates that if farmers could lift average grain yields around the world just to the level of today's average U.S. corn grower, one-half of current global cropland--an area the size of the Amazon basin--could be spared.

If agriculture is a leading indicator, then the continuous drive to produce more from less will prevail in other parts of the economy Certainly with shrinking agricultural land requirements, water distribution and use around the world can be greatly altered, since nearly two-thirds of water now goes for irrigation. Overall, the technologies of the future will, in the words of Ausubel, be "cleaner, leaner, lighter, and drier"--that is, more efficient and less wasteful of materials and water. They will be much more tightly integrated through microprocessor-based control and will therefore use human and natural resources much more efficiently and productively.

Energy intensity, land intensity, and water intensity (and, to a lesser extent, materials intensity) for both manufacturing and agriculture are already heading downward. Only in agriculture are they falling fast enough to offset the surge in population, but, optimistically, advances in science and technology should accelerate the downward trends in other sectors, helping to decouple economic development from environmental impact in the coming century. One positive sign is the fact that recycling rates in North America are now approaching 65% for steel, lead, and copper and 30% for aluminum and paper. A second sign is that economic output is shifting away from resource-intensive products toward knowledge-based, immaterial goods and services. As a result, although the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) increased 200-fold (in real dollars) in the twentieth century, the physical weight of our annual output remains the same as it was in 1900. If anything, this trend will be accelerating. As Kevin Kelly, the editor of Wired magazine, noted, "The creations most in demand from the United States [as exports] have lost 50% of their physical weight per dollar of value in only six years.... Within a generation, two at most, the number of people working in honest-to-goodness manufacturing jobs will be no more than the number of farmers on the land--less than a few percent. Far more than we realize, the network economy is pulling us all in."

Even pollution shows clear signs of being decoupled from population and economic growth. Economist Paul Portney notes that, with the exception of greenhouse gases, "in the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] countries, the favorable experience [with pollution control] has been a triumph of technology That is, the ratio of pollution per unit of GDP has fallen fast enough in the developed world to offset the increase in both GDP per capita and the growing number of 'capitas' themselves."

The fourth opportunity for science and technology stems from their enormous potential to unlock resources not now available, to reduce human limitations, to create new options for policymakers and businesspeople alike, and to give us new levels of insight into future challenges. Technically resources have little value if we cannot unlock them for practical use. With technology, we are able to bring dormant resources to life. For example, it was only with the development of an electrolytic process late in the nineteenth century that aluminum--the most abundant metal on earth--became commercially available and useful. Chemistry unlocked hydrocarbons. And engineering allowed us to extract and put to diverse use untapped petroleum and gas fields. Over the course of history, technology has made the inaccessible accessible, and resource depletion has been more of a catalyst for change than a longstanding problem.

Technology provides us with last-ditch methods (what economists would call substitutions) that allow us to circumvent or leapfrog over crises of our own making. Agricultural technology solved the food crisis of the first half of the nineteenth century. The English "steam crisis" of the 1860s, triggered by the rapid rise of coal-burning steam engines and locomotives, was averted by mechanized mining and the discovery and use of petroleum. The U.S. "timber crisis" that Teddy Roosevelt publicly worried about was circumvented by the use of chemicals that enabled a billion or so railroad ties to last for decades instead of years. The great "manure crisis" of the same era was solved by the automobile, which in a few decades replaced some 25 million horses and freed up 40 million hectares (100 million acres) of farmland, not to mention improving the sanitation and smell of inner cities. Oil discoveries in Texas and then in the Middle East pushed the pending oil crisis of the 1920s into the future. And the energy crisis of the 1970s stimulated the development of new sensing and drilling technology, sparked the advance of non--fossil fuel alternatives, and deepened the penetration of electricity with its fuel flexibility into the global economy Thanks to underground imaging technology, today's known gas resources are an order of magnitude greater than the resources known 20 years ago, and new reserves continue to be discovered.

Technology has also greatly extended human limits. It has given each of us a productive capability greater than that of 150 workers in 1800, for example, and has conveniently put the power of hundreds of horses in our garages. In recent decades, it has extended our voice and our reach, allowing us to easily send our words, ideas, images, and money around the world at the speed of light.

But global sustainability is not inevitable. In spite of the tremendous promise that technology holds for a sustainable future, there is the potential for all of this to backfire before the job can be done. There are disturbing indications that people sometimes turn in fear and anger on technologies, industries, and institutions that openly foster an ever-faster pace of change. The current opposition to nuclear power genetically altered food, the globalization of the economy and the spread of American culture should give us pause. Technology has always presented a two-edged sword, serving as both cause and effect, solving one problem while creating another that was unintended and often unforeseen. We solved the manure crisis, but automotive smog, congestion, and urban sprawl took its place. We cleaned and transformed the cities with all-electric buildings rising

thousands of feet into the sky. But while urban pollution was thereby dramatically reduced, a portion of the pollution was shifted to someone else's sky.

Breaking limits

"Limits to growth" was a popular theme in the 1970s, and a best-selling book of that name predicted dire consequences for the human race by the end of

the century. In fact, we have done much better than those predictions, largely because of a factor the book missed--the potential of new technology to break limits. Repeatedly, human societies have approached seemingly insurmountable barriers only to find the means and tools to break through. This ability has now become a source of optimism, an article of faith, in many parts of the world.

Today's perceived limits, however, look and feel different. They are global in nature, multicultural, and larger in scale and complexity than ever before. Nearly 2 billion people in the world are without adequate sanitation, and nearly as many are without access to clean drinking water. AIDS is spreading rapidly in the regions of the world least able to fight it. Atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases are more than 30% greater than preindustrial levels and are climbing steadily. Petroleum reserves, expected to be tapped by over a billion automobiles worldwide by 2015, may last only another 50-100 years. And without careful preservation efforts, the biodiversity of the planet could become as threatened in this coming century as it was at the end of the last ice age, when more than 70% of the species of large mammals and other vertebrates in North America disappeared (along with 29% in Europe and 86% in Australia). All these perceived limits require innovation of a scope and intensity surpassing humankind's current commitment.

The list of real-world problems that could thwart global sustainability is long and sobering. It includes war, disease, famine, political and religious turmoil, despotism, entrenched poverty, illiteracy, resource depletion, and environmental degradation. Technology can help resolve some of these issues--poverty and disease, resource depletion, and environmental impact, for example--but it offers little recourse for the passions and politics that divide the world. The likelihood is that we will not catch up and overtake the moving target of global sustainability in the coming century, but given the prospects for technology, which have never been brighter, we may come surprisingly close. We should put our technology to work, striving to lift more than 5 billion people out of poverty while preventing irreversible damage to the biosphere and irreversible loss of the earth's natural resources.

##### No risk of “endless warfare”- we should embrace pragmatism in

Gray 7—Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies and Professor of International Relations and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, graduate of the Universities of Manchester and Oxford, Founder and Senior Associate to the National Institute for Public Policy, formerly with the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Hudson Institute (Colin, July, “The Implications of Preemptive and Preventive War Doctrines: A Reconsideration”, <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/ssi10561/ssi10561.pdf>)

7. A policy that favors preventive warfare expresses a futile quest for absolute security. It could do so. Most controversial policies contain within them the possibility of misuse. In the hands of a paranoid or boundlessly ambitious political leader, prevention could be a policy for endless warfare. However, the American political system, with its checks and balances, was designed explicitly for the purpose of constraining the executive from excessive folly. Both the Vietnam and the contemporary Iraqi experiences reveal clearly that although the conduct of war is an executive prerogative, in practice that authority is disciplined by public attitudes. Clausewitz made this point superbly with his designation of the passion, the sentiments, of the people as a vital component of his trinitarian theory of war. 51 It is true to claim that power can be, and indeed is often, abused, both personally and nationally. It is possible that a state could acquire a taste for the apparent swift decisiveness of preventive warfare and overuse the option. One might argue that the easy success achieved against Taliban Afghanistan in 2001, provided fuel for the urge to seek a similarly rapid success against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq. In other words, the delights of military success can be habit forming. On balance, claim seven is not persuasive, though it certainly contains a germ of truth. A country with unmatched wealth and power, unused to physical insecurity at home—notwithstanding 42 years of nuclear danger, and a high level of gun crime—is vulnerable to demands for policies that supposedly can restore security. But we ought not to endorse the argument that the United States should eschew the preventive war option because it could lead to a futile, endless search for absolute security. One might as well argue that the United States should adopt a defense policy and develop capabilities shaped strictly for homeland security approached in a narrowly geographical sense. Since a president might misuse a military instrument that had a global reach, why not deny the White House even the possibility of such misuse? In other words, constrain policy ends by limiting policy’s military means. This argument has circulated for many decades and, it must be admitted, it does have a certain elementary logic. It is the opinion of this enquiry, however, that the claim that a policy which includes the preventive option might lead to a search for total security is **not at all convincing**. Of course, folly in high places is always possible, which is one of the many reasons why popular democracy is the superior form of government. It would be absurd to permit the fear of a futile and dangerous quest for absolute security to preclude prevention as a policy option. Despite its absurdity, this rhetorical charge against prevention is a stock favorite among prevention’s critics. It should be recognized and dismissed for what it is, a debating point with little pragmatic merit. And strategy, though not always policy, **must be nothing if not pragmatic**.

##### Realism is true and inevitable – trying to shift away causes great power war

**Mearsheimer 1** [professor of political science at University of Chicago, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, pg. 361]

The optimists' claim that security competition and war among the great powers has been burned out of the system is wrong. In fact, all of the major states around the globe still care deeply about the balance of power and are destined to compete for power among themselves for the foreseeable future. Consequently, realism will offer the most powerful explanations of international politics over the next century, and this will be true **even if the debates among academic** and policy **elites are dominated by non-realist theories**. In short, the real world remains a realist world. States still fear each other and seek to gain power at each other's expense, because international anarchy-the driving force behind greatpower behavior-did not change with the end of the Cold War, and there are few signs that such change is likely any time soon. States remain the principal actors in world politics and there is still no night watchman standing above them. For sure, the collapse of the Soviet Union caused a major shift in the global distribution of power. But it did not give rise to a change in the anarchic structure of the system, and without that kind of profound change, there is no reason to expect the great powers to behave much differently in the new century than they did in previous centuries.Indeed, considerable evidence from the 1990s indicates that power politics has not disappeared from Europe and Northeast Asia, the regions in which there are two or more great powers, as well as possible great powers such as Germany and Japan. There is no question, however, that the competition for power over the past decade has been low-key. Still, there is potential for intense security competion among the great powers that might lead to a major war. Probably the best evidence of that possibility is the fact that the United States maintains about one hundred thousand troops each in Europe and in Northeast Asia for the explicit purpose of keeping the major states in each region at peace.

##### There is no alternative to capitalism or a clear transition

Kliman, 4 – PhD, Professor of Economics at Pace University

(Andrew, Andrew Kliman’s Writings, “Alternatives to Capitalism: What Happens After the Revolution?” http://akliman.squarespace.com/writings/)

Have we faced the harsh reality that, unless th[e] inseparability between the dialectics of thought and of revolution does exist, any country that does succeed in its revolution may retrogress, since the world revolution cannot occur at one stroke everywhere and world capitalism continues to exist? … [Lenin’s] *practice* of the dialectic of thought as well as of revolution underlined his call for a Third International. Raya Dunayevskaya, “Marxist-Humanist Perspectives, 1985-86” I. Concretizing the Vision of a New Human Society We live at a moment in which it is harder than ever to articulate a liberatory alternative to capitalism. As we all know, the collapse of state-capitalist regimes that called themselves “Communist,” as well as the widespread failures of social democracy to remake society, have given rise to a widespread acceptance of Margaret Thatcher’s TINA – the belief that “there is no alternative.” Yet the difficulty in articulating a liberatory alternative is not mostly the product of these events. It is an inheritance from the past. To what extent has such an alternative ever been articulated? There has been a lot of progress – in theory and especially in practice – on the problem of forms of organization – but new organizational forms by themselves are not yet an alternative. A great many leftists, even revolutionaries, did of course regard nationalized property and the State Plan, under the control of the “vanguard” Party, as socialism, or at least as the basis for a transition to socialism. But even before events refuted this notion, it represented, at best, an evasion of the problem. It was largely a matter of leftists with authoritarian personalities subordinating themselves and others to institutions and power with a blind faith that substituted for thought. How such institutions and such power would result in human liberation was never made clear. Vague references to “transition” were used to wave the problem away. Yet as Marxist-Humanism has stressed for more than a decade, the anti-Stalinist left is also partly responsible for the crisis in thought. It, too, failed to articulate a liberatory alternative, offering in place of private- and state-capitalism little more than what Hegel (*Science of Logic*, Miller trans., pp. 841-42) called “the empty negative … a *presumed* absolute”: The impatience that insists *merely* on getting beyond the *determinate* … and finding itself immediately in the absolute, has before it as cognition nothing but the empty negative, the abstract infinite; in other words, a *presumed* absolute, that is presumed because it is not *posited*, not *grasped*; grasped it can only be through the *mediation* of cognition … . The question that confronts us nowadays is whether we can do better. Is it possible to make the vision of a new human society more concrete and determinate than it now is, through the mediation of cognition? According to a long-standing view in the movement, it is not possible. The character of the new society can only be concretized by practice alone, in the course of trying to remake society. Yet if this is true, we are faced with a vicious circle from which there seems to be no escape, because acceptance of TINA is creating barriers in practice. In the perceived absence of an alternative, practical struggles have proven to be self-limiting at best. They stop short of even tryingto remake society totally – and for good reason. As Bertell Ollman has noted (Introduction to *Market Socialism: The Debate among Socialists*, Routledge, 1998, p. 1), “People who believe [that there is no alternative] will put up with almost any degree of suffering. Why bother to struggle for a change that cannot be? … people [need to] have a good reason for choosing one path into the future rather than another.”

##### Centuries of capitalism and recent space programs empirically deny the impact—they have to prove why the plan makes it worse

##### Vagueness means the alt doesn’t solve

Grossberg 92 – Communication Studies Professor, UNC (Lawrence, We Gotta Get Out of This Place, p 388-90)

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be tempered by the realities of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnation of the evil of capitalism were sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression), is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, "the masses" are **not waiting to be led into revolution**, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide-rather undemocratically, I might add-to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain "civility" in the world. The world system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is simply too weak in the current context to effectively organize people, and **too vague to provide** **any** **direction**.

##### Alternative/movements fail- "last place aversion" sabotages redistribution efforts

Ilyana Kuziemko Assistant Professor of Economics and Public Affairs @ Princeton (also super hot) and Michael I. Norton Associate Professor of Business Administration in the Marketing Unit and Marvin Bower Fellow at the Harvard Business School (so so looking )http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=occupy-wall-street-psychology 10-12-11

If ever Americans were up for a bit of class warfare, now would seem to be the time. The current financial downturn has led to a $700 billion tax-payer-financed bank bailout and an unemployment rate stuck stubbornly above nine percent. Onto this scene has stepped the Occupy Wall Street (OWS) movement, which seeks to bring together a disparate group of protesters united in their belief that the current income distribution is unfair. “The one thing we all have in common is that We are the 99% that will no longer tolerate the greed and corruption of the 1%,” says their website. In an era of bank bailouts and rising poverty – and where recent data show that the top 1 percent control as much as 35 percent of the total wealth in America – it would appear that the timing of this movement to reconsider the allocation of wealth could not be more perfect. Or, maybe not. Support for redistribution, surprisingly enough, has plummeted during the recession. For years, the General Social Survey has asked individuals whether “government should reduce income differences between the rich and the poor.” Agreement with this statement dropped dramatically between 2008 and 2010, the two most recent years of data available. Other surveys have shown similar results. What might explain this trend? First, the change is not driven by wealthy white Republicans reacting against President Obama’s agenda: the drop is if anything slightly larger among minorities, and Americans who self-identify as having below average income show the same decrease in support for redistribution as wealthier Americans. Our recent research suggests that, far from being surprised that many working-class individuals would oppose redistribution, we might actually expect their opposition to rise during times of turmoil – despite the fact that redistribution appears to be in their economic interest. Our work suggests that people exhibit a fundamental loathing for being near or in last place – what we call “last place aversion.” This fear can lead people near the bottom of the income distribution to oppose redistribution because it might allow people at the very bottom to catch up with them or even leapfrog past them. How does last-place aversion play out with regard to redistribution? In our surveys, we asked Americans whether they supported an increase to the minimum wage, currently $7.25 per hour. Those making $7.25 or below were very likely to support the increase – after all, they would be immediate beneficiaries. In addition, people making substantially more than $7.25 were also fairly positive towards the increase. Which group was the most opposed? Those making just above the minimum wage, between $7.26 and $8.25. We might expect people who make just below and just above $7.25 to have similar lifestyles and policy attitudes – but in this case, while those making below $7.25 would benefit if the minimum wage were raised to, say, $8.25, those making just above $7.25 would run the risk of falling into a tie for last place. We’ve also found evidence of last place aversion in laboratory experiments. In one, we created an artificial income distribution by endowing individuals with different sums of money and showing them their “rank”– with each rank separated by $1. We then gave them an additional $2, which they had to give to either the person directly below or directly above them in the distribution. In this income distribution, of course, giving $2 to the person below you means he will jump ahead of you in rank. In our experiments, most people still give to the person below them – after all, the alternative is to give $2 to a person who already has more money than you. People in second-to-last place, however, who would fall to last place when giving the money to the person below them, are the least likely to do so: so strong is their desire to avoid last place that they choose to give the money to a wealthier person (the person above them) nearly half the time. If Americans behave like people in our experiments, then it could be challenging to unite those in the bottom of the income distribution to support redistribution.

# AFF EVIDENCE ROUND 6

## 2ac prolif

##### R and D directly ensures LFTR development

Lollis, 11 [October 10th, Ms. Tina, Funding for Liquid-Fluoride Thorium Reactor, Online Petition Request to the Obama Administration done via an independent third party, <http://www.thepetitionsite.com/2/Green-Energy/>]

We the undersigned petition you, the Obama Administration for a cleaner, more stable and sustainable energy source. During the years of the Johnson Administration they experimented with Molten-Salt Reactors using the natural element of Thorium, which we have have an abundance of buried in the Nevada desert. With use of the Liquid-Fluoride Thorium Reactors (LFTR), you will not only provide a cleaner, sustainable energy source to the United States, but to the world, as well. Using thorium has many advantages: -Research has already been conducted (reactor active from 1965-1969 Molten Salt Reactor Experiment). -One hundred grams of Thorium meets the current US citizen's lifetime energy needs. -LFTR 'burns' nearly all of its fuel. -Current Light Water Reactors burn only 3.4% of fuel, the rest is introduced into the waste stream. -LFTR generates much less waste. -LFTR burns existing nuclear waste as a fuel source. -The Thorium decay chain produces medical isotopes including Bi-213 (Distributed Cancers). -Thorium is abundant enough in the United States to achieve Energy Independence. -LFTR is passively safe, in a full power loss, LFTR cools naturally (No chance of meltdown via power-loss/natural disaster). -LFTR is perfect for Desalinization. -LFTR could completely replace fossil fuels as our grids energy source. -Thorium is 120x more abundant naturally than fissile uranium. -Known US Thorium reserves represent well over 500 years our current TOTAL power consumption. -Thorium fuel cycles does NOT produce weapons grade waste. -Kirk Sorenson has been invited to speak to Google about this tech multiple times. -Energy Independence has massive implications on our federal budget deficit. This, and many other benefits could be found by funding further research and development of a Thorium LFTR reactors. China, France, and other countries are currently working on this technology. It would be a great travesty to allow technology we developed 50 years ago, to be commercialized by the other great nations on this earth and fall behind with a 50 year head start. Thorium LFTR technology, is Green and Sustainable Technology. The resource is sufficiently large to be inexhaustible on a large scale time frame (500-5000 years in proven reserves per current energy usage). The resource is Green because of its lack of airborne greenhouse gasses, along with its ability to completely replace dirty fossil fuels. Kirk Sorenson projects 2-5 years for a prototype, 300-400million dollars, 5-10 years for commercial production.

##### And, the plan accelerates development

Barton, ‘9

[Charles, retired counselor, writes for Energy From Thorium, “The Liquid Fluoride Thorium Paradigm,” http://www.theoildrum.com/node/4971/]

The Obama campaign, properly in my opinion, opposed the Yucca Mountain nuclear repository. Indeed, there is a far more effective way to use the $25 billion collected from utilities over the past 40 years to deal with waste disposal. This fund should be used to develop fast reactors that consume nuclear waste, and thorium reactors to prevent the creation of new long-lived nuclear waste. By law the federal government must take responsibility for existing spent nuclear fuel, so inaction is not an option. Accelerated development of fast and thorium reactors will allow the US to fulfill its obligations to dispose of the nuclear waste, and open up a source of carbon-free energy that can last centuries, even millennia. It is commonly assumed that 4th generation nuclear power will not be ready before 2030. That is a safe assumption under "business-as-usual”. However, given high priority it is likely that it could be available sooner. It is specious to argue that R&D on 4th generation nuclear power does not deserve support because energy efficiency and renewable energies may be able to satisfy all United States electrical energy needs. Who stands ready to ensure that energy needs of China and India will be entirely met by efficiency and renewables?

**And, LFTR’s are impervious to prolif – shifting away from uranium is key**

**Martin, 12** [May 8th, Richard, A contributing editor for Wired since 2002, he has written about energy, for Time, Fortune, The Atlantic, and the Asian Wall Street Journal, editorial director for Pike Research, the leading cleantech research and analysis firm, former Technology Producer for ABCNews.com, Technology Editor for The Industry Standard (2000-2001), and Editor-at- Large for Information Week (2005-2008), recipient of the “Excellence in Feature Writing" Award from the Society for Professional Journalists and the White Award for Investigative Reporting, Educated at Yale and the University of Hong Kong, , “SuperFuel: Thorium, the Green Energy Source for the Future”, ISBN 978—0»230-116474]

IN REPORTING ON THE THORIUM POWER MOVEMENT, I heard plenty of reasons why it would never work. After a year or so I classified them into three categories: market barriers, challenges related to waste and proliferation, and what I came to call the traditionalist argument. The market-based argument is simple: the nuclear power industry has a fuel today that is abundant and inexpensive. Why should it switch to a new, relatively unproven fuel? These assumptions are faulty (uranium may well not be inexpensive and plentiful much longer—see the comments of Srikumar Banerjee, chair of India’s Atomic Energy Commission, from chapter 7). More important, this argument does not take into account the broader costs and risks of uranium-based nuclear power, which have been highlighted by the Fukushima-Daiichi accident. There’s little chance of nuclear power’s fulfilling its promise until those costs are driven down—by shifting to thorium power. The waste and proliferation issues are more complicated, and I will break them down into four elements.“ In distilled form they sum up the objections to thorium from both the nuclear establishment and antinuclear groups. 1. The use of enriched uranium or plutonium in thorium fuel to ignite the fission reaction carries proliferation risks, and U-233 is as useful as Pu-239 for making nuclear bombs. This is the central claim of those who dismiss thorium’s prospects for reducing the nuclear waste stream: Solid-fuel thorium reactors produce both U233 (the fissile daughter element of Th232) and plutonium, so what’s the difference? What’s more, thorium reactors require lowenriched uranium or plutonium to initiate the fission reaction, thus creating more material that can be refined into bombs. The kernel of truth here is that the U233 (and thus the plutonium as well) created in the transmutation of thorium is contaminated by U232, one of the nastiest isotopes in the universe. With a half-life of less than 70 years, U-232 decays into the radioisotopes bismuth-212 and thallium-208, which emit intense gamma rays that make it very, very hard to handle and transport (not to mention reprocess) and that would very likely destroy the electronics of any weapon into which they were built. Theoretically, it's possible to make a bomb with U-233, but plutonium is much easier to make and does not come with the problematic U-232. Militaries will always opt for plutonium and U235, because they can't afford to expose their personnel to the deadly risks of U232. As for terrorists, they'd be better off simply buying natural uranium on the open market and finding a way to enrich it. The United States reportedly tested bombs with U-233 cores in the late 1950s, but no country has ever included it as a material as a part of its nuclear weapons program. It's useless even for the most zealous of hypothetical suicide bombers, because they’d probably never reach their target. 2. Most proposed thorium reactors require reprocessing to separate out the U-233 for use in fresh fuel. As with conventional uranium power plants that include reprocessing, bomb-making material is separated out, making it vulnerable to theft or diversion. This is a tired canard. Never mind that every nuclear fuel cycle currently in production or contemplated generates “bomb-making material” -- this statement ignores the realities of weapons building. Most Gen IV designs described in this chapter involve fuel recycling; indeed, as the Peterson report stated, recycling is critical to the future of nuclear power. To be sure, reprocessing spent fuel rods from a solid fuel thorium reactor is not a simple matter, whether you’re making bombs or new fuel. But it’s important to note that, as with all these arguments, external reprocessing is necessary only for solid fuel reactors, not LFTRs. Alone among advanced reactor designs, LFTRs have the capacity to reprocess the fuel in the reactor building itself, while the reactor is operating. There’s no opportunity for diversion unless you raid the entire plant, shut down the reactor, and figure out a way to separate and abscond with the weaponizable isotopes. Good luck with that. 3. The claim that radioactive waste from thorium reactors creates waste that would have to be isolated from the environment for only 500 years, whereas irradiated uranium-only fuel remains dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years, is false. Thorium-based reactors create long-lived fission products like technetium-99 (its half-life is more than 200,000 years), and thorium- 232 is extremely long lived (its half-life is 14 billion years). This argument ignores the larger context. The volume of fission products from thorium-based solid fuel reactors is about a tenth of that from conventional reactors. What's more, in small amounts, many of these fission products have become common in modern life. Technetium-99, for example, is powerful stuff, worthy of respectful treatment; it’s also commonly used, in a slightly altered form, in medical imaging procedures. Millions of patients ingest it every day without significant risk. The amounts of technetium-99 produced in solid-fuel thorium reactors would be negligible; in LFTRs it would be processed off along with other fission products and largely recycled. Some geological storage will be required, but in general waste from LFTRs decays to safe, stable states within a few hundred years, far less than the millennia required for the by-products of uranium reactors. As for Th-232, it's long lived but safe. The longerlived a radioactive element is, the lower its radioactivity, with its very long half-life, Th-232 is an exceedingly weak producer of radiation. It is so common that it's found in small amounts in virtually all rock, soil, and water. You could sleep with it under your pillow and suffer no ill effects. 4. Reprocessing of thorium fuel cycles has not been successful because uranium-232 is created along with uranium-233. U-232, which has a halflife of about 70 years, is extremely radioactive and is therefore quite dangerous in small quantities. U-232 is indeed extremely radioactive, but its brief half-life means that in less than a century half of it will have decayed to a stable form. Because isotopes decay at a geometric rate (50 percent of half of the original material, or one-quarter of the original, is still radioactive after another 70 years, then one-eighth, one-sixteenth, and so on), the decrease in radioactivity drops off quickly. Many, many hazardous materials are put in storage for centuries. We do not object to them. To summarize, the most common objections to thorium power from the perspective of radioactive waste and the proliferation of nuclear weapons are inflated for solid fuel reactors, and they simply do not apply to LFTRs. That leaves the traditionalist argument, which essentially echoes Milton Shaw and the WASH-1222 report from 1972: It can’t be done because it has never been done before. When I heard this brand of defeatism, it always came from someone with a vested interest in the current nuclear power establishment. I’ll explore the traditionalist argument in more detail in the final pages of this book.

##### The plan sets an international proliferation standard – best data proves

Grae, 08 [Seth Grae, President and CEO, Thorium Power Ltd'Thorium Power can play a key role in India's nuclear industry', <http://www.ltbridge.com/assets/7.pdf>]

Why is efficient and modern nuclear fuel technology important? Modern fuel technology is vitally important because the future of nuclear power depends on the industry's ability to address the lingering concerns—proliferation, waste and operating economics. All across the world, there are hundreds of new reactors in planning or at different stages of development. But everyone acknowledges the concerns and almost everyone agrees that we can't deploy 20th century technology in order to build a 21st century industry. We need advanced nuclear fuel technology that is safe, viable and economical. The IAEA and World Nuclear Association agree that thorium is an optimal alternative to uranium fuel and there is a clear movement towards thorium fuel. Also, India has always been at the scientific and technological forefront, and India's experts understand the distinct advantages of using thorium in the nuclear fuel cycle. Thorium Power is uniquely positioned to establish a new standard in non-proliferation because we know that the promise of safe nuclear power will only be realised if and when we deploy advanced, non-proliferative fuel-based solutions.

## 2ac topicality

##### We meet –

##### Counter interp – R&D is topical and the following laundry list

US Energy Information Administration, 1 (Renewable Energy 2000: Issues and Trends, Report prepared by the US Energy Information Administration, “Incentives, Mandates, and Government Programs for Promoting Renewable Energy”, http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/ftproot/renewables/06282000.pdf)

Over the years, incentives and mandates for renewable energy have been used to advance different energy policies, such as ensuring energy security or promoting environmentally benign energy sources. Renewable energy has beneficial attributes, such as low emissions and replenishable energy supply, that are not fully reflected in the market price. Accordingly, governments have used a variety of programs to promote renewable energy resources, technologies, and renewable-based transportation fuels.1 This paper discusses: (1) financial incentives and regulatory mandates used by Federal and State governments and Federal research and develop- ment (R&D),2, 3 and (2) their effectiveness in promoting renewables. A financial incentive is defined in this report as providing one or more of the following benefits: • A transfer of economic resources by the Government to the buyer or seller of a good or service that has the effect of reducing the price paid, or, increasing the price received, respectively; • Reducing the cost of production of the good or service; or, • Creating or expanding a market for producers. 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.4 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.

## 2ac counterplan

##### Only congressional action solves – overcomes external resistance

Farley, 07 [Peter, “Cleaner Nuclear Power?”, <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/409099/cleaner-nuclear-power/>]

Nuclear watchdogs say that Thorium Power's technology has real potential. Moreover, they say that the legislation is needed. It would force the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which regulates the nuclear industry, to create new offices at the agencies to study thorium-fuel options and promote their use abroad. Advertisement http://sync.mathtag.com/sync/img?type=sync&mt_exid=20&redir=http%3a%2f%2fdis.criteo.com%2fpump%2fmatch.aspx%3fc%3d2%26uid%3d%5bMM_UUID%5d "It makes a lot of sense in my view," says Thomas Cochran, director of the nuclear program at the [Natural Resources Defense Council](http://www.nrdc.org/), in Washington. He says that congressional action is needed to overcome resistance within the DOE to exploring thorium.

##### Doesn’t solve the case – restrictions are codified in federal law – prevents the requisite licensing, means the cp fails to cause commercialization – that’s 1ac Martin

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

In the United States, it is the responsibility of industry to design, construct, and operate commercial nuclear power plants. However, DOE has statutory authority under the Atomic Energy Act to promote and support nuclear energy technologies for commercial applications. In general, appropriate government roles include researching high-potential technologies beyond the investment horizon of industry and also reducing the technical risks of new technologies. In the case of new commercial reactor designs, potential areas of NE involvement could include: Enabling new technologies to be inserted into emerging and future designs by providing access to unique laboratory resources for new technology development and, where appropriate, demonstration. • Working through the laboratories and universities to provide unique expertise and facilities to industry for R&D in the areas of: o Innovative concepts and advanced technologies. o Fundamental phenomena and performance data. o Advanced modeling and simulation capabilities. APRIL 2010 22 34 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP o New technology testing and, if appropriate, demonstration. o Advanced manufacturing methods. Representative R&D activities that support each of the roles stated above are presented below. The level of DOE investment relative to industry investment will vary across the spectrum of these activities, with a generally increasing trend in DOE investment for longer-term activities. Finally, there is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaborations with other nations through multilateral and bilateral agreements including the Generation IV International Forum, which is investigating multiple advanced reactor concepts. DOE is also a participant in OECD/NEA and IAEA initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems.

And, doesn’t solve prolif leadership - Hargraves and Wallace say only a national initiative sends a credible signal and creates barriers to use – NRC credibility is key that’s Bengelsdorf – only federal action solves nuclear cred

Fertel, 05 - Senior Vice President And Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute (Marvin, CQ Congressional Testimony, “NUCLEAR POWER'S PLACE IN A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY,” 4/28, lexis) //DH

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the federal government's nuclear energy programs, and to maintain America's leadership in nuclear technology development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation. Such efforts have provided a dramatic contribution to global security, as evidenced by the U.S.-Russian nonproliferation agreement to recycle weapons-grade material from Russia for use in American reactors. Currently, more than 50 percent of U.S. nuclear power plant fuel depends on converted Russian warhead material. Nowhere is continued congressional oversight more important than with DOE's program to manage the used nuclear fuel from our nuclear power plants. Continued progress toward a federal used nuclear fuel repository is necessary to support nuclear energy's vital role in a comprehensive national energy policy and to support the remediation of DOE defense sites. Since enactment of the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, DOE's federal repository program has repeatedly overcome challenges, and challenges remain before the Yucca Mountain facility can begin operation. But as we address these issues, it is important to keep the overall progress of the program in context. There is international scientific consensus that a deep geologic repository is the best solution for long-term disposition of used military and commercial nuclear power plant fuel and high-level radioactive byproducts. The Bush administration and Congress, with bipartisan support, affirmed the suitability of Yucca Mountain for a repository in 2002. Over the past three years, the Energy Department and its contractors have made considerable progress providing yet greater confirmation that this is the correct course of action and that Yucca Mountain is an appropriate site for a national repository. --During the past year, federal courts have rejected significant legal challenges by the state of Nevada and others to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the 2002 Yucca Mountain site suitability determination. These challenges questioned the constitutionality of the Yucca Mountain Development Act and DOE's repository system, which incorporates both natural and engineered barriers to contain radioactive material safely. In the coming year, Congress will play an essential role in keeping this program on schedule, by taking the steps necessary to provide increased funding for the project in fiscal 2006 and in future years. Meeting DOE's schedule for initial repository operation requires certainty in funding for the program. This is particularly critical in view of projected annual expenditures that will exceed $1 billion beginning in fiscal 2007. Meeting these budget requirements calls for a change in how Congress provides funds to the project from monies collected for the Nuclear Waste Fund. The history of Yucca Mountain funding is evidence that the current funding approach must be modified. Consumer fees (including interest) committed to the Nuclear Waste Fund since its f6rmation in 1983 total more than $24 billion. Consumers are projected to pay between $750 million to $800 million to the fund each year, based on electricity generated at the nation's 103 reactors. This is more than $2 million per day. Although about $8 billion has been used for the program, the balance in the fund is nearly $17 billion. In each of the past several years, there has been a gap between the annual fees paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants and disbursements from the fund for use by DOE at Yucca Mountain. Since the fund was first established, billions of dollars paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants to the Nuclear Waste Fund-intended solely for the federal government's used fuel program-in effect have been used to decrease budget deficits or increase surpluses. The industry believes that Congress should change the funding mechanism for Yucca Mountain so that payments to the Nuclear Waste Fund can be used only for the project and be excluded from traditional congressional budget caps. Although the program should remain subject to congressional oversight, Yucca Mountain appropriations should not compete each year for funding with unrelated programs when Congress directed a dedicated funding stream for the project. The industry also believes that it is appropriate and necessary to consider an alternative perspective on the Yucca Mountain project. This alternative would include an extended period for monitoring operation of the repository for up to 300 years after spent fuel is first placed underground. The industry believes that this approach would provide ongoing assurance and greater confidence that the repository is performing as designed, that public safety is assured, and that the environment is protected. It would also permit DOE to apply evolving innovative technologies at the repository. Through this approach, a scientific monitoring program would identify additional scientific information that can be used in repository performance models. The project then could update the models, and make modifications in design and operations as appropriate. Congressional committees like this one can help ensure that DOE does not lose sight of its responsibility for used nuclear fuel management and disposal, as stated by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. The industry fully supports the fundamental need for a repository so that used nuclear fuel and the byproducts of the nation's nuclear weapons program are securely managed in an underground, specially designed facility. World-class science has demonstrated that Yucca Mountain is the best site for that facility. A public works project of this magnitude will inevitably face challenges. Yet, none is insurmountable. DOE and its contractors have made significant progress on the project and will continue to do so as the project enters the licensing phase. Congressional oversight also can play a key role in maintaining and encouraging the stability of the NRC's regulatory process. Such stability is essential for our 103 operating nuclear plants and equally critical in licensing new nuclear power plants. Congress played a key role several years ago in encouraging the NRC to move toward a new oversight process for the nation's nuclear plants, based on quantitative performance indicators and safety significance. Today's reactor oversight process is designed to focus industry and NRC resources on equipment, components and operational issues that have the greatest importance to, and impact on, safety. The NRC and the industry have worked hard to identify and implement realistic security requirements at nuclear power plants. In the three-and-a-half years since 9/11, the NRC has issued a series of requirements to increase security and enhance training for security programs. The industry complied-fully and rapidly. In the days and months following Sept. 11, quick action was required. Orders that implemented needed changes quickly were necessary. Now, we should return to the orderly process of regulating through regulations. The industry has spent more than $1 billion enhancing security since September 2001. We've identified and fixed vulnerabilities. Today, the industry is at the practical limit of what private industry can do to secure our facilities against the terrorist threat. NRC Chairman Nils Diaz and other commissioners have said that the industry has achieved just about everything that can be reasonably achieved by a civilian force. The industry now needs a transition period to stabilize the new security requirements. We need time to incorporate these dramatic changes into our operations and emergency planning programs and to train our employees to the high standards of our industry-and to the appropriately high expectations of the NRC. Both industry and the NRC need congressional oversight to support and encourage this kind of stability. CONCLUSION Electricity generated by America's nuclear power plants over the past half-century has played a key part in our nation's growth and prosperity. Nuclear power produces over 20 percent of the electricity used in the United States today without producing air pollution. As our energy demands continue to grow in years to come, nuclear power should play an even greater role in meeting our energy and environmental needs. The nuclear energy industry is operating its reactors safely and efficiently. The industry is striving to produce more electricity from existing plants. The industry is also developing more efficient, next-generation reactors and exploring ways to build them more cost-effectively. The public sector, including the oversight committees of the U.S. Congress, can help maintain the conditions that ensure Americans will continue to reap the benefits of our operating plants, and create the conditions that will spur investment in America's energy infrastructure, including new nuclear power plants. One important step is passage of comprehensive energy legislation that recognizes nuclear energy's contributions to meeting our growing energy demands, ensuring our nation's energy security and protecting our environment. Equally important, however, is the need to ensure effective and efficient implementation of existing laws, like the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and to provide federal agencies with the resources and oversight necessary to discharge their statutory responsibilities in the most efficient way possible. The commercial nuclear power sector was born in the United States, and nations around the world continue to look to this nation for leadership in this technology and in the issues associated with nuclear power. Our ability to influence critical international policies in areas like nuclear nonproliferation, for example, depends on our ability to maintain a leadership role in prudent deployment, use and regulation of nuclear energy technologies here at home, in the United States, and on our ability to manage the technological and policy challenges-like waste management-that arise with all advanced technologies.

##### And, policy through the DOE is essential to create effective international norms and spur tech development

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

A goal-driven, science-based approach is essential to achieving the stated objectives while exploring new technologies and seeking transformational advances. This science-based approach, depicted in Figure 1, combines theory, experimentation, and high-performance modeling and simulation to develop the fundamental understanding that will lead to new technologies. Advanced modeling and simulation tools will be used in conjunction with smaller-scale, phenomenon-specific experiments informed by theory to reduce the need for large, expensive integrated experiments. Insights gained by advanced modeling and simulation can lead to new theoretical understanding and, in turn, can improve models and experimental design. This R&D must be informed by the basic research capabilities in the DOE Office of Science (SC). NE maintains access to a broad range of facilities to support its research activities. Hot cells and test reactors are at the top of the hierarchy, followed by smaller-scale radiological facilities, specialty engineering facilities, and small non-radiological laboratories. NE employs a multi-pronged approach to having these capabilities available when needed. The core capabilities rely on DOE-owned irradiation, examination, chemical processing and waste form development facilities. These are supplemented by university capabilities ranging from research reactors to materials science laboratories. In the course of conducting this science-based R&D, viii APRIL 2010 10 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP infrastructure needs will be evaluated and considered through the established planning and budget development processes. There is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaboration with other nations via multilateral and bilateral agreements, including the Generation IV International Forum. DOE is also a participant in Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development/Nuclear Energy Agency (OECD/NEA) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems. In addition to these R&D activities, international interaction supported by NE and other government agencies will be essential in establishment of international norms and control regimes to address and mitigate proliferation concerns.

##### Only congressional r&d solves worker shortages

**Kammen, 03** - professor of nuclear engineering at Berkeley (Daniel, Federal News Service, Prepared Testimony before the House Committee on Science, 6/12, lexis) //DH

The federal government plays the pivotal role in the encouragement of innovation in the energy sector. Not only are federal funds critical, but as my work and that of others has demonstrated6, private funds generally follow areas of public sector support. One particularly useful metric although certainly not the only measure --. of the relationship between funding and innovation is based on patents. Total public sector funding and the number of patents - across all disciplines in the United States have both increased steadily over at least the past three decades (Figure 5). The situation depicted here, with steadily increasing trends for funding and results (measured imperfectly, but consistently, by patents) is not as rosy when energy R&D alone is considered. In that case the same close correlation exists, but the funding pattern has been one of decreasing resources (Figure 6A). Figure 6A shows energy funding levels (symbol: o) and patents held by the national laboratories (symbol: ). The situation need not be as bleak as it seems. During the 1980s a number of changes in U.S. patent law permitted the national laboratories to engage in patent partnerships with the private sector. This increased both the interest in developing patents, and increased the interest by the private sector in pursuing patents on energy technologies. The squares (l) in figure 6 show that overall patents in the energy sector derived. Figure 6B reveals that patent levels in the nuclear field have declined, but not only that, publicprivate partnerships have taken placed (shaded bars), but have not increased as dramatically as in energy field overall (Figure 6A). There are a number of issues here, so a simple comparison of nuclear R&D to that on for example, fuel cells, is not appropriate. But it is a valid to explore ways to increase both the diversity of the R&D. This is a particularly important message for **federal** policy. Novel approaches are needed to encourage new and innovative modes of research, teaching, and industrial innovation in the nuclear energy field. To spur innovation in nuclear science a concerted effort would be needed to increase the types and levels of cooperation by universities and industries in areas that depart significantly from the current 'Generation III+' and equally, away from the 'Generation IV' designs. Similar conclusions were reached by M. Granger Morgan, head of the Engineering and Public Policy Program at Carnegie Mellon University, in his evaluation of the need for innovative in the organization and sociology of the U. S. nuclear power industrys. A second important issue that this Committee might consider is the degree of **federal** support for nuclear fission relative to other nations. Funding levels in the U.S. are significantly lower than in both Japan and France. Far from recommending higher public sector funding, what is arguably a more successful strategy would be to increase the private sector support for nuclear R&D and student training fellowships. Importantly, this is precisely the sort of expanded publicprivate partnership that has been relatively successful in the energy sector generally. It is incorrect, however, to think that this is a process that can be left to the private sector. There are key issues that inhibit private sector innovation. As one example, many nuclear operating companies have large coal assets, and thus are unlikely to push overly hard, in areas that threaten another core business. This emphasis on industry resources used to support and expanded nuclear program - under careful public sector management - has been echoed by a variety of nuclear engineering faculty members: I believe that if you. were to survey nuclear engineering department heads, most would select a national policy to support new nuclear construction, over a policy to increase direct financial support to nuclear engineering departments. A firm commitment by the federal government, to create incentives sufficient to ensure the construction of a modest number of new nuclear plants, with the incentives reduced for subsequent plants, would be the best thing that could possibly be done for nuclear engineering education and revitalization of the national workforce for nuclear science and technology. - Professor Per Peterson, Chair, Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

##### The impact is the case

**BENGELSDORF, 07** – consultant and former director of both key State and Energy Department offices that are concerned with international nuclear and nonproliferation affair (HAROLD, “THE U.S. DOMESTIC CIVIL NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE AND U.S. NONPROLIFERATION POLICY”, White Paper prepared for the American Council on Global Nuclear Competitiveness May, <http://www.nuclearcompetitiveness.org/images/COUNCIL_WHITE_PAPER_Final.pdf)//DH>

Thus the challenge the U.S. nuclear industry faces today is whether the U.S. civil nuclear infrastructure will be strong enough to support a hoped for nuclear revival in this country, which could entail the construction and commissioning of up to eight nuclear power units during the 2010 to 2017 period. Several studies have been devoted to this question, and the answer is by no means certain. The shortage in skilled labor is expected to double in this country by the year 2020 and the workforce will stop growing as the baby boomers start to retire.

##### Courts cant rule on energy production restrictions – violates ‘Political Question’ doctrine

Matthew Hall (JD, Loyola Law School, former associate attorney at a litigation firm, and was an Adjunct Professor of Law at Loyola Law School) Winter 2010 “ A Catastrophic Conundrum, But Not a Nuisance: Why the Judicial Branch is Ill-Suited to Set Emissions Restrictions on Domestic Energy Producers Through the Common Law Nuisance Doctrine” 13 Chap. L. Rev. 265, Lexis

However, the judicial branch cannot be the body which sets any sort of broad based policy on global warming. To begin with, it can be argued that Congress has already spoken on the appropriate timing for the implementation of any emissions restrictions on domestic energy producers. 13 Both houses of Congress separately urged that no emissions restrictions be agreed to absent a comprehensive global agreement by which other nations, including developing countries, agree to reduce their own emissions accordingly. 14 The theory behind such a policy would be that enacting domestic restrictions prior to completing negotiations on a global agreement would reduce the President's bargaining power in seeking emission reduction concessions from other nations. Congress likewise enacted legislation prohibiting domestic enforcement of the Kyoto Protocol on the grounds that it does not require developing nations to reduce their emissions. 15 If Congress has announced a policy of refraining from restricting domestic emissions absent a global agreement, any decision from the judiciary in contravention of this policy would be prohibited by the political question doctrine. 16 Even if Congress has yet to announce an official policy stance, the judicial branch would run afoul of the political [\*268] question doctrine should it attempt to set a broad based emissions reduction policy. The political question doctrine prohibits the judicial branch from issuing decisions which would require an "initial policy determination" of a kind not ordinarily made by the courts. 17 In order to create carbon dioxide emission restrictions, the judicial branch would be charged with making numerous value-based policy decisions. 18 These policy decisions would include whether the United States, as a nation, should commit to emissions restrictions for energy producers before a global accord is reached, and if so, the court would be required to weigh domestic economic interests against the need for emissions reductions to determine the appropriate schedule and degree of the required reductions. 19 In fact, the inordinate policy setting that would be required by a court in this context would exceed even those decisions made by courts widely accused of demonstrating unrestrained judicial activism - the New Deal era court and the Warren Court. 20 Through comparison to the "activist" decisions of these courts, it becomes apparent that judicial creation and implementation of emissions restrictions for domestic energy producers would be extraordinary action for the judicial branch to undertake. In short, the judicial branch is faced with a conundrum in its attempts to set emission standards: if it attempts to set widespread policy, it runs afoul of the political question doctrine, but it if tries to narrowly tailor emissions restrictions to a given defendant, the impact of the decision would be so slight on the consequences of global warming that the redressability prong of traditional Article III standing analysis cannot be met. As such, the only appropriate means by which to regulate carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gas emissions is through the other coordinate branches of government.

##### Court rulings link to elections – political backlash from Obama and congress overwhelms – dramatically swings popular opinion

Eric Hamilton (J.D. Candidate, Stanford Law School, 2013) August 30, 2012 “Politicizing the Supreme Court” http://www.stanfordlawreview.org/online/politicizing-supreme-court

To state the obvious, Americans do not trust the federal government, and that includes the Supreme Court. Americans believe politics played “too great a role” in the recent health care cases by a greater than two-to-one margin.[1] Only thirty-seven percent of Americans express more than some confidence in the Supreme Court.[2] Academics continue to debate how much politics actually influences the Court, but Americans are excessively skeptical. They do not know that almost half of the cases this Term were decided unanimously, and the Justices’ voting pattern split by the political party of the president to whom they owe their appointment in fewer than seven percent of cases.[3] Why the mistrust? When the Court is front-page, above-the-fold news after the rare landmark decision or during infrequent U.S. Senate confirmation proceedings, political rhetoric from the President and Congress drowns out the Court. Public perceptions of the Court are shaped by politicians’ arguments “for” or “against” the ruling or the nominee, which usually fall along partisan lines and sometimes are based on misleading premises that ignore the Court’s special, nonpolitical responsibilities.

## 2ac elections

**No spillover—otherwise Georgia would have ended the relationship**

**Blank 9** (Stephen J., Professor of Research – Strategic Studies Institute, “Prospects for US-Russian Security Cooperation”, March, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB892.pdf)

Many might argue that this is a singularly inauspicious time to assess the prospects for U.S.- Russian security cooperation. Arguably, the prospects for bilateral cooperation lay buried under the wheels of Russia’s invasion of Georgia in August 2008. As Vice-President Richard Cheney has said to Georgian President Mikhail Saakashvili, “Russian aggression must not go unanswered,” and that “its continuation would have serious consequences for its relations with the United States.”1 Undoubtedly this invasion will have repercussions across the broad bilateral agenda, most of all insofar as regional security in the Caucasus is concerned. But ultimately, given their power, standing, and nuclear capability, dialogue and cooperation will be resumed at some point in the future. Therefore, an analysis of the prospects for and conditions favoring such cooperation is an urgent and important task that cries out for clarification precisely because current U.S.-Russian relations are so difficult. Russia, despite claims made for and against its importance, remains, by any objective standard, a key player in world affairs. It possesses this standing by virtue of its geographical location, Eurasia, its proximity to multiple centers of international tension and rivalry, its possession of a large conventional and nuclear force, its energy assets, and its seat on the UN Security Council. Beyond those attributes, it is an important barometer of trends in world politics, e.g., the course of democratization in the world. Furthermore, if Russia were so disposed, it could be the abettor and/or supporter of a host of negative trends in the world today. Indeed, some American elites might argue that it already is doing so. Even so, if U.S. policymakers and analysts see Russia more as a spoiler than as a constructive partner (whether rightly or wrongly), the fact remains that during the Cold War the Soviet Union was an active supporter of threats to world order such as international terrorism, and carried on a global arms race with the West. We negotiated productively with it on issues like arms control and proliferation.2 Today, no matter how bad Russo-American or East-West relations may be, no such threats are present or immediately discernible on the horizon.

**Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, economic concerns, and nuclear security**

**Graham 2007** (Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html, WEA)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

##### Environmental issues don’t swing the election -- they’re a low priority for voters.

Bowman, 4-18-12 [Karlyn, American Enterprise Institute, “Polls on the environment, energy, global warming and nuclear power,” http://www.aei.org/papers/politics-and-public-opinion/polls/polls-on-the-environment-energy-global-warming-and-nuclear-power-april-2012/]

In this annual compilation of polling data includes six major sections on the environment, key issues and findings include: \* In most polls, President Obama is receiving positive marks on the environment. In the February 2012 AP-GfK/Roper poll, 57 percent approved but 40 percent disapproved of his handling of the issue. In the March 2012 Pew poll, ratings of his handling of energy policy were even lower: 42 percent approved and 45 percent disapproved. \* The environment is not an issue on the front burner for most Americans today. In Pew’s 2012 question about priorities for President Obama and Congress, 43 percent said “protecting the environment” should be a top priority. As a point of comparison, 86 percent said strengthening the nation’s economy should be a top priority. \* Global warming doesn’t rank at or near the top of issues people want the president and Congress to address. In January 2012, 25 percent said global warming should be a top priority, ranking at the bottom in terms of top priorities.

##### Public supports nuclear power expansion -- no safety concerns.

Bowman, 4-18-12 [Karlyn, American Enterprise Institute, “Polls on the environment, energy, global warming and nuclear power,” http://www.aei.org/papers/politics-and-public-opinion/polls/polls-on-the-environment-energy-global-warming-and-nuclear-power-april-2012/]

\* President Obama is getting low marks on his handling of gas prices. In a February 2012 AP/GfK-Roper poll, 39 percent approved of the job he is doing in this area. Significant majorities say rising gas prices have caused difficulties in their households. \* The majority of Americans still think nuclear power is safe. In a March 2012 Gallup poll, 57 percent favored using nuclear energy as one way to provide electricity for the United States. But people still wouldn’t want to build a nuclear plant in their backyard. Only 35 percent told CBS pollsters in March 2011 that they would approve of a nuclear power plant in their community, and 62 percent disapproved. \* Americans like an “all-of-the-above” energy strategy that includes more energy production, developing alternative energy sources, more conservation and nuclear power.

##### Fukashima was a blip – people forgot

Duffy 12 – MD of Ipsos MORI Social Research Institute (Bob, November 3rd, “After Fukushima Public Opinion is Still Unclear on Nuclear Power” <http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/bobby-duffy/fukushima-public-opinion-nuclear_b_1335016.html_>) Jacome

The tragedy at Fukushima one year ago has had a hugely varied impact on public opinion and energy policy around the world. In our polling immediately afterwards, the effect seemed likely to be significant: a quarter of those who opposed nuclear power in the 24 countries surveyed said they did so because of Fukushima.

One year on, sitting in London or New York, it's easy to think that was a blip. Our tracking surveys in the UK, for example, show that while support for nuclear power did fall in mid-2011, it has bounced back to pre-Fukushima levels, and has even been slightly strengthened.

##### Romney will win – Obama’s approval ratings are too low

**Talgo, 9/16/12 –** commentator for Neon Tommy, a Los Angeles-based news source sponsored by the Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism covering breaking news (Tyler, “Why Romney Will Win The Election” <http://www.neontommy.com/news/2012/09/why-romney-will-win-election>)

Given the post-convention polling bounces, some may give Obama the advantage at this stage of the race, although the bounces are subsiding. For example, new NBC/WSJ polls of three swing states have Obama leading Romney by 49 to 44 percent in Florida and Virginia, and by 50 to 43 percent in Ohio. However, when we take a closer look at the numbers, a different story is revealed. In the Florida and Virginia polls, Democrats were oversampled by 5 percent, and in Ohio they were oversampled by 10 percent. Not convinced? Here’s another fact: recent CBS/NYT/Quinnipiac polls oversampled Democrats by nine percent in Florida and by eight percent in Ohio. The Florida poll had Obama at 51 percent and Romney at 45 percent, and the Ohio poll had Obama at 50 percent and Romney at 44 percent; so, both leads were smaller than the oversampling gap. If you ask me, the advantage here clearly goes to Romney; and, believe me, these are not the only examples.

All of this is revealed in the context of a time in which Republicans are much more enthusiastic than Democrats. Last month the number of Americans who consider themselves Republicans was the highest ever recorded since 2002 at 37.6 percent, compared to only 33.3 percent who consider themselves Democrats.

So, assuming that all else is equal, what does it mean when a national poll says something like 47 percent for Obama and 44 percent for Romney, or vise versa? The nature of the missing 10 percent is one of the most important factors that come to play in all presidential reelection campaigns. Historically, the final results in an election are almost always worse than polling suggests for an incumbent president. If you took the undecided vote, according to Gallup, from every general election since 1964 that featured an incumbent president seeking reelection, 89 percent of it went to the president’s challenger. You can bet that the Obama camp understands that a 47-44 poll in its favor is not good news at all. This is why it’s virtually unheard-of for an incumbent president to win reelection when he's polling below 50 percent.

##### The debates and labor statistics will determine the election

**Lombardo, 9/12**/12 - Global CEO, StrategyOne (Steve, “Why This Election Comes Down to Two Days in October,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-why-this\_b\_1877815.html)

Several national polls released this week show that President Obama received a small but meaningful bounce after the conventions. The bounce -- in the 3-5 point range -- is within the median for convention bounces since 1964. The problem for Republicans is that Romney got no bounce from his convention. In fact, his vote share likely shrunk a point or two in the last two weeks. While the Republican convention may have strengthened Romney's position with the base, it did little to expand his coalition. The momentum from "You didn't build that" has been halted. ¶ However, we see nothing in the data yet to suggest this is anything but a dead heat. For all the hand wringing over the GOP convention and the Romney campaign they are in a dead heat with an incumbent President with 55 days to go. When you look at likely voters in key swing states, this thing is truly 50/50. ¶ Here is our take as of 12 a.m. EST: ¶ The murder of Ambassador Stevens and the unrest in Libya will thrust both candidates into the foreign policy fray. It will be very interesting to see how each handles the coming hours and days and how much the media -- and ultimately voters -- focuses on the issue.¶ Look for a higher level of advertising spend from the Romney campaign in key battleground states over the next two weeks. History has shown that the candidate who is clearly in the lead by mid to late September will likely be the winner in November. That doesn't mean things can't change in October -- they can. But sentiment will start to firm up in the next two weeks. The Romney campaign has a $60 million cash-on-hand advantage, and they should use it now. Team Obama defined Romney in the spring using their cash advantage; the Romney campaign should not wait until October. They need to change the dynamic before October 1.¶ The two biggest dates of the campaign are October 3rd and October 5th. The first debate will be held on Wednesday, October 3rd at the University of Denver at 9 p.m. EST. For three reasons this will be far and away the most important debate:¶ It is the first and therefore, unless there is a major blunder, is likely to be the one that sets the image of Romney in stone.¶ We really do not believe that the other two will matter if Romney has a poor debate performance here. Romney has to win this debate pure and simple.¶ This one is purely on domestic policy, i.e. the economy. If Romney can't win this one, he is unlikely to win the other two, barring a miscue by the President.¶ On October 5th at 8:30 a.m. EST the Bureau of Labor Statistics will release the September unemployment numbers. This will be the most impactful announcement of the campaign. If the unemployment rate goes up it could be devastating for the president's reelection chances. Similarly, if it goes down -- especially if it goes below 8 percent -- it may pretty much secure an Obama victory in November.¶

##### Gridlock inevitable with any election outcome

Curry, 9/11/12 - NBC News national affairs writer (Tom, NBC Politics, “Romney election could create new scenario for EPA and coal,” <http://nbcpolitics.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/09/11/13807749-romney-election-could-create-new-scenario-for-epa-and-coal?lite>)

Whether Mitt Romney or Barack Obama wins the presidential election, a congressional impasse in 2013 seems likely. That’s because under most conceivable election scenarios – with Romney or Obama in the White House, and with either Democrats maintaining their Senate majority, or the Republicans taking it – the minority party could use the filibuster threat to block proposals it opposed.

##### The plan is key to self-sufficient forward operating bases

Ackerman, 11 [Spencer, February 18th, Latest Pentagon Brainstorm: Nuke-Powered War Bases, Wired. Com. http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/02/nuke-bases/]

Buried within Darpa’s 2012 budget request under the innocuous name of “Small Rugged Reactor Technologies” is a $10 million proposal to fuel wartime Forward Operating Bases with nuclear power. It springs from an admirable impulse: to reduce the need for troops or contractors to truck down roads littered with bombs to get power onto the base. It’s time, Darpa figures, for a “self-sufficient” FOB.¶ Only one problem. “The only known technology that has potential to address the power needs of the envisioned self-sufficient FOB,” the pitch reads, “is a nuclear-fuel reactor.” Now, bases could mitigate their energy consumption, like the [solar-powered Marine company](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/01/afghanistans-green-marines-cut-fuel-use-by-90-percent/) in Helmand Province, but that’s not enough of a game-changer for Darpa. Being self-sufficient is the goal; and that requires going nuclear; and that requires … other things.¶ To fit on a FOB, which can be anywhere from Bagram Air Field’s [eight square miles](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/08/u-s-afghan-mega-base/) to dusty collections of wooden shacks and concertina wire, the reactor would have to be “well below the scale of the smallest reactors that are being developed for domestic energy production,” Darpa acknowledges.¶ That’s not impossible, says Christine Parthemore, an energy expert at the Center for a New American Security. The Japanese and the South Africans have been working on miniature nuclear power plants for the better part of a decade; Bill Gates has [partnered with Toshiba](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8582692.stm) to build mini-nuke sites. (Although it’s not the most auspicious sign that one prominent startup for modular reactors [suspended its operations](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/nuclear-startup-nuscale-suspends-operation/) after growing cash-light last month.) Those small sites typically use uranium enriched to about 2 percent. “It would be really, really difficult to divert the fuel” for a bomb “unless you really knew what you were doing,” Parthemore says.¶ But Darpa doesn’t want to take that chance. Only “non-proliferable fuels (i.e., fuels other than enriched uranium or plutonium) and reactor designs that are fundamentally safe will be required of reactors that may be deployed to regions where hos tile acts may compromise operations.”¶ Sensible, sure. But it limits your options: outside of uranium or plutonium, [thorium](http://www.wired.com/magazine/2009/12/ff_new_nukes/) is the only remaining source for generating nuclear fuel. The Indians and now the Chinese have experimented with thorium for their nuclear programs, but, alas, “no one has ever successfully found a way” to build a functioning thorium reactor, Parthemore says, “in a safe and economical manner.”

Solves effective peacekeeping

Mosher et al., 8 (David E., Senior Policy Analyst @ RAND, Green Warriors: Army Environmental Considerations for Contingency Operations from Planning Through Post-Conflict, RAND)

The environment may also be important during the post-conflict phase of an operation,9 or even before combat operations end. Providing clean water, managing sewage, or providing irrigation water can be important for convincing the local populace to support the U.S. mission **and not an insurgency**, according to some commanders.10 Although these are not traditional Army missions, they can have an important effect on the outcome of an operation, from both a military and a political perspective. Addressing legacy problems can also help **a new government develop legitimacy and can enable U.S. forces to withdraw from the country sooner.** Indeed, many of the goals of stability operations defined in the 2006 edition of JP 3.0, Joint Operations, can have environmental components. Operational effectiveness can be hampered by poor environmental practices or helped by good ones. Logistics requirements and costs can be reduced by good practices, for instance, applying technologies to **reduce operational requirements for petroleum, oil,** and lubricants (POL) or field water treatment systems, or reducing acute threats to soldier health. Good environmental practices can also reduce the resources that must be diverted to address environmental issues. Commanders may also want to reduce or prevent liabilities, either financial or diplomatic. Good environmental awareness and practices during contingency operations can reduce the financial liabilities the Army and the United States may face. On more than one occasion in recent operations, contractors have removed hazardous wastes from base camps and, without Army knowledge, dumped them along the side of a road or in other inappropriate locations, sometimes to avoid disposing of them properly or to sell the drums that hold the wastes. These actions have created cleanup costs for the Army that are many times higher than the original price of the contract. In other cases, the Army has had to spend large sums to remediate serious preexisting environmental contamination at base camps, expenses that could have been avoided if the base camps had been located elsewhere. Financial liabilities can also arise from claims brought by U.S. soldiers who believe they were exposed to hazardous substances, as the Army’s past experiences with Agent Orange and Gulf War Illness illustrate. 11 Members of the local populace may also bring claims against the Army for environmentally related damage, draining funds that could be more effectively used for reconstruction or stabilization activities. Inadequate attention to environmental issues can also create diplomatic liabilities. Illegal dumping by contractors and poor waste management practices by soldiers have caused immediate diplomatic problems with host nations whose support has been critical. Long-term diplomatic problems from environmental problems can also emerge years after an operation is over. Perhaps most important are the environmental issues that can affect U.S. national objectives, those strategic political and economic objectives that U.S. leaders established when they committed forces to the contingency operation in the first place. One such national objective may be winning and maintaining support of the local populace. Although environmental conditions may be poor and national environmental laws may be weak or nonexistent, our research indicates that locals often care deeply about the environment, which can be critical to their survival, livelihood, and well-being. Vital environmental issues can include access to clean drinking water, effective sewage systems, and viable farmland (see Box 1.1). Restoring or building these basic infrastructures is often essential for the economic and social development necessary for stability. To the extent that such projects improve cooperation with locals, they can lower security risks, improve intel- ligence, and speed reconstruction. National objectives that have environmental components also include preserving natural resources that have important economic value (such as oil fields or fisheries) and even preserving cultural resources that are a matter of national, regional, religious, or cultural pride. If long-term stability of a country is a mission objective, sustainability and the long-term health of nbatural systems, including watersheds, forests, ecosystems, biodiversity, and farmlands, are also important. Local customs and practices can take the place of laws, and therefore military leaders, when designing plans and conducting operations, should understand how the local people interact with their environment. The environmental components of national objectives are often seen as falling outside the normal conception of the military mission. Because they have little to do with combat operations or military objectives, they are often not taken into consideration during the Army’s planning, training, or operations. Yet ignoring these broader political objectives **can lead to failure**, as Prussian military writer Carl von Clausewitz warned.12 Thus, the environmental dimensions of national objectives should be carefully considered. The manner in which the military conducts its operations can affect environmental outcomes upon which the success of the overall mission may depend. There is some evidence that national objectives such as stabilizing societies after conflict are now being emphasized at the Army’s combat training centers, but the degree to which environmental considerations are included is unclear.

**Global nuclear war**

Dean 95 [Jonathan, former ambassador to NATO, The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, p. google]

IN ANY EVENT, in a world of interconnecting COMMUNICATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL, TRADE, AND FINANCIAL LINKS, the United States, a leading industrial trading country that needs access to raw materials and markets, usually ends up paying in one way or another when a major regional conflict erupts. IN PRACTICAL TERMS, it is impossible for the United States to avoid some degree of involvement when major regional conflicts break out. FOR 200 YEARS, THE UNITED STATES HAS BEEN URGING LIBERTY, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, FREE MARKET VALUES, VOLUNTARY MUTUAL AID AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY ON THE OUTSIDE WORLD. THE UNITED STATES IS THE SOLE SURVIVING WORLD-CLASS POWER, WITH MILITARY STRENGTH AND GNP FAR LARGER THAN ANY OTHER COUNTRY. AS A RESULT, when large-scale conflict erupts, the United States cannot avoid being called on for help, as it was in Somalia, Bosnia, Rwanda, and Haiti. For the United States to seek to stand aside or to respond only weakly in such cases is to risk damage to its credibility AND WORLDWIDE INFLUENCE. PRESIDENT CLINTON JUSTIFIED THE NATO BOMBING OF SERBIAN POSITIONS IN BOSNIA AND THE U.S. INVASION OF HAITI BY SAYING THAT THE CREDIBILITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE U.S. WAS AT STAKE, AS IT WAS. IT IS TRUE THAT PAST ADMINISTRATIONS USED SIMILAR ARGUMENTS TO JUSTIFY CONTINUED U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM LONG AFTER IT WOULD HAVE BEEN WISE TO WITHDRAW. NONETHELESS, WHEN THE COLLECTIVE DISAPPOINTMENT OF WORLD OPINION OVER THE BEHAVIOR OF THE UNITED STATES (OR OF ANY MAJOR COUNTRY) BECOMES INTENSE AND ENDURING, IT BEGINS TO UNDERMINE THE INTERNATIONAL PRESTIGE AND STANDING OF THE ENTIRE NATION CONSIDERABLE DIMINUTION OF U.S. STATURE AND INFLUENCE HAS ALREADY TAKEN PLACE OVER THE PAST FOUR OR FIVE YEARS IN CONNECTION WITH FALTERING U.S. POLICIES TOWARD BOSNIA, SOMALIA, AND RWANDA. FORTUNATELY, AMERICANS ARE NOT SPARTANS, ROMANS OR PRUSSIANS-SELF-DISCIPLINED MILITARISTIC PEOPLES WHO CONSIDERED IT A MATTER OF NATIONAL PRIDE NOT TO RECOIL FROM CONFLICT BECAUSE OF CASUALTIES AMONG THEIR FORCES. HOWEVER, IF THE TRENDS CONTINUE THAT UNDERLIE THE PUBLIC OUTRAGE THAT FOLLOWED THE DEATH OF U.S. SERVICEMEN IN SOMALIA, AND U.S. ADMINISTRATIONS CONTINUE TO ABSTAIN FROM PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES BECAUSE THEY COULD ENTAIL CASUALTIES, THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT LONG REMAIN A WORLD POWER. If U.S. national prestige declines further under conditions like these, the U.S. capacity to constructively influence the course of events without the use of force will decrease. And when force must be used, the United States may have to use more of it to be effective. EXPERTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD EXPECT GROWING POPULATION PRESSURES AND INCREASING ENVIRONMENTAL STRESS TO DEVELOP OVER THE COMING DECADES INTO INTENSE, FAR-REACHING SOCIAL UNREST AND REGIONAL CONFLICT. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS THE SOLUTION, HOWEVER SLOW AND UNCERTAIN IT MAY BE IN COMING. BUT the world also needs effective regional conflict-prevention procedures. Left on its own, regional violence can lead to **confrontation** and even **war between the great powers**, including the United States, AS MIGHT OCCUR, FOR EXAMPLE, in the event of conflict between Ukraine and Russia or between China and its neighbors. IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, unchecked regional violence and the fear of further violence will lead **more states to develop nuclear weapons**. IN PAST DECADES, this process occurred in Israel, South Africa, India, Pakistan, IRAQ, and PRESUMABLY, IN North Korea. A world with 20 or 30 nuclear weapon states would not only make a more effective global security system impossible, it would lead the present nuclear weapon states to modernize and increase their weapons-and it would markedly increase the vulnerability of the United States to direct attack. Instead of SHRUGGING AT HUMAN FALLIBILITY, accepting war as inevitable, AND REACTING AFTER IT HAPPENS, U.S. policy should aim at establishing an international peacekeeping system that can head off an increasing number of conflicts. CONSEQUENCES IF THIS REASONING IS ACCEPTED, THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD DECIDE ON AND PUBLICLY DECLARE AN EXPLICIT LONG-TERM POLICY OF JOINING WITH OTHER COUNTRIES IN SEEKING A GRADUAL LOWERING OF THE LEVEL OF ARMED CONFLICT IN THE WORLD THROUGH PREVENTING A GROWING PROPORTION OF POTENTIAL WARS AND CURTAILING WARS WHEN THEY DO OCCUR. This goal would be achieved by building an increasingly effective worldwide network of regional conflict-prevention and peacekeeping organizations headed by a more effective United Nations.

## 2ac critique

**Permute –**

##### Prefer util

Cumminsky 90 – Professor of Philosophy, Bates (David, Kantian Consequentialism, Ethics 100.3, p 601-2, p 606, jstor)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."30 Why, however, is this not equally true of all those that we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, one fails to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? We have a duty to promote the conditions necessary for the existence of rational beings, but both choosing to act and choosing not to act will cost the life of a rational being. Since the basis of Kant's principle is "rational nature exists as an end-in-itself' (GMM, p. 429), the reasonable solution to such a dilemma involves promoting, insofar as one can, the conditions necessary for rational beings. If I sacrifice some for the sake of other rational beings, I do not use them arbitrarily and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have "dignity**, an unconditional and incomparable value" that transcends any market value (GMM, p. 436), **but**, as rational beings, persons **also** have **a fundamental equality which dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The formula of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration dictates that one sacrifice some to save many. [continues] According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. Respect for rational beings requires that, in deciding what to do, one give appropriate practical consideration to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness. Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings lead to a consequentialist normative theory. We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices which a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that, in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.

##### No root cause– prefer proximate causes

**Moore, 04** [John Norton, Professor of Law at the University of Virginia He formerly served as the first Chairman of the Board of the United States Institute of Peace and as the Counselor on International Law to the Department of State, Winter, “Beyond the Democratic Peace: Solving the War Puzzle”, 44 Va. J. Int'l L. 341, Lexis Law]

If major interstate war is predominantly a product of a synergy between a potential nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence, what is the role of the many traditional "causes" of war? Past, and many contemporary, theories of war have focused on the role of specific disputes between nations, ethnic and religious differences, arms races, poverty and social injustice, competition for resources, incidents and accidents, greed, fear, perceptions of "honor," and many other factors. Such factors may well play a role in motivating aggression or generating fear and manipulating public opinion. The reality, however, is that while some of these factors may have more potential to contribute to war than others, there may well be an **infinite set of motivating factors**, or human wants, motivating aggression. It is not the independent existence of such motivating factors for war but rather the circumstances permitting or encouraging high-risk decisions leading to war that is the key to more effectively controlling armed conflict. And the same may also be true of democide. The early focus in the Rwanda slaughter on "ethnic conflict," as though Hutus and Tutsis had begun to slaughter each other through spontaneous combustion, distracted our attention from the reality that a nondemocratic Hutu regime had carefully planned and orchestrated a genocide against Rwandan Tutsis as well as its Hutu opponents. [n158](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1329520437445&returnToKey=20_T13973620735&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.647208.6119287203#n158) Certainly if we were able to press a button and end poverty, racism, religious intolerance, injustice, and endless disputes, we would want to do so. Indeed, democratic governments must remain committed to policies that will produce a better world by all measures of human progress. The broader achievement of democracy and the rule of law will itself assist in this progress. No one, however, has yet been able to demonstrate the kind of robust correlation with any of these "traditional" causes of war that is reflected in the "democratic peace." Further, given the difficulties in overcoming many of these social problems, an approach to war exclusively dependent on their solution may **doom us to war for generations** to come.

##### Violence declining now – because of things consistent with the aff

**Pinker, 11** (11/24 Steven, Professor of Psychology at Harvard University, “Violence Vanquished: We believe our world is riddled with terror and war, but we may be living in the most peaceable era in human existence. Why brutality is declining and empathy is on the rise,” 9-24-2011, <http://online.ws> j.com/article/SB10001424053111904106704576583203589408180.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

On the day this article appears, you will read about a shocking act of violence. Somewhere in the world there will be a terrorist bombing, a senseless murder, a bloody insurrection. It's impossible to learn about these catastrophes without thinking, "What is the world coming to?" With all its wars, murder and genocide, history might suggest that the taste for blood is human nature. Not so, argues Harvard Prof. Steven Pinker. He talks to WSJ's Gary Rosen about the decline in violence in recent decades and his new book, "The Better Angels of Our Nature." But a better question may be, "How bad was the world in the past?" Believe it or not, the world of the past was much worse. **Violence has been in decline for thousands of years**, and today we may be living in **the most peaceable era in the existence of our species**. The decline, to be sure, has not been smooth. It has not brought violence down to zero, and it is not guaranteed to continue. But it is a persistent historical development, visible on scales from millennia to years, from the waging of wars to the spanking of children. This claim, I know, invites skepticism, incredulity, and sometimes anger. **We tend to estimate the probability of an event from the ease with which we can recall examples**, and scenes of carnage are more likely to be beamed into our homes and burned into our memories than footage of people dying of old age. There will always be enough violent deaths to fill the evening news, so **people's** **impressions of violence will be disconnected from its actual likelihood**. Evidence of our bloody history is not hard to find. Consider the genocides in the Old Testament and the crucifixions in the New, the gory mutilations in Shakespeare's tragedies and Grimm's fairy tales, the British monarchs who beheaded their relatives and the American founders who dueled with their rivals. Today the decline in these brutal practices can be quantified. A look at the numbers shows that over the course of our history, humankind has been blessed with six major declines of violence. The first was a process of pacification: the transition from the anarchy of the hunting, gathering and horticultural societies in which our species spent most of its evolutionary history to the first agricultural civilizations, with cities and governments, starting about 5,000 years ago. For centuries, social theorists like Hobbes and Rousseau speculated from their armchairs about what life was like in a "state of nature." Nowadays we can do better. Forensic archeology—a kind of "CSI: Paleolithic"—can estimate rates of violence from the proportion of skeletons in ancient sites with bashed-in skulls, decapitations or arrowheads embedded in bones. And ethnographers can tally the causes of death in tribal peoples that have recently lived outside of state control. These investigations show that, on average, about 15% of people in prestate eras died violently, compared to about 3% of the citizens of the earliest states. Tribal violence commonly subsides when a state or empire imposes control over a territory, leading to the various "paxes" (Romana, Islamica, Brittanica and so on) that are familiar to readers of history. It's not that the first kings had a benevolent interest in the welfare of their citizens. Just as a farmer tries to prevent his livestock from killing one another, so a ruler will try to keep his subjects from cycles of raiding and feuding. From his point of view, such squabbling is a dead loss—forgone opportunities to extract taxes, tributes, soldiers and slaves. The second decline of violence was a civilizing process that is best documented in Europe. Historical records show that between the late Middle Ages and the 20th century, European countries saw a 10- to 50-fold decline in their rates of homicide. The numbers are consistent with narrative histories of the brutality of life in the Middle Ages, when highwaymen made travel a risk to life and limb and dinners were commonly enlivened by dagger attacks. So many people had their noses cut off that medieval medical textbooks speculated about techniques for growing them back. Historians attribute this decline to the consolidation of a patchwork of feudal territories into large kingdoms with centralized authority and an infrastructure of commerce. Criminal justice was nationalized, and zero-sum plunder gave way to positive-sum trade. People increasingly controlled their impulses and sought to cooperate with their neighbors. The third transition, sometimes called the Humanitarian Revolution, took off with the Enlightenment. Governments and churches had long maintained order by punishing nonconformists with mutilation, torture and gruesome forms of execution, such as burning, breaking, disembowelment, impalement and sawing in half. The 18th century saw the widespread abolition of judicial torture, including the famous prohibition of "cruel and unusual punishment" in the eighth amendment of the U.S. Constitution. At the same time, many nations began to whittle down their list of capital crimes from the hundreds (including poaching, sodomy, witchcraft and counterfeiting) to just murder and treason. And a growing wave of countries abolished blood sports, dueling, witchhunts, religious persecution, absolute despotism and slavery. The fourth major transition is the respite from major interstate war that we have seen since the end of World War II. Historians sometimes refer to it as the Long Peace. Today we take it for granted that Italy and Austria will not come to blows, nor will Britain and Russia. But centuries ago, the great powers were almost always at war, and until quite recently, Western European countries tended to initiate two or three new wars every year. The cliché that the 20th century was "the most violent in history" ignores the second half of the century (and may not even be true of the first half, if one calculates violent deaths as a proportion of the world's population). Though it's tempting to attribute the Long Peace to nuclear deterrence, non-nuclear developed states have stopped fighting each other as well. Political scientists point instead to the **growth of democracy, trade and international organizations**—all of which, the **statistical evidence shows**, **reduce the likelihood of conflict**. They also credit the **rising valuation of human life** over national grandeur—a hard-won lesson of two world wars. The fifth trend, which I call the New Peace, involves war in the world as a whole, including developing nations. Since 1946, several organizations have tracked the number of armed conflicts and their human toll world-wide. The bad news is that for several decades, the decline of interstate wars was accompanied by a bulge of civil wars, as newly independent countries were led by inept governments, challenged by insurgencies and armed by the cold war superpowers. The less bad news is that civil wars tend to kill far fewer people than wars between states. And the best news is that, since the peak of the cold war in the 1970s and '80s, organized conflicts of all kinds—**civil wars, genocides, repression** by autocratic governments, terrorist attacks—**have declined throughout the world**, and their **death tolls have declined even more precipitously**. The rate of documented direct **deaths from political violence** (war, terrorism, genocide and warlord militias) **in the past decade is an unprecedented few hundredths of a percentage point**. Even if we multiplied that rate to account for unrecorded deaths and the victims of war-caused disease and famine, it would not exceed 1%. The most immediate cause of this New Peace was the demise of communism, which ended the proxy wars in the developing world stoked by the superpowers and also discredited genocidal ideologies that had justified the sacrifice of vast numbers of eggs to make a utopian omelet. Another contributor was the expansion of international peacekeeping forces, which really do keep the peace—not always, but far more often than when adversaries are left to fight to the bitter end. Finally, the postwar era has seen a cascade of "rights revolutions"—a growing revulsion against aggression on smaller scales. In the developed world, the civil rights movement obliterated lynchings and lethal pogroms, and the women's-rights movement has helped to shrink the incidence of rape and the beating and killing of wives and girlfriends. In recent decades, the movement for children's rights has significantly reduced rates of spanking, bullying, paddling in schools, and physical and sexual abuse. And the campaign for gay rights has forced governments in the developed world to repeal laws criminalizing homosexuality and has had some success in reducing hate crimes against gay people. \* \* \* \* Why has violence declined so dramatically for so long? Is it because violence has literally been bred out of us, leaving us more peaceful by nature? This seems unlikely. Evolution has a speed limit measured in generations, and many of these declines have unfolded over decades or even years. Toddlers continue to kick, bite and hit; little boys continue to play-fight; people of all ages continue to snipe and bicker, and most of them continue to harbor violent fantasies and to enjoy violent entertainment. It's more likely that human nature has always comprised inclinations toward violence and inclinations that counteract them—such as self-control, empathy, fairness and reason—what Abraham Lincoln called "the better angels of our nature." Violence has declined because historical circumstances have increasingly favored our better angels. **The most obvious of these pacifying forces has been the state, with its monopoly on the legitimate use of force**. A disinterested judiciary and police can defuse the temptation of exploitative attack, inhibit the impulse for revenge and circumvent the self-serving biases that make all parties to a dispute believe that they are on the side of the angels. We see evidence of the pacifying effects of government in the way that rates of killing declined following the expansion and consolidation of states in tribal societies and in medieval Europe. And we can watch the movie in reverse when violence erupts in zones of anarchy, such as the Wild West, failed states and neighborhoods controlled by mafias and street gangs, who can't call 911 or file a lawsuit to resolve their disputes but have to administer their own rough justice. **Another pacifying force has been commerce**, a game in which everybody can win. As technological progress allows the exchange of goods and ideas over longer distances and among larger groups of trading partners, **other people become more valuable alive than dead**. They switch from being targets of demonization and dehumanization to potential partners in reciprocal altruism. For example, though the relationship today between America and China is far from warm, we are unlikely to declare war on them or vice versa. Morality aside, they make too much of our stuff, and we owe them too much money. A third peacemaker has been cosmopolitanism—the expansion of people's parochial little worlds through literacy, mobility, education, science, history, journalism and mass media. These forms of virtual reality can prompt people to take the perspective of people unlike themselves and to expand their circle of sympathy to embrace them. These technologies have also powered an expansion of rationality and objectivity in human affairs. People are now less likely to privilege their own interests over those of others. They reflect more on the way they live and consider how they could be better off. Violence is often reframed as a problem to be solved rather than as a contest to be won. We devote ever more of our brainpower to guiding our better angels. It is probably no coincidence that the Humanitarian Revolution came on the heels of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment, that the Long Peace and rights revolutions coincided with the electronic global village. Whatever its causes, the implications of the historical decline of violence are profound. So **much depends on** **whether we see our era as a nightmare of** crime, terrorism, **genocide and war or as a period that, in** **the light of the historical and statistical facts, is blessed by unprecedented levels of peaceful coexistence**. Bearers of good news are often advised to keep their mouths shut, lest they lull people into complacency. But this prescription may be backward. **The discovery that fewer people are victims of violence** **can thwart cynicism among compassion-fatigued news readers who might otherwise think that the dangerous parts of the world are irredeemable hell holes**. And **a better understanding of what drove the numbers down can steer us toward doing things that make people better off** rather than congratulating ourselves on how moral we are. As one becomes aware of the historical decline of violence, the world begins to look different. The past seems less innocent, the present less sinister. One starts to appreciate the small gifts of coexistence that would have seemed utopian to our ancestors: the interracial family playing in the park, the comedian who lands a zinger on the commander in chief, the countries that quietly back away from a crisis instead of escalating to war. For all the tribulations in our lives, for all the troubles that remain in the world, the decline of violence is an accomplishment that we can savor—and an impetus to cherish the forces of civilization and enlightenment that made it possible..

##### Globalized technological thought is good. Rejecting technological thought also rejects technological innovation and dooms us to extinction. This also defends our ontology

**Heaberlin, 4** – nuclear engineer, led the Nuclear Safety and Technology Applications Product Line at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (Scott, A Case for Nuclear-Generated Electricity, p. 31-40)

Well, then let's not do that, huh? Well, no, not hardly, because without that use of fertilizers we couldn't produce the food to feed the population. We just couldn't do it. Here are some comparisons."

If you used no fertilizers or pesticides you could get 500 kilograms of grain from a hectare in a dry climate and as much as 1000 kilograms in a humid cli­mate. If you got organic and used animal manure as fertilizer, assuming you could find enough, you might get as much as 2000 kilograms per hectare. For a sense of scale, the average in the United States, where recall we only get half the food value to hectare as the intensively farmed Chinese crop land, we get about 4500 kilograms per hectare on the average. In serious cornfields with fertilizer, irrigation, and pesticides, the value is 7000 kilograms per hectare.

Modern mechanized, chemically supported agriculture produces 7 to 14 times the food that you would get without those advantages. Even the best organic farming would produce only 30 to 45% of the food value you would get from the same sized chemically fertilized farm, and that is assuming you could get the manure you needed to make it work.

In very stark terms, without the chemically enhanced farming we would have probably something like one-fifth the food supply we have now. That means four-fifths the population would not be fed, at least as we are organized now. So, no, just giving up on fertilizers is not in the deal.

However, we could get the hydrogen and energy from sources other than natural gas. Nuclear energy could be used to provide electricity to extract hydrogen from water and produce the process heat required to combine the hydrogen and nitrogen from the air. That is just a thought to stick in your mind. While we are looking at energy use in agriculture, here are a few more numbers for you.10 If you look at the energy input into agriculture and the energy you get out, you see some interesting facts. By combining the energy used to make fertilizers and pesticides, power irrigation, and run the farm machinery in the United States, we use about 0.7 kcal of fossil fuel energy for each 1 kcal of food we make. This doesn't include the energy needed to process and transport the food. In Europe where they farm more intensely, the amount of energy out is just about the same as energy in. In Germany and Italy the numbers are 1.4 and 1.7 kcal energy input to each 1 kcal output respectively. The point is you need energy to feed people, well at least a lot of people.

Which gets us back to Cohen and his question. One of the studies he examined looked at a "self-sustaining solar energy system." For the United States, this would replace all fossil energy and provide one-fifth to one-half the current energy use. The conclusion of the study was that this would either produce" a significant reduction in our standard of living ... even if all the energy conservation measures known today were adopted" or if set at the current standard of living, "then the ideal U.S. population should be targeted at 40-100 million people." The authors of that study then cheerfully go on to point out that we do have enough fossil fuel to last a least a century, as long as we can work out the pesky environmental problems. So, you can go to a "self-sustaining" energy economy as long as you are willing to shoot between 2 out of 3 and 6 out of 7 of your neighbors.

And this is a real question. The massive use of fossil fuel driven agriculture to provide the fertilizers and pesticides, and power the farm equipment, is a) vitally important to feed everyone, and b) something we just can't keep up in a business-as-usual fashion. Sustainable means you can keep doing it. Fossil energy supplies are finite; you will run out some time. Massive use of fossil energy and the greenhouse gases they produce also may very well tip the planet into one of those extinction events in which a lot of very bad things happen to a lot of the life on the earth.

O.K. to Cohen's big question, how many people can the earth support? What it comes down to is that the "Well, it depends" answer depends on

• what quality of life you will accept,

• what level of technology you will use, and

• what level of social integration you will accept.

We have seen some of the numbers regarding quality of life. Clearly if you are willing to accept the Bangladesh diet, you can feed 1.8 times more people than if you chose the United States diet.

If you choose the back-to-nature, live like our hearty forefathers, level of technology, you can feed perhaps one-fifth as many people as you can with modern chemical fertilized agriculture. The rest have to go.

And here is the tough one. You can do a lot better, get a lot more people on the planet, if you just force a few things. Like, no more land wasted in growing grapes for wine or grains for whiskey and beer. No cropland used for tobacco. No more grain wasted on animals for meat, just grain for people. No more rich diets for the rich countries, share equally for everyone. No more trade barriers; too bad for the farmers in Japan and France, those countries would just have to accept their dependence on other countries for their food. It is easy to see that at least some of those might actually be a pretty good thing; however, the kicker is how do you get them to happen? After all, Mussolinill did make the trains run on time. How could you force these things without a totalitarian state? Are you willing to give up your ability to choose for yourself for the common good? It is not pretty, is it?

Cohen looked at all the various population estimates and concluded that most fell into the range of 4 to 16 billion. Taking the highest value when researchers offered a range, Cohen calculated a high median of 12 billion and taking the lower part of the range a low median of 7.7 billion. The good news in this is 12 billion is twice as many people as we have now. The bad news is that the projections for world population for 2050 are between 7.8 and 12.5 billion. That means we have got no more than 50 years before we exceed the nominal carrying capacity of the earth. Cohen also offers a qualifying observation by stating the "First Law of Information," which asserts that 97.6% of all statistics are made up. This helps us appreciate that application of these numbers to real life is subject to a lot of assumptions and insufficiencies in our understanding of the processes and data.

However, we can draw some insights from all of this. What it comes down to is that if you choose the fully sustainable, non-fossil fuel long-term options with only limited social integration, the various estimates Cohen looked at give you a number like 1 billion or less people that the earth can support. That means 5 out of 6 of us have got to go, plus no new babies without an offsetting death.

On the other hand, if you let technology continue to do its thing and perhaps get even better, the picture need not be so bleak. We haven't made all our farmland as productive as it can be. Remember, the Chinese get twice the food value per hectare as we do in the United States. There is also a lot of land that would become arable if we could get water to it. And, of course, in case you need to go back and check the title of this book, there are alternatives to fossil fuels to provide the energy to power that technology.

So given a positive and perhaps optimistic view of technology, we can look to some of the high technology assumption based studies from Cohen's review. From the semi-credible set of these, we can find estimates from 19 to 157 billion as the number of people the earth could support with a rough average coming in about 60 billion. This is a good time to be reminded of the First Law of Information. The middle to lower end of this range, however, might be done without wholesale social reprogramming. Hopefully we would see the improvement in the quality of life in the developing countries as they industrialize and increase their use of energy. Hopefully, also this would lead to a matching of the reduction in fertility rates that has been observed in the developed countries, which in turn would lead to an eventual balancing of the human population.

The point to all this is the near-term future of the human race depends on technology. If we turn away from technology, a very large fraction of the current and future human race will starve. If we just keep on as we are, with our current level of technology and dependence on fossil fuel resources, in the near term it will be a race between fertility decrease and our ability to feed ourselves, with, frankly, disaster the slight odds-on bet. In a slightly longer term, dependence on fossil fuels has got to lead to either social chaos or environmental disaster. There are no other end points to that road. It doesn't go anywhere else.

However, if we accept that it is technology that makes us human, that technology uniquely identifies us as the only animal that can choose its future, we can choose to live, choose to make it a better world for everyone and all life. This means more and better technology. It means more efficient technology that is kinder to the planet but also allows humans to support large numbers in a high quality of life. That road is not easy and has a number of ways to screw up. However, it is a road that can lead to a happier place, a better place.

Two Concluding Thoughts on the Case for Technology

Two more points and I will end my defense of technology. First, I want to bring you back from all the historical tour and all the numbers about population to something more directly personal. Let me ask you two questions.

What do you do for a living?

What did you have for breakfast?

Don't see any connection between these questions or of their connection to·the subject of technology? Don't worry, the point will come out shortly. I am just trying to bring the idea of technology back from this grand vision to its impact on your daily life.

Just as a wild guess, your answer to the first question was something that, say 500 years ago, didn't even exist. If we look 20,000 years ago, the only job was" get food." Even if you have a really directly socially valuable job like a medical doctor, 20,000 years ago you would have been extraneous. That is, the tribe couldn't afford you. What, no way! A doctor could save lives, surely a tribe would value such a skill. Well, sure, but the tribe could not afford taking one of their members out of the productive */I* getting the food" job for 20 years while that individual learned all those doctor skills.

If you examine the "what you do for a living" just a bit I think you will see a grand interconnectedness of all things. I personally find it pretty remarkable that we have a society that values nuclear engineers enough that I can make a living at it. Think about it. Somehow what I have done has been of enough value that, through various taxpayer and utility ratepayers, society has given me enough money for food and shelter. The tribe 20,000 years ago wouldn't have put up with me for a day.

You see, that is why we as humans are successful, wildly successful in fact. We work together. "Yeah, sure we do," you reply, " read a newspaper lately?" Well, *O.K.,* we fuss and fight a good deal and some of us do some pretty stupid and pretty mean things. But the degree of cooperation is amazing if you just step back a bit.

O.K., what did you have for breakfast: orange juice, coffee, toast, maybe some cereal and milk? Where do these things come from? Orange juice came from Florida or California. Coffee came from South America. Bread for the toast came perhaps from Kansas; cereal, from the Mid-West somewhere. The jam on the toast may have come from Oregon, or maybe Chile. Milk is probably the only thing that came from within a hundred miles of your breakfast table. Think about it. There were hundreds of people involved in your breakfast. Farmers, food-processing workers, packaging manufacturers, transportation people, energy producers, wholesale and retail people. Perhaps each one only spent a second on their personal contribution to your personal breakfast, but they touch thousands of other people's breakfasts as well. In turn, you buying the various components of your breakfast supported, in your part, all those people. They in turn, in some way or another, bought whatever you provide to society that allowed you to buy breakfast. Pretty amazing, don't you think?

Now when you look at all that, think about what ties all the planetwide interconnection, Yep, you guessed it: technology. Without technology, you get what is available within your personal reach, and what you produce is available only to those who are near enough that you can personally carry it to them on your own two feet. Technology makes our world work. It gives you personally a productive and socially valuable way to make both a living and to provide your contribution to the rest of us**.**

I want you to stop a minute and really think about that. What would your life be like without technology? Could you do what you currently do? Would anyone be able to use what you do? Would anyone pay you for that? "But I am a school teacher," you say, "of course, they would pay me!" Are you sure? Why do you need schools if there is no technology? All I need is to teach the kid how to farm and how to hunt. Sons and daughters can learn that by working in the fields along with their parents. See what I mean?

Now, I have hopefully reset your brain. Sure, you are still going to be hit with daily "technology is bad" messages. Hopefully, you are a bit more shielded against that din, and you have been given some perspective to balance that message and are prepared to see the true critical value of technology to human existence. The point is that technology is what makes us human. Without it, we are just slightly smarter monkeys.

You may feel that 6 billion of us are too many, and that may very well be. I personally don't know how to make that value decision. Which particular person does one select as being one of the excess ones?

However, the fact is that there are 6 billion of us, and it looks like we are headed for 10 to 12 billion in the next 50 years, Without not only the technology we have, but significantly better and more environmentally friendly technology, the world is going to get ugly as we approach these numbers,

On the other hand, with the right technologies we can not only support those numbers, we can do it while we close the gap between the haves and have-nots. We can make it a better place for everyone. It takes technology and the energy to drive it. Choosing technology is what we have to do to secure the evolutionary selection of us as a successful species, Remember, some pages back in discussing the unlikely evolutionary path to us, I said we are not the chosen, unless. Unless we choose us. This is what I meant. We are totally unique in all of evolutionary history. We humans have the unique ability and opportunity to choose either our evolutionary success or failure. A choice of technology gives us a chance. A choice rejecting technology dooms us as a species and gives the cockroaches the chance in our place. Nature doesn't care what survives, algae seas, dinosaurs, humans, cockroaches, or whatever is successful. If we care, we have to choose correctly.

As an aside, let me address a point of philosophy here. If any of this offends your personal theology, I offer this for your consideration. Genesis tells us God gave all the Earth to humanity and charged us with the stewardship thereof. So it is ours to use as well as we can. That insightful social philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli put it this way in 1501:

"What remains to be done must be done by you; since in order not to deprive us of our free will and such share of glory as belongs to us, God will not do everything Himself."

*O.K.,* you are saying, "I give." You have beaten the socks off me. Technology is good; technology is the identifying human trait and our only hope. But what is this stuff about choosing technology or not? Technology just happens doesn't it? I mean, technology always advances, it always has, so why the big deal?

Well, that is my last point on technology. It doesn't always just happen, and people have chosen to turn away from technology. In what might have seemed at the time to be a practical social decision, huge future implications were imposed on many generations to come. It has happened. Let me take you on one more trip through history. I think you will find it enlightening. In *Guns, Germs, and Steel,* Jared Diamond explores the question of why the European societies came to be dominate over all the other human cultures on earth. It is a fascinating story and provides a lot of insight into how modern societies evolved. In moving through history, he comes across a very odd discontinuity. He observes that if you came to earth from space in the year 1400 A.D., looked around, and went home to write your research paper on the probable future of the earth, you would clearly conclude the Chinese would run the entire planet shortly. Furthermore, you could conclude they would do it pretty darn well. If those same extraterrestrial researchers were to pop into their time machine and come back to earth in any year from say 1800 to now, they would be totally amazed to see China as a large, but relatively backward, country, struggling to catch up with their European and American peers.

To understand the significance of this, you have to go on that research trip with the extraterrestrials and look at China before 1400. In *The Lever af Riches,* Joel Mokyr dedicates one chapter looking at the comparisons of technology development in China to that in Europe. He lists the following as technology advantages China had in the centuries before 1400:

• Extensive water control projects, alternately draining and irrigating

land, significantly boosting agricultural production

• Sophisticated iron plow introduced sixth century B.C.

• Seed drills and other farm tools, introduced around 1000 *A.D.*

• Chemical and organic fertilizers and pesticides used

• Blast furnaces and casting of iron as early as 200 B.C., not known in Europe until fourteenth century

• Advanced use of power sources in textile production, not seen in Europe until the Industrial Revolution

• Invention of compass around 960 A.D.

• Major advances in maritime technology (more in a bit on this)

• Invention of paper around 100 A.D. (application as toilet paper by *590 A.D.).*

In the year 1400 AD., China was a world power, perhaps the only true world power. Their technology in agriculture, textiles, metallurgy, and maritime transportation were far in advance of any other country. They had a strong central government and a very healthy economy.

Their naval strength provides a real insight into the degree of this dominance. Dr. Diamond sends us to an extremely readable book *When China Ruled the Seas-The Treasure Fleet of the Dragon Throne 1405-1433* by Dr. Louise Levathes. Dr. Levathes takes us on an inside tour of the Chinese empire during these years. She focuses on the great treasure fleets that China set forth in these early years of the fifteenth century. In her book she has a wonderful graphic that overlays a Chinese vessel of the treasure fleet (-1410) with Columbus's *St. Maria* (1492). At 85 feet in length and three masts, the *St. Maria* is dwarfed by the nine-masted, 400-foot-long Chinese vessel.

The Chinese sailed fleets of these magnificent vessels throughout oceans of South Asia, to India, and even as far as the eastern coast of Africa. With this naval domination China claimed tribute from Japan, Korea, the nations of the Malay Archipelago, and various states within what is now India. Through both trade and the occasional application of military force, China provided an enlightened and progressive direction for all the nations within this sphere of influence. If two princes in India were fighting over a throne, it was the recognition, or lack thereof, from the Chinese emperor that decided who would rule. Setting a policy of religious inclusion and tolerance, the Chinese engaged the Arabian traders and calmed religious disputes within Asia.

With applications of power sources in textiles and advanced metallurgy, the Chinese were in the same position in 1400 as the British were in 1750, ready to launch into the Industrial Revolution. They traded with nations thousands of miles from home with vast, sophisticated shipping fleets. They were poised to extend this trade all the way to Europe and perhaps find the New World by going east instead of the European's going west in search of the rich Chinese markets.

But if we pop into that extraterrestrial time machine and drop into China in 1800, we find a technologically backward nation, humbled by a relatively small force of Europeans with "modern" military technology who wantonly imposed their will on the Chinese. The Chinese have been struggling to catch up with European and American technology ever since and so far not quite being able to do that. The domination of China by the Japanese during World War II shows how complete the turnaround was. In 1400 Japan was but one of many vassal states huddled about the feet of the Imperial Chinese throne. In 1940 the Japanese military crushed the Chinese government while marching on to control much of South Asia.

What could have happened to turn this clear champion of technology, trade, enlightened leadership with all its advantages over both its neighbors and yet-distant foreign competitors into such a weak, backward giant?

Mokyr goes through a pretty complete list of potential causes. He looks at diet, climate, and inherent philosophical mindset rejecting each as a credible actor mainly on the bases that all of these conditions were present during the period of technological and economic growth as well as the subsequent stagnation. Therefore, these were not determining factors in the turnabout. In the end he concludes, as does Diamond and Levathes, that it was just politics.

Yep, that is right. It was good, old human politics. Dr. Levathes gives us a delightful insider's view of the personalities and politics of Imperial progressions during this critical time period. To make a short story of it, the party that had been in control during the expansionist period supported the great treasure fleets, commerce with foreign nations, use and expansion of technology, and a rather harsh control of the rival party. The rival party was based on Confucian philosophy that preached a rigid, inward-looking, controlled existence.

When the Confucian party gained control of the throne, they had their opportunity to push back on the prior ruling party that had oppressed them so harshly for so long. And they did. They wanted nothing to do with foreigners; we have all we need at home, here in China, they said. The fleet was disbanded and the making of ocean-going vessels forbidden. Technology was no longer "encouraged." Again, their position was what we have is good enough, stop with all this new nonsense. Over a period of just a few years, the course of the entire nation was shifted from what would have appeared to be a bright future as the leading power in the world to a large, but relatively insignificant, backwater, rich in history and culture, but all backward looking to a former glory.

That was it. A shift in the political agenda. At the time, to the leaders in control, one that made sense. Focus at home, use what you have now, create order, discipline, control. In 50 years Japanese pirates controlled the coast of China, and the former ruler of the seas from Asia to Africa could not get out of their harbors safely.

So, you see **if the "technology is bad" message gets incorporated into too many of our daily decisions,** we can turn from our bright future into something else. The difference is that this time the stakes are much higher than they were in fifteenth century China. If we, in the developed nations, make the wrong choices, we doom all of humanity by our folly. It is not just that we miss the potential bright future, we miss the chance to avoid the combined human population growth and resources exhaustion disaster coming at us like a runaway train. Technology is the only way to prevent that train wreck. We can hear the siren's call of anti-technology, come back to nature and let the train run us down in a bloody mess, or we can try our best to use technology wisely and win free to make a better life for everyone.

##### Perm—do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alt—if the alt solves the squo, the perm solves the link

##### Turn—only the neg forgets Being by abandoning empiricism

**Latour 2** – Professor, Paris Institute of Political Studies (Bruno, Environmentalism, ed Direk, p 303)

Who has forgotten Being? No one, no one ever has, otherwise Nature would be truly available as a pure 'stock'. Look around you: scientific objects are circulating simultaneously as subjects objects and discourse. Networks are full of Being. As for machines, they are laden with subjects and collectives. How could a being lose its difference, its incompleteness, its mark, its trace of Being? This is never in anyone's power; otherwise we should have to imagine that we have truly been modern, we should be taken in by the upper half of the modern Constitution. Has someone, however, actually forgotten Being? Yes: anyone who really thinks that Being has really been forgotten. As Levi-Strauss says, 'the barbarian is first and foremost the man who believe in barbarism.' (Levi-Strauss, [1952] 1987. p. 12). Those who have failed to undertake empirical studies of sciences, technologies, law, politics, economics, religion or fiction have lost the traces of Being that are distributed everywhere among beings. If, scorning empiricism, you opt out of the exact sciences, then the human sciences, then traditional philosophy, then the sciences of language, and you hunker down in your forest -- then you will indeed feel a tragic loss. But what is missing is you yourself, not the world! Heidegger's epigones have converted that glaring weakness into a strength. 'We don't know anything empirical, but that doesn't matter, since your world is empty of Being. We are keeping the little flame of Being safe from everything, and you, who have all the rest, have nothing.' On the contrary: we have everything, since we have Being, and beings, and we have never lost track of the difference between Being and beings. We are carrying out the impossible project undertaken by Heidegger, who believed what the modern Constitution said about itself without understanding that what is at issue there is only half of a larger mechanism which has never abandoned the old anthropological matrix. **No one can forget Being, since there has never been a modern world**, or, by the same token, metaphysics. We have always remained pre-Socratic, pre-Cartesian, pre-Kantian, pre-Nietzschean. No radical revolution can separate us from these pasts, so there is no need for reactionary counter-revolutions to lead us back to what has never been abandoned. Yes, Heraclitus is a surer guide than Heidegger: 'Einai gar kai entautha theous.'

##### External events—like natural catastrophes—that threaten our existence also threaten the being-ness of Dasein

**Svenaeus 10**—Centre for Studies in Practical Knowledge, Department of Philosophy, Södertörn University (Fredrik, 24 November 2010, “Illness as unhomelike being-in-the-world: Heidegger and the phenomenology of medicine,” *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, Springer, RBatra) \*\*\*First paragraph is quoting Heidegger’s *Being and Time*

If we adhere to this interpretation of the concept of ‘meaning’, that is in principle ontological-existential [that is – phenomenological], all beings whose mode of being is unlike Dasein must be understood as unmeaningful (unsinnig), as essentially bare of meaning as such. ‘Unmeaningful’ does not mean here a value judgment, but expresses an ontological determination. And only what is unmeaningful (unsinnig) can be absurd (widersinnig). Objectively present things encountered through Dasein [in its being-in-the-world] can, so to speak, run against its being, for example, events of nature which break in on us **and destroy us**. (1996, pp. 151–152, translation altered)

What I would like to focus on here is the very meaninglessness suffered by human Dasein when it encounters something that is not only unmeaningful (unsinnig), but also absurd (widersinnig). The example given by Heidegger is the encountering of “events of nature which break in on us and destroy us”. I think what he has in mind here is something like a catastrophe of nature—an earthquake or a tornado—but would it not also hold for a disease? A disease, at least a severe one, is indeed something which breaks in on us and destroys us. Such phenomena, according to Heidegger, resist meaning; they are even an offense to our attempts to find a place for them in our life as a meaningful whole. They strike against us as something totally unfamiliar, which threatens our existence.

Now, it could be said that there is a way of making sense of diseases, namely, the explanation of their causes by science, which can also lead to ways of interfering with the disease and curing the person who has been affected by it. The same could possibly be said about tornados and earthquakes to the extent that it is possible to predict and guard oneself against them with the help of meteorology, geology, and construction technology. But this way of dealing with the absurd and strange, making the phenomena in question unmeaningful rather than absurd, in the terminology of Heidegger, does not mean that the phenomena in question easily find a place in the everyday world of Dasein. They are still **a source of meaninglessness** on the everyday level, since they are hard to incorporate into the totality of relevance that constitutes the meaningfulness of human being. **They are a threat to the homelike being-in-the-world of Dasein in their radical and dreadful otherness.**

##### No link—we’ve already conducted ontological examination and determined that realism is the best ontology to stop conflict

##### No internal link between their link evidence and their impact evidence—there is a logical gap between standing reserve and extinction

##### Extinction turns the alternative

**Reilly 8**—26 year career in politics during which he founded the nation’s largest political consulting firm of its time. Reilly managed winning campaigns for a wide variety of high-profile candidates, including current Pelosi(Clint, “From Heidegger to the Environment: Californians Are in the World,” 19 August 2008, http://www.californiaprogressreport.com/2008/08/from\_heidegger.html,)

Even in today’s age of cutting-edge science and technology, it is important to remember that history can still be shaped by big ideas. In the 18th century, a philosophy of knowledge emboldened the Founding Fathers to build our democracy – a system of government based on the meritocracy of ideas, rights of the individual and a free press. Capitalism itself is rooted in an innate belief in the power of individual initiative rather than the supremacy of group action – which inspired Marxism and Communism. Philosophy can be mind numbingly boring. But it can help us more clearly see the path to a better world. The mid-20th century German philosopher Martin Heidegger had a favorite term, “Dasein,” which cannot be translated precisely into a single English word. The rough meaning is “being-in-the-world,” Heidegger’s description of human existence. Heidegger’s most important point was that it is impossible to separate a person from the earth. Without the “world,” a human being could not know, grow or even live. A person is like a tree planted in the earth; without the earth, the tree could not exist. But there is a second implication to Heidegger’s “being-in-the-world” bumper sticker. To be in the world is also to be “in common with other beings.” Whether we like it or not, we live in a natural state of dependence upon one another. Put another way, it is impossible to accurately define existence without affirming our dependence not only upon the earth, but also upon our fellow human beings. Was the German philosopher, who lived through World War II without standing up to Nazism’s atrocities, a closet environmentalist and a globalist before his time? Why is this somewhat obvious definition of human existence important to our world today? Many theories of human progress are rooted in a moral imperative. The Christian practice of charity is premised on the religious conviction that we are all God’s children and equal members of the human family. Therefore we are obligated to donate, assist and help others in need. Christians are also challenged to respect nature as God’s creation. This implies that charity and environmentalism are a sacrifice rather than a reflection of our collective self-interest. The truth is exactly the opposite. Protecting the earth and uniting the planet is the only logical political agenda of Dasein. In Jeffrey Sachs’ 2008 book “Common Wealth,” he argues that “the defining challenge of the 21st century will be to face the reality that humanity shares a common fate on a crowded planet.” Sachs, director of Columbia University’s Earth Institute, cites four imperatives for world leaders to address: 1) Pressure on the earth’s ecosystems will produce climate change and species extinction. 2) Population growth will tax the earth. 3) The unequal distribution of wealth across the world is untenable. 4) Failed institutions impair vital global cooperation and problem solving. Last week, Russia invaded Georgia, sparking fears of a reconstituted cold war. The assault belied the presumption that the world was moving beyond nationalism. Fundamental conflicts between Islamic and Western cultures still dominate global politics. Despite a growing consensus on the need for international efforts to curb emissions and develop clean energy, the earth still reels from pollution. Poverty and sickness in sub-Saharan Africa contradict the image of a world that has conquered disease and hunger. And thousands of nuclear bombs still have the unthinkable power to destroy the earth and the entire human race. Those who thought that war and hunger would be easily conquered by science are slowly realizing that our toughest challenges are ahead. Perhaps we need to be reminded of Heidegger’s truth: **No “world,” no “being,”** no “we,” no “I.”

##### The alternative doesn’t solve

**Riis 11**—Carlsberg Research Fellow and Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Science Studies at Roskilde University, Ph.D. from Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Søren, 8 February 2011, “Towards the origin of modern technology: reconfiguring Martin Heidegger’s thinking,” RBatra)

Moreover, Heidegger maintains: ‘‘Readiness-to-hand is the way in which entities as they are ‘in themselves’ are defined ontologico-categorially.’’47 According to Heidegger’s fundamental phenomenology, which he unfolds in detail in Being and Time and reaffirms a decisive part of in ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology,’’ nature is ‘‘primally’’ revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-;’’ that is to say, **‘‘**nature’’ is a resource long before the actual rise of modern and ancient technology, namely simultaneously with the very origin of human beings**.** That something is primordially revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-’’ does not imply that it is actually used or serves accordingly, but that it is revealed as standing ready to be utilized in the corresponding context. As such, it is revealed as ‘‘standing-reserve.’’ This, for example, also corresponds to the empirical fact that prehistoric humans settled close to woods and rivers. In these areas they always had stockpiles of timber, power for transportation, and easy access to drinking water. Based on ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and completed through references to Being and Time, we now have an interpretation of the origin of the essence of modern technology, which traces back the characteristic revealing of das Gestell to the beginning of humankind.48 This does not imply that prehistoric technology is identical with contemporary technology; rather the third genealogy of the rule of das Gestell suggests that **when ‘‘we still more primally’’ try to consider the origin of the challenging revealing characterizing the rule of das Gestell, we in fact rediscover that it is connected to being human**. The rule of das Gestell has challenged humans as long as they have existed. In this sense, **humans** **first and foremost exist under the rule of das Gestell**.49 This also entails a revision and precision of Heidegger’s renowned formula characterizing the world-connectedness of human existence: being-in-the-world. Based on the comparison of ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and Being and Time, human existence is better described as being-under-the-spell-of-das-Gestell. Trying to understand the various more-or-less explicit accounts of the origin of the rule of das Gestell in ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and the resulting ambiguity is not just an exercise, nor only a way to criticize Heidegger. Rather, it is a way to better understand the nuances and layers in Heidegger’s thinking concerning technology and to warn against a short-sighted ‘‘saving’’ from an alleged danger. If the challenging revealing of nature, which characterizes the rule of das Gestell is taken seriously, then **we cannot avoid it just by revolutionizing our technology, instead, we must revise our very human existence.**

##### Preventing nuclear war precedes ontology

**Santoni** **85** - Maria Theresa Barney Chair Emeritus of Philosophy at Denison University (Ronald, “Nuclear War: Philosophical Perspectives” p 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to omnicide. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we Simultaneously act to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the ams race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about out disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be too permissive in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be an early accomplice to the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its annihilation. The Nuremburg tradition calls not only for a new way of thinking, a “new internationalism” in which we all become co-nurturers of the whole planet, but for resolute actions that will sever our complicity with nuclear criminality and the genocidal arms race, and work to achieve a future which we can no longer assume. We must not only “come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought” (Fox) but must act now - with a “new consciousness” and conscience - to prevent the unthinkable, by cleansing the earth of nuclear weaponry. Only when that is achieved will ultimate violence be removed as the final arbiter of our planet’s fate.

## 1ar case

**Trends prove hegemony is good – collapse is historically disastrous**

**Kagan, 12** [2/7/12, Robert, The World America Made, Master Harvard, Ph.D American U, Columnist for the Washington Post, listed a top 100 public intellectual, p. Amazon Kindle]

IN THE FRANK CAPRA classic It’s a Wonderful Life, George Bailey gets a chance to see what his world would have looked like had he never been born. It would be nice if we could do the same for the United States, to see what the world would have looked like had the United States not been the preeminent power shaping it for the past six decades, and to imagine what the world might look like if America were to decline, as so many nowadays predict. We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today—the widespread freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity (even despite the current economic crisis), and the absence of war among great powers. In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are over a hundred. For four centuries prior to 1950, global gross domestic product (GDP) rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the twentieth century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past sixty years no great powers have gone to war with one another. Our era is best known for the war that never happened, between the United States and the Soviet Union.1 There’s plenty wrong with our world, of course, but from the perspective of thousands of years of recorded history, in which war, despotism, and poverty have been the norm, and peace, democracy, and prosperity the rare exceptions, our own era has been a golden age. Some believe this is the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving “norms” of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government—forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But there is also another possibility. Perhaps the progress we enjoy was not an inevitable evolution of the human species but rather the product of a unique and perhaps fleeting set of circumstances: a particular arrangement of power in the international system that favors a certain worldview over others. Maybe if those conditions were to change, if power were to shift, then the characteristics of the world order would change, too. Perhaps democracy has spread to over a hundred nations since 1950 not simply because democracy. Perhaps the stunning global economic growth of the past six decades reflects an economic order shaped by the world’s leading free-market economy. Perhaps the era of peace we have known has something to do with the enormous power wielded by one nation. History shows that world orders, including our own, are transient. They rise and fall. And the institutions they erected, the beliefs that guided them, and the “norms” that shaped the relations among nations within them—they fall, too. Every international order in history has reflected the beliefs and interests of its strongest powers, and every international order has changed when power shifted to others with different beliefs and interests. On some occasions, the prevailing world order has simply collapsed into disorder. When the Roman Empire fell, the order it supported fell, too. Not just Roman government and law but an entire economic system stretching from northern Europe to North Africa was disrupted and would take centuries to rebuild. Culture, the arts, even progress in science and technology, were set back for centuries. People lost the recipe for cement. We saw a similar collapse of world order in our own time. The world we know today was erected amid the chaos and destruction following World War II and the collapse of the European-dominated order that had evolved over four centuries. That order was far from perfect: it produced many wars, an aggressive imperialism, and the widespread oppression of nonwhite races, but it also produced the conditions for an era of great human advances. By the late nineteenth century British control of the seas and the balance of great powers on the European continent together had provided the relative security and stability to allow a growth in prosperity, a modest if tenuous expansion of personal freedoms, and a world knit closer by the revolutions in commerce and communication we today call globalization. It kept peace among the great powers for almost four decades after the Napoleonic Wars, and for another four decades after the wars of German unification. It was so successful that many concluded at the dawn of the twentieth century that mankind had reached a summit of evolution and that major war and tyranny had become obsolete. Yet with the outbreak of World War I, the age of settled peace and advancing liberalism—of European civilization approaching its pinnacle—collapsed into an age of hyper-nationalism, despotism, and economic calamity. The once promising spread of democracy and liberalism halted and then reversed course, leaving a handful of outnumbered and besieged democracies living nervously in the shadow of their newly fascist and totalitarian neighbors. Suddenly it was a world filled the end of the era of American preeminence need not mean the end of the present liberal international order. The expectation, if not assumption, is that the good qualities of that order—the democracy, the prosperity, the peace among great powers—can transcend the decline of American power and influence. Even with diminished American power, the political scientist G. John Ikenberry writes, “the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive.”2 And there is an accompanying view that American decline is in any case already a fact of life, so whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, there is nothing we can do about it. Against this backdrop, it is worth exploring to what degree the present world order depends on American power and its unique qualities. What would it mean for the future if the international order were no longer shaped primarily by the United States and like-minded allied nations? Who or what would take America’s place? And there is another set of questions, equally important: Is America really in decline? Or are Americans in danger of committing preemptive superpower suicide out of a misplaced fear of declining power?

**Primacy is the lynchpin of Asian stability—decline risks nuclear war, deterrence breakdowns, and prolif**

**Lieber 2005** – PhD from Harvard, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown, former consultant to the State Department and for National Intelligence Estimates (Robert, “The American Era”, page 158, WEA)

Parallels between America’s role in East Asia and its involvements in Europe might seem far-fetched. Asia’s geography and history are enormously different, there is no regional organization in any way comparable to the European Union, the area is not a zone of peace, conflict among its leading states remains a potential risk, and there is nothing remotely resembling NATO as a formal multilateral alliance binding the United States to the region’s security and the regional states to one another. Yet, as in Europe, **the United States plays a unique stabilizing role in Asia that no other country or organization is capable of playing**. Far from being a source of tension or instability, this presence tends to reduce competition among regional powers and to deter armed conflict. Disengagement, as urged by some critics of American primacy, would probably lead to more dangerous competition or power-balancing among the principal countries of Asia as well as to a more unstable security environment and the spread of nuclear weapons. As a consequence, even China acquiesces in America’s regional role despite the fact that it is the one country with the long-term potential to emerge as a true major power competitor.

**Heg key to solve India-Pakistan conflict**

**Goh** Chok, Senior Minister of Singapore, International Institute for Strategic Studies, June 4, **2004** (http://www.iiss.org/conferences/the-shangri-la-dialogue/shangri-la-dialogue-2005/2004-speech-archive/keynote-address-prime-minister-goh-chok-tong)

In Asia, as in Europe, unease with America’s overwhelming global dominance is high. But Asia is more keenly aware than Europe of the vital role that the US plays in maintaining global stability. No matter what their misgivings, only a few Asian countries, and certainly  no major US ally, opposed the US on Iraq. There is a clearer appreciation in Asia than in Europe that the fundamental issue in Iraq now is the credibility and resolve of the US. This is because Asia still faces many serious security challenges. Kashmir, North Korea and cross-strait relations between Beijing and Taipei are potential flashpoints. If things go terribly wrong, the conflicts could even turn nuclear. The US is **central** to the management of all three potential flashpoints. All three conflicts also have a direct impact on the global struggle against terrorism. Let me conclude therefore with a few words on each. Potential Flashpoints in Asia The India-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir is a longstanding one, difficult to resolve because of religion and history. If a conflict breaks out, it is not difficult to imagine Kashmir becoming a new theatre for jihad and a fertile ground for breeding terrorists. But India and Pakistan know that a conflict over Kashmir will have devastating consequences for each other and the entire South Asian region. **The US holds the ring**. The desire of both Islamabad and New Delhi to maintain good relations with the US gives Washington leverage that it exercised in 2001 to avert a possible nuclear war.

**The impact is extinction and is highly probable**

Ghulam **Fai**, PhD, Executive Director of the Kashmiri American Council, Business Recorder, 12-17-**2000**

India has suffered modest economic sanctions for its muscular nuclear and missile profiles. But the global worry over its domestically popular aspiration to big power status has rocketed because of the ongoing conflict in Kashmir. Pakistan has sought to match India bomb for bomb and missile for missile. And the greatest causes belli for warring between the two South Asian rivals is Kashmir, which has already sparked two such clashes. But they came before India and Pakistan could engage in nuclear volleys that could **menace the entire planet with nuclear winter** or a variation of that apocalypse. It is the potential for nuclear exchanges over Kashmir that has prompted President Bill Clinton and his national security advisers to characterise the disputed territory as the **most dangerous place on the earth**.

## 1ar disad

#### The plan creates jobs in key swing states -- boosts reelection probability.

Korte, 4-27-12

[Gregory, USA Today, “Politics stands in the way of nuclear plant's future,” http://www.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/story/2012-04-13/usec-centrifuges-loan-guarantees/54560118/1]

. USEC estimates the project at its peak will generate 3,158 jobs in Ohio, and 4,284 elsewhere. Pike County, home to the centrifuges, has a 13% unemployment rate — the highest in Ohio. The median household income is about $40,000. The average job at USEC pays $77,316. Centrifuge parts are stacked up in Piketon. "It's as shovel-ready as they come," says spokeswoman Angela Duduit. Indeed, the project has enjoyed bipartisan support. A USA TODAY review of DOE records shows that no fewer than 46 members of Congress — 32 Republicans and 14 Democrats — have pressured the Obama administration to approve the loan guarantee for USEC. "Quick action is paramount," said one bipartisan letter. "It is imperative that this application move forward now," said another. The congressional support comes from states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia, Missouri, Alabama, Indiana, Maryland, North Carolina and South Carolina— an almost exact overlay of the states that would benefit from the 7,442 jobs the company says would be created.

# AFF EVIDENCE ROUND 7

## 2ac case

#### It will be fast and destabilizing

**Horowitz, 2009** [April, Michael, Department of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons,” journal of conflict resolution, vol 53, no 2]

Learning as states gain experience with nuclear weapons is complicated. While to some extent, nuclear acquisition might provide information about resolve or capabil-  ities, it also generates uncertainty about the way an actual conflict would go—given  the new risk of nuclear escalation—and uncertainty about relative capabilities. Rapid proliferation may especially heighten uncertainty given the potential for reasonable  states to disagree at times about the quality of the capabilities each possesses.2 What  follows is an attempt to describe the implications of inexperience and incomplete  information on the behavior of nuclear states and their potential opponents over time.  Since it is impossible to detail all possible lines of argumentation and possible  responses, the following discussion is necessarily incomplete. This is a first step.  The acquisition of nuclear weapons increases the confidence of adopters in their  ability to impose costs in the case of a conflict and the expectations of likely costs if  war occurs by potential opponents. The key questions are whether nuclear states  learn over time about how to leverage nuclear weapons and the implications of that  learning, along with whether actions by nuclear states, over time, convey information  that leads to changes in the expectations of their behavior—shifts in uncertainty—  on the part of potential adversaries.  Learning to Leverage?  When a new state acquires nuclear weapons, how does it influence the way the  state behaves and how might that change over time? Although nuclear acquisition  might be orthogonal to a particular dispute, it might be related to a particular secu-  rity challenge, might signal revisionist aims with regard to an enduring dispute, or  might signal the desire to reinforce the status quo.  This section focuses on how acquiring nuclear weapons influences both the new  nuclear state and potential adversaries. In theory, system wide perceptions of nuclear  danger could allow new nuclear states to partially skip the early Cold War learning  process concerning the risks of nuclear war and enter a proliferated world more cog-  nizant of nuclear brinksmanship and bargaining than their predecessors. However,  each new nuclear state has to resolve its own particular civil–military issues surrounding operational control and plan its national strategy in light of its new capa-  bilities. Empirical research by Sagan (1993), Feaver (1992), and Blair (1993)  suggests that viewing the behavior of other states does not create the necessary tacit  knowledge; there is no substitute for experience when it comes to handling a nuclear  arsenal, even if experience itself cannot totally prevent accidents. Sagan contends  that civil–military instability in many likely new proliferators and pressures gener-ated by the requirements to handle the responsibility of dealing with nuclear weapons  will **skew decision making** toward more offensive strategies (Sagan 1995). The ques-  tions surrounding Pakistan’s nuclear command and control suggest there is no magic  bullet when it comes to new nuclear powers’ making control and delegation decisions (Bowen and Wolvén 1999).  Sagan and others focus on inexperience on the part of new nuclear states as a key  behavioral driver. Inexperienced operators and the bureaucratic desire to “justify”  the costs spent developing nuclear weapons, combined with organizational biases  that may favor escalation to avoid decapitation—the “use it or lose it” mind-set—  may cause new nuclear states to adopt riskier launch postures, such as launch on warning, or **at least be perceived that way by other states** (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992;  Sagan 1995).3  Acquiring nuclear weapons could alter state preferences and make states more likely to escalate disputes once they start, given their new capabilities.4 But their  general lack of experience at leveraging their nuclear arsenal and effectively com-  municating nuclear threats could mean new nuclear states will be more likely to  select adversaries poorly and to find themselves in disputes with resolved adver-  saries that will reciprocate militarized challenges. The “nuclear experience” logic also suggests that more experienced nuclear states  should gain knowledge over time from nuclearized interactions that helps leaders  effectively identify the situations in which their nuclear arsenals are likely to make  a difference. Experienced nuclear states learn to select into cases in which their com-  parative advantage, nuclear weapons, is more likely to be effective, increasing the  probability that an adversary will not reciprocate.  Coming from a slightly different perspective, uncertainty about the consequences  of proliferation on the balance of power and the behavior of new nuclear states on  the part of their potential adversaries could also shape behavior in similar ways (Schelling 1966; Blainey 1988). While a stable and credible nuclear arsenal com-  municates clear information about the likely costs of conflict, in the short term,  nuclear proliferation is likely to increase uncertainty about the trajectory of a war,  the balance of power, and the preferences of the adopter.

**Trends prove hegemony is good – collapse is historically disastrous**

**Kagan, 12** [2/7/12, Robert, The World America Made, Master Harvard, Ph.D American U, Columnist for the Washington Post, listed a top 100 public intellectual, p. Amazon Kindle]

IN THE FRANK CAPRA classic It’s a Wonderful Life, George Bailey gets a chance to see what his world would have looked like had he never been born. It would be nice if we could do the same for the United States, to see what the world would have looked like had the United States not been the preeminent power shaping it for the past six decades, and to imagine what the world might look like if America were to decline, as so many nowadays predict. We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today—the widespread freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity (even despite the current economic crisis), and the absence of war among great powers. In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are over a hundred. For four centuries prior to 1950, global gross domestic product (GDP) rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the twentieth century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past sixty years no great powers have gone to war with one another. Our era is best known for the war that never happened, between the United States and the Soviet Union.1 There’s plenty wrong with our world, of course, but from the perspective of thousands of years of recorded history, in which war, despotism, and poverty have been the norm, and peace, democracy, and prosperity the rare exceptions, our own era has been a golden age. Some believe this is the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving “norms” of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government—forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But there is also another possibility. Perhaps the progress we enjoy was not an inevitable evolution of the human species but rather the product of a unique and perhaps fleeting set of circumstances: a particular arrangement of power in the international system that favors a certain worldview over others. Maybe if those conditions were to change, if power were to shift, then the characteristics of the world order would change, too. Perhaps democracy has spread to over a hundred nations since 1950 not simply because democracy. Perhaps the stunning global economic growth of the past six decades reflects an economic order shaped by the world’s leading free-market economy. Perhaps the era of peace we have known has something to do with the enormous power wielded by one nation. History shows that world orders, including our own, are transient. They rise and fall. And the institutions they erected, the beliefs that guided them, and the “norms” that shaped the relations among nations within them—they fall, too. Every international order in history has reflected the beliefs and interests of its strongest powers, and every international order has changed when power shifted to others with different beliefs and interests. On some occasions, the prevailing world order has simply collapsed into disorder. When the Roman Empire fell, the order it supported fell, too. Not just Roman government and law but an entire economic system stretching from northern Europe to North Africa was disrupted and would take centuries to rebuild. Culture, the arts, even progress in science and technology, were set back for centuries. People lost the recipe for cement. We saw a similar collapse of world order in our own time. The world we know today was erected amid the chaos and destruction following World War II and the collapse of the European-dominated order that had evolved over four centuries. That order was far from perfect: it produced many wars, an aggressive imperialism, and the widespread oppression of nonwhite races, but it also produced the conditions for an era of great human advances. By the late nineteenth century British control of the seas and the balance of great powers on the European continent together had provided the relative security and stability to allow a growth in prosperity, a modest if tenuous expansion of personal freedoms, and a world knit closer by the revolutions in commerce and communication we today call globalization. It kept peace among the great powers for almost four decades after the Napoleonic Wars, and for another four decades after the wars of German unification. It was so successful that many concluded at the dawn of the twentieth century that mankind had reached a summit of evolution and that major war and tyranny had become obsolete. Yet with the outbreak of World War I, the age of settled peace and advancing liberalism—of European civilization approaching its pinnacle—collapsed into an age of hyper-nationalism, despotism, and economic calamity. The once promising spread of democracy and liberalism halted and then reversed course, leaving a handful of outnumbered and besieged democracies living nervously in the shadow of their newly fascist and totalitarian neighbors. Suddenly it was a world filled the end of the era of American preeminence need not mean the end of the present liberal international order. The expectation, if not assumption, is that the good qualities of that order—the democracy, the prosperity, the peace among great powers—can transcend the decline of American power and influence. Even with diminished American power, the political scientist G. John Ikenberry writes, “the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive.”2 And there is an accompanying view that American decline is in any case already a fact of life, so whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, there is nothing we can do about it. Against this backdrop, it is worth exploring to what degree the present world order depends on American power and its unique qualities. What would it mean for the future if the international order were no longer shaped primarily by the United States and like-minded allied nations? Who or what would take America’s place? And there is another set of questions, equally important: Is America really in decline? Or are Americans in danger of committing preemptive superpower suicide out of a misplaced fear of declining power?

## 2ac states

**No warming**

**Beisner 10** — former associate professor of interdisciplinary studies in economics, government, and public policy, Covenant. PhD, University of St. Andrews (Calvin, Forget Global Warming Mini Ice Age May Be on Its Way, 12 January 2010, http://www.rightsidenews.com/201001128144/energy-and-environment/forget-global-warming-mini-ice-age-may-be-on-its-way.html, AMiles) Note – graph omitted

The UK's MailOnline did just that this week under the headline The mini ice age starts here. Lead paragraph? "The bitter winter afflicting much of the Northern Hemisphere is only the start of a global trend towards cooler weather that is likely to last for 20 or 30 years, say some of the world's most eminent climate scientists." Right. MailOnline reporter David Rose doesn't call them "the world's leading climate skeptics." He calls them "some of the world's most eminent climate scientists"--and he goes on to cite "Mojib Latif, a leading member of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)," "Anastasios Tsonis, head of the University of Wisconsin Atmospheric Sciences Group," and "William Gray, emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Colorado State University." Contrary to fears of inexorably diminishing Arctic sea ice, Rose cites the U.S. National Snow and Ice Data Center as reporting that "Arctic summer sea ice has increased by 409,000 square miles, or 26 per cent, since 2007." Though snow's been unusual for most of the southern half of the United Kingdom in recent decades, the Mail published the accompanying satellite photo of Great Britain during the recent cold snap. The island is essentially all covered with snow. Rose reported record lows as far south as Cuba--something I can attest to, living near Miami in south Florida, where we experienced sub-freezing weather over the weekend. He quoted Tsonis as saying that last week 56% of the United States was covered by snow--something that hasn't happened in several decades. And the "'Arctic oscillation'--a weather pattern that sees the development of huge 'blocking' areas of high pressure in northern latitudes, driving polar winds far to the south . . . is at its strongest for at least 60 years. As a result, the jetstream--the high-altitude wind that circles the globe from west to east and normally pushes a series of wet but mild Atlantic lows across Britain--is currently running not over the English Channel but the Strait of Gibraltar." Consequently, most of the Northern Hemisphere is much colder this winter than it's been in decades--and the Southern Hemisphere is cooler, too. According to Rose, Latif, Tsonis, and other scientists attribute the cold shift primarily to a shift in the world's dominant ocean circulations--the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation--from a warm phase to a cool phase, something that happens about every 20 to 30 years. "The scientists' predictions also undermine the standard climate computer models, which assert that the warming of the Earth since 1900 has been driven solely by man-made greenhouse gas emissions and will continue as long as carbon dioxide levels rise. They say that their research shows that much of the warming was caused by oceanic cycles when they were in a 'warm mode' as opposed to the present 'cold mode'." That's a point made by Dr. Roy W. Spencer in the science chapter of the Cornwall Alliance's new document A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming and illustrated in the graph below. "A significant share of the warming we saw from 1980 to 2000 and at earlier periods in the 20th Century was due to these cycles," said Latif, "perhaps as much as 50 per cent. They have now gone into reverse, so winters like this one will become much more likely. Summers will also probably be cooler, and all this may well last two decades or longer. The extreme retreats that we have seen in glaciers and sea ice will come to a halt. For the time being, global warming has paused, and there may well be some cooling." Tsonis also believes that the ocean current cycles dominated global climate change in the 20th century, including the post-1970s, the period many point to as driven by human greenhouse gas emissions, but he doesn't venture to attribute specific percentages to the natural and human causes. "I do not believe in catastrophe theories," Rose quoted him as saying. "Man-made warming is balanced by the natural cycles, and I do not trust the computer models which state that if CO2 reaches a particular level then temperatures and sea levels will rise by a given amount. These models cannot be trusted to predict the weather for a week, yet they are running them to give readings for 100 years." Gray went farther: "Most of the rise in temperature from the Seventies to the Nineties was natural. Very little was down to CO2--in my view, as little as five to ten per cent." Gray, Tsonis, and Latif all agreed that the findings about the ocean currents undermined the credibility of the computer climate models on which the IPCC and other alarmists rely.

##### Doesn’t solve the case – restrictions are codified in federal law – prevents the requisite licensing, means the cp fails to cause commercialization – that’s 1ac Martin

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

In the United States, it is the responsibility of industry to design, construct, and operate commercial nuclear power plants. However, DOE has statutory authority under the Atomic Energy Act to promote and support nuclear energy technologies for commercial applications. In general, appropriate government roles include researching high-potential technologies beyond the investment horizon of industry and also reducing the technical risks of new technologies. In the case of new commercial reactor designs, potential areas of NE involvement could include: Enabling new technologies to be inserted into emerging and future designs by providing access to unique laboratory resources for new technology development and, where appropriate, demonstration. • Working through the laboratories and universities to provide unique expertise and facilities to industry for R&D in the areas of: o Innovative concepts and advanced technologies. o Fundamental phenomena and performance data. o Advanced modeling and simulation capabilities. APRIL 2010 22 34 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP o New technology testing and, if appropriate, demonstration. o Advanced manufacturing methods. Representative R&D activities that support each of the roles stated above are presented below. The level of DOE investment relative to industry investment will vary across the spectrum of these activities, with a generally increasing trend in DOE investment for longer-term activities. Finally, there is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaborations with other nations through multilateral and bilateral agreements including the Generation IV International Forum, which is investigating multiple advanced reactor concepts. DOE is also a participant in OECD/NEA and IAEA initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems.

And, doesn’t solve prolif leadership - Hargraves and Wallace say only a national initiative sends a credible signal and creates barriers to use – NRC credibility is key that’s Bengelsdorf – only federal action solves nuclear cred

Fertel, 05 - Senior Vice President And Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute (Marvin, CQ Congressional Testimony, “NUCLEAR POWER'S PLACE IN A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY,” 4/28, lexis) //DH

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the federal government's nuclear energy programs, and to maintain America's leadership in nuclear technology development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation. Such efforts have provided a dramatic contribution to global security, as evidenced by the U.S.-Russian nonproliferation agreement to recycle weapons-grade material from Russia for use in American reactors. Currently, more than 50 percent of U.S. nuclear power plant fuel depends on converted Russian warhead material. Nowhere is continued congressional oversight more important than with DOE's program to manage the used nuclear fuel from our nuclear power plants. Continued progress toward a federal used nuclear fuel repository is necessary to support nuclear energy's vital role in a comprehensive national energy policy and to support the remediation of DOE defense sites. Since enactment of the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, DOE's federal repository program has repeatedly overcome challenges, and challenges remain before the Yucca Mountain facility can begin operation. But as we address these issues, it is important to keep the overall progress of the program in context. There is international scientific consensus that a deep geologic repository is the best solution for long-term disposition of used military and commercial nuclear power plant fuel and high-level radioactive byproducts. The Bush administration and Congress, with bipartisan support, affirmed the suitability of Yucca Mountain for a repository in 2002. Over the past three years, the Energy Department and its contractors have made considerable progress providing yet greater confirmation that this is the correct course of action and that Yucca Mountain is an appropriate site for a national repository. --During the past year, federal courts have rejected significant legal challenges by the state of Nevada and others to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the 2002 Yucca Mountain site suitability determination. These challenges questioned the constitutionality of the Yucca Mountain Development Act and DOE's repository system, which incorporates both natural and engineered barriers to contain radioactive material safely. In the coming year, Congress will play an essential role in keeping this program on schedule, by taking the steps necessary to provide increased funding for the project in fiscal 2006 and in future years. Meeting DOE's schedule for initial repository operation requires certainty in funding for the program. This is particularly critical in view of projected annual expenditures that will exceed $1 billion beginning in fiscal 2007. Meeting these budget requirements calls for a change in how Congress provides funds to the project from monies collected for the Nuclear Waste Fund. The history of Yucca Mountain funding is evidence that the current funding approach must be modified. Consumer fees (including interest) committed to the Nuclear Waste Fund since its f6rmation in 1983 total more than $24 billion. Consumers are projected to pay between $750 million to $800 million to the fund each year, based on electricity generated at the nation's 103 reactors. This is more than $2 million per day. Although about $8 billion has been used for the program, the balance in the fund is nearly $17 billion. In each of the past several years, there has been a gap between the annual fees paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants and disbursements from the fund for use by DOE at Yucca Mountain. Since the fund was first established, billions of dollars paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants to the Nuclear Waste Fund-intended solely for the federal government's used fuel program-in effect have been used to decrease budget deficits or increase surpluses. The industry believes that Congress should change the funding mechanism for Yucca Mountain so that payments to the Nuclear Waste Fund can be used only for the project and be excluded from traditional congressional budget caps. Although the program should remain subject to congressional oversight, Yucca Mountain appropriations should not compete each year for funding with unrelated programs when Congress directed a dedicated funding stream for the project. The industry also believes that it is appropriate and necessary to consider an alternative perspective on the Yucca Mountain project. This alternative would include an extended period for monitoring operation of the repository for up to 300 years after spent fuel is first placed underground. The industry believes that this approach would provide ongoing assurance and greater confidence that the repository is performing as designed, that public safety is assured, and that the environment is protected. It would also permit DOE to apply evolving innovative technologies at the repository. Through this approach, a scientific monitoring program would identify additional scientific information that can be used in repository performance models. The project then could update the models, and make modifications in design and operations as appropriate. Congressional committees like this one can help ensure that DOE does not lose sight of its responsibility for used nuclear fuel management and disposal, as stated by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. The industry fully supports the fundamental need for a repository so that used nuclear fuel and the byproducts of the nation's nuclear weapons program are securely managed in an underground, specially designed facility. World-class science has demonstrated that Yucca Mountain is the best site for that facility. A public works project of this magnitude will inevitably face challenges. Yet, none is insurmountable. DOE and its contractors have made significant progress on the project and will continue to do so as the project enters the licensing phase. Congressional oversight also can play a key role in maintaining and encouraging the stability of the NRC's regulatory process. Such stability is essential for our 103 operating nuclear plants and equally critical in licensing new nuclear power plants. Congress played a key role several years ago in encouraging the NRC to move toward a new oversight process for the nation's nuclear plants, based on quantitative performance indicators and safety significance. Today's reactor oversight process is designed to focus industry and NRC resources on equipment, components and operational issues that have the greatest importance to, and impact on, safety. The NRC and the industry have worked hard to identify and implement realistic security requirements at nuclear power plants. In the three-and-a-half years since 9/11, the NRC has issued a series of requirements to increase security and enhance training for security programs. The industry complied-fully and rapidly. In the days and months following Sept. 11, quick action was required. Orders that implemented needed changes quickly were necessary. Now, we should return to the orderly process of regulating through regulations. The industry has spent more than $1 billion enhancing security since September 2001. We've identified and fixed vulnerabilities. Today, the industry is at the practical limit of what private industry can do to secure our facilities against the terrorist threat. NRC Chairman Nils Diaz and other commissioners have said that the industry has achieved just about everything that can be reasonably achieved by a civilian force. The industry now needs a transition period to stabilize the new security requirements. We need time to incorporate these dramatic changes into our operations and emergency planning programs and to train our employees to the high standards of our industry-and to the appropriately high expectations of the NRC. Both industry and the NRC need congressional oversight to support and encourage this kind of stability. CONCLUSION Electricity generated by America's nuclear power plants over the past half-century has played a key part in our nation's growth and prosperity. Nuclear power produces over 20 percent of the electricity used in the United States today without producing air pollution. As our energy demands continue to grow in years to come, nuclear power should play an even greater role in meeting our energy and environmental needs. The nuclear energy industry is operating its reactors safely and efficiently. The industry is striving to produce more electricity from existing plants. The industry is also developing more efficient, next-generation reactors and exploring ways to build them more cost-effectively. The public sector, including the oversight committees of the U.S. Congress, can help maintain the conditions that ensure Americans will continue to reap the benefits of our operating plants, and create the conditions that will spur investment in America's energy infrastructure, including new nuclear power plants. One important step is passage of comprehensive energy legislation that recognizes nuclear energy's contributions to meeting our growing energy demands, ensuring our nation's energy security and protecting our environment. Equally important, however, is the need to ensure effective and efficient implementation of existing laws, like the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and to provide federal agencies with the resources and oversight necessary to discharge their statutory responsibilities in the most efficient way possible. The commercial nuclear power sector was born in the United States, and nations around the world continue to look to this nation for leadership in this technology and in the issues associated with nuclear power. Our ability to influence critical international policies in areas like nuclear nonproliferation, for example, depends on our ability to maintain a leadership role in prudent deployment, use and regulation of nuclear energy technologies here at home, in the United States, and on our ability to manage the technological and policy challenges-like waste management-that arise with all advanced technologies.

##### And, policy through the DOE is essential to create effective international norms and spur tech development

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

A goal-driven, science-based approach is essential to achieving the stated objectives while exploring new technologies and seeking transformational advances. This science-based approach, depicted in Figure 1, combines theory, experimentation, and high-performance modeling and simulation to develop the fundamental understanding that will lead to new technologies. Advanced modeling and simulation tools will be used in conjunction with smaller-scale, phenomenon-specific experiments informed by theory to reduce the need for large, expensive integrated experiments. Insights gained by advanced modeling and simulation can lead to new theoretical understanding and, in turn, can improve models and experimental design. This R&D must be informed by the basic research capabilities in the DOE Office of Science (SC). NE maintains access to a broad range of facilities to support its research activities. Hot cells and test reactors are at the top of the hierarchy, followed by smaller-scale radiological facilities, specialty engineering facilities, and small non-radiological laboratories. NE employs a multi-pronged approach to having these capabilities available when needed. The core capabilities rely on DOE-owned irradiation, examination, chemical processing and waste form development facilities. These are supplemented by university capabilities ranging from research reactors to materials science laboratories. In the course of conducting this science-based R&D, viii APRIL 2010 10 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP infrastructure needs will be evaluated and considered through the established planning and budget development processes. There is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaboration with other nations via multilateral and bilateral agreements, including the Generation IV International Forum. DOE is also a participant in Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development/Nuclear Energy Agency (OECD/NEA) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems. In addition to these R&D activities, international interaction supported by NE and other government agencies will be essential in establishment of international norms and control regimes to address and mitigate proliferation concerns.

##### Only congressional r&d solves worker shortages

**Kammen, 03** - professor of nuclear engineering at Berkeley (Daniel, Federal News Service, Prepared Testimony before the House Committee on Science, 6/12, lexis) //DH

The federal government plays the pivotal role in the encouragement of innovation in the energy sector. Not only are federal funds critical, but as my work and that of others has demonstrated6, private funds generally follow areas of public sector support. One particularly useful metric although certainly not the only measure --. of the relationship between funding and innovation is based on patents. Total public sector funding and the number of patents - across all disciplines in the United States have both increased steadily over at least the past three decades (Figure 5). The situation depicted here, with steadily increasing trends for funding and results (measured imperfectly, but consistently, by patents) is not as rosy when energy R&D alone is considered. In that case the same close correlation exists, but the funding pattern has been one of decreasing resources (Figure 6A). Figure 6A shows energy funding levels (symbol: o) and patents held by the national laboratories (symbol: ). The situation need not be as bleak as it seems. During the 1980s a number of changes in U.S. patent law permitted the national laboratories to engage in patent partnerships with the private sector. This increased both the interest in developing patents, and increased the interest by the private sector in pursuing patents on energy technologies. The squares (l) in figure 6 show that overall patents in the energy sector derived. Figure 6B reveals that patent levels in the nuclear field have declined, but not only that, publicprivate partnerships have taken placed (shaded bars), but have not increased as dramatically as in energy field overall (Figure 6A). There are a number of issues here, so a simple comparison of nuclear R&D to that on for example, fuel cells, is not appropriate. But it is a valid to explore ways to increase both the diversity of the R&D. This is a particularly important message for **federal** policy. Novel approaches are needed to encourage new and innovative modes of research, teaching, and industrial innovation in the nuclear energy field. To spur innovation in nuclear science a concerted effort would be needed to increase the types and levels of cooperation by universities and industries in areas that depart significantly from the current 'Generation III+' and equally, away from the 'Generation IV' designs. Similar conclusions were reached by M. Granger Morgan, head of the Engineering and Public Policy Program at Carnegie Mellon University, in his evaluation of the need for innovative in the organization and sociology of the U. S. nuclear power industrys. A second important issue that this Committee might consider is the degree of **federal** support for nuclear fission relative to other nations. Funding levels in the U.S. are significantly lower than in both Japan and France. Far from recommending higher public sector funding, what is arguably a more successful strategy would be to increase the private sector support for nuclear R&D and student training fellowships. Importantly, this is precisely the sort of expanded publicprivate partnership that has been relatively successful in the energy sector generally. It is incorrect, however, to think that this is a process that can be left to the private sector. There are key issues that inhibit private sector innovation. As one example, many nuclear operating companies have large coal assets, and thus are unlikely to push overly hard, in areas that threaten another core business. This emphasis on industry resources used to support and expanded nuclear program - under careful public sector management - has been echoed by a variety of nuclear engineering faculty members: I believe that if you. were to survey nuclear engineering department heads, most would select a national policy to support new nuclear construction, over a policy to increase direct financial support to nuclear engineering departments. A firm commitment by the federal government, to create incentives sufficient to ensure the construction of a modest number of new nuclear plants, with the incentives reduced for subsequent plants, would be the best thing that could possibly be done for nuclear engineering education and revitalization of the national workforce for nuclear science and technology. - Professor Per Peterson, Chair, Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

##### The impact is the case

**BENGELSDORF, 07** – consultant and former director of both key State and Energy Department offices that are concerned with international nuclear and nonproliferation affair (HAROLD, “THE U.S. DOMESTIC CIVIL NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE AND U.S. NONPROLIFERATION POLICY”, White Paper prepared for the American Council on Global Nuclear Competitiveness May, <http://www.nuclearcompetitiveness.org/images/COUNCIL_WHITE_PAPER_Final.pdf)//DH>

Thus the challenge the U.S. nuclear industry faces today is whether the U.S. civil nuclear infrastructure will be strong enough to support a hoped for nuclear revival in this country, which could entail the construction and commissioning of up to eight nuclear power units during the 2010 to 2017 period. Several studies have been devoted to this question, and the answer is by no means certain. The shortage in skilled labor is expected to double in this country by the year 2020 and the workforce will stop growing as the baby boomers start to retire.

##### States can’t overcome industry proclivity for uranium

Niiler, ‘11

[Eric, Washington Post, 12-15, “Nuclear power entrepreneurs push thorium as a fuel,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/nuclear-power-entrepreneurs-push-thorium-as-a-fuel/2011/12/15/gIQALTinPR\_story.html]

Dr. Dan Ingersoll's biggest argument is that we shouldn't use it because it hasn't been proven to work yet? Are you kidding me? Oh ok, we shouldn't invest in any research at all then because none has been proven yet. Is he forgetting the MSR project at Oak ridge in the 60's? The real reason the nuclear industry doesn't want throium on the table is because A. they won't be able to make a financial killing on it like they do with uranium. What would happen to GE if suddenly the energy from $60,000,000,000 worth of uranium will become available from $10,000 of thorium. There are too many people who have invested in uranium. B. thorium is inefficient as a source of plutonium for bombs.

##### That means they’ll be too risk averse to respond to incentives

Niiler, ‘11

[Eric, Washington Post, 12-15, “Nuclear power entrepreneurs push thorium as a fuel,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/nuclear-power-entrepreneurs-push-thorium-as-a-fuel/2011/12/15/gIQALTinPR\_story.html]

Sorensen says a LFTR using a mixture of thorium as a fuel plus either uranium or plutonium to kick-start the reaction could produce higher core temperatures at lower pressures than steam reactors, meaning it would not need as many safety and cooling systems. Even better, he says, LFTRs could be configured to consume the spent fuel that is sitting around the country at nuclear sites. page 3 Other entrepreneurs are taking a different tack. McLean-based Lightbridge wants to mix thorium and uranium to slightly boost the output of existing nuclear plants. Lightbridge is helping the Russian government build such a program, said Seth Grae, the company’s president and chief executive. But most U.S. nuclear energy industry executives are wary of both approaches to thorium, saying that neither utilities nor investors are eager to gamble on an unfamiliar technology. “Customers are telling us, ‘Let’s focus on taking [financial] risk off the table, not putting it back on,’ ” said Chris Mowry, president and chief executive of Babcock & Wilcox, a Lynchburg-based firm that is building smaller reactors fueled by uranium. “We view [thorium] as something that’s down the road. It’s more of the science-project phase.”

## 2ac qer cp

#### Should doesn’t express certainty

**Green, 89 – US District Judge (**EMERSON EMORY, Captain, USNR (Ret.), Plaintiff v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, Defendant Civil Action No. 83-2494 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 708 F. Supp. 1335; 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2993; 49 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 677; 51 Empl. Prac. Dec. (CCH) P39,276 March 22, 1989, Decided March 22, 1989, Filed, lexis)

Defendant argues that the "should" and "also desired" is "plainly permissive," [5](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1304195469571&returnToKey=20_T11858051186&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.871370.3788639477" \l "fnote5) while plaintiff points out that "should" is a past tense of "shall." While "shall" denotes a mandatory action when used in statutes and contracts, "should" does not ordinarily  [\*\*10]  express such certainty. [6](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1304195469571&returnToKey=20_T11858051186&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.871370.3788639477" \l "fnote6) By examining the context in which "should" is used within the policy statements, this Court concludes that it is not used in a mandatory manner. In setting out the requirements of board membership at that time, the Navy consistently used "will" or "must." The subsection addressing minority officers was the only one in this memorandum that used "should," instead of "will" or "must."

#### Resolved can be an opinion not necessarily a determination

**Webster’s** Revised Unabridged Dictionary, **1998** [dictionary.com]

**Resolved:**

5. To express, as an opinion or determination, by resolution and vote; to declare or decide by a formal vote; -- followed by a clause; as, the house resolved (or, it was resolved by the house) that no money should be apropriated (or, to appropriate no money).

**Doesn’t solve the net benefit – plan is key to overcoming status quo resistance within the DOE**

Farley, 07 [Peter, “Cleaner Nuclear Power?”, <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/409099/cleaner-nuclear-power/>]

Nuclear watchdogs say that Thorium Power's technology has real potential. Moreover, they say that the legislation is needed. It would force the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which regulates the nuclear industry, to create new offices at the agencies to study thorium-fuel options and promote their use abroad. Advertisement http://sync.mathtag.com/sync/img?type=sync&mt_exid=20&redir=http%3a%2f%2fdis.criteo.com%2fpump%2fmatch.aspx%3fc%3d2%26uid%3d%5bMM_UUID%5d "It makes a lot of sense in my view," says Thomas Cochran, director of the nuclear program at the [Natural Resources Defense Council](http://www.nrdc.org/), in Washington. He says that congressional action is needed to overcome resistance within the DOE to exploring thorium.

**The plan is a perquisite to the CP – the QTR needs policies to base its analysis off of, like federal R&D – means a QER on thorium can’t guarantee certainty unless the plan happens**

**Trembath 11** – Policy Analyst, Energy and Climate Program (Alex, "DOE Releases First Quadrennial Techonology Review" The Breakthrough, <http://thebreakthrough.org/archive/doe_releases_first_quadrennial>)

But there are also important elements missing from the QTR. While the report effectively covers the broad energy imperatives facing the United States, specific policies and funding mechanisms are glossed over. A multi-year technology policy from DOE will require flexibility, but some policy instruments will prove essential if the nation is to achieve any of the goals laid out in the report: Increasing federal funding for energy technology R&D, as recommended by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology last fall; creating a Clean Energy Deployment Administration (CEDA) to build public-private partnerships and bridge technologies from demonstration to full maturation; and reformed subsidy policies that prioritize innovation over deployment. Alternative and additional policy instruments are available, and including them in these discussions is important for building an ambitious and fruitful policy dialogue.

#### QER doesn’t solve and has empirically failed

Steven Barlas (Owner of Freelance Washington Journalists, Founder and President

Peerless Placement) January/February 2012 “Does the U.S. Really Need An Energy Policy?” http://wa-dcwriter.blogspot.com/2012/01/does-us-really-need-energy-policy.html

Ever since the Arab oil embargo of 1973, U.S. president after U.S. president has paid at least rhetorical attention to the need for the federal government to develop an energy independence policy. Last March 30, in a speech at Georgetown University, President Obama announced his Blueprint for a Secure Energy Future. He said: "We’ve known about the dangers of our oil dependence for decades. Richard Nixon talked about freeing ourselves from dependence on foreign oil. And every President since that time has talked about freeing ourselves from dependence on foreign oil. Politicians of every stripe have promised energy independence, but that promise has so far gone unmet."¶ But it is highly unlikely that Obama's Blueprint will lead to a firmer footing for U.S. energy security than past Blueprints from other presidents, or, perhaps more importantly, whether a Blueprint is even necessary. Obama's Blueprint policy is a loosely knit set of policies which focus on producing more oil at home and reducing dependence on foreign oil by developing cleaner alternative fuels and greater efficiency. The Blueprint is not the result of any particular deep thinking or strategy. The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) called for the development of such a strategy in its November 2010 Report to the President on Accelerating the Pace of Change in Energy Technologies Through an Integrated Federal Energy Policy. The PCAST called for a Quadrennial Technology Review (QTR) as the first step in preparing a Quadrennial Energy Review. The DOE completed the QTR in November 2011, six months after Obama published his Blueprint.¶ Steven E. Koonin, Under Secretary for Science, DOE, says the QTR is limited in scope and all the DOE felt it could get done given budget and time. "Technology development absent an understanding and shaping of policy and market context in which it gets deployed is not a productive exercise," he states. At this point there is no indication that the DOE will even undertake the much more important QER, much less complete it any time soon.¶ The larger reality is that any energy independence plan proposed by any U.S. President--whether based on a QER or not--has as much a chance of coming to fruition as Washington's hapless Redskins have of getting into the Super Bowl. In any case, the rhetoric of President after President aside, maybe the U.S. doesn't even need an energy independence or energy security policy.

## 2ac elections

#### Romney wouldn’t start a trade war with China if elected

**Politico, 9-15-12**, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/81254.html

Mitt Romney is hoping his tough talk on China policy will win him votes — but few of his big business donors or fellow Republicans support what he’s saying or believe he’d follow through if elected.¶ And if he did, many analysts say, he’d likely spark a disastrous and counter-productive trade war that would hurt both American consumers and the workers he says he’s trying to protect. But Romney advisers say voters shouldn’t expect him to back off the tough talk if he gets elected, and other experts say fears of a “trade war” are overblown since the Chinese need the American market just as much consumers like cheap Chinese imports.

#### China won’t retaliate—no impact

Bosco 9/6—national security consultant, master of laws from Georgetown (Joseph A., 9/6/12, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/china-and-a-mitt-romney-presidency/2012/09/06/32917432-f76f-11e1-a93b-7185e3f88849_story.html>, RBatra)

First, it takes two to wage a “trade war.” When China realizes that Mr. Romney is serious about declaring it a currency manipulator (which it is), wiser counsel may well prevail in Beijing. Playing by international rules is far more in China’s interest than is retaliating against free and fair trade. China could avoid the choice between dangerous escalation and embarrassing submission by preemptively starting to free its currency before a Romney inauguration.

#### Cooperation is hindered by domestic politics – internal link’s inevitable

**Czarnezki**, **11** [Jason J. Professor of Law in the Environmental Law Center and Faculty Director of the U.S.-China¶ Partnership for Environmental Law at Vermont

Law School; A.B., J.D, “CLIMATE POLICY &¶ U.S.-CHINA RELATIONs”, Published After April 4th 2011. <http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Jason%20Czarnezki%20Climate%20Policy%20and%20China.pdf>]

Both the United States and China are hindered by the reality of domestic politics and their ability to blame the other for lack of progress. Professor¶ Cinnamon Carlarne, increasing future political pressure, described the 2010¶ Cancun Climate Change Conference as “a determinative point for both a 2¶ degree world and the continuing validity of the UNFCCC process,”44 but¶ COP-16 in Cancun has come and gone with little fanfare. The Cancun¶ process avoided the high-stakes drama of Copenhagen, successfully set up a¶ fund for adaptation measures in poor countries, created a mechanism for¶ technology transfer, approved a deal to protect tropical forests, and ensured¶ adherence to the goals put forward in the Copenhagen Accord.45 IV. DOMESTIC POLITICS¶ The United States and Chinese governments have significant domestic¶ political pressures that limit their ability and desire to come to a progressive¶ international agreement on climate change, and these pressures create the¶ type of chaos and self-interested behavior seen at Copenhagen.¶ China does not want to limit its amazing and historic economic growth¶ and development. The domestic justifications are sound and¶ understandable. Economic prosperity defines global power, many Chinese¶ still need to be brought out of poverty, and economic success provides the¶ necessary stability for the ruling Communist party to stay in power. As a¶ result, China is happy to become far more energy efficient, but will make¶ no emissions limitations promises that have the potential to limit overall¶ economic growth.¶ To this end, China has developed “carbon intensity” targets in an effort¶ to slow its greenhouse gas emissions and become more energy efficient.¶ China proposes to reduce carbon intensity—the amount of CO2 emitted per¶ unit of economic output—by forty to forty-five percent, compared with¶ 43. Agence France-Presse, China and U.S. Blame Each Other as Climate Talks Conclude,¶ PORTFOLI (Oct. 9, 2010, 7:39PM), http://portfo.li/o/255346-china-and-u-s-blame-each-other-as-climatetalks-¶ conclude.¶ 44. Carlarne, supra note 37, at 149.¶ 45. John M. Broder, Climate Talks End with Modest Deal on Emissions, N.Y. TIMES, Dec. 11,¶ 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/12/science/earth/12climate.html.¶ 670 VERMONT JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAW [Vol. 12¶ 2005.46 Unfortunately, under this plan, even though the rate of emissions¶ will slow, overall emissions will continue to rise. This will eventually rub¶ up against “The China Problem”—that even if other countries reduce¶ emissions to zero, China’s growth and emissions alone, despite improving¶ energy intensity, have the potential to push global temperature above the¶ two degree Celsius threshold goal, and potentially further.47¶ Similar to China, the United States has domestic political and economic¶ considerations that have created roadblocks for international climate¶ agreements and domestic initiatives. These roadblocks include concerns¶ about limiting economic growth, a culture and infrastructure that support¶ high levels of driving and energy consumption, strong lobbying by energy¶ and automobile industries against greenhouse gas regulation, dismissal of¶ climate science, and anti-internationalism among both politicians and¶ citizens. As a result, the U.S. government has not enacted a single law¶ explicitly requiring any public or private entity to mitigate its greenhouse¶ gas impact on the global climate.¶

#### Wind PTC incentives are coming

Laura DiMugno (writer for NAWP, North American Wind Power) September 20 2012 “House Rules Committee Throws Out Wind Energy PTC Proposals” http://www.nawindpower.com/e107\_plugins/content/content.php?content.10430

One pro-renewables amendment will be allowed to go up for debate. The measure, introduced by Rep. Ed Markey, D-Mass., would create a renewable electricity and energy efficiency standard. Similar measures have been proposed numerous times in the Senate by Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., but have never gained considerable traction.¶ The legislation will go up for debate on Thursday and is scheduled to be voted on this Friday. The bill expected to pass the House but is unlikely to get past the Democrat-controlled Senate. Even if it were to pass the Senate, the White House has threatened to veto the legislation, according to a report from The Hill.¶ Exemplified by the measures recently introduced by Blumenauer and Boswell, the looming expiration of the wind PTC is causing some congressional leaders to feverishly tack on PTC-extension amendments to any energy-related legislation up for consideration on Capitol Hill.¶ Last week, Markey introduced an amendment to the Republican-drafted “No More Solyndras Act” - a bill that seeks to terminate the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE) loan-guarantee program - that would make the prohibition of new loan guarantees contingent on the extension of the wind energy PTC. The measure was defeated by a vote of 175-234.¶ Meanwhile, a one-year extension of the PTC for wind remains alive in an omnibus tax-extenders bill that has passed the Senate Finance Committee and awaits a vote by the full Senate. It remains to be seen when the vote will happen, but Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., has said on numerous occasions that he wants to get the bill passed before the Senate breaks.¶ The bill also contains a one-year extension of the investment tax credit, which the offshore wind industry has said is critical to jump-starting development in the U.S.

#### Link is empirically denied

Howell,11 [Katie, \*\*No Date Cited, but Referencing the FY2011 Budget, Obama Budget Increases Funding for Energy Research and Nuclear Power, Scientific American Magazine, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=obama-energy-research-nuclear-power

Nuclear energy and [energy research](http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode.cfm?id=obama-on-energy-and-basic-research-09-02-26) are among the big winners in the proposed $28.4 billion [Energy Department](http://www.energy.gov/) fiscal 2011 budget the White House unveiled today. The almost 5 percent increase in funding from fiscal 2010 covers a $36 billion boost in loan guarantee authority for [nuclear power](http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=next-generation-nuclear) facilities for a total of $54 billion, $300 million for an innovative energy research program, and a $226 million increase in funding for the Office of Science for research and development of "breakthrough" technologies for a total of $5.1 billion. The White House proposed the additional funds to DOE even as Obama has called for a freeze on non-military spending at 2010 levels.

#### Nuke power doesn’t swing the election – both policies are the same

**Wood, 9-13-12**

[Elisa, AOL, “What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy,” http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/]

Fossil fuels and renewable energy have become touchy topics in this election, with challenger Mitt Romney painting President Barack Obama as too hard on the first and too fanciful about the second – and Obama saying Romney is out of touch with energy's future. But two other significant resources, nuclear power and energy efficiency, are evoking scant debate. What gives? Nuclear energy supplies about 20 percent of US electricity, and just 18 months ago dominated the news because of Japan's Fukushima Daiichi disaster – yet neither candidate has said much about it so far on the campaign trail. Romney mentioned nuclear power only seven times in his recently released white paper, while he brought up oil 150 times. Even wind power did better with 10 mentions. He pushes for less regulatory obstruction of new nuclear plants, but says the same about other forms of energy. Obama's campaign website highlights the grants made by his administration to 70 universities for research into nuclear reactor design and safety. But while it is easy to find his ideas on wind, solar, coal, natural gas and oil, it takes a few more clicks to get to nuclear energy. The Nuclear Energy Institute declined to discuss the candidates' positions pre-election. However, NEI's summer newsletter said that both "Obama and Romney support the use of nuclear energy and the development of new reactors."

#### Economy is key – Obama needs a win

**Kurlander, 9/6** communications strategist and columnist for the Sun Sentinel (Steven Kurlander, 6 September 2012, “One Crucial Question Will Decide Who Wins the Presidency in November,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-kurlander/one-crucial-question-will\_b\_1858837.html)//CC

Elections are often simply defined by the context in which major topics are debated by the candidates -- and how these issues are themselves framed can often decide the outcomes, particularly in close elections. The 2012 election will be no different. President Obama's strategy so far has been to employ a cynical class warfare strategy that revolves around attacking GOP candidate Mitt Romney's wealth and raising insidious social issues to deflect from his record during his first term in office. So for a while it was strictly a nasty, negative race driven by the Obama camp about issues like the war on women, voter suppression, gay marriage, the wealthy not paying their fair share of taxes and the like. But that changed last week. Romney and the GOP finally managed to change the momentum of the race and place the president and the Democratic Party on the defensive by framing a simple question to the American people at their otherwise lackluster convention: "Are you better off than you were four years ago?" This question has now focused the whole election on the failure of the Obama Administration to fix the economy during his first term. Ronald Reagan successfully posed this same question at the end of a debate with President Jimmy Carter just one week before the 1980 election to juxtapose his opponent's record in office, which was characterized by stagflation and diplomatic failure in Iran. Looking back at that election, many say Reagan won the election after that debate. Historically, it's proven to be a very serious, powerful question in bad economic times. While at first Obama surrogates initially had difficulty on last Sunday's news talk shows answering that question, Democrats are now arguing that in fact, things are better now in September, 2012, than December, 2008. "You want to know whether we're better off? I've got a little bumper sticker for you. Osama bin Laden is dead, and General Motors is alive," Vice President Biden said at a recent campaign stop in Detroit. Yet a majority of the American people doesn't buy that argument. According to a recent poll conducted by The Hill, over half of those asked think the country is in worse condition than in 2008, when Obama took office in the midst of an economic collapse. A number of other polls about American life and confidence indexes are also at all time lows. GOP vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan went one step further this week, arguing that times under the Carter Administration were even better than now: "The president can say a lot of things and he will," said Ryan in North Carolina. "But he can't tell you that you're better off. Simply put, the Jimmy Carter years look like the good old days compared to where we are right now." Because of the tremendous growth in negativity that is the result of unfettered spending by super PACS, a majority of beleaguered American voters who have been impacted by a long-term depression and two expensive wars will cast their ballots this November with a mindset that votes more against Obama or Romney rather than pull the lever for the best qualified candidate to occupy the Oval Office. So it's which campaign can show who is the worst candidate rather than the better one that wins. That commanding question of "Are you better off than four years ago?" definitely plays into that negative context, and hurts the president, despite such Obama accomplishments like withdrawing troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, stimulating a recovery in the "American" auto sector, fostering a 4,000 point gain in the stock market and record corporate profits, and providing millions more with health insurance under Obamacare. Obama's problem is that life for most Americans just plain sucks now -- gas prices keep climbing, more and more people continue to be upside down and stuck in their homes, high, long-term unemployment for minorities, older workers, and students persists, and most importantly, there's none of that "hope" he promised for improvement. The struggle to make ends meet never seems to end. So unlike 1980, in this presidential race it's just not a question of being better off than before for most Americans, but whether their hard lives will ever get better ever again under a second Obama administration. That's the real, and only, issue that promises to define the 2012 presidential election.

#### The plan creates shovel ready jobs – causes Obama win

Korte, 4-27-12

[Gregory, USA Today, “Politics stands in the way of nuclear plant's future,” http://www.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/story/2012-04-13/usec-centrifuges-loan-guarantees/54560118/1]

. USEC estimates the project at its peak will generate 3,158 jobs in Ohio, and 4,284 elsewhere. Pike County, home to the centrifuges, has a 13% unemployment rate — the highest in Ohio. The median household income is about $40,000. The average job at USEC pays $77,316. Centrifuge parts are stacked up in Piketon. "It's as shovel-ready as they come," says spokeswoman Angela Duduit. Indeed, the project has enjoyed bipartisan support. A USA TODAY review of DOE records shows that no fewer than 46 members of Congress — 32 Republicans and 14 Democrats — have pressured the Obama administration to approve the loan guarantee for USEC. "Quick action is paramount," said one bipartisan letter. "It is imperative that this application move forward now," said another. The congressional support comes from states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia, Missouri, Alabama, Indiana, Maryland, North Carolina and South Carolina— an almost exact overlay of the states that would benefit from the 7,442 jobs the company says would be created.

#### Public supports nuclear power expansion -- no safety concerns.

Bowman, 4-18-12 [Karlyn, American Enterprise Institute, “Polls on the environment, energy, global warming and nuclear power,” http://www.aei.org/papers/politics-and-public-opinion/polls/polls-on-the-environment-energy-global-warming-and-nuclear-power-april-2012/]

\* President Obama is getting low marks on his handling of gas prices. In a February 2012 AP/GfK-Roper poll, 39 percent approved of the job he is doing in this area. Significant majorities say rising gas prices have caused difficulties in their households. \* The majority of Americans still think nuclear power is safe. In a March 2012 Gallup poll, 57 percent favored using nuclear energy as one way to provide electricity for the United States. But people still wouldn’t want to build a nuclear plant in their backyard. Only 35 percent told CBS pollsters in March 2011 that they would approve of a nuclear power plant in their community, and 62 percent disapproved. \* Americans like an “all-of-the-above” energy strategy that includes more energy production, developing alternative energy sources, more conservation and nuclear power.

#### Romney will win – Obama’s approval ratings are too low

**Talgo, 9/16/12 –** commentator for Neon Tommy, a Los Angeles-based news source sponsored by the Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism covering breaking news (Tyler, “Why Romney Will Win The Election” <http://www.neontommy.com/news/2012/09/why-romney-will-win-election>)

Given the post-convention polling bounces, some may give Obama the advantage at this stage of the race, although the bounces are subsiding. For example, new NBC/WSJ polls of three swing states have Obama leading Romney by 49 to 44 percent in Florida and Virginia, and by 50 to 43 percent in Ohio. However, when we take a closer look at the numbers, a different story is revealed. In the Florida and Virginia polls, Democrats were oversampled by 5 percent, and in Ohio they were oversampled by 10 percent. Not convinced? Here’s another fact: recent CBS/NYT/Quinnipiac polls oversampled Democrats by nine percent in Florida and by eight percent in Ohio. The Florida poll had Obama at 51 percent and Romney at 45 percent, and the Ohio poll had Obama at 50 percent and Romney at 44 percent; so, both leads were smaller than the oversampling gap. If you ask me, the advantage here clearly goes to Romney; and, believe me, these are not the only examples.

All of this is revealed in the context of a time in which Republicans are much more enthusiastic than Democrats. Last month the number of Americans who consider themselves Republicans was the highest ever recorded since 2002 at 37.6 percent, compared to only 33.3 percent who consider themselves Democrats.

So, assuming that all else is equal, what does it mean when a national poll says something like 47 percent for Obama and 44 percent for Romney, or vise versa? The nature of the missing 10 percent is one of the most important factors that come to play in all presidential reelection campaigns. Historically, the final results in an election are almost always worse than polling suggests for an incumbent president. If you took the undecided vote, according to Gallup, from every general election since 1964 that featured an incumbent president seeking reelection, 89 percent of it went to the president’s challenger. You can bet that the Obama camp understands that a 47-44 poll in its favor is not good news at all. This is why it’s virtually unheard-of for an incumbent president to win reelection when he's polling below 50 percent.

#### The debates and labor statistics will determine the election

**Lombardo, 9/12**/12 - Global CEO, StrategyOne (Steve, “Why This Election Comes Down to Two Days in October,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-why-this\_b\_1877815.html)

Several national polls released this week show that President Obama received a small but meaningful bounce after the conventions. The bounce -- in the 3-5 point range -- is within the median for convention bounces since 1964. The problem for Republicans is that Romney got no bounce from his convention. In fact, his vote share likely shrunk a point or two in the last two weeks. While the Republican convention may have strengthened Romney's position with the base, it did little to expand his coalition. The momentum from "You didn't build that" has been halted. ¶ However, we see nothing in the data yet to suggest this is anything but a dead heat. For all the hand wringing over the GOP convention and the Romney campaign they are in a dead heat with an incumbent President with 55 days to go. When you look at likely voters in key swing states, this thing is truly 50/50. ¶ Here is our take as of 12 a.m. EST: ¶ The murder of Ambassador Stevens and the unrest in Libya will thrust both candidates into the foreign policy fray. It will be very interesting to see how each handles the coming hours and days and how much the media -- and ultimately voters -- focuses on the issue.¶ Look for a higher level of advertising spend from the Romney campaign in key battleground states over the next two weeks. History has shown that the candidate who is clearly in the lead by mid to late September will likely be the winner in November. That doesn't mean things can't change in October -- they can. But sentiment will start to firm up in the next two weeks. The Romney campaign has a $60 million cash-on-hand advantage, and they should use it now. Team Obama defined Romney in the spring using their cash advantage; the Romney campaign should not wait until October. They need to change the dynamic before October 1.¶ The two biggest dates of the campaign are October 3rd and October 5th. The first debate will be held on Wednesday, October 3rd at the University of Denver at 9 p.m. EST. For three reasons this will be far and away the most important debate:¶ It is the first and therefore, unless there is a major blunder, is likely to be the one that sets the image of Romney in stone.¶ We really do not believe that the other two will matter if Romney has a poor debate performance here. Romney has to win this debate pure and simple.¶ This one is purely on domestic policy, i.e. the economy. If Romney can't win this one, he is unlikely to win the other two, barring a miscue by the President.¶ On October 5th at 8:30 a.m. EST the Bureau of Labor Statistics will release the September unemployment numbers. This will be the most impactful announcement of the campaign. If the unemployment rate goes up it could be devastating for the president's reelection chances. Similarly, if it goes down -- especially if it goes below 8 percent -- it may pretty much secure an Obama victory in November.¶

#### Gridlock inevitable with any election outcome

Curry, 9/11/12 - NBC News national affairs writer (Tom, NBC Politics, “Romney election could create new scenario for EPA and coal,” <http://nbcpolitics.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/09/11/13807749-romney-election-could-create-new-scenario-for-epa-and-coal?lite>)

Whether Mitt Romney or Barack Obama wins the presidential election, a congressional impasse in 2013 seems likely. That’s because under most conceivable election scenarios – with Romney or Obama in the White House, and with either Democrats maintaining their Senate majority, or the Republicans taking it – the minority party could use the filibuster threat to block proposals it opposed.

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)