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### 1NC Topicality

#### Managing government military use is distinct from a “financial incentive”

Gillingham, Newell and Palmer 2006 (Kenneth, Richard and Karen, Resources for the Future, Stanford University, Energy Efficiency Policies: A Retrospective Examination, Annual Review of Environment and Resources, Vol. 31: 161-192, DOI: 10.1146/annurev.energy.31.020105.100157)

In this descriptive survey of demand-side energy efficiency policies, we focus on the adoption of energy-efficient equipment and building practices rather than on energy research and development. Although the applicable programs and policies span quite a broad range, they tend to fall into four general categories: appliance standards, financial incentive programs (for energy-efficient investments), information and voluntary programs, and management of government energy use. We limit the study scope by omitting building codes, professional codes, and transportation polices (including Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards).

#### Even if purchase agreements were topical, they don’t *increase-* there’s nobody to conclude an agreement with

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

Safety and reliability performance¶ The NRC is responsible for regulation of the nuclear industry, including¶ regulation of reactors, fuel-cycle facilities, materials, and waste.¶ Improvement in and enforcement of regulations and requirements¶ for nuclear plant operations have led to improvements in multiple¶ areas. The number of significant events8 (i.e., those events that could¶ lead to a serious safety breach) have decreased from almost 2.5 events¶ per plant in 1985 to 0.1 events per plant in 2007. NRC has also¶ recorded a decrease in automatic scrams9 over the past 20 years.¶ Safety systems are set up throughout the plant to either manually or¶ automatically deal with problems that are detected in the reactor. In¶ 2007, 25 safety system actuations were recorded in the 104 operating¶ nuclear plants. This 2007 figure is smaller than the 1985 figure. The¶ total radiation dose accumulated by workers decreased 20 percent¶ between 1985 and 2007.¶ In 2009, nuclear power plants had a capacity factor of 90.5 percent,¶ generating approximately 800 billion kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity¶ at an average production cost of 2.03 cents/kWh. This production¶ cost includes expenses for uranium fuel, maintenance, and¶ operations [42]. New SMR designs are expected to equal or exceed¶ the standards set by large reactors. SMRs have other important¶ attributes that were described in the DOE preliminary note.¶ While SMRs promise several advantages over large reactors none are¶ currently available. They are currently in the design phase and will¶ require extensive engineering and demonstration before they are¶ ready to be commercialized in the United States.

#### Reasons to vote-

#### Predictability- there are infinite theoretical technologies which they could just “promise to buy”- allows affs that say the tech never materializes to spike all our DAs and read signal advantages about “supporting research” into cold fusion or whatever

#### Ground- all of our DAs like oil, natural gas or even politics are premised on changing commercial energy- our interp guarantees them all the same tech sectors but forces them to prove viability which gives us solvency takeouts- reaches the best middle ground between including new energies and having serious debates about them

### 1NC CP

#### Text – The President of the United States should establish an interagency commission that should publish a energy review based on the results of bipartisan congressional consultation. The interagency commission’s review should substantially increase power purchase agreements for energy production in the United States from light water small modular reactors as a part of its first biennial energy review.

#### Competes---the CP’s policy statement is not legally binding---it doesn’t enact the plan, it simply recommends its mandates

Charles H. Koch 5, the Dudley W. Woodbridge Professor of Law, William and Mary School of Law, Spring 2005, “Policymaking by the Administrative Judiciary,” Alabama Law Review, 56 Ala. L. Rev. 693, p. lexis n110 E.g., Consol Edison Co of New York v. FERC, 315 F.3d 316, 323 (D.C. Cir 2003)

"Policy statements" differ from substantive rules that carry the "force of law," because they lack "present binding effect" on the agency. When an agency hears a case under an established policy statement, it may decide the case using that policy statement if the decision is not otherwise arbitrary and capricious. Id. n111 One brand of nonlegislative rule, "statements of policy," may not have a binding effect on the agency, resulting in even more ambiguous application to administrative judges Several courts distinguish statements of policy from other nonlegislative rules because the latter are not "binding norms" which control the agency For example, the D.C. Circuit described a statement of policy in these terms An agency policy statement does not seek to impose or elaborate or interpret a legal norm. It merely represents an agency position with respect to how it will treat--typically enforce--the governing legal norm By issuing a policy statement, an agency simply lets the public know its current enforcement or adjudicatory approach . . . Policy statements are binding on neither the public, nor the agency Syncor Int'l Corp v. Shalala, 127 F.3d 90, 94 (D.C. Cir. 1997). A statement might not be binding because it serves the dual purpose of "informing the public of the agency's future plans and priorities for exercising its discretionary power," as well as educating and providing direction to agency personnel who are required to implement the agency's policies and exercise its discretionary powers in specific cases. Mada-Luna v. Fitzpatrick, 813 F.2d 1006, 1013 (9th Cir. 1987). A statement acts only prospectively and it does not establish a "binding norm." Id. at 1014 Nonetheless, even a statement may confine the agency's discretion where it would be unfair to deny the statement some effect. Ronald Levin urges that statements and interpretative rules have virtually the same effect Ronald in Levin, Nonlegislative Rules and the Administrative Open Mind, 41 DUKE L J 1497, 1503 (1992).

#### And, it solves the entirety of the case and avoids politics

Rothkopf, Prof @ Columbia and Georgetown, ‘11 David Rothkopf October 26, 2011 CEO and Editor-at-Large of Foreign Policy, he also taught international affairs and national security studies at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs and Georgetown's School of Foreign Service. The time for a White House-led national energy policy is right now http://rothkopf.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/10/26/ the\_time\_for\_a\_white\_house\_led\_national \_energy\_policy\_is\_right\_now

It is currently conventional wisdom in Washington that the president will have a difficult time advancing any major new policy initiatives between now and the election. It would be a mistake for the president and unfortunate for the country were that to prove to be an accurate forecast. Fortunately, nothing is more suspect than Washington's conventional wisdom. Further, it is fully in the president's power to challenge the low expectations of political professionals and average citizens everywhere by building his campaign around not only a rehash of what he has accomplished and a wish list of things for the future, but by enlivening it with meaningful, major new efforts that he is undertaking immediately due to the urgency of the challenges the United States faces. One area in which such an effort is not just needed but is effectively several generations overdue is energy policy. To date, the administration's efforts in the area of energy have concentrated on greening the U.S. energy mix and the jobs that green energy might bring. While worthy, the efforts have been bogged down and undercut for a variety of reasons: ranging from the tactical decision to put health care ahead of energy among policy priorities, the inflated and dubious nature of many green job provisions, the success of climate skeptics in impeding the cap-and-trade debate, and the recent kerfuffle over Solyndra (and, by extension, government energy loan programs, alternative energy programs in general, and the whole idea of "picking winners" associated with some elements of green energy policy). The Energy Department even initiated a worthy Quadrennial Technology Review that mimicked the Quadrennial Defense Review, Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, and the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review processes at Defense, Homeland Security, and State respectively. But it was not a broad-gauge energy policy and the United States has been in need of such a policy for decades. There have been abortive efforts in that direction but they have been compromised or stopped short of becoming a regular element of U.S. government policy making. One reason for the problem is that despite the fact that the Department Of Energy was created to help ensure the creation of such policies during the 1970s, it is simply incapable of overseeing the development of the kind of comprehensive policy that is needed. Unlike defense policy or diplomacy policy, critical components of a true energy policy are managed not in one agency but across the entirety of the U.S. government. It is a domestic and an international issue, a security and an economic issue, a regulatory, financial, diplomatic, and environmental issue. Furthermore, for better or for worse, energy issues have tended to become too politicized by different special interests. Recognizing the need for a "whole of government" approach to the issue, the Bush administration put Vice President Dick Cheney in charge of its effort in this direction. But because of his perceived closeness to certain segments of the energy community (which is far more diverse than typically understood), the process was sidetracked. Similarly, Obama's efforts to date have been impeded because, as one senior official said to me, they have been "too tied up in the climate issue." But of course, the reason an energy policy is so essential is because real energy policy is not just about green jobs, it is about every single job in the United States. Every business depends on access to energy. So do individual citizens and the economy as a whole. Energy, the largest industrial sector in the world, touches every other sector in profound ways. Interruptions in supply, spikes in prices, changes in regulation, shifts in demand, and innovations in technology have ripple effects that go from border to border, from the top to the bottom of the economy. Indeed, part of the problem with the Obama administration's framing of energy issues is that it has been too narrowly focused on new technology and regulation. Not only does energy require a "whole of government" approach, it demands a "whole of economy" approach and above and beyond that a "whole of U.S. national interests" vision. The president could initiate a regular, institutionalized, interagency, economy-wide, holistic energy policy development process without congressional approval -- though he should do it with active bipartisan consultation. He contemplated this during his transition when the idea of an Energy Policy Council or Energy Security Council was contemplated, advocated by at the time by folks like campaign honcho and thoughtful energy-policy thinker, former White House Chief of Staff John Podesta. Because the approach needs to be interagency, it should be directed out of the White House. And because energy security and economic security need to drive it, it should be quarterbacked by National Security Advisor Tom Donilon with the support of National Economic Advisor Gene Sperling. The NSC has more staff, so it should probably lead on this. The Department Of Energy could serve as a kind of secretariat and coordinate key components. But vital issues go well beyond their scope of work and capabilities and pertain to questions like regional stability, access to sea lanes, resource competition, currency policy, etc. While there is a fondness and precedent for quadrennial reviews in the federal government at the moment, it might make sense for this to be more frequent, possibly biennial, especially given the speed of developments in this area. If a congressional mandate for the approach can be won, terrific. If it can be done by executive order, terrific. Who could possibly rationally oppose the development of such a policy?¶ In an election year, of course, such an effort would seem timely and be widely supported -- especially with all eyes on the economy, with so many tens of millions of jobs supported directly and indirectly by the energy sector, and with so many watershed developments possible in areas like supply (shale gas, offshore gas, oil sands, the Arctic) and technology (efficiency tops the list), even revenue generation (the tax policy implications are great and reform opportunities, even those fueled by some kind of market-driven energy or carbon mechanism would be well worth considering). We are on the verge of real transformation at home and around the world in this area -- in traditional as well as new forms of energy, with the vastly increased possibilities of U.S. domestic supply one of the few clear potential game changers for the U.S. economy. (China's domestic energy development policy focuses on "energy under foot." I'm not for slavishly following Chinese policies ... but "under foot" would be a good place to look for our security and growth, too.)¶ Developing the policy would take us into 2013 and either the second term of the Obama administration or the first term of a new administration. But America should not wait until then to address this vital set of concerns ... and much can be done during the year ahead to send a strong message that a time of critical national and economic security we are not sitting on our hands. President Obama can launch such an effort, get credit for it, and address a long overdue need within the U.S. policy apparatus.

### 1NC Politics

#### Will pass- bill comes out in April- new business-labor agreement gets everyone on board but it’s not final

LA Times 3/30/2013 (Labor and business leaders clear hurdle in immigration talks, http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-illegal-immigration-workers-20130329,0,1275171.story)

Labor and business leaders have agreed to a plan for setting wages for low-skilled immigrant workers, possibly ending a scuffle that delayed negotiations in the Senate over a sweeping plan to overhaul the country’s immigration system and create a pathway to citizenship for the estimated 11 million illegal immigrants in the country, officials involved in the talks said.¶ Senators drafting the bill are reviewing the compromise, worked out Friday by representatives from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO, and have not yet decided to include it in their bill, the officials said.¶ But the breakthrough may put the bipartisan group of eight senators back on track to unveil a bill soon after Congress returns from a two-week recess on April 8. Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) said in a statement that the negotiators are now “closer than we have ever been.”¶ The Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO were asked by the senators in December to design a guest worker program that would satisfy labor shortages in the U.S. while still protecting workers rights.¶ A row between negotiators flared up last week over how much to pay immigrant workers. The impasse threatened to derail the talks and caused the senators to push back plans to finish writing the bill by the end of March.¶ Labor leaders wanted to ensure that the salaries of foreign workers would not decrease the wages of Americans doing the same job in the same part of the country. The chamber was concerned that if employers were required to pay higher wages, businesses would not use the program and would continue to hire illegal immigrant workers.¶ After heated discussions this week, the two sides agreed to that employers would pay actual wages paid to American workers or the prevailing wages for the type of job, whichever was higher. The Bureau of Labor Statistics determines prevailing wages based on city, experience and training.¶ According to the plan, the new visa program would be run by a professional bureau at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. The number of visas issued each year would be determined by a formula based on job demand, unemployment numbers and other data.¶ No more than 200,000 visas could be issued each year for low-wage jobs such as housekeeping and landscaping.¶ If the senators don’t agree to the proposal, labor and business leaders will have to go back to the negotiating table.¶ “Ultimately, the final decisions will be made by the senators involved,” Randel Johnson, senior vice president for labor, immigration and employee benefits at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said in a statement.

#### Plan costs capital --- it’s massively unpopular.

Fairley 10 Peter, IEEE Spectrum, May, "Downsizing Nuclear Power Plants,” [spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/downsizing-nuclear-power-plants/0](http://spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/downsizing-nuclear-power-plants/0)

However, there are political objections to SMRs. Precisely because they are more affordable, they may well increase the risk of proliferation by bringing the cost and power output of nuclear reactors within the reach of poorer countries.¶ Russia’s first SMR, which the nuclear engineering group Rosatom expects to complete next year, is of particular concern. The Akademik Lomonosov is a floating nuclear power plant sporting two 35-MW reactors, which Rosatom expects to have tethered to an Arctic oil and gas operation by 2012. The reactor’s portability prompted Greenpeace Russia to call this floating plant the world’s most dangerous nuclear project in a decade**.¶**SMRs may be smaller than today’s reactors. But, politically at least, they’re just as nuclear.

#### CIR is key to high-skill immigration

LA Times 11/9/2012 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China."¶ There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said.

That’s key to India’s economy- US trade ties and increased remittance flows build economic institutions

Gupta and Hegde 2009 (Rupayan and S. Aaron, Assistant Professor of Economics at the Department of Economics, The Gabelli School of Business, Roger Williams University; Assistant Professor of Economics at the Department of Economics, California State University, Bakersfield, An Exploratory Study of Financial Remittances Among Non-Resident Indians in the United States, http://www.springerlink.com/content/npk346515g13127t/fulltext.html)

Remittances sent back home by migrants are an important component of the development finance of less developed countries. Remittances also help in partially offsetting the social loss suffered by developing nations due to the “brain drain” of skilled workers. Ratha (2005) discussed in detail the economic benefits of foreign remittances. These benefits include the increase in foreign exchange reserves, a positive effect on savings and investment, output growth, and multiplier effects if consumed. Hence, the factors influencing remittances by non-residents and first generation migrants to their home country is of considerable interest to policymakers who want to encourage such remittances. This is especially true in the case of India, which has seen a large outflow of skilled labor to foreign countries, particularly to the United States, over the past decade. As non-resident Indians and immigrants of Indian origin often retain close ties with their home country, they are recognized as prime sources of remittances.1 There is much interest in Indian policy circles to identify policy measures that would encourage the increase in volume of remittances back to India. In this paper, we identify the social and economic characteristics affecting the remittance pattern of working households of Indian origin residing in the United States.2 On the basis of identified characteristics, we suggest improvements to some of the remittance-related policies of the Indian government. This exploratory study is the first step towards understanding this complex problem. As a background to our study, we note that there has been considerable outflow of skilled labor from India to the United States over the past decade, a trend that continues unabated to this day. One needs to study the immigration statistics of the United States to gain a perspective of this outflow of skilled labor from India to the United States. In 2006, Indian nationals received 125,717 temporary worker visas (H-1B) to the United States. This was the highest number of H-1B visas granted to workers from any nation.3 Also of note is that 65,363 Indian nationals were granted legal permanent resident status in the United States in 20074 while 47,542 Indian nationals were granted U.S. citizenship in 2006.5 Given these statistics, there is reason to believe that there exists significant potential for the Indian government to tap into remittances from the large community of professionally successful, well-established non-resident Indians6 (NRIs) working in the United States.

Indian econ accesses multiple scenarios for extinction – nuclear winter with Pakistan, nuclear war with China, and Naxalite Insurgency

Robinson ‘10

Dr. David Robinson, History lecturer at Edith Cowan University in Perth, Western Australia and published author that holds a PhD in History, and is mid-way through a Master of International Relations degree. “The Regional and Global Implications of India’s Rise as a Great Power.” – June 17th, 2010 – made available at http://lfort.wordpress.com/2010/06/17/indias-rise-as-a-great-power/#\_ftn21

Over the last decade there has been an increasing focus on India’s economic and military expansion, and its consequences for South Asia and the world. India is rapidly rising to become a great power, but its ascent depends on maintaining relative domestic stability, and carefully crafting its policies towards the United States and its neighbours Pakistan and China. All four states are nuclear powers, so the consequences of any conflict between them are potentially dire.[1] India has found the post-Cold War international environment amenable to expansion of its bilateral ties with all the major powers simultaneously, and has thus pursued a strategy of ‘poly-alignment’ – seeking to be a ‘bridging power’ between the sometimes competing poles of the United States, Russia, China, and the European Union.[2] This inverts India’s traditional non-alignment policy, allowing India to reap the benefits of closer economic and strategic ties while maintaining the same spirit of balanced international relations.[3] To a degree this arises from uncertainty about the shape of the emerging international order, and India’s own lack of a credible vision of its place in that environment.[4] Nonetheless, its growing wealth and population is now enabling India to build up its military might, and as “a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic democracy … India is being asked to shoulder global responsibilities in consonance with its rising global stature”.[5] This paper will consider India’s rise as a global power, and the likely regional and global implications, through a specific focus on its relations with its strategically significant neighbours Pakistan and China, and argue that fundamentally the balance of power between them will not change dramatically in the near future. As Indian power increases it will inevitably challenge existing political, economic and military patterns, but as Harsh Pant argues, “India continues to be ambivalent about power, it has failed to develop a strategic agenda commensurate with its growing economic and military capabilities … throughout history, India has failed to master the creation, deployment and use of its military instruments in support of its national objectives”.[6] From independence in 1947 Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru pursued a strategy of non-alignment that sought to avoid participation in the Cold War, prioritising multilateral institutions and the Non-Aligned Movement. Indian policy was always opposed to the use of military force in international relations.[7] However, as India begins to assert itself as a regional power it is today moving to convert its ‘brown-water’ navy into a ‘blue-water’ navy and is expanding the reach of its air force, moving beyond border control and demonstrating greater concern for strategic issues, such as the protection of shipping lanes.[8] While maintaining constructive relations with the United States, India has also been involved in trilateral dialogue with China and Russia, increasingly sharing their vision of a multipolar world based on consensus among the major powers. India has also become a non-voting member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO), through which China and Russia have sought to strategically counterbalance NATO advancement into the Middle East and Central Asia.[9] At the same time, it is China’s conventional and nuclear capabilities that many argue remain the primary military threat to India’s security and the key motivation for India’s own nuclear weapons program; while the United States, under the G.W. Bush administration, negotiated a substantial deal that would assist India’s ‘civilian’ nuclear development. India’s other major challenge comes from its unstable neighbour Pakistan, with which full-scale war and nuclear exchange have been avoided despite clashes in the Kargil region of Kashmir in 1999, and attacks on India by Pakistani-backed terrorists in 2001 and 2008.[10] The collapse of the Soviet Union and the 1991 Gulf War confronted India with an unprecedented financial crisis, as India simultaneously lost access to Eastern European markets, global oil prices spiked, and over 100,000 Indians were repatriated from the Gulf region, thus precluding their remittances. These economic shocks forced a dramatic rethink of Indian economic and foreign policies. Under Prime Minister Narasimha Rao India steered towards greater economic liberalisation and diplomatic diversity. The Rao government sought greater engagement with the United States and China, as well as making overtures to Israel and seeking improved relations with Southeast Asia through a ‘Look East’ policy.[11] Since then India’s average GDP growth rate has hovered at around 7 percent, and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) has predicted that in spite of the global financial crisis, India’s growth should remain at 6.5 percent in 2010.[12] Not only has India maintained this amazing economic growth, but it is also envisaged that in the next two decades India’s population “will surpass China’s to make it the world’s most populous country, and its rapidly expanding middle class may constitute up to 60 percent of its 1.3 billion-plus people”.[13] Internationally the Indian diaspora now numbers over 20 million, and is relatively affluent, successful, and well-integrated – spreading India’s ‘soft’ cultural influence.[14] While the approximately 3.7 million Indian nationals now living in the six Gulf (GCC) states specifically remit around $8 billion annually.[15] Despite India’s meteoric economic development, it can be said India has both the best of the First World and the worst of the Third World within its borders, and faces unprecedented human security challenges.[16] India now has 410 million people living below the U.N. poverty line – 37.2 percent of its population and actually 100 million more people than in 2004 – and millions of India’s rural poor are faced with food price inflation of up to 17 percent.[17] 60 percent of Indian labour is still agricultural, and the integration of hundreds of millions of peasants into a modern economy may be an extremely painful process.[18] And while Indian infrastructure such as roads, civil aviation, ports, and telecommunications have experienced noticeable improvements in recent years, electricity, railways, and irrigation all still need significant investment; and India continues to lag in social infrastructure, such as education and healthcare.[19] These social inequalities have fuelled the widespread ‘Naxalite’ Maoist insurgency affecting vast areas throughout eastern and central India, and whose 20,000 insurgents current Prime Minister Manmohan Singh identified as the “greatest internal security threat” facing the nation.[20] These internal issues pose the first challenge to India’s rise as a great power, as external projection must be based on a firm foundation of domestic stability. The requirements for domestic stability also shape India’s international needs. Pant asserts that, The biggest challenge for India remains that of continuing to achieve the rates of economic growth that it has enjoyed in recent years. Everything else is of secondary importance. … Unless India can sustain this momentum, its larger foreign policy ambitions cannot be realized”.[21] The political stability of India (and similarly its neighbour China) “is absolutely dependent on continued economic dynamism, which is in turn dependent on energy and resources which must be imported”[22], thus the process of diversifying and securing access to international energy sources is a vital element in avoiding domestic social and political turbulence.[23] In this context Indian oil and gas companies have been encouraged to invest abroad, and have the long-term aim of producing tens of millions of tons of oil a year overseas by 2025. India has thus been developing strategic relationships with the major oil-producing Gulf countries like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates, Central Asian states such as Turkmenistan, and increasingly Iran, as potential sources of energy. Multinational oil and gas pipeline projects have been high on India’s agenda for over a decade, though poor relations with its neighbours Pakistan, Bangladesh and Myanmar have prevented such a scheme; while the United States has used its significant leverage to insist India chooses between pipeline projects or a US-supported nuclear energy programme.[24] The United States has been particularly concerned by India’s relations with Iran, which the international community has worked to isolate for some time. In this case the US is battling the logic of supply and demand as Iran has the world’s third largest reserve of oil, is nearby to India, and India is a resource-hungry customer. But India and Iran also have a convergence of other economic and strategic interests. The ‘Road Map to Strategic Cooperation’ signed by Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Iranian leader Mohammad Khatami in 2003 also mapped out cooperation for increased bilateral trade, and developments like Iran’s Chahbahar port complex, the Chahbahar-Fahranj-Bam railway link, and a Marine Oil Tanking Terminal.[25] The broader aim of these facilities is a North-South Transport Corridor with Russia that would help facilitate the flow of goods across Central Asia, taking cargo from Iran’s ports of Bandar Abbas or Chahbahar via rail to the Caspian Sea and on to Russia’s Caspian ports. This route would significantly reduce travel time and transport costs for exporters like India.[26] India and Iran also share concerns about Sunni Islamist power in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and there are reports of a strategic deal allowing Indian access to Iranian military bases and equipment in the event of war with Pakistan.[27] Politically, Iran has recognised Kashmir as a legitimate part of India; while India is thought to have transferred sensitive nuclear and rocket technology to Tehran, with direct security consequences for Europe and the United States.[28] So, with energy pipelines still far from reality, and only a nascent civilian nuclear programme, India remains highly dependence on energy imports and increasingly seeks to secure sea shipping lanes for the transportation of oil, from nations like Iran and Myanmar, to as far abroad as Sudan and Nigeria.[29] Nearly half of global seaborne trade passes through the Indian Ocean, around 40 percent of offshore oil production comes from the Indian Ocean, and 65 percent of the world’s oil and 35 percent of its gas reserves are found in the littoral states of the Ocean. This makes the region generally strategically significant. With India’s ever-growing reliance on imported energy, any disruptions in the Indian Ocean (which are particularly feasible at ‘choke points’ such as the Strait of Hormuz, the Gulf of Aden, the Suez Canal and the Strait of Malacca) can lead to serious consequences for the Indian economy. While a key danger is interruption of supply during a time of war, today non-state actors, such as organised criminals, pirates or terrorists, are also an increasing threat.[30] As India increasingly sees itself as a great power, and defines its security in terms of the entire Indian Ocean basin, its strategic frontiers will stretch from the African coast, to the Strait of Malacca and the South China Sea, and potentially southwards as far as Antarctica. Continentally, India already looks to the economic and strategic importance of Central Asia, and has made moves to consolidate its strategic footing, including two airbases in Tajikistan.[31] The US government’s recent National Intelligence Council ‘Global Trends 2025’ report projects that, “Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue-water naval capabilities”.[32] Indeed India spent $10.5 billion between 2004 and 2007 on creating the world’s fourth-largest military[33], and is projected to spend more than $45 billion on arms purchases between 2009 and 2013.[34] These will include long-range aircraft, aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines that are intended to make India a formidable force in the Indian Ocean.[35] The Indian Navy is planning over the next decade to create a fleet of 130-140 vessels comprising three aircraft carrier battle groups, and has created a Far Eastern Naval Command, headquartered on the Andaman Islands – 190 nautical miles from Chinese facilities at Great Coco Island.[36] Meanwhile, India’s longer-term plans involve constructing a fleet capable of projecting power into the South China Sea.[37] There is also much speculation around India’s production of the new ‘Surya’ ICBM, which may use technology from India’s civilian space programme. India’s Agni medium-range ballistic missile programme currently consists of missiles with ranges of upwards of 700kms, 2,000kms, and 3,000kms. The Surya project will result in missiles with ranges of 5,000 kms, which can hit Chinese targets; 8,000-12,000 kms, which can reach the United States and Europe; and 20,000 kms, which will have a global reach. These will have the option of a nuclear payload, and potentially multiple warheads.[38] The reported 12,000km-range Surya-2 in particular is tailor-made to target the United States.[39] This expansion of India’s missile capacity may create increased tensions with China, and may hinder cooperation with Europe and the United States.[40] Today the United States remains the key external actor in the Indian Ocean, with its military presence stretching from north and east Africa to the Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea, east to Singapore, and southwards to Diego Garcia. “America’s raw power in the region has made it imperative that New Delhi court the United States”.[41] From the time of Indian independence some American analysts already saw the potential for India to compete for influence with Communist China, but as India took its non-aligned path the US found a willing ally in Pakistan, which provided military bases in exchange for economic and military aid.[42] The US relationship with Pakistan led to them taking financial and political actions against India following the 1965 and 1971 Indo-Pakistani wars, despite Pakistan being the aggressor. Eventually President Reagan made moves to close the diplomatic gap with India in an effort to wean New Delhi away from dependence on Moscow, thus the 1982-1991 period witnessed a gradual warming of US-Indian relations. The collapse of superpower competition in 1991 then allowed the United States to move away from its Pakistani ally and engage with India.[43] By March 2000 President Clinton made this new relationship clear while visiting India, stating that, “we are convinced that it is time to chart a new and purposeful direction in our relationship”.[44] This was enacted through the ‘Next Steps in Strategic Partnership’ agreement of January 2004, which announced expanded cooperation in civilian nuclear activities and space programs, as well as missile defence. A senior official made the strategic design of this relationship clear, announcing that America’s, “goal is to help India become a major world power in the 21st century … We understand fully the implications, including military implications, of that statement”.[45] As part of this emerging relationship the United States has subsequently held joint military operations with India, encouraging them to actively patrol the Indian Ocean and the South China Sea, and President G.W. Bush sponsored agreements facilitating the development of India’s nuclear program.[46] President Bush signed the US-India Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Bill into law in December 2006, which will result in up to $40 billion in trade with India in defence and energy products.[47] Contrary to non-proliferation goals, the deal leaves India free to develop its military nuclear capabilities and increases its ability to access uranium and nuclear technologies.[48] Supporters of the deal see it as President Bush’s, “greatest foreign policy achievement. This success, if sustained through wise policies and skilful diplomacy by future administrations, will portend enormous consequences for the future balance of power in Asia and globally to the advantage of the United States”.[49] Subsequently, under the Obama administration, the Indian government signed a $2.1 billion contract with the US for eight long-range maritime reconnaissance aircraft, capable of anti-submarine and anti-surface naval warfare.[50] Despite India’s advocacy of a non-polar world, Indian policymakers recognise the benefits of American sponsorship; and both nations agree that it serves neither American nor Indian interests for a powerful authoritarian China to dominate the Asian landmass, or for radical Islamic to wage wars that threaten the security of both states.[51] Thus, as the United States perceives strategic advantage from assisting India’s rise to great power status, and India is receiving tangible military and economic benefits from this relationship, for the foreseeable future India’s continued ascendance will be supported by the global hegemon. India’s geographically closest and most frequently problematic relationship is with its neighbour and prodigal twin Pakistan. India’s rise as a great power will most immediately impact the extremely dangerous stalemate between these two states. Many security concerns converge in Pakistan, which has been a key supporter of the Taliban in Afghanistan, factions of which the Pakistani Army is now fighting in a de facto civil war; elements within the state support Islamic terrorist organisations that periodically attack India, provoking regional crises; and, the Pakistani Army has a growing nuclear arsenal, which could be vulnerable to misuse by malicious elements within the state.[52] India and Pakistan engaged in wars in 1965 and 1971, with crises surrounding continuing Pakistani support for an indigenous insurgency in the disputed Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir erupting periodically, and threatening war in 1990.[53] Following Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests in May 1998, Pakistani incursions across the Line of Control in the Kargil region of Kashmir led to another limited war, and the veiled nuclear threat by Pakistani Foreign Secretary Shamshad Ahmed, “We will not hesitate to use any weapon in our arsenal to defend our territorial integrity”.[54] Major terrorist attacks in Jammu and Kashmir on 1 October 2001, and in the Indian capital Delhi on 13 December 2001, again threatened war though merely resulted in major military manoeuvres by India – code-named Operation Parakram.[55] The lack of military retaliation by India despite grave provocation seems to suggest that India is successfully deterred by Pakistan’s nuclear capability, and this in turn only fuels the eagerness of elements within Pakistan to provoke them.[56] Pakistan has adopted an ‘asymmetric nuclear escalation posture’, which has deterred Indian conventional military power and thus enabled Pakistan’s “aggressive strategy of bleeding India by a ‘thousand cuts’ with little fear of significant retaliation”.[57] India is four times larger and seven times more populated than Pakistan, and as Pakistan averages only 300 miles in width it is susceptible to a central assault that would spilt the country in two. A number of important Pakistani cities also lie close to the international border in the Indus River basin.[58] As Pakistan is thus extremely vulnerable to conventional attack by India’s larger military, it defines such an attack as an existential threat to the Pakistani state. Pakistani Lt. Gen. Khalid Kidwai thus outlined that Pakistan would use its nuclear weapons if India attacks Pakistan and conquers a large part of its territory; India destroys a large part of Pakistan’s land or air forces; India blockades Pakistan in an effort to strangle it economically; or India pushes Pakistan into a state of political destabilisation.[59] This asymmetric escalation posture is designed for a rapid first use of nuclear weapons against conventional attacks, thus leaving India without the ability to punish terrorist attacks through conventional retaliation.[60] As elements within Pakistan continue to provoke India, this creates an extremely dangerous imbalance reliant on India’s restraint to maintain peace. Vipin Narang notes that, “Scholars who study the South Asian nuclear balance have argued that if a limited clash between India and Pakistan were to expand into a full-scale conventional war, escalation to the nuclear level would likely result”.[61] And most of the ‘war-game’ scenarios played out by the US military also foresee any conventional conflict between India and Pakistan escalating to the use of nuclear weapons within the first 12 days.[62] New analyses of this eventuality reveal that a conflict be­tween India and Pakistan, in which 100 nuclear bombs were dropped on cities and industrial areas within the two countries, would kill more than 20 million people from the blasts, fires and radioactivity. However, in addition, the explosions could produce enough smoke to cripple global agriculture. Smoke generated by burning cities could create a climatic response that immediately reduces sunlight, cools the planet, and reduces precipitation worldwide. This ‘nuclear winter’ would reduce or eliminate agricultur­al production over vast areas, simultaneously decreasing crop yields nearly everywhere at once. Approximately one billion people worldwide today live on marginal food supplies and would be directly threatened with starvation.[63] While some analysts maintain that nuclear weapons would only be used in a measured way, the chaos, fear and interruption of communications that would follow nuclear war’s commencement leads some to doubt that attacks would be limited in any rational manner.[64] Additionally, Pakistan could face a decision to use its entire nuclear arsenal quickly or lose it to Indian forces which seize its military bases.[65] Thus unrestrained nuclear war in South Asia potentially has cataclysmic regional and global consequences. Following the terrorist attack by Kashmiri militants in December 2001 and the subsequent military standoff with Pakistan in Operation Parakram, the Indian Army announced a new limited war policy in April 2004 called the Cold Start doctrine, which aims to allow conventional retaliation without posing an existential threat to Pakistan.[66] Under Cold Start the Indian army would avoid delivering a catastrophic blow to Pakistan, and instead deliberately only make shallow territorial gains, 50–80kms deep, that could be used in post-conflict negotiations. This doctrine aims to deny Pakistan the justification of ‘regime survival’ for employing nuclear weapons in response to a conventional Indian attack.[67] However, Walter C. Ladwig foresees that, “An operational Cold Start capability could lead Pakistan to lower its nuclear red line, put its nuclear weapons on a higher state of readiness, develop tactical nuclear weapons, or undertake some equally destabilizing course of action”.[68] The danger of escalation is further compounded by the relatively immature ‘command and control’ and early warning systems of both India’s and Pakistan’s nuclear arsenals.[69] Scott Sagan also points out the danger of nuclear accident as, if one of the nations accidentally blows up a nuclear warhead on one of its own military bases, it probably will not have adequate surveillance intelligence to know it has not been attacked by its enemy, and thus may falsely ‘retaliate’ against the other country.[70]

### 1NC Madagascar

#### No oil sands development in Madagascar now- *cost* is the main variable

BBC 10/25/2012 (How will oil affect Madagascar's environmental riches?, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-20075866)

Amid the hills of western Madagascar, villagers have long been aware of a thick sticky substance naturally seeping out of the ground.¶ But it is only recently that these unconventional oil deposits in the region of Melaky have attracted the attention of investors.¶ The rising prices of oil on world markets, coupled with new technologies aim to turn the Indian Ocean island - famous for its unique habitat and wildlife - into a significant oil producer.¶ Tsimiroro is extremely remote - even by the vast island's standards - and most of Madagascar Oil's estimated 100 employees are flown by small plane from the capital, Antanarivo, 300km (about 185 miles) to the east of the oil field.¶ "Currently I work three weeks on the site and get one week off," says a 48 year old oil worker as he arrives at Tsimiroro airstrip after a week in Antananarivo with his wife in children.¶ Tsimiroro, south of the town of Morafenobe, has proven reserves of 1.7bn barrels of heavy oil - buried some 100m to 200m beneath the mountainous region.¶ "Our main objective now is to demonstrate that this oil is a world class asset with a great commercial value," says Laurie Hunter, the British CEO of Madagascar Oil, which has oil concessions totalling 30,000 sq km in the region.¶ Oil is already being pumped in Tsimiroro but only on a very small scale.¶ A few dozens of barrels a day are produced - with the objective of reaching 1,000 barrels a day during 2013.¶ But unlike light crude oil, the hydro carbon in Tsimiroro is hard to extract.¶ A pilot scheme is due to start in November designed to validate high-tech methods needed to extract it.¶ The new technology is able to inject steam into the ground to soften the oil.¶ Commercial exploitation may still be years away, but the prospects of oil being produced in the impoverished country has raised a mix of expectations and concerns among Malagasy people.

#### SMRs enable *cost-efficient tar sands extraction*

Fin 2011 (Al, runs a number of very successful blogs that cover, energy, technology, news and politics, Oil Shale Mining and Research Picking Up Steam, http://oilprice.com/Energy/Crude-Oil/Oil-Shale-Mining-And-Research-Picking-Up-Steam.html)

In the US, companies can find it difficult to get permits for even the most rudimentary research into improved methods of oil shales in situ production or mining. As long as that is the case, energy producers will find it slow going to develop cleaner and more efficient methods of producing a more environmentally friendly shale oil product. In other words, should it become necessary to use this resource, we will use far more environmentally destructive processes -- thanks to the faux environmental regime of Obama - Salazar and its constraints on basic energy research. Gigantic unconventional reserves lie virtually untapped across the planet. But the massive amounts of energy needed to get at them -- and hence, the greenhouse gases released -- is a thought that makes environmentalists bolt awake at night. ...The American Petroleum Institute right now is wracking its members' brains to figure out how to blast a substance called Kerogen from solid rock in Wyoming, Colorado and Utah. If this modern-day alchemy proves commercially viable, the United States could begin exploiting crude oil reserves three times the size of Saudi Arabia's. Just never mind that turning Kerogen into fuel requires massive energy inputs -- code for greenhouse gases -- and up to 3.2 barrels of water for each barrel of shale oil. That hasn't stopped the parched Middle Eastern country of Jordan from signing two major project agreements in the past three years. And recent reports indicate a third is coming soon. \_Tyee Yes, Jordan is another country besides Estonia that will not hesitate to use its oil shale kerogens in whatever way will help the country survive and prosper. ...Jordan, where Royal Dutch Shell is thinking so far out it has signed a contract with the authorities that has the potential, given contract renewals and so on, to last more than 100 years, according to Mr Shaw. The contract, signed in 2009, grants Shell exclusive oil shale exploration rights to a concession area, where it already is drilling for oil shale samples, analyzing them and developing a geological model of Jordan’s deep oil shale resources. Shell says, “There is still a lot to be learnt about the geology and nature of the Jordan oil shale resources” before a decision on a commercial project can be taken. That is true, as it is about oil shale resources globally. Nonetheless, it already seems clear why the majors have never gotten caught up in the peak oil arguments. Given all the potential source rocks out there, and the industry’s record of technologial advancements, they are a long way from pronouncing the last drop of oil has been produced. \_GWPF Kerogens are simply precursors to petroleum which have not been sufficiently heat and pressure treated to make the conversion to crude oil and gas. But the use of nuclear reactor heat -- to finish the job -- for in situ oil shale extraction is likely to make a big difference in global hydrocarbon resources within the next 30 years. The coming wave of small modular reactors are likely to boost oil sands production in Canada, heavy oils in Venezuela, and oil shales in the US and elsewhere -- if the energy starvationists can ever be removed from positions of power and influence.

#### SMRs *would* be used for Madagascar projects- especially energy intensive

The Guardian 2010 (Madagascar Oil brings tar sands project to London market, http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2010/nov/29/oil-oilandgascompanies)

Environmental regulations are also unlikely to be onerous in an island famed for its biodiversity. The Voahary Gasy, an alliance of Madagascan environmental groups, complains that the government has released very little information. But the first projects are likely to use up more energy than the world's only other existing oil sands projects, in Alberta in Canada. The Tsimiroro project will use an "in-situ" method, which involves injecting vast amounts of steam into the ground to heat up the oil and allow it to surface. According to industry estimates, to extract five barrels of oil at Tsimiroro will burn up one barrel of oil, although any excess electricity produced to generate steam could be used at the other project. According to the Pembina Institute, an environmental group, for every barrel of oil used in similar oil projects in Alberta, about 5.5 barrels of oil are produced on average.¶ The Bemolanga field, one of the world's largest untapped oil sands fields, could also be more energy - and carbon - intensive than equivalent projects in Alberta. The project would use open-cast mining to dig out the oily sand and rock. Because the material's bitumen content is lower at 5.5% – compared with 11% in Alberta – it would be harder to separate. However, it is thought that a higher proportion of the oil in Bemolanga could be recovered than in Alberta, so this would reduce the comparative energy intensity.

#### Tar sands development in Madagascar causes environmental destruction and deforestation in a *key carbon sink-* ensures catastrophic warming

Rakotondralambo 2011 (Holly, of Alliance Voahary Gasy, a coalition of 28 Malagasy environmental and human rights organisations, The threat to Madagascar from tar sands; a first hand account, Interview with Liz Murray of the World Development Movement, http://www.wdm.org.uk/blog/threat-madagascar-tar-sands-first-hand-account)

Liz: what are the specific concerns about tar sands mining?¶ Holly: There is growing concern among local communities about the effects that tar sands mining might have on agricultural land, water sources and the unique biodiversity of Madagascar; particularly since we have seen the devastation that has occurred in the Canadian tar sands mining areas. There is great poverty in Madagascar. Many people in the tar sands areas in Madagascar are small scale subsistence farmers who have had their land passed down through their families. They are afraid that they will lose their land or that it will get poisoned. There are also fears about the machinery and the huge lorries that will pass through this area to get to the mining sites.¶ There are also concerns that water supplies may be contaminated with toxic pollution in the same way that we have seen with the Athabasca river in Canada. There are very limited water supplies in this part of Madagascar and most people rely heavily on the rivers for all their water needs, including drinking, cooking and washing. Trees are also used to provide water, and local people make a kind of beer from this which they can sell to make some money. But to exploit the tar sands deposits, many trees may have to be cut down. And on top of this, the Malagasy government and people will only get a tiny percentage, as little as 4%, of the profits from any tar sands extraction.¶ Of course we are also worried about the effect of tar sands extraction on climate change. We are part of the international network REDD, a United Nations collaborative programme working to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries. We don’t have very much old growth forest in Madagascar, but what we do have is vital as a carbon sink and could also have value to our country on the carbon markets. But mining tar sands, which are such a dirty form of fossil fuel, will completely undermine and waste these efforts to reduce climate change.

#### Warming guarantees multiple positive feedbacks triggering extinction, adaptation cannot solve

Tickell ‘8 (Oliver, Climate Researcher, “On a Planet 4C Hotter, All We Can Prepare for is Extinction,” The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>)

We need to get prepared for [four degrees of global warming](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/06/climatechange.scienceofclimatechange), Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a [4C rise](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/07/carbonemissions.climatechange) is absurd and dangerous. [Global warming](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/climatechange) on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the [beginning of our extinction](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/08/kingsnorthclimatecamp.climatechange). The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term [sea level rises](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/gallery/2007/dec/05/climatechange.flooding?picture=331454811) of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, [floods](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/08/climatechange.flooding) and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer [melting of the Arctic sea ice](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/10/climatechange.arctic). The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

#### Independently, Madagascar’s environment is key to *botanical* diversity

Halpern 2002 (Georges M. Halpern is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Medicine (London), and of 26 other prestigious national, foreign and international academies and scientific societies. He is also a doctor of internal medicine and allergy/immunology, and a PhD/DSc in pharmaceutical sciences. He is past-professor of medicine, and nutrition, University of California, Davis. He is the author of seventeen books and 56 book chapters and has published 138 original papers -- The Healing Trail: Essential Oils of Madagascar – page 14-15)

Tectonic forces split Pangaea into two continents, Laurasia and Gondwanaland, at the end of the Paleozoic era 200 to 250 million years ago. Gondwanaland became what are now the continents of the southern hemisphere, as well as India. In the mid-to-late Jurassic period, about 165 million years ago, Madagascar and India – they formed a mini-continent called Greater India – split from Africa and began drifting into the Indian Ocean. Approximately 85 million years ago, India and Madagascar parted company. India “slammed” into Asia in a violent slow-motion collision that produced the Himalaya Mountains. Madagascar has been on its own for at least 85 million years. The lemurs of Madagascar, the bush babies of Africa, and the lorises of Asia share a common ancestor who lived not on the lost continent of Lemuria, but on Gondwanaland. Gondwanaland became South America, Africa, Madagascar, India, and Australia. Most of these land masses border other lands, whereas Madagascar was isolated for 85 million years. **Its flora and fauna evolved in a time capsule**. Is Madagascar the last remnant of the ancient continent Gondwanaland ? It is intriguing to think so. Madagascar has one of the richest and most varied flora in the world. Although the island accounts for only 2 percent of the African continent, 20 percent of the vascular plant species of Africa are found in Madagascar. (Vascular plants, which comprise the majority of plants, have specialized tissues for moving water and photosynthetic products. Algae and mosses are non-vascular plants.) Fully 80 percent of its vascular plant species are endemic. In other words, eight of ten vascular plant species on the island are found in Madagascar and *nowhere else in the world.* **Madagascar is a botanical treasure-house**. Estimating the number of plant species on the island is in itself difficult, because remote areas of the island have not been explored by botanists. The number of plant species ranges from 7,300 to 14,000. To put these numbers in perspective, Brazil, the leader in plant species diversity, has about 55,000 plant species. However, Brazil is eleven times larger than Madagascar. Moreover, Brazil has no endemic plant families, while Madagascar has ten. Other statistics that give a picture of Madagascar’s botanical diversity and uniqueness include: ¶ Ten plants families and 260 genera are endemic to Madagascar. Only Australia, with 13 endemic plants families, has more endemic plant families than Madagascar, and Australia is 13 times the size of Madagascar.¶ More than 1,000 species of endemic orchids are found on Madagascar. This total exceeds the number found in all of Africa. ¶ More bamboo species are found in the Tsaratanana Massif, a mountain range in northern Madagascar, than in all of Africa. ¶ More than 130 species of palms are found on the island, far more than are found in all of Africa.¶ These statistics are startling, and they underscore the importance of saving Madagascar’s rainforest. We simply do not know how many undiscovered plant species are being made extinct by fire, erosion, and other forms of environmental degradation. About 50 percent of pharmaceutical drugs are derived from plants. Who knows if another rosy periwinkle (Catharanthus roseus) is waiting to be discovered in Madagascar ? As Chapter 12 explains, pharmaceutical drugs derived from the rosy periwinkle, also known as the Madagascar periwinkle, have dramatically improved patients’ chances of recovering from childhood leukemia and Hodgkin’s Disease.

#### Botanical diversity checks extinction- Our impact isn’t contagious disease, but that ailments and synthetic adjustments will kill much of humanity and effect immune systems.

Duke 1990 (PhD – Dr. James A. Duke is a former Botanist and ethnobotanist with the US Department of Agriculture, and he now teaches at Tai Sophia. He is a published author of many books. This is an excerpt from: Promising phytomedicinals. p. 491-498. In: J. Janick and J.E. Simon (eds.), Advances in new crops. – available via: http://www.hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/proceedings1990/v1-491.html)

Two hundred and fifty years ago, there were few or no synthetic medicines. The 250,000-300,000 species of higher plants were the main source of drugs for the world's population. Today, 75% of the world's population, the poor 3/4ths, still relies on those plants and other tools of traditional medicine. In the U.S. and Europe the ecological movement has brought about a renewed interest in traditional medicines. High inflation rates in the third world have caused some citizens to return to or begin using herbal remedies. In Bolivia, the Ministry of Health and the Faculty of Medicine of the National University have given official and moral support for the return to native medicines (Healy 1986). Life expectancy of the poor has not increased quite so much as with the richer quarter of the world's population, who depend on non-traditional medicine. Even among prescription drugs, at least 25% contain at least one compound derived from higher plants. The percentage might be higher if we include over-the-counter (OTC) drugs. Today, many avant garde North American citizens, too, are beginning to seek natural alternatives to iatrogenic synthetics. The prescription drug market is around $40 billion\*\* today, suggesting a value of about $10 billion for those drugs containing at least one compound derived from higher plants. Ironically, illicit drugs, mostly natural generate more revenue than prescription drugs, United States markets alone for illicit drugs are estimated at more than $150 billion. In the 250 years when the "developed" quarter of the world shifted largely from naturals to synthetics, life expectancy and population nearly doubled, especially among the "developed" quarter. Who, then, would argue that natural drugs are better than synthetics? Some advocates of natural medicine tend to opt for the natural given a choice between a natural and synthetic of equal efficacy and toxicity. They argue that humans and our hominid ancestors coevolved with the natural compounds. Our genes and immune system also coevolved with many of the natural compounds, but have not experienced any of tomorrow's synthetics. IMPORTANT MEDICINAL PLANT SPECIES Table 1 was compiled mostly from published lists (Morton 1977, Farnsworth et al. 1985, Duke 1985a, and Tyler 1987). It lists 250 of the more important medicinal species, including those from which many of our prescription drugs are derived. Though more than half, maybe even more than three quarters, of the world's plant species are tropical, only about half of these 250 medicinal species are tropical. Why should half of the medicinal species be temperate? Simply because developed countries developed most drugs and, with the peculiar exception of the United States, developed countries tended to study their local flora first enabling them to rely on their own domestic supply. However, the United States imports much of its crude drug supply. Because of the high cost of labor in the United States, it is cheaper to import such things as chamomile from Europe, psyllium from India, and even jimson weed. But finished pharmaceutical products, like agricultural products, are among the few non-deficit columns in the United States export-import balance sheet. I agree with others, such as Norman Farnsworth, America's most outspoken pharmacognoscist, who believe that somewhere in the plant kingdom there is a remedy for everything. But we may have to wait for the Japanese to develop and promote these remedies. In 1986, Japan developed 40% of the new drugs reaching the market, while the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and France all together came up with only 40%, leaving 20% for the rest of the world. In 1987, Japan captured 56% of the natural product patents summarized in Phytotherapy Research. Evolution argues quietly for the natural drug, while economics argues loudly for the unnatural drug. It now costs $125 million to bring a new drug to market in the United States. Out of 4,000 starts, only one makes it to market. Drug companies are not inclined to invest $125 million to prove an herb safe and efficacious. If we grow our medicine and self-medicate, the drug companies could not recoup their $125 million. Pharmaceutical firms do actively study potential medicinal plants, discovering bioactive compounds, which, with some molecular modifications, become proprietary, enabling them to recoup their investment Podophyllotoxin and/or deoxypodophyllotoxin occur in such diverse genera as Anthriscus, Hernandia, Juniperus, Linum, and Podophyllum, some temperate, some tropical. Podophyllotoxin has been converted to etoposide (or vepeside) by a pharmaceutical firm (Bristol Myers). Etoposide was approved for cancer of the testicles in 1984 and for small cell cancer of the lungs in 1986. We assume, since the drug is approved, that it is safe and efficacious. It is said to be more safe and efficacious than the natural compound from which it derives. As with aspirin, etoposide may have fewer side effects than the natural compound from which it derives. But if the natural compound podophyllotoxin were safer and/or more efficacious, Bristol Myers would not be obligated to tell us. They could legally, and with economic good sense, withhold that information until the patent on etoposide expires. Who knows? Conceivably they may already have better naturals and semisynthetics! Why should they introduce them until they've recouped their investment on etoposide? Drug companies' fiscal health necessarily comes before your physical health. All plant species contain poisonous, medicinal and nutritional compounds. For example, the nutritional value of herb teas is not to be discounted. Almost any foliar herb tea, with its vitamin C, could have prevented scurvy, scourge of sailors of the day of long voyages. In the tropics, 25-50 million children may be suffering from xerophthalmia, which could be alleviated or corrected by beta-carotene. A single large carrot may provide four times the vitamin A recommended daily allowance (RDA) (as beta-carotene). Fresh leafy vegetables average about 4,000 ug beta-carotene per 100 g. Foliar herbs used in herb teas also contain relatively high levels of betacarotene. On a zero-moisture basis (ZMB, water removed by calculation), the average herb is richer than 3% milk (ZMB) in fiber, calcium, iron, vitamin A, thiamin, niacin, and vitamin C (Duke and Atchley 1986). We credit our forefathers with the intelligence to have discovered which species around them were poisonous and which were edible. Yet we sometimes seem reluctant to credit them with discovering those intermediate properties we call medicinal activities. Our forefathers discovered many, if not most of the important medicinal species tabulated herein. Farnsworth et al. (1985) calculated that 74% of 119 plant-derived drugs were discovered as a result of chemical studies to isolate the active substances responsible for their traditional use. In other words, we are indebted to our fore fathers empirical observations for about 75% of these currently used botanicals. We may expect new discoveries and uses among these same species, this year, next decade, next century. Only in this decade did we learn, e.g., about antiretroviral activities of hypericin, and anticirrhotic activity of colchicine, compounds rather common in temperate species. We obtain our berberine, ephedrine (also synthesized), hypericin, papaverine (also synthesized), podophyllotoxin, sanguinarine, scopolamine, mostly from temperate species, but, we could get all of them from tropical species. With greater species diversity in the tropics, it follows that there is also a greater diversity in biologically active compounds in the tropics. We've been cautioned by conservationists that tropical species (and their contained compounds) are jeopardized by habitat destruction. Such habitat destruction could endanger sources of some of our current medicines (i.e. Physostigma) and pesticides (i.e. Ryania) in genera confined to the tropics. The world will benefit from conservation of these species. The future discovery of new products from unexplored plants is dependent upon such conservation. In Table 1, I've attempted to estimate the relative rarity of the medicinal plant germplasm in the United States. In Column 3 (Germplasm Availability) a Y (for Yes) indicates that germplasm is readily available, M (for Maybe) indicates that germplasm is limited, while an N (for No) indicates a perceived scarcity or nonexistence of public germplasm in the United States. Species scored M and N should be obtained through germplasm exploration or exchange. In a computer data base, entitled Father Nature's Farmacy, I am compiling the surprising array of new medicinal uses for old (and some new) medicinal plants and the biologically active compounds contained therein. Firmly convinced that we could reduce the greenhouse effect significantly I urge the use of natural medicinal and pesticidal compounds (with biomass fuel as a byproduct in lieu of fossil fuels). Recently, there was near hysteria over traces of daminozide (Alar) (LD50 8,400 mg/kg orally in rats) in apples which contain several natural pesticides more toxic than alar. If Americans are going to get hysterical over traces of relatively non-toxic pesticides and growth regulators in the food chain, perhaps the much more copious natural pesticides should be removed from the food chain and put in the pesticide can, leaving the synthetics in the minds of man rather than the mouths of babes. Reforestation of 100 million hectares with medicinal, pesticidal, and energy species, could tie up enough CO2 to halt the increase in CO2, hence retard or nullify the greenhouse warming (Duke 1985b). Two billion hectares in oil palm could provide us with enough oil (50 billion barrels) which, transesterified, could satisfy the world's energy needs renewably. There's much to be said for growing energy oils in the tropical zone and food oils (less saturated) in the temperate zone. Elsewhere, I have detailed hundreds of new medicinal developments, the majority with old well-known medicinal species, the minority with species like Castanospermum australe A. Cunn. et Fras for which I find no folk medicinal data in the literature. Here are just a few reported new uses for compounds from well-known old medicinal species: anabasine as antifumitory, artemisinin for malaria, chymopapain for disc problems, colchicine for cirrhosis, cynarin for choleretic activity, huperzine for anticholinesterase activity, hypericin for antiretroviral activity, gammalinolenic acid for atopic eczema, lobeline as an antifumitory, pilocarpine for xerostomia, polygodiol for antiyeast activity, psoralen for leukemia, sanguinarine for antiplaque activity, silymarin for hepatitis, taxol for antitumor activity, tetrahydrocannabinol for glaucoma, and yohimbine for serotinergic activity. If forced to name the most important tropical medicinal species, I would apologetically list, with caveats, the following: Catharanthus, Cephaelis, Cinchona, Datura, Dioscorea, Erythroxylum, Physostigma (or Dioclea), Pilocarpus, Psoralea, and Rauwolfia. Collectively these have played a big role in dozens of major disorders. The United States is deficient in germplasm for more than half of these. CONCLUSIONS Once we have investigated and analyzed the tropical species as intensively as temperate species, I predict we'll find many more important medicinal species in the tropics. Already there are hundreds of well-known biologically active compounds from the thousands of tropical species that are used as folk or proven medicines. But fewer than 2% of these tropical species have been analyzed. It seems our duty as plant scientists and custodians of Planet Earth is to study carefully these plants. The value of products they can produce will exceed by a magnitude or more the cost of preserving them from extinction. Somewhere in the tropics, there are probably compounds that will alleviate or correct every ailment known to mankind. Let's only hope someone finds them before the species and Tropical Medicine Chest become extinct. The survival of (hu)mankind is intimately dependent on the survival of forests. The more diverse tropical floras, containing more biologically active compounds, are even more threatened than the better studied temperate floras.

(Note: This was edited for gendered language)

### Solvency

#### 1. Framing Argument – The development time means no short-term impact – if we win there is any gap between the plan and deployment of SMRs our offense comes first

#### 2. Their author concludes it takes a decade just for SMR approval

Andres and Breetz 1AC Article ‘11 (Richard B., Professor of national Security Strategy at the national War College and a Senior fellow and energy and environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic research, institute for national Strategic Studies, at the national Defense University, Hanna L., doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts institute of technology, "Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications," February 2011, www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/StrForum/SF-262.pdf, Mike)

International Reactor Innovative and Secure (IRIS) model, which mostly uses mature LWR technology in a stationary, site-constructed 335 MWe plant, to Hyperion’s Power Module, which has been designed as a factorysealed, truck-transportable, 25 MWe “nuclear battery” with minimal in-core moving mechanical components.17 Second, these reactors today exist only on paper; as Ingersoll explains, “None of the designs are ready for construction today or have even initiated the design certification review process.”18 This means that there are unresolved economic, technical, and regulatory issues associated with these designs. For some of the more novel concepts, it may be a decade or more before they get design approval from the NRC.19

#### Uranium will run out before 2050 if they revive nuclear- it’s not sustainable

Dittmar 2012 (Michael, Institute of Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Nuclear energy: Status and future limitations, Energy, Volume 37, Issue 1, January 2012, Pages 35–40, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.05.040)

4. Why we should not count on miracles from future fission and fusion reactors¶ 4.1. Existing and future standard nuclear reactors¶ While it is acknowledged in general that fossil fuels are finite, most people think that potential problems are still a few generations away and that nuclear fission and fusion energy, following some decades of research and technology, will be the solution. This view is supported by the idea that the known conventional uranium resources can satisfy the current yearly requirements for up to about 100 years. The result of these assumptions is that the situation is believed to be essentially under control. However, it has not gone totally unnoticed that the current real nuclear contribution to the final energy mix is tiny and that some nuclear growth scenario needs to be taken into account.¶ Taking for example the current maximal nuclear growth scenario from the RB09 of perhaps 2% as a guideline, by 2030 nuclear energy would still provide only about 20% compared to the world electric energy supplied in 2009. Taking a more aggressive growth scenario of 5%/year, e.g. a doubling time of roughly 14 years, nuclear energy would reach the capacity to produce today’s total electric energy numbers by roughly 2050, still only about 1/6th of today’s total amount of energy and about 500,000 tons of uranium would be required on an annual basis. Assuming such a 5% annual growth scenario, the claimed to be known exploitable uranium resources in the ground, about 6.3 million tons [3], would already be exploited around the year 2046. Still, even with the more moderate 2% growth scenario, the known resources would be terminated during the next 55 years.

#### Give zero cred to any solvency evidence- SMRs are made-up hypotheticals

Dittmar 2012 (Michael, Institute of Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Nuclear energy: Status and future limitations, Energy, Volume 37, Issue 1, January 2012, Pages 35–40, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.05.040)

4.3. Thorium based fission reactors and other new reactors¶ Not much experimentation with respect to thorium reactor fuel has been reported during the past years. However, the program to develop a high temperature high efficiency pebble bed thorium reactor in South-Africa has been stopped [14]. It follows that those who hope for future TH232 breeder reactors are left with nothing but modeling to support their hopes. Taking the current financial world crisis into account, the construction and realization of thorium prototype reactors during the coming years does not look very promising. During the last years some newspaper reports about future “small” scale wonder nuclear reactors appeared. The articles claim that such projects are supported by some rich private promoters and also by the US and Russian governments. However, looking at similar claims and plans from past decades one might give them not much more credibility than most people give to snake oil medicine. This view seems to be supported by the latest news about such claims [15].

#### SMRs suck- they link harder to every single one of our more generic-sounding nuclear takeouts

Nuclear Power Daily, citing Makhijani, engineering PhD from Berkeley, 2010 ('Small Modular Reactors' No Panacea For What Ails Nuclear Power, citing Arjun Makhijani, http://www.nuclearpowerdaily.com/reports/Small\_Modular\_Reactors\_No\_Panacea\_For\_What\_Ails\_Nuclear\_Power\_999.html)

The same industry that promised that nuclear power would be "too cheap to meter" is now touting another supposed cure-all for America's power needs: the small modular reactor (SMR).¶ The only problem is that SMRs are not only unlikely live up to the hype, but may well aggravate cost, safety, and environmental problems, according to a new fact sheet prepared by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) and Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR).¶ The small modular reactor is being pitched by the nuclear power industry as a sort of production-line auto alternative to hand-crafted sports car, with supposed cost savings from the "mass manufacturing" of modestly sized reactors that could be scattered across the United States on a relatively quick basis.¶ The facts about SMRs are far less rosy. As the IEER/PSR document notes: "Some proponents of nuclear power are advocating for the development of small modular reactors as the solution to the problems facing large reactors, particularly soaring costs, safety, and radioactive waste. Unfortunately, small-scale reactors can't solve these problems, and would likely exacerbate them."¶ Co-author Arjun Makhijani, the president of IEER, holds a Ph.D. in engineering (specialization: nuclear fusion) from the University of California at Berkeley.¶ He said: "Amidst the evaporating hopes for a nuclear renaissance, nuclear power proponents are pinning their hopes on small modular reactors without thinking carefully about the new problems they will create such as inspecting production lines in China, procedures for recalls, or the complications and costs of a variety of new forms of nuclear waste."¶ The supposed cost benefits of SMRs are also subject to debate. The costs of mass manufacturing would be offset at least in part by loss of economies of scale. Further, modular construction will impose much higher costs on the first units, increasing the uncertainty and risk of initiating nuclear power projects.¶ As IEER/PSR researchers note: "The cost picture for sodium-cooled reactors is also rather grim. They have typically been much more expensive to build than light water reactors, which are currently estimated to cost between $6,000 and $10,000 per kilowatt in the US. The costs of the last three large breeder reactors have varied wildly. In 2008 dollars, the cost of the Japanese Monju reactor (the most recent) was $27,600 per kilowatt (electrical); French Superphenix (start up in 1985) was $6,300; and the Fast Flux Test Facility (startup in 1980) at Hanford was $13,800. This gives an average cost per kilowatt in 2008 dollars of about $16,000, without taking into account the fact that cost escalation for nuclear reactors has been much faster than inflation ... Spent fuel management for SMRs would be more complex, and therefore more expensive, because the waste would be located at many more sites."¶ The IEER/PSR fact sheet also raises significant safety-related concerns. Eliminating secondary containment would decrease costs but raise safety issues, while including that containment would raise costs.¶ As regards to sodium-cooled reactors they note: "The world's first nuclear reactor to generate electricity, the EBR I in Idaho, was a sodium-potassium-cooled reactor that suffered a partial meltdown. EBR II, which was sodium-cooled reactor, operated reasonably well, but the first US commercial prototype, Fermi I in Michigan had a meltdown of two fuel assemblies and, after four years of repair, a sodium explosion. The most recent commercial prototype, Monju in Japan, had a sodium fire 18 months after its commissioning in 1994, which resulted in it being shut down for over 14 years. The French Superphenix, the largest sodium-cooled reactor ever built, was designed to demonstrate commercialization. Instead, it operated at an average of less than 7 percent capacity factor over 14 years before being permanently shut."¶ The Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR) exemplifies the types of problems that SMR technology has encountered in the past two decades. The factsheet concludes that "Despite 50 years of research by many countries, including the United States, the theoretical promise of the PBMR has not come to fruition. The technical problems encountered early on have yet to be resolved, or apparently, even fully understood. PMBR proponents in the US have long pointed to the South African program as a model for the US. Ironically, the US Department of Energy is once again pursuing this design at the very moment that the South African government has pulled the plug on the program due to escalating costs and problems."¶ And what about SMRs as some kind of "silver bullet" for averting global warming?¶ The IEER/PSR fact sheet points out: "Efficiency and most renewable technologies are already cheaper than new large reactors. The long time - a decade or more - that it will take to certify SMRs will do little or nothing to help with the global warming problem and will actually complicate current efforts underway. For example, the current schedule for commercializing the above-ground sodium cooled reactor in Japan extends to 2050, making it irrelevant to addressing the climate problem. Relying on assurances that SMRs will be cheap is contrary to the experience about economies of scale and is likely to waste time and money, while creating new safety and proliferation risks, as well as new waste disposal problems."¶ The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research provides policy-makers, journalists, and the public with understandable and accurate scientific and technical information on energy and environmental issues. IEER's aim is to bring scientific excellence to public policy issues in order to promote the democratization of science and a safer, healthier environment.¶ The Physicians for Social Responsibility Safe Energy program focuses on protecting public health, taxpayer dollars, and national security by preventing the construction of expensive, dirty, and dangerous new nuclear reactors.¶ More than 60 years since the first civilian nuclear reactor was turned on, a mature industry is still dependent on government subsidies and economically unsound, mired in unresolved safety issues, and a threat to public health.

#### Plan can’t cause investment or construction- nobody believes it’s real- their ev is all from designers promoting their projects

ENR 2012 (Engineering News-Record, Small Modular Reactors Are Emerging As Next Wave in Sector Construction, 2/27, lexis)

With federal approval to build the first U.S. nuclear reactors in 30 years granted on Feb. 9, two units in the state of Georgia set to generate 2,200 MW of power will proceed. However, the nuclear industry sees future growth in a more scaled-down version known as the small modular reactor, or SMR. Firms already are developing SMRs, ranging in size from 45 MW to 300 MW.¶ «It's time to take the next step, and just about everyone agrees that small reactors are the way forward,» says Chris Mowry, president of the Babcock & Wilcox division that is developing, with Bechtel Corp., a small nuclear reactor, called mPower. Several other companies are pushing into the SMR marketplace, too, including NuScale Power, in partnership with Fluor Corp.; Holtec, in partnership with The Shaw Group Inc., and Westinghouse Co. All SMRs are in a preliminary design stage; at the earliest, the first reactor is expected in 2020.¶ With small-reactor development costs a fraction of the cost of larger reactors, a plant rated at a few hundred megawatts would likely cost about $1 billion to $2 billion, Mowry says. That amount is small enough to secure financing through private capital markets, he adds.¶ SMRs also could be used to build out a 1,000-plus-MW nuclear powerplant at a more gradual pace. «At the end of the day, that's really the value proposition,» Mowry says. He believes the 12 utilities that have applied to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for large-reactor licenses, but have not committed to building them, could transfer their investments and work into applications for small reactors.¶ But not all utilities believe the switch is that simple. «[SMRs] are a long way off from licensing,» said William Johnson, president and CEO of Progress Energy Inc. at a Feb. 9 industry briefing. «In addition, is it economic? It's too conceptual now.»

#### Their ev exaggerates nuclear viability for financial reasons- default neg

Dittmar 2012 (Michael, Institute of Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Nuclear energy: Status and future limitations, Energy, Volume 37, Issue 1, January 2012, Pages 35–40, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.05.040)

5. Can we understand nuclear energy as part of the energy problem before potential nuclear nightmares turn into disasters of unprecedented scales?¶ As we have explained above, commercial nuclear energy is currently contributing only a tiny fraction of about 14% (and only 2.3% to the final useful energy mix) to the worldwide electric energy mix. Still, the nuclear reality in many rich countries of the OECD block demonstrates that it will be essentially impossible to keep their current nuclear energy capacity from slowly declining during the next decade(s). Current hopes from nuclear energy believers, often expressed in our Western media, are thus based on plans in China, India and Russia. Could it perhaps be possible that such statements about the nuclear renaissance are made with the hope that a few Western companies, with the nuclear power plant construction know how, can sell such nuclear power plants in exchange for hundreds of billions of dollars accumulated by China (and soon by India and Russia) during its past years of economic boom? While this idea might be too far fetched, it would at least explain why the acknowledged stressed uranium supply situation during the coming years [3] is almost never discussed in the corresponding reports like in the 2003 and 2009 MIT studies [6].

#### Expanding the domestic industry leads to global exports of *conventional* nuclear power- makes the whole company more profitable, not just its activities with their reactors

Fuhrmann 2012 (Matthew, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University, previously held research fellowships at Harvard and CFR, Splitting Atoms: Why Do Countries Build Nuclear Power Plants?, International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations, Volume 38, Issue 1, 2012, DOI:10.1080/03050629.2012.640209)

Despite the challenges associated with higher front-end costs, firms try to maximize their profits by promoting the construction of nuclear power plants. In the United States, for example, companies such as Westinghouse and General Electric have historically sought to expand America's reliance on nuclear energy. 2 The degree to which firms are successful depends in large part on market size. Nuclear industries can pursue foreign markets, of course, but companies that have larger domestic markets are likely to have greater success in encouraging the use of nuclear power.

#### Developing nuclear power causes war- preemption incentives and targets for terrorists

Fuhrmann 2012 (Matthew, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University, previously held research fellowships at Harvard and CFR, Splitting Atoms: Why Do Countries Build Nuclear Power Plants?, International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations, Volume 38, Issue 1, 2012, DOI:10.1080/03050629.2012.640209)

There may also be a more direct relationship between nuclear energy programs and violent conflict, although scholars are only beginning to systematically probe this connection (for example, Beardsley and Asal 2011; Horowitz 2011). Nuclear power plants sometimes provide targets of opportunity for adversaries during ongoing interstate wars (for example, Fuhrmann and Kreps 2010; Ramberg 1984) and terrorists seeking to trigger a Fukushima-like incident could also find these facilities to be inviting targets (for example, Early, Fuhrmann, and Li 2011; Miller and Sagan 2009). Civilian nuclear facilities may also provide incentives for preventive war. In 1981, for example, the Israeli Air Force bombed an Iraqi civilian nuclear research reactor known as Osiraq in a “bolt from the blue” raid to eliminate Baghdad's capability to build the bomb. While the violence related to nuclear power programs has been quite limited to date, one can easily imagine a scenario where attacks against nuclear facilities are more deadly in the future (Reiter 2011).

### 1NC Grid

#### Empicially denied- hurricane sandy

#### They wrote their plan wrong- Power purchasing agreements mean the DOD buys power from privately owned SMRs which means they are still attached to the grid

#### Small modular *renewables* are dominating the small markets now- no SMRs- we control uniqueness- solves “microgrids”

Lovins 2012 (Amory, physicist, environmental scientist, writer, and Chairman/Chief Scientist of the Rocky Mountain Institute, Oxford MA, A Farewell to Fossil Fuels: Answering the Energy Challenge, Foreign Affairs, March/April, proquest)

REPOWERING PROSPERITY The United States must replace its aging, dirty, and insecure electric system by 2050 just to offset the loss of power plants that are being retired. Any replacement will cost about $6 trillion in net present value, whether it is more of the same, new nuclear power plants and "clean coal," or centralized or distributed renewable sources. But these differ profoundly in the kinds of risks they involve -- in terms of security, safety, finance, technology, fuel, water, climate, and health -- and in how they affect innovation, entrepreneurship, and customer choice. Choosing electricity sources is complicated by copious disinformation, such as the myth that nuclear power was thriving in the United States until environmentalists derailed it after the March 1979 Three Mile Island meltdown. In fact, bad economics made orders for nuclear power plants in the United States fall by 90 percent from 1973 to 1975 and dry up completely by 1978. Indeed, soaring capital costs eventually halted nuclear expansion in all market-based power systems, and by 2010, all 66 reactors under construction worldwide had been bought by central planners. Even after the U.S. government raised its subsidies for new reactors in 2005 to at least their construction costs, not one of the 34 proposed units could attract private capital; they simply had no business case. Neither do proposed "small modular reactors": nuclear reactors do not scale down well, and the economies sought from mass-producing hypothetical small reactors cannot overcome the head start enjoyed by small modular renewables, which have attracted $1 trillion since 2004 and are adding another $0.25 trillion a year. After the 2011 Fukushima nuclear disaster, John Rowe, chair of Exelon (the United States' biggest nuclear power producer), pronounced the nuclear renaissance dead. In truth, market forces had killed it years earlier. New coal and nuclear plants are so uneconomical that official U.S. energy forecasts predict no new nuclear and few new coal projects will be launched. Investors are shunning their high costs and financial risks in favor of small, fast, modular renewable generators. These reduce the financial risk of building massive, slow, monolithic projects, and needing no fuel, they hedge against volatile gas prices. Already, wind and solar power's falling costs are beating fossil-fueled power's and nuclear power's rising costs. Some solar panels now sell wholesale for less than $1 a watt (down 75 percent in three years), some installed solar-power systems in Germany sell for $2.80 a watt, and some U.S. wind-power contracts charge less than three cents per kilowatt-hour -- all far below recent forecasts. Solar power's plummeting cost, a stunning market success, is ruining some weaker or slower solar-cell-makers, but solar and wind power are extinguishing the prospects of coal and nuclear power around the world. So is cheap new natural gas -- a valuable transitional resource if its many uncertainties can be resolved, but not a serious disappointment if they cannot, since higher efficiency and renewable energy should lower the demand for gas.

#### No threat to power grids- their studies don’t take into account the laws of physics

Toor 10 (Amar Toor, “Don't Worry, Terrorists Won't Bring Down the U.S. Power Grid, Researchers Say”, http://www.switched.com/2010/10/14/dont-worry-terrorists-wont-bring-down-the-u-s-power-grid-re/, 10/14/10, Accessed 7/13/12, WITASZEK)

Over the past few months, many politicians and national security experts have grown increasingly worried about what might happen if the U.S. power grid were ever to fall prey to a terrorist attack. Concerns first arose last March, when a scientific study published in the journal Safety Science suggested that even an attack on a small corner of the electrical network could unleash a domino effect across the country, effectively shutting down the entire grid. A subsequent paper published in the journal Nature legitimized these concerns, demonstrating that a similar cascade took down the Italian national power grid in 2003. Now, however, a new study has soundly refuted these claims, which the authors dismiss as "a bunch of hooey." Authored by University of Vermont power grid expert Paul Hines and Penn State's Seth Blumsack, this latest study questions the mathematical model underpinning the apocalyptic scenarios outlined in both the Safety Science and Nature articles. These so-called topological models, Science Daily explains, are essentially graphs of interconnected networks, which are often used to map the flow of river networks, highway traffic and supply chains. According to this model, whenever one node in the network fails or changes, the next will fail, as well -- hence the aforementioned domino effect that many fear. Hines and Blumsack, though, argue that these topological models don't account for the unique laws of physics that govern the flow of electricity. In their article, which was published in the journal Chaos, the researchers point out that the most susceptible parts of the grid are only those which see the most electricity flow, like major connectors or power generating stations. Given the complexity of the U.S. power grid, moreover, it's a bit simplistic, Hines argues, to conceive of the network as a series of dominoes. "Some modelers have gotten so fascinated with these abstract networks that they've ignored the physics of how things actually work -- like electricity infrastructure," Hines says, "and this can lead you grossly astray." The ultimate takeaway, then, is that our power grid is probably more secure than we think, and perhaps too complex for terrorists to bring down in a single blow. And, if lawmakers buy Hines's and Blumsack's approach, they may end up saving a lot of money. "If the government takes these topological models seriously," Hines says, "and changes their investment strategy to put walls around the substations that have the least amount of flow -- it would be a massive waste of resources."

#### There impact story makes no sense-if EMPs take out the grid there is no way to retaliate with nuclear weapons

#### EMP impact claims are bias

Farley, Assistant professor at the University of Kentucky’s Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce and a contributor to PRA’s Right Web 9’

[Robert, “The EMP Threat: Lots of Hype, Little Traction” (<http://www.rightweb.irc-online.org/articles/display/the_emp_threat_lots_of_hype_little_traction>) October, T.a]

The central political purpose of the EMP awareness movement appears to be advancement of the cause of missile defense. The most extreme estimates of the effect of EMP restore the Cold War-era existential fears of nuclear war. Schwellenbach argues "what's driving it is the political global context—it gives the right an issue that allows them to justify hawkish behavior. It is almost a perfect solution to any argument against missile defense—North Korea and Iran.”[[11](http://www.rightweb.irc-online.org/articles/display/the_emp_threat_lots_of_hype_little_traction#_edn11)] The 90 percent casualty estimate advanced by EMP awareness advocates hypes the notion that the United States faces potential annihilation at the hands of its enemies, and goes a step farther: even the smallest nuclear power can destroy the United States with a small number of warheads. This, in turn, reaffirms the need for both a secure missile defense shield (including space-based interceptor weapons) and a grand strategy of preventive war against potential nuclear and ballistic missile proliferators. Almost all EMP awareness advocates—including Gaffney, Gingrich, and Huckabee—call for increased spending on missile defense. Gaffney and Gingrich have also called for a “robust” policy of preemptive war, including attacks on Iranian and North Korean missiles on their launching pads. The fact that EMP is poorly researched and not well understood works in its favor as a scare tactic. Since evidence of EMP’s allegedly lasting impact is purely theoretical, EMP awareness advocates can make outlandish claims regarding the threat that even the smallest nuclear arsenal poses. They can also point to allegations made by the official EMP Commission, ignoring the fact that many outside experts dispute its findings. The Niagara conference’s emphasis on strategic and policy considerations shows that alarmist predictions about EMP attacks serve as fodder for promotion of a larger nuclear weapons stockpile, for missile defense, and for preventive attacks.

#### No escalation - Obama will not use nuclear weapons first

NYT, 2010 [April 5th, Obama Limits When U.S. Would Use Nuclear Arms, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/06/world/06arms.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0]

WASHINGTON — President Obama said Monday that he was revamping American nuclear strategy to substantially narrow the conditions under which the United States would use nuclear weapons.¶ Discussing his approach to nuclear security the day before formally releasing his new strategy, Mr. Obama described his policy as part of a broader effort to edge the world toward making nuclear weapons obsolete, and to create incentives for countries to give up any nuclear ambitions. To set an example, the new strategy renounces the development of any new nuclear weapons, overruling the initial position of his own defense secretary.¶ Mr. Obama’s strategy is a sharp shift from those of his predecessors and seeks to revamp the nation’s nuclear posture for a new age in which rogue states and terrorist organizations are greater threats than traditional powers like Russia and China.¶ It eliminates much of the ambiguity that has deliberately existed in American nuclear policy since the opening days of the cold war. For the first time, the United States is explicitly committing not to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear states that are in compliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, even if they attacked the United States with biological or chemical weapons or launched a crippling cyberattack.¶ Those threats, Mr. Obama argued, could be deterred with “a series of graded options,” a combination of old and new conventional weapons. “I’m going to preserve all the tools that are necessary in order to make sure that the American people are safe and secure,” he said in the interview in the Oval Office.¶ White House officials said the new strategy would include the option of reconsidering the use of nuclear retaliation against a biological attack, if the development of such weapons reached a level that made the United States vulnerable to a devastating strike.¶ Mr. Obama’s new strategy is bound to be controversial, both among conservatives who have warned against diluting the United States’ most potent deterrent and among liberals who were hoping for a blanket statement that the country would never be the first to use nuclear weapons.¶ Mr. Obama argued for a slower course, saying, “We are going to want to make sure that we can continue to move towards less emphasis on nuclear weapons,” and, he added, to “make sure that our conventional weapons capability is an effective deterrent in all but the most extreme circumstances.”¶ The release of the new strategy, known as the Nuclear Posture Review, opens an intensive nine days of nuclear diplomacy geared toward reducing weapons. Mr. Obama plans to fly to Prague to sign a new arms-control agreement with Russia on Thursday and then next week will host 47 world leaders in Washington for a summit meeting on nuclear security.¶ The most immediate test of the new strategy is likely to be in dealing with Iran, which has defied the international community by developing a nuclear program that it insists is peaceful but that the United States and its allies say is a precursor to weapons. Asked about the escalating confrontation with Iran, Mr. Obama said he was now convinced that “the current course they’re on would provide them with nuclear weapons capabilities,” though he gave no timeline.¶ He dodged when asked whether he shared Israel’s view that a “nuclear capable” Iran was as dangerous as one that actually possessed weapons.¶ “I’m not going to parse that right now,” he said, sitting in his office as children played on the South Lawn of the White House at a daylong Easter egg roll. But he cited the example of North Korea, whose nuclear capabilities were unclear until it conducted a test in 2006, which it followed with a second shortly after Mr. Obama took office.¶ “I think it’s safe to say that there was a time when North Korea was said to be simply a nuclear-capable state until it kicked out the I.A.E.A. and become a self-professed nuclear state,” he said, referring to the International Atomic Energy Agency. “And so rather than splitting hairs on this, I think that the international community has a strong sense of what it means to pursue civilian nuclear energy for peaceful purposes versus a weaponizing capability.”¶ Mr. Obama said he wanted a new United Nations sanctions resolution against Iran “that has bite,” but he would not embrace the phrase “crippling sanctions” once used by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. And he acknowledged the limitations of United Nations action. “We’re not naïve that any single set of sanctions automatically is going to change Iranian behavior,” he said, adding “there’s no light switch in this process.”¶ In the year since Mr. Obama gave a speech in Prague declaring that he would shift the policy of the United States toward the elimination of nuclear weapons, his staff has been meeting — and arguing — over how to turn that commitment into a workable policy, without undermining the credibility of the country’s nuclear deterrent.¶ The strategy to be released on Tuesday is months late, partly because Mr. Obama had to adjudicate among advisers who feared he was not changing American policy significantly enough, and those who feared that anything too precipitous could embolden potential adversaries. One senior official said that the new strategy was the product of 150 meetings, including 30 convened by the White House National Security Council, and that even then Mr. Obama had to step in to order rewrites.¶ He ended up with a document that differed considerably from the one President George W. Bush published in early 2002, just three months after the Sept. 11 attacks. Mr. Bush, too, argued for a post-cold-war rethinking of nuclear deterrence, reducing American reliance on those weapons.¶ But Mr. Bush’s document also reserved the right to use nuclear weapons “to deter a wide range of threats,” including banned chemical and biological weapons and large-scale conventional attacks. Mr. Obama’s strategy abandons that option — except if the attack is by a nuclear state, or a nonsignatory or violator of the nonproliferation treaty.¶ The document to be released Tuesday after months of study led by the Defense Department will declare that “the fundamental role” of nuclear weapons is to deter nuclear attacks on the United States, allies or partners, a narrower presumption than the past. But Mr. Obama rejected the formulation sought by arms control advocates to declare that the “sole role” of nuclear weapons is to deter a nuclear attack.¶ There are five declared nuclear states — the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China. Three states with nuclear weapons have refused to sign — India, Pakistan and Israel — and North Korea renounced the treaty in 2003. Iran remains a signatory, but the United Nations Security Council has repeatedly found it in violation of its obligations, because it has hidden nuclear plants and refused to answer questions about evidence it was working on a warhead.¶ In shifting the nuclear deterrent toward combating proliferation and the sale or transfer of nuclear material to terrorists or nonnuclear states, Mr. Obama seized on language developed in the last years of the Bush administration. It had warned North Korea that it would be held “fully accountable” for any transfer of weapons or technology. But the next year, North Korea was caught aiding Syria in building a nuclear reactor but suffered no specific consequence.¶ Mr. Obama was asked whether the American failure to make North Korea pay a heavy price for the aid to Syria undercut Washington’s credibility.¶ “I don’t think countries around the world are interested in testing our credibility when it comes to these issues,” he said. He said such activity would leave a country vulnerable to a nuclear strike, and added, “We take that very seriously because we think that set of threats present the most serious security challenge to the United States.”¶ He indicated that he hoped to use this week’s treaty signing with Russia as a stepping stone toward more ambitious reductions in nuclear arsenals down the road, but suggested that would have to extend beyond the old paradigm of Russian-American relations.¶ “We are going to pursue opportunities for further reductions in our nuclear posture, working in tandem with Russia but also working in tandem with NATO as a whole,” he said.

#### They say Taiwan- there is no reason SMRs are key to resolve the Taiwan conflict – Air craft carriars solve

#### Economic ties deter war between China and Taiwan

Eric Ting-Lun Huang, LL.B. Soo-chow University School of Law, Taiwan, ROC; LL.M., and currently S.J.D. candidate, Golden Gate Law, Spring 2003, 9 Ann. Surv. Int'l & Comp. L. 55

After twelve years of negotiations, Taiwan was admitted as a full member of the World Trade Organization on January 1, 2002. The WTO admission of both sides of the Taiwan Strait has created a new opportunity for the further development of crossstrait relations. This is because not only will there be closer cross-strait trade and economic relations, but both sides will also be able to use the WTO spirit of consultation to handle other issues resulting from promoting cross-strait trade normalization. Although the WTO is not a place to discuss political affairs, the two sides of the Strait can reduce political tensions and gradually increase economic cooperation through their repeated contacts at WTO meetings.

#### Cyberattacks won’t happen independently of regular war

Gartzke 2012 (12/7, Erik, Associate Professor of Political Science at University of California, San Diego, The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War on the Internet Back Down to Earth, http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/papers/cyberwar\_12062012.pdf)

4.2 Warfare in Cyberspace¶ Beyond questions of means and motive, two basic features make cyber warfare different from other¶ types of conflict. First, the bulk of damage contemplated by cyberwar is in all likelihood temporary.¶ The assumption among many cyber-pessimists that the potential for creating harm is sufficient to¶ make cyber space a suitable substitute for, or at least an alternative to, terrestrial conflict is simply¶ incorrect. Shutting down the power grid, or preventing communication could be tremendously¶ costly, but most such damage can be corrected quickly and with comparatively modest investment¶ of tangible resources. Regardless, damage of this type is sunk. Losses experienced over a given time¶ interval cannot be recovered whatever one's reactions and so should not have much direct impact¶ on subsequent policy behavior. Harm inflicted over the internet or through any other medium¶ will matter politically when it involves changes to the subsequent balance of power, or when it¶ indicates enemy capabilities that must be taken into account in future plans. Precisely because¶ cyberwar does not involve bombing cities or devastating armored columns, the damage inflicted¶ will have a short-term impact on targets.10 To accomplish meaningful objectives, cyber attacks¶ must contribute to other aspects of a more conventional war effort. In order to affect the long-term¶ balance-of-power, for instance, cyberwar must be joined to other, more traditional, forms of war.¶ Temporary damage can be useful in two circumstances. First, compromising or incapacitating¶ networks might afford an enemy valuable tactical, or even strategic, advantages. An opponent that¶ cannot shoot, move, resupply or communicate will be easier to defeat. However, this still requires¶ the advantaged party to act through some medium of combat to seize the initiative. Notions that¶ cyber attacks will themselves prove pivotal in future war are reminiscent of World War I artillery¶ barrages that cleared enemy trenches, but which still required the infantry and other arms to achieve¶ a breakout. Whether an actor can benefit from cyberwar depends almost entirely on whether the¶ actor is willing and able to combine a cyber attack with some other method | typically kinetic¶ warfare | that can convert temporary advantages achieved over the internet into a lasting blow.¶ Internet attacks thus offer an assailant a \soft kill" that is valuable only when attackers intend and¶ prosecute follow-on attacks with traditional military force to permanently weaken an enemy.11¶ The notion of a devastating surprise attack is a particularly baroque aspect of cyberwar paranoia,¶ and is certainly frightening to the degree that such scenarios are accurate. However, the idea¶ of a surprise attack over the internet is in fact extremely misleading and relies on a fundamental¶ misconception of the role of internet-based aggression. It has seldom been the case in modern times¶ that any one element of combat proves pivotal. Instead, it is the ability to combine elements into¶ a complex whole that increasingly distinguishes adept utilization of military force (Biddle 2004).¶ The archetype of modern, combined arms warfare is the blitzkreig, where the lethality and¶ effectiveness of conventional military violence is enhanced by actions designed to disrupt the enemy's¶ military and civilian infrastructure. An important element of blitzkreig was the use of terror¶ weapons, such as the Ju 87 \Stuka" dive bomber, to sow panic, mobilizing enemy populations¶ to flood roads and railways, thereby crippling infrastructure needed by the defense. Yet, fear is¶ temporary and in the absence of substance, quickly subsides. The Stukas were effective only as long¶ as Germany held other military advantages over its enemies. Unless threatened with immediate¶ invasion, the terror role of the Stuka was largely redundant. Stukas contributed little to Germany's¶ attempt to subdue the United Kingdom, for example. Stuka units experienced heavy casualties¶ against a competent air defense and had to be removed from service in the Battle of Britain. The¶ hubris of Luftwaffe commander Göring in promising victory while exploiting only a single domain¶ (the air) was precisely that he exaggerated the independent effect of a new technology on war.¶ There is no reason to believe that cyberwar will be any more useful as an isolated instrument¶ of coercive foreign policy. An attack that causes temporary harm will inevitably be followed by¶ countermeasures and heightened vigilance, as has happened for example in Estonia in the aftermath¶ of the 2007 attacks. For cyber aggression to have lasting effects, a virtual attack must be¶ combined with physical intervention. Knocking out communications or power infrastructure could¶ cause tremendous disruption, but the ability to quickly recover from such attacks implies that the¶ consequences in terms of the balance of national power would be negligible. The need to follow¶ virtual force with physical force in order to achieve lasting political effects suggests that the application¶ of cyber warfare independent of conventional forms of warfare will be of tertiary importance in¶ strategic and grand strategic terms. If one cannot foresee circumstances where physical aggression¶ is plausible independent of cyberwar, then cyberwar is also unlikely to constitute a critical threat.

#### Increasing reactors for *military use* makes them terrorist targets

Greenpeace ‘6 (“Nuclear Terrorism,” June 27, <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/nuclear/safety/nuclear-terrorism/>, Mike)

"Nuclear terrorism is still often treated as science fiction - I wish it were. But unfortunately we live in a world of excess hazardous materials and abundant technological know-how, in which some terrorists clearly state their intention to inflict catastrophic casualties." That's not our quote, it's UN General Secretary Kofi Annan's. He has good reason to be concerned by the threat of nuclear terrorism. The UN's International Atomic Energy Agency believe it is "far more likely" post 9/11 that terrorists could target nuclear facilities worldwide. Because of their importance for the electricity supply system, the severe consequences of radioactive releases as well as because of their symbolic character, nuclear power plants are "attractive" targets for terrorist as well as for military attacks. An attack on a nuclear facility can lead to radioactive releases equivalent to several times those released at Chernobyl. Nuclear facilities could be targets in case of war if a military use is suspected. The spectrum of possible modes of attack is very diverse. Attacks could be performed by air, on the ground and from the water. As further evidence shows that more and more terrorists are considering the nuclear option, industry and government plans to increase the number of reactors globally smacks of irresponsible stupidity. Read here to find out just how mad it is: Detailed plans of Britain's nuclear sites, including Sizewell, were found in a car linked to the July 2005 London bombings. A terrorist strike on Sellafield's storage tanks of radioactive waste in the UK could kill over 2 million people. Due to the type of radioactive waste stored there the consequences of an attack could dwarf the effects of the Chernobyl disaster. During 2004-05 there were over forty cases of potential security breaches at UK civil nuclear sites. During 2005 three suspected terrorists were caught by the Lucas Heights nuclear research reactor near Sydney, Australia. A taped interview shown on Al-Jazeera TV on September 10th 2002, contained a statement that Al Qaeda initially planned to include a nuclear plant in its 2001 attack sites. To date, there have been six known direct attacks on nuclear power plants in France, South Africa, Switzerland, the Philippines, and Spain. The International Policy Institute for Counter Terrorism database includes 167 terrorist incidents involving a nuclear target for the period 1970-1999. One direct consequence of the real threat of terrorist attack is that governments and the nuclear industry are seeking to restrict public access to information about how the industry operates. On the grounds of nuclear safety and security, less and less information is being made public, making it harder to scrutinize the operations of the nuclear industry. This restriction on public information, rather than guaranteeing there will be no terrorist attack on a nuclear facility will be sucessful (no such guarantee is possible) reduces the public (and critical organisations such as Greenpeace) ability to challenge the unsafe operation of nuclear plants. Instead of destroying civil liberties, government efforts to provide real security would be better served through nuclear phase-out's and investments in renewables and efficiency. A wind turbine or solar panel, unlike a nuclear facility, is not an attractive terrorist target!

### 1NC Heg

#### The status quo solves this advantage- their Martino evidence is about domestic competitiveness whereas their kagan evidence is about forward power projection with things like air craft carriers, not something the aff interacts with

#### Leadership IS NOT based on domestic industry- it’s based on the LEGACY of safety and tech leadership, which the SQ obviously solves- no reason institutional legitimacy will go away if we do renewables instead

Domenici and Miller September 2012 (Senator Pete V. Domenici¶ Former U.S. Senator and Bipartisan¶ Policy Center Senior Fellow¶ ENERGY PROJECT STAFF¶ Lourdes Long¶ Senior Policy Analyst¶ Warren F. “Pete” Miller, Ph.D.¶ Former Department of Energy Assistant¶ Secretary for Nuclear Energy; Maintaining U.S.¶ Leadership in¶ Global Nuclear¶ Energy Markets, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Nuclear%20Report.PDF)

Given this near-term expansion, the United States will¶ continue to be a world leader in the development of¶ advanced reactor technologies, including Generation¶ III+ advanced passive reactors and SMRs. International¶ interest in developing new nuclear-generating capacity, on¶ the other hand, presents potentially substantial business¶ opportunities for the domestic nuclear industry. Commercial¶ nuclear exports generate obvious economic benefits for¶ U.S. firms and for the nation’s overall balance of trade.¶ Importantly, they also help the United States retain a major¶ role in the evolution and maintenance of international¶ nuclear safety and nonproliferation regimes. Other nations¶ not only look to the U.S. industry for operational expertise,¶ they see the NRC as setting the international gold standard¶ for safety and physical security regulation. DOE’s National¶ Nuclear Security Administration, meanwhile, has a great¶ deal of influence over the nonproliferation aspects of¶ international fuel-cycle issues. Set against this considerable legacy of institutional and¶ technological dominance, however, are the many real¶ challenges the U.S. industry confronts today, on multiple¶ fronts—poor economics, increased safety and security¶ requirements, and uncertainty about the resolution of the¶ waste management issue. The crisis at the Fukushima¶ Daiichi plant focused the attention of regulators and the¶ public on the need for continued attention to safety and¶ security at existing reactors, particularly as some of the older¶ plants approach the end of their extended 60-year license¶ periods. In 2029, the earliest licensed plant will reach the¶ 60-year operation limit, and, after that, approximately onethird¶ of the fleet will quickly follow. While some plants may¶ engage in another round of relicensing for up to 80 years,¶ a significant fraction likely will be retired and replaced by¶ newer-generation resources (potentially including some¶ nuclear replacements).

#### Decline inevitable- Material power trades off with social power which is the only relevant

Buzan 11 (Barry, London School of Economics, Department of International Relations, "A World Order Without Superpowers: Decentred Globalism")

In terms of material capability, the United States is the only state that has the relative economic size, the military capability and the political and cultural status to play the superpower role. Its relative economic weight is not declining precipitately, and its military lead remains daunting. But the US is almost certainly in medium-term relative material decline compared to rising powers, and the need for it to adjust to a more multipolar world is a well-established theme in the literature.6 Yet loss of relative mate- rial capability is probably not going to be the main factor moving the US away from sole superpower status. The key factors in this move will be social, and they are working both within the US, where the will to support a superpower role may well be waning, and outside it, where the US is likely to find ever fewer followers, whether it wants to lead or not. It is interesting to note how many commentators on US politics make the point that the US is more likely to be driven out of its superpower status by the unwillingness of its citizens to support the role than by the rise of any external challenger.7 And externally, Waltz was right in his prediction that ‘countries that wield overwhelming power will be tempted to misuse it. And even when their use of power is not an abuse, other states will see it as being so’.8 Several other American realists echo this worry, observing that there is already a disjuncture between a US self-perception of benign leadership, and a wide- spread image of it elsewhere as a threat whose foreign policy, particularly on trade and the Middle East, is driven overwhelmingly by domestic politics.9 The superpower status of the US rests as much, or possibly more, on its social status as on its material capability. The fact that Japan and Europe broadly accept American leadership gives the US legiti- macy, and insulates it from the formation of a counter-pole coalition. Changes in social support on either the domestic or international level could thus quite quickly shift the US from superpower to great power status.

#### Hegemonic decline doesn't cause conflict- new international system eliminates zero-sum formula

Buzan 11 (Barry, London School of Economics, Department of International Relations, "A World Order Without Superpowers: Decentred Globalism")

In 2004 I argued, in line with much mainstream thinking, that the most likely scenario for the coming decades was continuation of the US as the sole superpower accompanied by several great powers. This idea still forms the core of the debates about polarity. Its main theme is whether or not the US will be able to preserve its sole superpower status, or whether rising challengers, mainly China, will soon return the world order to bipolarity. It is typical of the Western part of this debate to be looking for ways to preserve US hegemony/leadership either by maintaining and exploiting a power advantage or by re- legitimizing its leading role using institutions to accommodate rising powers.1 My sec- ond most likely scenario from 2004 was one in which there would be no superpowers, only great powers, and I argued that this would produce a rather uncertain world. I now think that this scenario is becoming more likely, but can be seen in a more positive light. I argue here that it offers an alternative third way of thinking about the coming world order: not whether there will be one superpower or more, but no superpowers, only great powers. We may be heading quite quickly into such a world, and this may be no bad thing. The mainstream polarity debates typically ignore the fact that there is an alterna- tive to having either to balance against the US or bandwagon with it. Others can, and increasingly do, use the diminished power and authority of the US as a reason to ignore or circumscribe it, and to carve their own pathways in regional and global politics.2 Continued US leadership is neither necessary nor, arguably, desirable to keep the world order from falling into 1930s-style imperial competition.

#### Heg doesn’t solve war

Maher 10 Richard Maher, Ph.D. in Political Science at Brown University, November 12, 2010,“The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World”, http://dl2af5jf3e.scholar.serialssolutions.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/?sid=google&auinit=R&aulast=Maher&atitle=The+paradox+of+American+unipolarity:+Why+the+United+States+may+be+better+off+in+a+post-unipolar+world&id=doi:10.1016/j.orbis.2010.10.003&title=Orbis+(Philadelphia)&volume=55&issue=1&date=2011&spage=53&issn=0030-4387

The other way to think about power is the ability to realize one's own preferences or preferred outcomes, or the ability to influence other actors—usually other states but not always—to do what you want them to do. When we think of power this way, we realize that the United States’ vast resources alone often are not sufficient to realize its preferred ends. There is no perfect correlation between the resources at one's command and the ability to realize preferred outcomes. Perhaps no other period of world politics in recent memory represents this discrepancy more acutely than today. U.S. capabilities dwarf those of any other state. Politically, diplomatically, and economically the United States remains in a preeminent position. While it hardly gets everything it wants, no other country can match U.S. influence in these realms. At the same time, from Iran, to North Korea, Pakistan, Iraq, and Afghanistan, not to mention Russia and China, the United States is seemingly not getting its way on issues central to its interests. More states are unafraid to challenge the United States (if only at the margins), ignore its blandishments, or seek to decrease their reliance or dependence on American security guarantees.

#### Competitiveness not key to heg

Brooks and Wohlforth 8 Stephen G. Brooks is Assistant Professor and William C. Wohlforth is Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College, “World out of Balance, International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy,” p. 32-35

American primacy is also rooted in the county's position as the world's leading technological power. The United States remains dominant globally in overall R&D investments, high-technology production, commercial innovation, and higher education (table 2.3). Despite the weight of this evidence, elite perceptions of U.S. power had shifted toward pessimism by the middle of the first decade of this century. As we noted in chapter 1, this was partly the result of an Iraq-induced doubt about the utility of material predominance, a doubt redolent of the post-Vietnam mood. In retrospect, many assessments of U.S. economic and technological prowess from the 1990s were overly optimistic; by the next decade important potential vulnerabilities were evident. In particular, chronically imbalanced domestic finances and accelerating public debt convinced some analysts that the United States once again confronted a competitiveness crisis.23 If concerns continue to mount, this will count as the fourth such crisis since 1945; the first three occurred during the 1950s (Sputnik), the 1970s (Vietnam and stagflation), and the 1980s (the Soviet threat and Japan's challenge). None of these crises, however, shifted the international system's structure: multipolarity did not return in the 1960s, 1970s, or early 1990s, and each scare over competitiveness ended with the American position of primacy retained or strengthened.24¶ Our review of the evidence of U.S. predominance is not meant to suggest that the United States lacks vulnerabilities or causes for concern. In fact, it confronts a number of significant vulnerabilities; of course, this is also true of the other major powers.25 The point is that adverse trends for the United States will not cause a polarity shift in the near future. If we take a long view of U.S. competitiveness and the prospects for relative declines in economic and technological dominance, one takeaway stands out: relative power shifts slowly. The United States has accounted for a quarter to a third of global output for over a century. No other economy will match its combination of wealth, size, technological capacity, and productivity in the foreseeable future (tables 2.2 and 2.3).¶ The depth, scale, and projected longevity of the U.S. lead in each critical dimension of power are noteworthy. But what truly distinguishes the current distribution of capabilities is American dominance in all of them simultaneously. The chief lesson of Kennedy's 500-year survey of leading powers is that nothing remotely similar ever occurred in the historical experience that informs modern international relations theory. The implication is both simple and underappreciated: the counterbalancing constraint is inoperative and will remain so until the distribution of capabilities changes fundamentally. The next section explains why.

#### Heg resilient

Lieber 9 Department of Government, Georgetown University, Robert, Persistent primacy and the future of the American era, International Politics (2009) 46, 119–139

In general, effective alternatives to the role played by the United States tend to be inadequate or absent altogether, and neither the UN, nor other international bodies such as the EU, the African Union, the Arab League or the Association of Southeast Asian Nations offer an effective substitute. As Robert Kagan has observed, 'American predominance does not stand in the way of progress toward a better world.... It stands in the way of regression toward a more dangerous world' ([Kagan, 2007](http://www.palgrave-journals.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ip/journal/v46/n2/full/ip200844a.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib24)). In short, on the demand side, there is an ample need for America's active engagement. What then about the supply side? The domestic costs and complications are evident but need to be weighed in context. The long-term reality of external threats creates a motivation for engagement abroad, as does the possibility of future attacks on the US homeland. During the 2008 presidential campaign, and despite a heated domestic political climate and sharp disagreement about Iraq and the foreign policy of the Bush administration, none of the leading candidates of either party called for dramatic retrenchment. In addition, they largely concurred on the need to increase the size of the armed forces. Indeed, and unlike the Vietnam era, popular support for the troops has been widespread, even among many critics of the Iraq war. Constraints on the capacity of adversaries also need to be taken into account. Russia under Putin has put pressure on its immediate neighbors and seeks to rebuild its armed forces, but Moscow's ability to regain the superpower status of the former Soviet Union remains limited. The Russian armed forces remain mostly in weakened condition, the total population is half that of the USSR and declining by 700 000 per year, male life expectancy is barely 60 years of age, the economy is overwhelmingly dependent on revenues from oil and natural gas and thus vulnerable to softening world market prices. The long-term stability of its crony capitalism and increasingly authoritarian political system is uncertain. China, despite extraordinary economic growth and modernization, will continue to depend on rapid expansion of trade and the absorption of vast numbers of people moving from the countryside to the cities. It may well become a major military challenger of the United States, first regionally and even globally, but only over the very long term. Demography also works to the advantage of the United States. Most other powerful states, including China and Russia as well as Germany and Japan, face the significant aging of their populations. Although the United States needs to finance the costs of an aging population, this demographic shift is occurring to a lesser extent and more slowly than among its competitors. Mark Haas argues that these factors in global aging 'will be a potent force for the continuation of US power dominance, both economic and military' ([Haas, 2007](http://www.palgrave-journals.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ip/journal/v46/n2/full/ip200844a.html#bib17), p. 113). Finally, the United States benefits from two other unique attributes, flexibility and adaptability. Time and again, America has faced daunting challenges and made mistakes, yet it has possessed the inventiveness and societal flexibility to adjust and respond successfully. Despite obvious problems, not least the global financial crisis, there is reason to believe that America's adaptive capacity will allow it to respond to future requirements and threats. None of this assures the maintenance of its world role, but the domestic underpinnings to support this engagement remain relatively robust. Thus for the foreseeable future, US primacy is likely to be sustainable. America's own national interest – and the fortunes of a global liberal democratic order – depend on it.

### 1NC Prolif

#### No solvency-SMRs still use HEU so a country could develop nuclear weapons

#### No widespread proliferation

Hymans 12

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

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. **Such warnings have routinely proved wrong** - for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq - but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground - and their failure rate is much higher - than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age.

As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. **These problems are debilitating**, and **they cannot be fixed** simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### Their authors exaggerate

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

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

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

Israel represents another case in which the benefits of nuclear weapons remain unclear. Although Israel adopted a policy of ambiguity about its nuclear program, most in the region understood that Israel possessed nuclear weapons by the late-1960s. These weapons did not deter Syria or Egypt from launching a large-scale conventional assault in 1973, however. Nor did they help the Israeli Defense Force compel acquiescence in Lebanon in 1982 or 2006. Nuclear weapons have not resolved the Palestinian question, and when it came to removing the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq, Israel relied not on its nuclear arsenal but on the United States to do so -- through conventional means -- in 2003. Israeli nukes have thus far failed to intimidate the Iranians into freezing their nuclear program. Moreover, Israel has pursued a defense policy designed around the goal of maintaining superiority at every level of military escalation, from asymmetrical anti-terror efforts to high-intensity conventional combat. Thus, it is unclear whether the nuclear program has even saved Israel any money.

The problem with nukes is that there are strong material and normative pressures against their use, not least because states that use nukes risk incurring nuclear retaliation. Part of the appeal of nuclear weapons is their bluntness, but for foreign policy objectives requiring a scalpel rather than a sledgehammer, they are useless. As a result, states with nuclear neighbors quickly find that they can engage in all manner of harassment and escalation without risking nuclear retaliation. The weapons themselves are often more expensive than the foreign policy objectives that they would be used to attain. Moreover, normative pressures do matter. Even “outlaw” nations recognize that the world views the use of nuclear -- not to mention chemical or biological -- weapons differently than other expressions of force. And almost without exception, even outlaw nations require the goodwill of at least some segments of the international community.

Given all this, it is not at all surprising that many countries eschew nuclear programs, even when they could easily attain nuclear status. Setting aside the legal problems, nuclear programs tend to be expensive, and they provide relatively little in terms of foreign policy return on investment. Brazil, for example, does not need nuclear weapons to exercise influence in Latin America or deter its rivals. Turkey, like Germany, Japan and South Korea, decided a long time ago that the nuclear “problem” could be solved most efficiently through alignment with an existing nuclear power.

Why do policymakers, analysts and journalists so consistently overrate the importance of nuclear weapons? The answer is that everyone has a strong incentive to lie about their importance. The Iranians will lie to the world about the extent of their program and to their people about the fruits of going nuclear. The various U.S. client states in the region will lie to Washington about how terrified they are of a nuclear Iran, warning of the need for “strategic re-evaluation,” while also using the Iranian menace as an excuse for brutality against their own populations. Nonproliferation advocates will lie about the terrors of unrestrained proliferation because they do not want anyone to shift focus to the manageability of a post-nuclear Iran. The United States will lie to everyone in order to reassure its clients and maintain the cohesion of the anti-Iran block.

None of these lies are particularly dishonorable; they represent the normal course of diplomacy. But they are lies nevertheless, and serious analysts of foreign policy and international relations need to be wary of them.

Nonproliferation is a good idea, if only because states should not waste tremendous resources on weapons of limited utility. Nuclear weapons also represent a genuine risk of accidents, especially for states that have not yet developed appropriately robust security precautions. Instability and collapse in nuclear states has been harrowing in the past and will undoubtedly be harrowing in the future. All of these threats should be taken seriously by policymakers. Unfortunately, as long as deception remains the rule in the practice of nuclear diplomacy, exaggerated alarmism will substitute for a realistic appraisal of the policy landscape.

#### No domino effect – it’s empirically denied

Bergenas 10 (Research Associate at the Henry L. Stimson Center, Johan, “The Nuclear Domino Myth”, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66738/johan-bergenas/the-nuclear-domino-myth)

But there's one problem with this "nuclear domino" scenario: the historical record does not support it. Since the dawn of the nuclear age, many have feared rapid and widespread nuclear proliferation; 65 years later, only nine countries have developed nuclear weapons. Nearly 20 years elapsed between the emergence of the first nuclear state, the United States, in 1945, and the fifth, China, in 1964. The next 40 years gave birth to only five additional nuclear countries: India, Israel, South Africa, Pakistan, and North Korea. South Africa voluntarily disarmed in the 1990s, as did Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. After Israel developed a nuclear weapons capability in the late 1960s, no regional nuclear chain reaction followed, even though the country is surrounded by rivals. Nor was there even a two-country nuclear arms race in the region.

#### Prolif key to international stability- solves your advantage

Waltz 12 – Senior Research Scholar at the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies and Adjunct Professor of Political Science at Columbia University (Kenneth N., Foreign Affairs. Why Iran Should get the Bomb Nuclear Balancing Would Mean Stability.http://sistemas.mre.gov.br/kitweb/datafiles/IRBr/pt-br/file/CAD/LXII%20CAD/Pol%C3%ADtica/Why%20Iran%20Should%20Get%20the%20Bomb.pdf)

The third possible outcome of the standoff is that Iran continues its current course and publicly goes¶ nuclear by testing a weapon. U.S. and Israeli officials have declared that outcome unacceptable, arguing¶ that a nuclear Iran is a uniquely terrifying prospect, even an existential threat. Such language is typical of¶ major powers, which have historically gotten riled up whenever another country has begun to develop a¶ nuclear weapon of its own. Yet so far, every time another country has managed to shoulder its way into the nuclear club, the other members have always changed tack and decided to live with it. In fact, by reducing imbalances in military power, new nuclear states generally produce more regional and international stability, not less. Israel's regional nuclear monopoly, which has proved remarkably durable for the past four decades, has long fueled instability in the Middle East. In no other region of the world does a lone, unchecked nuclear¶ state exist. It is Israel's nuclear arsenal, not Iran's desire for one, that has contributed most to the current crisis. Power, after all, begs to be balanced. What is surprising about the Israeli case is that it has taken¶ so long for a potential balancer to emerge.¶ Of course, it is easy to understand why Israel wants to remain the sole nuclear power in the region and¶ why it is willing to use force to secure that status. In 1981, Israel bombed Iraq to prevent a challenge to¶ its nuclear monopoly. It did the same to Syria in 2007 and is now considering similar action against Iran.¶ But the very acts that have allowed Israel to maintain its nuclear edge in the short term have prolonged an imbalance that is unsustainable in the long term. Israel's proven ability to strike potential nuclear rivals with impunity has inevitably made its enemies anxious to develop the means to prevent Israel from doing so again. In this way, the current tensions are best viewed not as the early stages of a relatively recent Iranian nuclear crisis but rather as the final stages of a decades-long Middle East nuclear crisis that will end only when a balance of military power is restored.¶ UNFOUNDED FEARS¶ One reason the danger of a nuclear Iran has been grossly exaggerated is that the debate surrounding it¶ has been distorted by misplaced worries and fundamental misunderstandings of how states generally¶ behave in the international system. The first prominent concern, which undergirds many others, is that¶ the Iranian regime is innately irrational. Despite a widespread belief to the contrary, Iranian policy is¶ made not by "mad mullahs" but by perfectly sane ayatollahs who want to survive just like any other¶ leaders. Although Iran's leaders indulge in inflammatory and hateful rhetoric, they show no propensity for self-destruction. It would be a grave error for policymakers in the United States and Israel to assume otherwise.¶ Yet that is precisely what many U.S. and Israeli officials and analysts have done. Portraying Iran as¶ irrational has allowed them to argue that the logic of nuclear deterrence does not apply to the Islamic Republic. If Iran acquired a nuclear weapon, they warn, it would not hesitate to use it in a first strike against Israel, even though doing so would invite massive retaliation and risk destroying everything the Iranian regime holds dear. Although it is impossible to be certain of Iranian intentions, it is far more likely that if Iran desires nuclear weapons, it is for the purpose of providing for its own security, not to improve its offensive capabilities (or destroy itself). Iran may be intransigent at the negotiating table and defiant in the face of sanctions,¶ but it still acts to secure its own preservation. Iran's leaders did not, for example, attempt to close the Strait of Hormuz despite issuing blustery warnings that they might do so after the EU announced its planned oil embargo in January. The Iranian regime clearly concluded that it did not want to provoke what would surely have been a swift and devastating American response to such a move. Nevertheless, even some observers and policymakers who accept that the Iranian regime is rational still¶ worry that a nuclear weapon would embolden it, providing Tehran with a shield that would allow it to act¶ more aggressively and increase its support for terrorism.

#### No incentive for aggression- empirically rhetoric has not resulted in annihilation, and concessions throughout history prove

Pillar 12 – Visiting Professor @ Georgetown University in Security Studies and a member of the Center for Peace and Security Studies. (Paul, We Can Live with a Nuclear Iran. The Washington Monthly, 44. 3/4 (Mar/Apr 2012): 13-19. Proquest)

Meanwhile, the Israeli government, which has led the way in talking up the danger of an Iranian bomb, represents a significant hazard outside Washington's control. It was most likely the Israelis, for instance, who orchestrated the provocatively timed attack on Roshan. Defense Minister Ehud Barak recently dialed down the heat somewhat by saying that an Israeli decision to strike Iran was "far off." But Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, mindful of the U.S. electoral calendar and the possibility that Barack Obama might pull off a victory in November, may see a temporary opportunity to precipitate a conflict in which a preelection U.S. president would feel obliged to join in on Israel's side.¶ Yet even without an Israeli decision to start a war, recent U.S., Iranian, and Israeli actions already constitute an escalation toward one. Rising tensions have increased the chance that even a minor incident, such as a seaborne encounter in the Persian Gulf, could spiral out of control. And Iran's own covert actions - perhaps including the recent spate of car bombs targeting Israeli officials in India and Georgia and last year's bizarre alleged plot to blow up a restaurant in Washington, D.C., and kill the Saudi ambassador - feed even more hostility from the U.S. and Israel, escalating further the risk of open conflict.¶ Thus we find ourselves at a strange pass. Those in the United States who genuinely yearn for war are still a neoconservative minority. But the danger that war might break out - and that the hawks will get their way - has nonetheless become substantial. The U.S. has just withdrawn the last troops from one Middle Eastern country where it fought a highly costly war of choice with a rationale involving weapons of mass destruction. Now we find ourselves on the precipice of yet another such war - almost purely because the acceptable range of opinion on Iran has narrowed and ossified around the "sensible" idea that all options must be pursued to prevent the country from acquiring nuclear weapons.¶ Given the momentousness of such an endeavor and how much prominence the Iranian nuclear issue has been given, one might think that talk about exercising the military option would be backed up by extensive analysis of the threat in question and the different ways of responding to it. But it isn't. Strip away the bellicosity and political rhetoric, and what one finds is not rigorous analysis but a mixture of fear, fanciful speculation, and crude stereotyping. There are indeed good reasons to oppose Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons, and likewise many steps the United States and the international community can and should take to try to avoid that eventuality. But an Iran with a bomb would not be anywhere near as dangerous as most people assume, and a war to try to stop it from acquiring one would be less successful, and far more costly, than most people imagine.¶ What difference would it make to Iran's behavior and influence if the country had a bomb? Even among those who believe that war with the Islamic Republic would be a bad idea, this question has been subjected to precious little careful analysis. The notion that a nuclear weapon would turn Iran into a significantly more dangerous actor that would imperil U.S. interests has become conventional wisdom, and it gets repeated so often by so many diverse commentators that it seldom, if ever, is questioned. Hardly anyone debating policy on Iran asks exactly why a nuclear-armed Iran would be so dangerous. What passes for an answer to that question takes two forms: one simple, and another that sounds more sophisticated.¶ The simple argument is that Iranian leaders supposedly don't think like the rest of us: they are religious fanatics who value martyrdom more than life, cannot be counted on to act rationally, and therefore cannot be deterred. On the campaign trail Rick Santorum has been among the most vocal in propounding this notion, asserting that Iran is ruled by the "equivalent of al-Qaeda," that its "theology teaches" that its objective is to "create a calamity," that it believes "the afterlife is better than this life," and that its "principal virtue" is martyrdom. Newt Gingrich speaks in a similar vein about how Iranian leaders are suicidal jihadists, and says "it's impossible to deter them."¶ The trouble with this image of Iran is that it does not reflect actual Iranian behavior. More than three decades of history demonstrate that the Islamic Republic's rulers, like most rulers elsewhere, are overwhelmingly concerned with preserving their regime and their power - in this life, not some future one. They are no more likely to let theological imperatives lead them into self-destructive behavior than other leaders whose religious faiths envision an afterlife. Iranian rulers may have a history of valorizing martyrdom - as they did when sending young militiamen to their deaths in near-hopeless attacks during the Iran-Iraq War in the 1980s - but they have never given any indication of wanting to become martyrs themselves. In fact, the Islamic Republic's conduct beyond its borders has been characterized by caution. Even the most seemingly ruthless Iranian behavior has been motivated by specific, immediate concerns of regime survival. The government assassinated exiled Iranian dissidents in Europe in the 1980s and '90s, for example, because it saw them as a counterrevolutionary threat. The assassinations ended when they started inflicting too much damage on Iran's relations with European governments. Iran's rulers are constantly balancing a very worldly set of strategic interests. The principles of deterrence are not invalid just because the party to be deterred wears a turban and a beard.¶ If the stereotyped image of Iranian leaders had real basis in fact, we would see more aggressive and brash Iranian behavior in the Middle East than we have. Some have pointed to the Iranian willingness to incur heavy losses in continuing the IranIraq War. But that was a response to Saddam Hussein's invasion of the Iranian homeland, not some bellicose venture beyond Iran's borders. And even that war ended with Ayatollah Khomeini deciding that the "poison" of agreeing to a cease-fire was better than the alternative. (He even described the ceasefire as "God's will" - so much for the notion that the Iranians' God always pushes them toward violence and martyrdom.)¶

# 2nc

## Madagascar

### Impacts

#### Tar sands destroy Madagascar environment

Murray 2011 (Liz, Head of Scottish campaigns, World Development Movement, Threat to Madagascar, The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/jun/07/madagascar-biodiversity-environment-mining-tar-sands)

WWF's important study of the many new species found in Madagascar in the past 10 years underlines the vital need for environmental protection and human development to go hand in hand (Madagascar's record of biodiversity: 600 species discovered in a decade, 6 June). But there is a new and direct threat to that in Madagascar from the onshore mining of tar sands and heavy oil – the dirtiest of all fossil fuels. French oil company Total is test-mining a large area in western Madagascar. Extracting tar sands there could divert or pollute already scarce local water sources and wreck the environment, which local people rely on for subsistence farming.¶ There are likely to be few jobs for locals and little in it for the Malagasy government, with only about 4% of future profits likely to come to them. But this is not just a problem for the local people to solve. The tentacles of the global economy mean that the UK is implicated. The Royal Bank of Scotland, 83% owned by the UK government, has provided hundreds of millions of pounds of corporate finance to Total, which is leading the way in exploiting Madagascan tar sands. Our government must force RBS to review its lending policies on fossil fuels and say no to financing the mining of tar sands.

#### Development would be on *key environmental reserves*

Wykes and Heywood 2010 (Sarah and Steven, of Friends of the Earth Europe, Tar sands: ¶ Fuelling the climate crisis, undermining EU energy¶ security and damaging development objectives, http://www.foei.org/en/resources/publications/pdfs/2010/tar-sands-fuelling-the-climate-crisis-undermining-eu-energy-security-and-damaging-development-objectives)

Environmental and social issues¶ On the western edge of the Tsimiroro field is the 1,520km2 Tsingy¶ de Bemeraha nature reserve, a UNESCO World Heritage site¶ since 1990. The area was awarded UNESCO status because of its¶ limestone karst landscapes, undisturbed forests, mangrove¶ swamps and rare animal species (it is the only place in the world¶ where the armoured leaf chameleon can be found). Around half¶ of the reserve is designated as a “strict” or “integral” reserve,¶ meaning no development or tourism is allowed. Despite this,¶ UNEP claim that “there is no management plan or zoning […]¶ boundaries are not marked [...] [n]o effort is made to patrol the¶ Reserve or prevent legal infractions”108. East of Bemolanga lies¶ the smaller reserve of Ambohijanahary. There is little public¶ information about this area, and what little there is highlights¶ that its only real protection is its inaccessibility109. Madagascar is¶ a highly biodiverse country, with up to two-thirds of its species¶ being endemic to the country.

### Yes Warming

#### Statistical Analysis Prove Climate Denialism Has Zero Scientific Backing in Peer Reviewed Journals – Its All Spin and Media Manipulation

Jim Powell is a science author. He has been a college and museum president and was a member of the National Science Board for 12 years, appointed first by President Reagan and then by President George H. W. Bush. 11/15 2012 Why Climate Deniers Have No Scientific Credibility - In One Pie Chart http://www.desmogblog.com/2012/11/15/why-climate-deniers-have-no-credibility-science-one-pie-chart

Polls show that many members of the public believe that scientists substantially disagree about human-caused global warming. The gold standard of science is the peer-reviewed literature. If there is disagreement among scientists, based not on opinion but on hard evidence, it will be found in the peer-reviewed literature.¶ I searched the Web of Science for peer-reviewed scientific articles published between 1 January 1991 and 9 November 2012 that have the keyword phrases "global warming" or "global climate change." The search produced 13,950 articles. See methodology.¶ I read whatever combination of titles, abstracts, and entire articles was necessary to identify articles that "reject" human-caused global warming. To be classified as rejecting, an article had to clearly and explicitly state that the theory of global warming is false or, as happened in a few cases, that some other process better explains the observed warming. Articles that merely claimed to have found some discrepancy, some minor flaw, some reason for doubt, I did not classify as rejecting global warming. Articles about methods, paleoclimatology, mitigation, adaptation, and effects at least implicitly accept human-caused global warming and were usually obvious from the title alone. John Cook and Dana Nuccitelli also reviewed and assigned some of these articles; John provided invaluable technical expertise.¶ This work follows that of Oreskes (Science, 2005) who searched for articles published between 1993 and 2003 with the keyword phrase “global climate change.” She found 928, read the abstracts of each and classified them. None rejected human-caused global warming. Using her criteria and time-span, I get the same result. Deniers attacked Oreskes and her findings, but they have held up.¶ Some articles on global warming may use other keywords, for example, “climate change” without the "global" prefix. But there is no reason to think that the proportion rejecting global warming would be any higher.¶ By my definition, 24 of the 13,950 articles, 0.17% or 1 in 581, clearly reject global warming or endorse a cause other than CO2 emissions for observed warming. The list of articles that reject global warming is here. The 24 articles have been cited a total of 113 times over the nearly 21-year period, for an average of close to 5 citations each. That compares to an average of about 19 citations for articles answering to "global warming," for example. Four of the rejecting articles have never been cited; four have citations in the double-digits. The most-cited has 17.¶ Of one thing we can be certain: had any of these articles presented the magic bullet that falsifies human-caused global warming, that article would be on its way to becoming one of the most-cited in the history of science.¶ The articles have a total of 33,690 individual authors. The top ten countries represented, in order, are USA, England, China, Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia, France, Spain, and Netherlands. (The chart shows results through 9 November 2012.)¶ Global warming deniers often claim that bias prevents them from publishing in peer-reviewed journals. But 24 articles in 18 different journals, collectively making several different arguments against global warming, expose that claim as false. Articles rejecting global warming can be published, but those that have been have earned little support or notice, even from other deniers.¶ A few deniers have become well known from newspaper interviews, Congressional hearings, conferences of climate change critics, books, lectures, websites and the like. Their names are conspicuously rare among the authors of the rejecting articles. Like those authors, the prominent deniers must have no evidence that falsifies global warming.¶ Anyone can repeat this search and post their findings. Another reviewer would likely have slightly different standards than mine and get a different number of rejecting articles. But no one will be able to reach a different conclusion, for only one conclusion is possible: Within science, global warming denial has virtually no influence. Its influence is instead on a misguided media, politicians all-too-willing to deny science for their own gain, and a gullible public.¶ Scientists do not disagree about human-caused global warming. It is the ruling paradigm of climate science, in the same way that plate tectonics is the ruling paradigm of geology. We know that continents move. We know that the earth is warming and that human emissions of greenhouse gases are the primary cause. These are known facts about which virtually all publishing scientists agree.

### Madagascar: Key Solve Disease

#### Avoiding Madagascar defo is key to medical breakthroughs

Thomas ‘3 (Karim Thomas – Princeton graduate and founder of SPARKS, an organization that has helped establish a new school in the Afghan capital of Kabul and strives to promote youth involvement in community service worldwide. Preserving Biodiversity in Forest Ecosystems – May 2nd -- <http://www.princeton.edu/~mauzeral/wws402f_s03/JP.Karim.Thomas.pdf> )

While some proponents of action would advance an argument based on morality (and the notion that it is unethical for humans to cause the extinction of other species), there are other, more practical reasons, which, while not detracting from the moral position, are certainly compelling to those who would dismiss it. Consider, for instance, the fact that one quarter of all pharmaceuticals in the United States are made from plants; or that eighty percent of the people in the Third World depend upon natural remedies derived from plants for their primary health care.5 Each day brings the increased destruction of ecosystems, and by extension, greater potential that humanity may be inadvertently destroying its best hope of beating AIDS, SARS or any other host of illnesses which at present have no cure by causing the extinction of even a single species. If this seems alarmist, the case of the Madagascar periwinkle makes a convincing case for the urgency of protecting the earth’s biological resources. The Madagascar periwinkle, whose only natural habitat was the Madagascar rainforest (one of the ten recognized “hotspots” of biodiversity on earth, and home to many animal species found nowhere else on earth, including: butterflies and moths, 97%; primates, reptiles and frogs, 90%; and flowering plants, 75%) is now extinct in the wild due mainly to extensive and unsustainable logging practices.6 The periwinkle increases the chance of survival for children with leukemia from 20 percent to 80 percent – a remarkable 300% increase from a single plant.7 Had the periwinkle’s properties not been recognized before the destruction of the forest ecosystem in Madagascar caused its elimination, thousands of patients suffering from leukemia would not have access to the vital medicines derived from the plant. As deforestation continues, how many “Madagascar periwinkles” are we destroying, and with them, our chance for a better life?

#### Madagascar key -- Periwinkle proves

Elrod 2008 (Dr. Sharon Shaw Elrod – formerly of the University of Nebraska Medical Center – Biomes -- http://www.biomesonline.com/monographs/medicine.html)

The loss of these species could have a catastrophic effect on human life. For example, the Madagascar rose periwinkle (Catharanthus roseus) had a huge impact on the medical community. The two drugs that are derived from this periwinkle are monumental to those with Hodgkin's disease, leukemia, and other blood cancers. Survival rates for childhood leukemia alone rose from 10% to 90% with the use of the periwinkle's derived drugs. This species was endemic to Madagascar and is currently extinct there due to deforestation. It has been cultivated in other places since, but had we lost this species before its potential was known, survival rates could still be at 10% for this illness.

### Link Debate

#### SMRs enable more oil

Ingersoll 2009 (DT, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Nuclear Technology Programs Office, Deliberately small reactors and the second nuclear era, Progress in Nuclear Energy, Volume 51, Issues 4–5, May–July 2009, Pages 589–603, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2009.01.003)

6. DSR applications¶ It is likely that large nuclear plants will continue to be the option of choice for well-developed, large-grid markets for the foreseeable future. However, the rapidly increasing cost of fabrication and construction of large plants in recent years ($4–6 billion in 2008) may cause smaller utilities and owner/operators to consider smaller plant sizes even in large-grid regions. In developed countries like the U.S., where electricity demand growth has been a modest 1.5–1.8% per year, the reduced cash outlay feature of smaller plants will become increasingly attractive to customers and investors alike.¶ The real attractiveness of small reactors is their flexibility to enter traditionally non-nuclear energy markets. Additional applications have emerged that could significantly benefit from replacing their current fossil fuel consumption with the use of nuclear power, if the appropriate reactor designs are available. These applications include:¶ •¶ Water desalination and purification¶ •¶ Advance oil recovery process from oil shale and tar sands¶ •¶ Hydrogen production for the enrichment of liquid fuels and eventually fuel cell applications¶ •¶ Advanced energy conversion processes such as coal-to-liquids and liquid biofuel production¶ •¶ General process heat for chemical or manufacturing processes¶ •¶ Districting heating¶ In all cases, smaller sized, more robust reactors are more likely to enable these applications than will large plants because of the many advantages discussed earlier.

#### Market forces ensure- SMR producers will gear their designs toward *non-electric purposes*

Ingersoll 2009 (DT, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Nuclear Technology Programs Office, Deliberately small reactors and the second nuclear era, Progress in Nuclear Energy, Volume 51, Issues 4–5, May–July 2009, Pages 589–603, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2009.01.003)

8. Summary

Smaller sized nuclear reactors had a major role in the initial development of the commercial nuclear power industry during the first nuclear era. Today, large plants operating in the U.S. set a high standard for safety, availability and cost competitiveness. To successfully enter the market place, new plant designs must offer a compelling promise of even higher performance or serve a new mission than base load electricity. In the past decade, a number of new “deliberately small” reactor designs have emerged that promise further improvements in safety, construction, operations and economics, and also are well suited for other energy-intensive applications. Improved safety is accomplished by lower fuel inventory, greater use of passive safety features, and by eliminating design features that are vulnerable to potential accidents. The smaller physical size contributes to added flexibilities in fabrication, construction and siting. Finally, lower capital cost and shorter construction time contribute to reduced investment risk and cash outlay profiles.

#### Nuclear = more oil sands

Stewart 2012 (John, startlingly few appearances on The Daily Show, director of policy and¶ research with the Canadian Nuclear Association, NUCLEAR IN THE OIL SANDS:¶ BUILDING ON CANADA’S¶ STRENGTHS, http://www.wincanada.org/uploads/filemanager/pdf/CNA/Stewart\_Nuclear\_Oil\_Sands\_Feb\_2012.pdf)

If nuclear energy could economically be applied to bitumen extraction from western¶ Canada’s oil sands — a process that currently uses fossil fuel — it would conserve¶ natural gas, improve the carbon profile of the oil sands, help to mitigate public¶ perception problems in the US market and facilitate longer-term oil sands industry¶ growth. It might also open doors to a dramatically lower-carbon electricity system¶ across Canada. Stimulated by an uptake of nuclear in resource processing, new¶ generations of nuclear reactors could increasingly supplant fossil-fuelled generation,¶ not just in big-grid areas, but even in smaller northern communities and at military¶ installations — replacing dirty air and expensive power with clean air, knowledge¶ jobs and affordable, reliable energy.

### UQ Debate

#### Oil sands are too expensive to extract now

Barr 11/2/2012 (Greg, Managing Editor of the Houston Business Journal, Canadian oil sands production faces labor shortage, spiraling costs, http://www.bizjournals.com/houston/news/2012/11/02/canadian-oil-sands-production-faces.html)

Labor shortages and escalating production costs could stifle production in Canada's oil sands, potentially affecting long-range output for major projects, according to a confidential government memo.¶ CBC News, which obtained the April memo by a high-ranking official with Canada's Department of Natural Resources, said investors may find future returns affected by the rising costs, despite buoyant oil prices that have made extracting the oil more affordable.¶ A key election issue has been the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline by TransCanada Corp. that would bring Canadian oil sands crude to Texas Gulf Coast refineries.¶ Natural Resources Minister Joe Oliver recently has estimated that the oil sands projects would need $650 billion in capital investments in the next decade to meet production projections, CBC said.¶ "Although current crude prices promote oil sands development, ever-increasing capital and operating costs could make this price insufficient to support oil sands development at forecast levels," said the memo acquired by CBC News.¶ The memo said the labor shortages and associated fast-rising labor costs have contributed to a doubling of operating and capital costs per barrel of oil produced from the oil sands, the report said.¶ The Canadian government is currently reviewing a controversial proposal by Chinese state-run oil company CNOOC to acquire Calgary, Alberta-based Nexen in a deal valued at about $15.2 billion.

#### No oil sands now because of *extraction costs*

Gasser 2012 (Kurt, J.D. candidate 2012, S.J. Quinney College of Law, University of Utah, The TransCanada Keystone XL Pipeline: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly Debate, 32 Utah Envtl. L. Rev. 489, lexis)

And finally, some argue the current methods of extracting oil from the tar sands are cost prohibitive unless oil prices remain high. Stockman's study also quotes Mr. Marvin Odum, Shell's head of tar sands, citing his statement from April 2010, where he "announced that the company would not go ahead with any new tar sands projects in the next five years and perhaps longer because of the expense of doing so." n64 Odum is quoted as saying, "the oil sands have become one of the most costly places on earth to pursue oil projects." n65 He went on to say, "the 100,000 barrel a day (b/d) project will require minimum oil prices of $ 70-75 to turn a profit." n66 If success of the pipeline and tar sands in general is dependent upon higher prices, one could argue that despite increased supply derived from the Canadian tar sands oil, the U.S. would continue to pay higher prices per barrel simply to maintain stability.

### Warming Add-On

#### Nuke power trades off with renewables, jacks *short-term* transition key to solve *warming* and *peak fossil fuel*

Conolley 2011 (Heather, PhD Candidate in Political Science at UC- Santa Barbara, The Renaissance of Nuclear Energy in the Shadow of Climate Change, PhD Dissertation, proquest)

Given the long lead time associated with development and reactor ¶ construction, nuclear opponents argue that nuclear energy cannot make a big ¶ difference in reducing carbon emissions over the next two decades, when large ¶ reductions would have the most significant impact in mitigating the effects of climate ¶ change (Parenti, 2011; Squassoni, 2009:2). Delaying the reduction of emissions only ¶ compounds the difficulty in achieving stabilization targets and increases the risk of ¶ reaching a climate change “tipping point” beyond which more severe damage will be ¶ felt. As nuclear expert Sharon Squassoni (2009: 17) reports, According to the IPCC, limiting the average increase in global temperatures to ¶ a maximum of 2.4˚C above pre-industrial levels would require that all CO2¶ emissions peak by 2015 and fall between 50 and 85 percent below 2000 levels ¶ by 2050. The Human Development Report 2007/2008 underscored this, ¶ assessing that delaying reduction of emissions until 2020 would require even ¶ greater reductions later…¶ Because the window of opportunity to mitigate climate change impact is ¶ small, nuclear opponents argue that moneys would be better spent on quicker and less ¶ expensive efforts that can have an immediate impact on carbon emissions, like ¶ improvements in energy efficiency. Every dollar spent on nuclear power is a dollar ¶ not spent on renewable technologies like wind, solar, hydro and so on. Economist ¶ Mark Cooper argues that investments in nuclear technology can crowd out clean ¶ energy development because utility companies are locked in to big construction ¶ projects, making smaller alternatives seem threatening. Comparing states in the US, ¶ Cooper finds that those invested heavily in nuclear power had worse track records on ¶ efficiency and renewable development than states without large nuclear programs ¶ (Parenti, 2011). Thus opportunity costs for constructing nuclear reactors must be ¶ carefully considered.

### Alaska Add-On

#### Arctic war won’t happen – media exaggerates and US would win quickly

Beckhusen 8/9 (Robert, Wired, Russia and Canada Gear Up for Arctic Non-War, 2012, <http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/08/arctic/>) CC

The exaggerated fears of a coming Arctic war with Russia have largely receded since a media freakout last year. But that isn’t stopping Russia from building new bases in the frigid north. Canada is also splurging on Arctic drones. Less assertive is the United States, which is boosting Coast Guard operations near Alaska.¶ On Monday, Russian Security Council chief Nikolai Patrushev said Russia is planning to build a string of new naval bases in the Arctic. The bases are intended to be “key double-purpose sites” for warships “in remote areas of the Arctic Seas.” There’s no word on what those double purposes might be. Russia’s plans to create a “combined-arms force” for the Arctic is also still on track, according to Moscow-based news wire RIA Novosti.¶ The logic behind Russia’s Arctic bases is seductive. The thinking goes like this: As global warming causes the northern polar ice to recede — and one day disappear during the summer months — nations like Russia, Canada, Norway and the United States will scramble for the bountiful deposits of oil, gas and minerals hidden beneath, sparking an Arctic resource war. Oh, and a swarm of media reports — and even videogames — about a hypothetical war on the northern horizon.¶ But a war is exceedingly unlikely — because Russia would lose. For one, the United States has an overwhelming and decisive advantage in submarines. U.S. subs are more advanced, there are more of them, and their crews are better trained. It’s unlikely Arctic nations would also begin killing each other over low-key — and remote — territorial disputes.

#### No Arctic war- nobody will fight, cooperation is more likely, everyone’s goal is TRADE not TERRITORY

NYT 2012 (9/18, Race Is On as Ice Melt Reveals Arctic Treasures, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/19/science/earth/arctic-resources-exposed-by-warming-set-off-competition.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)

Ownership of the Arctic is governed by the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea, which gives Arctic nations an exclusive economic zone that extends 200 nautical miles from land, and to undersea resources farther away so long as they are on a continental shelf. The far northern Arctic Ocean belongs to no country, and conditions there are severe. In a place where exact boundaries were never much of a concern, haggling over borders has begun among the primary nations — between Canada and Denmark, and the United States and Canada, for example.¶ The United States has been hampered in the current jockeying because the Senate has refused to ratify the Convention of the Law of the Sea, even though both the Bush and Obama administrations have strongly supported doing so. This means the United States has not been able to formally stake out its underwater boundaries. “We are being left behind,” Deputy Secretary Nides said.¶ But experts say boundary disputes are likely to be rapidly resolved through negotiation, so that everyone can get on with the business of making money. There is “very little room for a race to grab territory, since most of the resources are in an area that is clearly carved up already,” said Kristofer Bergh, a researcher at the Stockholm Institute.¶ Even so, Arctic nations and NATO are building up military capabilities in the region, as a precaution. That has left China with little choice but to garner influence through a strategy that has worked well in Africa and Latin America: investing and joining with local companies and financing good works to earn good will. Its scientists have become pillars of multinational Arctic research, and their icebreaker has been used in joint expeditions.¶ And Chinese companies, some with close government ties, are investing heavily across the Arctic. In Canada, Chinese firms have acquired interests in two oil companies that could afford them access to Arctic drilling. During a June visit to Iceland, Premier Wen Jiabao of China signed a number of economic agreements, covering areas like geothermal energy and free trade.¶ In Greenland, large Chinese companies are financing the development of mines that are being developed around discoveries of gems or minerals by small prospecting companies, said Soren Meisling, head of the China desk at the Bech Bruun law firm in Copenhagen, which represents many of them. A huge iron ore mine under development near Nuuk, for example, is owned by a British company but financed in part by a Chinese steel maker.¶ Chinese mining companies have proved adept at working in challenging locales and have even proposed building runways for jumbo jets on the ice in Greenland’s far north to fly out minerals until the ice melts enough for shipping.¶ “There is already a sense of competition in the Arctic, and they think they can have first advantage,” said Jingjing Su, a lawyer in Bech Bruun’s China practice.¶ The efforts have clear political backing. Greenland’s minister for industry and mineral resources was greeted by Vice Premier Li Keqiang in China last November. A few months later, China’s minister of land and resources, Xu Shaoshi, traveled to Greenland to sign cooperation agreements.¶ Western analysts have worried that China could leverage its wealth, particularly in some of the cash-poor corners of the Arctic like Greenland and Iceland.¶ But Chinese officials have cast their motives in more generous terms. “China’s activities are for the purposes of regular environmental investigation and investment and have nothing to do with resource plundering and strategic control,” the state-controlled Xinhua news agency wrote this year.¶ Michael Byers, a professor of politics and law at the University of British Columbia, said the Chinese were unlikely to overstep their rights in a region populated by NATO members. “Despite the concerns I have about Chinese foreign policy in other parts of the world, in the Arctic it is behaving responsibly,” he said. “They just want to make money.”

## Solvency

#### Their ev exaggerates nuclear viability for financial reasons- default neg

Dittmar 2012 (Michael, Institute of Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Nuclear energy: Status and future limitations, Energy, Volume 37, Issue 1, January 2012, Pages 35–40, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.05.040)

5. Can we understand nuclear energy as part of the energy problem before potential nuclear nightmares turn into disasters of unprecedented scales?¶ As we have explained above, commercial nuclear energy is currently contributing only a tiny fraction of about 14% (and only 2.3% to the final useful energy mix) to the worldwide electric energy mix. Still, the nuclear reality in many rich countries of the OECD block demonstrates that it will be essentially impossible to keep their current nuclear energy capacity from slowly declining during the next decade(s). Current hopes from nuclear energy believers, often expressed in our Western media, are thus based on plans in China, India and Russia. Could it perhaps be possible that such statements about the nuclear renaissance are made with the hope that a few Western companies, with the nuclear power plant construction know how, can sell such nuclear power plants in exchange for hundreds of billions of dollars accumulated by China (and soon by India and Russia) during its past years of economic boom? While this idea might be too far fetched, it would at least explain why the acknowledged stressed uranium supply situation during the coming years [3] is almost never discussed in the corresponding reports like in the 2003 and 2009 MIT studies [6].

#### Even if they *could,* they *won’t-* doesn’t have the expertise, they would have no idea what they were doing- they take minimum 10 years with *existing designs,* of which there are zero for SMRs

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

Certification and licensing issues¶ The most basic licensing issue relates to whether NRC will have jurisdiction¶ over potential nuclear reactor sites or whether DoD could be¶ self-regulating. Our conversations with NRC indicate it is the only¶ possible licensing authority for reactors that supply power to the commercial¶ grid. However, DOE and DoD are authorized to regulate mis34¶ sion critical nuclear facilities under Section 91b of the Atomic Energy¶ Act. There is some historical precedent for DoD exercising this¶ authority. For example, the Army Nuclear Program was granted¶ exception under this rule with regard to the reactor that operated¶ aboard the Sturgis barge in the 1960s and 1970s [44].¶ It seems unlikely that DoD would pursue exemption under Section¶ 91b in the future.10 Regulating power plants is a function that lies¶ beyond DoD's core mission. The Department and the military services¶ are unlikely to have personnel with sufficient expertise to act as¶ regulators for nuclear power plants, and it could take considerable¶ time and resources to develop such expertise. Without NRC oversight¶ DoD would bear all associated risks.¶ The time required to obtain design certification, license, and build¶ the next generation of nuclear plants is about 9 to 10 years. After the¶ first plants are built it may be possible to reduce the time required for¶ licensing and construction to approximately 6 years [45].

#### Expanding the domestic industry leads to global exports of *conventional* nuclear power- makes the whole company more profitable, not just its activities with their reactors

Fuhrmann 2012 (Matthew, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University, previously held research fellowships at Harvard and CFR, Splitting Atoms: Why Do Countries Build Nuclear Power Plants?, International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations, Volume 38, Issue 1, 2012, DOI:10.1080/03050629.2012.640209)

Despite the challenges associated with higher front-end costs, firms try to maximize their profits by promoting the construction of nuclear power plants. In the United States, for example, companies such as Westinghouse and General Electric have historically sought to expand America's reliance on nuclear energy. 2 The degree to which firms are successful depends in large part on market size. Nuclear industries can pursue foreign markets, of course, but companies that have larger domestic markets are likely to have greater success in encouraging the use of nuclear power.

#### Developing nuclear power causes war- preemption incentives and targets for terrorists

Fuhrmann 2012 (Matthew, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University, previously held research fellowships at Harvard and CFR, Splitting Atoms: Why Do Countries Build Nuclear Power Plants?, International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations, Volume 38, Issue 1, 2012, DOI:10.1080/03050629.2012.640209)

There may also be a more direct relationship between nuclear energy programs and violent conflict, although scholars are only beginning to systematically probe this connection (for example, Beardsley and Asal 2011; Horowitz 2011). Nuclear power plants sometimes provide targets of opportunity for adversaries during ongoing interstate wars (for example, Fuhrmann and Kreps 2010; Ramberg 1984) and terrorists seeking to trigger a Fukushima-like incident could also find these facilities to be inviting targets (for example, Early, Fuhrmann, and Li 2011; Miller and Sagan 2009). Civilian nuclear facilities may also provide incentives for preventive war. In 1981, for example, the Israeli Air Force bombed an Iraqi civilian nuclear research reactor known as Osiraq in a “bolt from the blue” raid to eliminate Baghdad's capability to build the bomb. While the violence related to nuclear power programs has been quite limited to date, one can easily imagine a scenario where attacks against nuclear facilities are more deadly in the future (Reiter 2011).

## Grid Advantage

#### Squo Solves

#### SQ microgrids and renewables solve

Asmus and Adamson 2012 (Peter, Senior Research Analyst at Pike Research, a market research and consulting team that provides in-depth analysis of global clean technology markets, and Dr. Kerry-Ann, Research Director and Ph.D. in fuel cells from Imperial College, London, Military Microgrids: ¶ Stationary Base, Forward Operating Base, and¶ Mobile Smart Grid Networks for Renewables Integration,¶ Demand Response, and Mission-Critical Security, December, http://www.pikeresearch.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/MMG-12-Executive-Summary.pdf)

Stationary Military Bases¶ As awareness about the electrical grid’s vulnerability to terrorist attacks and severe storms has¶ increased in recent times, the U.S. military has become one of the strongest proponents of¶ microgrids. For fixed base military operations, microgrids offer the ultimate secure power¶ supply. Many Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and other military-related bases and offices¶ already have vintage microgrids in place. What is new is that these facilities are looking to¶ envelop entire bases with microgrids and integrate renewable distributed energy generation¶ (RDEG) onsite. When capable of safe islanding from the surrounding grid, RDEG offers the¶ ultimate security since fuel never runs out with solar or wind resources.¶ Pike Research has identified roughly two dozen military facilities in the United States that are¶ currently engaged in smart microgrid implementations. The Marines show the fastest initial¶ capacity growth spurt, but the Army shows signs of longer-term increases in annual capacity.¶ This is because the Army has a larger number of stationary bases requiring microgrid upgrades.¶ Most of these new microgrids incorporate RDEG as a way of increasing reliability and security.¶ The opportunity to help develop these microgrids has attracted a number of powerful¶ technology companies, including Lockheed Martin, General Electric (GE), Honeywell, Boeing,¶ and Eaton.

#### Any solvency deficit they have to the squo links to them and has no impact

Bressler 2012 (Matthew, Intern at the Rocky Mountain Institute, How Military SPIDERS Project Aids Grid Cyber-Security, http://blog.rmi.org/how\_military\_SPIDERS\_project\_aids\_grid\_cyber\_security)

Reinventing Fire, RMI’s roadmap to a U.S. energy future free of oil, coal, and nuclear power, identified both military and civilian microgrids as a potentially important lever for improving the long-term security and reliability of our electricity sector. A microgrid is a section of the overall grid that typically operates in routine conjunction with the rest of the grid but has enough generation, storage, and intelligence to function independently in emergencies. The military microgrids will provide this security by incorporating renewable generation, energy storage, demand-side management, and back-up fuel cells or diesel generation. While these components will allow a base to operate in an emergency and help support the community it’s in, by incorporating “smarter” technologies, the microgrid will also run more efficiently and require less power generated by fossil fuel-powered plants.¶ Introducing more touch points in the grid through new distributed generation and demand-side technologies will create reliability and efficiency benefits, but may also present security challenges. Additional access points to the grid theoretically open up new cyber-security holes for potential attackers. The military, however, is leveraging its expertise to develop secure technology to manage the microgrids. The military plans to test the security strength through exercises simulating attacks once its microgrids are up and running. While cyber threats may never be eradicated, decentralizing power production and distribution via microgrids can significantly decrease the impact of future threats.

### Taiwan

#### Economic ties deter war between China and Taiwan

Eric Ting-Lun Huang, LL.B. Soo-chow University School of Law, Taiwan, ROC; LL.M., and currently S.J.D. candidate, Golden Gate Law, Spring 2003, 9 Ann. Surv. Int'l & Comp. L. 55

After twelve years of negotiations, Taiwan was admitted as a full member of the World Trade Organization on January 1, 2002. The WTO admission of both sides of the Taiwan Strait has created a new opportunity for the further development of crossstrait relations. This is because not only will there be closer cross-strait trade and economic relations, but both sides will also be able to use the WTO spirit of consultation to handle other issues resulting from promoting cross-strait trade normalization. Although the WTO is not a place to discuss political affairs, the two sides of the Strait can reduce political tensions and gradually increase economic cooperation through their repeated contacts at WTO meetings.

### Cyberattacks

#### Cyberattacks won’t happen independently of regular war

Gartzke 2012 (12/7, Erik, Associate Professor of Political Science at University of California, San Diego, The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War on the Internet Back Down to Earth, http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/papers/cyberwar\_12062012.pdf)

4.2 Warfare in Cyberspace¶ Beyond questions of means and motive, two basic features make cyber warfare different from other¶ types of conflict. First, the bulk of damage contemplated by cyberwar is in all likelihood temporary.¶ The assumption among many cyber-pessimists that the potential for creating harm is sufficient to¶ make cyber space a suitable substitute for, or at least an alternative to, terrestrial conflict is simply¶ incorrect. Shutting down the power grid, or preventing communication could be tremendously¶ costly, but most such damage can be corrected quickly and with comparatively modest investment¶ of tangible resources. Regardless, damage of this type is sunk. Losses experienced over a given time¶ interval cannot be recovered whatever one's reactions and so should not have much direct impact¶ on subsequent policy behavior. Harm inflicted over the internet or through any other medium¶ will matter politically when it involves changes to the subsequent balance of power, or when it¶ indicates enemy capabilities that must be taken into account in future plans. Precisely because¶ cyberwar does not involve bombing cities or devastating armored columns, the damage inflicted¶ will have a short-term impact on targets.10 To accomplish meaningful objectives, cyber attacks¶ must contribute to other aspects of a more conventional war effort. In order to affect the long-term¶ balance-of-power, for instance, cyberwar must be joined to other, more traditional, forms of war.¶ Temporary damage can be useful in two circumstances. First, compromising or incapacitating¶ networks might afford an enemy valuable tactical, or even strategic, advantages. An opponent that¶ cannot shoot, move, resupply or communicate will be easier to defeat. However, this still requires¶ the advantaged party to act through some medium of combat to seize the initiative. Notions that¶ cyber attacks will themselves prove pivotal in future war are reminiscent of World War I artillery¶ barrages that cleared enemy trenches, but which still required the infantry and other arms to achieve¶ a breakout. Whether an actor can benefit from cyberwar depends almost entirely on whether the¶ actor is willing and able to combine a cyber attack with some other method | typically kinetic¶ warfare | that can convert temporary advantages achieved over the internet into a lasting blow.¶ Internet attacks thus offer an assailant a \soft kill" that is valuable only when attackers intend and¶ prosecute follow-on attacks with traditional military force to permanently weaken an enemy.11¶ The notion of a devastating surprise attack is a particularly baroque aspect of cyberwar paranoia,¶ and is certainly frightening to the degree that such scenarios are accurate. However, the idea¶ of a surprise attack over the internet is in fact extremely misleading and relies on a fundamental¶ misconception of the role of internet-based aggression. It has seldom been the case in modern times¶ that any one element of combat proves pivotal. Instead, it is the ability to combine elements into¶ a complex whole that increasingly distinguishes adept utilization of military force (Biddle 2004).¶ The archetype of modern, combined arms warfare is the blitzkreig, where the lethality and¶ effectiveness of conventional military violence is enhanced by actions designed to disrupt the enemy's¶ military and civilian infrastructure. An important element of blitzkreig was the use of terror¶ weapons, such as the Ju 87 \Stuka" dive bomber, to sow panic, mobilizing enemy populations¶ to flood roads and railways, thereby crippling infrastructure needed by the defense. Yet, fear is¶ temporary and in the absence of substance, quickly subsides. The Stukas were effective only as long¶ as Germany held other military advantages over its enemies. Unless threatened with immediate¶ invasion, the terror role of the Stuka was largely redundant. Stukas contributed little to Germany's¶ attempt to subdue the United Kingdom, for example. Stuka units experienced heavy casualties¶ against a competent air defense and had to be removed from service in the Battle of Britain. The¶ hubris of Luftwaffe commander Göring in promising victory while exploiting only a single domain¶ (the air) was precisely that he exaggerated the independent effect of a new technology on war.¶ There is no reason to believe that cyberwar will be any more useful as an isolated instrument¶ of coercive foreign policy. An attack that causes temporary harm will inevitably be followed by¶ countermeasures and heightened vigilance, as has happened for example in Estonia in the aftermath¶ of the 2007 attacks. For cyber aggression to have lasting effects, a virtual attack must be¶ combined with physical intervention. Knocking out communications or power infrastructure could¶ cause tremendous disruption, but the ability to quickly recover from such attacks implies that the¶ consequences in terms of the balance of national power would be negligible. The need to follow¶ virtual force with physical force in order to achieve lasting political effects suggests that the application¶ of cyber warfare independent of conventional forms of warfare will be of tertiary importance in¶ strategic and grand strategic terms. If one cannot foresee circumstances where physical aggression¶ is plausible independent of cyberwar, then cyberwar is also unlikely to constitute a critical threat.

## Heg

#### Hegemonic decline doesn't cause conflict- new international system eliminates zero-sum formula

Buzan 11 (Barry, London School of Economics, Department of International Relations, "A World Order Without Superpowers: Decentred Globalism")

In 2004 I argued, in line with much mainstream thinking, that the most likely scenario for the coming decades was continuation of the US as the sole superpower accompanied by several great powers. This idea still forms the core of the debates about polarity. Its main theme is whether or not the US will be able to preserve its sole superpower status, or whether rising challengers, mainly China, will soon return the world order to bipolarity. It is typical of the Western part of this debate to be looking for ways to preserve US hegemony/leadership either by maintaining and exploiting a power advantage or by re- legitimizing its leading role using institutions to accommodate rising powers.1 My sec- ond most likely scenario from 2004 was one in which there would be no superpowers, only great powers, and I argued that this would produce a rather uncertain world. I now think that this scenario is becoming more likely, but can be seen in a more positive light. I argue here that it offers an alternative third way of thinking about the coming world order: not whether there will be one superpower or more, but no superpowers, only great powers. We may be heading quite quickly into such a world, and this may be no bad thing. The mainstream polarity debates typically ignore the fact that there is an alterna- tive to having either to balance against the US or bandwagon with it. Others can, and increasingly do, use the diminished power and authority of the US as a reason to ignore or circumscribe it, and to carve their own pathways in regional and global politics.2 Continued US leadership is neither necessary nor, arguably, desirable to keep the world order from falling into 1930s-style imperial competition.

#### Heg doesn’t solve war

Maher 10 Richard Maher, Ph.D. in Political Science at Brown University, November 12, 2010,“The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World”, http://dl2af5jf3e.scholar.serialssolutions.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/?sid=google&auinit=R&aulast=Maher&atitle=The+paradox+of+American+unipolarity:+Why+the+United+States+may+be+better+off+in+a+post-unipolar+world&id=doi:10.1016/j.orbis.2010.10.003&title=Orbis+(Philadelphia)&volume=55&issue=1&date=2011&spage=53&issn=0030-4387

The other way to think about power is the ability to realize one's own preferences or preferred outcomes, or the ability to influence other actors—usually other states but not always—to do what you want them to do. When we think of power this way, we realize that the United States’ vast resources alone often are not sufficient to realize its preferred ends. There is no perfect correlation between the resources at one's command and the ability to realize preferred outcomes. Perhaps no other period of world politics in recent memory represents this discrepancy more acutely than today. U.S. capabilities dwarf those of any other state. Politically, diplomatically, and economically the United States remains in a preeminent position. While it hardly gets everything it wants, no other country can match U.S. influence in these realms. At the same time, from Iran, to North Korea, Pakistan, Iraq, and Afghanistan, not to mention Russia and China, the United States is seemingly not getting its way on issues central to its interests. More states are unafraid to challenge the United States (if only at the margins), ignore its blandishments, or seek to decrease their reliance or dependence on American security guarantees.

#### Competitiveness not key to heg

Brooks and Wohlforth 8 Stephen G. Brooks is Assistant Professor and William C. Wohlforth is Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College, “World out of Balance, International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy,” p. 32-35

American primacy is also rooted in the county's position as the world's leading technological power. The United States remains dominant globally in overall R&D investments, high-technology production, commercial innovation, and higher education (table 2.3). Despite the weight of this evidence, elite perceptions of U.S. power had shifted toward pessimism by the middle of the first decade of this century. As we noted in chapter 1, this was partly the result of an Iraq-induced doubt about the utility of material predominance, a doubt redolent of the post-Vietnam mood. In retrospect, many assessments of U.S. economic and technological prowess from the 1990s were overly optimistic; by the next decade important potential vulnerabilities were evident. In particular, chronically imbalanced domestic finances and accelerating public debt convinced some analysts that the United States once again confronted a competitiveness crisis.23 If concerns continue to mount, this will count as the fourth such crisis since 1945; the first three occurred during the 1950s (Sputnik), the 1970s (Vietnam and stagflation), and the 1980s (the Soviet threat and Japan's challenge). None of these crises, however, shifted the international system's structure: multipolarity did not return in the 1960s, 1970s, or early 1990s, and each scare over competitiveness ended with the American position of primacy retained or strengthened.24¶ Our review of the evidence of U.S. predominance is not meant to suggest that the United States lacks vulnerabilities or causes for concern. In fact, it confronts a number of significant vulnerabilities; of course, this is also true of the other major powers.25 The point is that adverse trends for the United States will not cause a polarity shift in the near future. If we take a long view of U.S. competitiveness and the prospects for relative declines in economic and technological dominance, one takeaway stands out: relative power shifts slowly. The United States has accounted for a quarter to a third of global output for over a century. No other economy will match its combination of wealth, size, technological capacity, and productivity in the foreseeable future (tables 2.2 and 2.3).¶ The depth, scale, and projected longevity of the U.S. lead in each critical dimension of power are noteworthy. But what truly distinguishes the current distribution of capabilities is American dominance in all of them simultaneously. The chief lesson of Kennedy's 500-year survey of leading powers is that nothing remotely similar ever occurred in the historical experience that informs modern international relations theory. The implication is both simple and underappreciated: the counterbalancing constraint is inoperative and will remain so until the distribution of capabilities changes fundamentally. The next section explains why.

#### Heg resilient

Lieber 9 Department of Government, Georgetown University, Robert, Persistent primacy and the future of the American era, International Politics (2009) 46, 119–139

In general, effective alternatives to the role played by the United States tend to be inadequate or absent altogether, and neither the UN, nor other international bodies such as the EU, the African Union, the Arab League or the Association of Southeast Asian Nations offer an effective substitute. As Robert Kagan has observed, 'American predominance does not stand in the way of progress toward a better world.... It stands in the way of regression toward a more dangerous world' ([Kagan, 2007](http://www.palgrave-journals.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ip/journal/v46/n2/full/ip200844a.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib24)). In short, on the demand side, there is an ample need for America's active engagement. What then about the supply side? The domestic costs and complications are evident but need to be weighed in context. The long-term reality of external threats creates a motivation for engagement abroad, as does the possibility of future attacks on the US homeland. During the 2008 presidential campaign, and despite a heated domestic political climate and sharp disagreement about Iraq and the foreign policy of the Bush administration, none of the leading candidates of either party called for dramatic retrenchment. In addition, they largely concurred on the need to increase the size of the armed forces. Indeed, and unlike the Vietnam era, popular support for the troops has been widespread, even among many critics of the Iraq war. Constraints on the capacity of adversaries also need to be taken into account. Russia under Putin has put pressure on its immediate neighbors and seeks to rebuild its armed forces, but Moscow's ability to regain the superpower status of the former Soviet Union remains limited. The Russian armed forces remain mostly in weakened condition, the total population is half that of the USSR and declining by 700 000 per year, male life expectancy is barely 60 years of age, the economy is overwhelmingly dependent on revenues from oil and natural gas and thus vulnerable to softening world market prices. The long-term stability of its crony capitalism and increasingly authoritarian political system is uncertain. China, despite extraordinary economic growth and modernization, will continue to depend on rapid expansion of trade and the absorption of vast numbers of people moving from the countryside to the cities. It may well become a major military challenger of the United States, first regionally and even globally, but only over the very long term. Demography also works to the advantage of the United States. Most other powerful states, including China and Russia as well as Germany and Japan, face the significant aging of their populations. Although the United States needs to finance the costs of an aging population, this demographic shift is occurring to a lesser extent and more slowly than among its competitors. Mark Haas argues that these factors in global aging 'will be a potent force for the continuation of US power dominance, both economic and military' ([Haas, 2007](http://www.palgrave-journals.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ip/journal/v46/n2/full/ip200844a.html#bib17), p. 113). Finally, the United States benefits from two other unique attributes, flexibility and adaptability. Time and again, America has faced daunting challenges and made mistakes, yet it has possessed the inventiveness and societal flexibility to adjust and respond successfully. Despite obvious problems, not least the global financial crisis, there is reason to believe that America's adaptive capacity will allow it to respond to future requirements and threats. None of this assures the maintenance of its world role, but the domestic underpinnings to support this engagement remain relatively robust. Thus for the foreseeable future, US primacy is likely to be sustainable. America's own national interest – and the fortunes of a global liberal democratic order – depend on it.

### Prolif

#### Their “leadership” evidence doesn’t refer to NONPROLIF leadership, only TECH leadership, we’ll still have soft power which is way more relevant to nonprolif, we can cooperate with the new tech leaders which are France and South Korea

Domenici and Miller September 2012 (Senator Pete V. Domenici¶ Former U.S. Senator and Bipartisan¶ Policy Center Senior Fellow¶ ENERGY PROJECT STAFF¶ Lourdes Long¶ Senior Policy Analyst¶ Warren F. “Pete” Miller, Ph.D.¶ Former Department of Energy Assistant¶ Secretary for Nuclear Energy; Maintaining U.S.¶ Leadership in¶ Global Nuclear¶ Energy Markets, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Nuclear%20Report.PDF)

With the world’s largest commercial nuclear fleet, the United¶ States was once the world’s leader in nuclear technology¶ development and operations. In recent years, other¶ countries, notably France and South Korea, have risen in¶ international prominence; these countries will continue to¶ develop technologies for domestic markets as well as to¶ export. It will be increasingly difficult for the United States to¶ maintain its technological leadership without some nearterm¶ domestic demand for new construction. Diminished¶ U.S. leadership will make U.S. firms less competitive in¶ nuclear export markets while also reducing U.S. influence¶ over nuclear developments abroad. As more countries seek¶ to develop nuclear capacity, the United States must work¶ with the international community to minimize the risk of¶ nuclear weapons proliferation.

#### Nuclear leadership now- solves spillover and science advantages

The Hill 10/25/2012 (Regulatory chief: Edge on nuclear power shifting to US, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/264113-nrc-chief-us-nuclear-industry-in-good-position)

U.S. nuclear innovation is on the rise as nuclear heavyweights Germany and Japan head toward a possible decline in technical expertise, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Chairwoman Allison Macfarlane said Thursday.¶ After the March 2011 nuclear reactor meltdown at Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi power plant, Germany decided to phase out nuclear power by 2022. Japan’s government also said it plans to eliminate nuclear power, though it is unclear whether that will materialize.¶ Curtailing nuclear power in those two leading nuclear nations will “probably” result in a shortage in technical proficiency there, Macfarlane said at a discussion hosted by the Center for American Progress, a left-leaning think tank.¶ “You’re probably not going to see a lot of young people becoming nuclear engineers. And so this is a concern not only to the nuclear industry, but to the regulators because you want to make sure that you have adequate staff to ensure that these facilities operate safely,” she said.¶ Macfarlane emphasized the U.S. “is not in that situation.” She likened Germany’s position to that of the United States in the 1990s.¶ “There was definitely a concern that we didn’t have adequate folks being trained, especially in nuclear engineering departments,” Macfarlane said. She added, “That changed a lot in the 2000s with the sort of nuclear renaissance.”¶ Macfarlane said that resurgence has helped the U.S. forge ahead with new types of reactors. She said those reactors are smaller, and therefore could cost less than the “extra large” legacy models.

# 1nr

### 1NR Politics

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in India.

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**2012** (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

=

### U

#### New deal means will pass, continued momentum key

NYT 3/29/2013 (Guest Workers Are at Crux of Groups’ Deal on Immigration, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/30/us/politics/guest-worker-program-low-skilled-immigrants.html?\_r=0)

 The nation’s top business and labor groups were near agreement Friday on a guest worker program for low-skilled immigrants, closing in on a deal that would eliminate one of the last significant obstacles to a new proposal for a broad overhaul of immigration laws, officials involved in the talks said.¶ The progress in the talks, which stalled late last week, had members of a bipartisan group of eight senators that has been working on an immigration bill increasingly optimistic that they would be able to introduce comprehensive legislation in the Senate when Congress returns the second week of April.¶ “We are very close, closer than we’ve ever been,” said Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York and a member of the Senate group. “We are very optimistic, but there are a few issues remaining.”¶ The intense talks, and the willingness of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the A.F.L.-C.I.O. — two groups that have often found themselves deeply divided over the immigration debate — to try to hammer out an agreement, was an indication of how much the climate has changed on overhauling the nation’s immigration laws.¶ When President George W. Bush pushed to revamp immigration laws in 2007, the inability of business and labor to agree on a plan for temporary guest workers was among the main reasons that effort failed. But now the two groups have weathered leaks to the news media and other setbacks in a sign of how serious both Democrats and Republicans are about getting a bill on President Obama’s desk by the end of the year.¶ Some involved in the negotiations remained hopeful that a deal would be reached by the weekend, but the Congressional recess, along with the Good Friday observance, made it difficult to lock all the moving pieces in place, those close to the talks said. And, while the members of the bipartisan group were optimistic, aides cautioned that no deal would be final until all the senators had signed off on every piece of the legislation.¶ The Chamber of Commerce and the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the nation’s main federation of labor unions, have been in discussions parallel to those of the Senate group, and have already reached a tentative agreement about the size and scope of a temporary guest worker program, which would grant up to 200,000 new visas annually for low-skilled workers. The labor-business talks came close to breaking down last Friday, on the eve of a two-week Congressional recess, over the issue of what the pay levels should be for low-skilled immigrants — often employed at restaurants and hotels or on construction projects — who could be brought in when employers said they faced labor shortages.¶ One of the last sticking points in the business-labor negotiations has been the specific type of jobs that would be excluded from the program. The nation’s construction unions, officials in the talks said, have persuaded the negotiators to exclude certain higher-skilled jobs, including crane operators and electricians, from the guest worker program.¶ Eliseo Medina, the secretary-treasurer of the Service Employees International Union and one of labor’s most influential voices on immigration issues, said, “We may be very close to a point where the senators will have an announcement soon.”¶ The tentative agreement seems to satisfy both groups: The business community is likely to see a number of visas that it considers adequate, while the agreement on wages is likely to please labor because it is not expected to affect the labor market adversely.¶ “The labor movement has been united in making sure aspiring Americans get a road map to citizenship and that any future flow program doesn’t reduce wages for any local workers,” said Tom Snyder, manager of the A.F.L.-C.I.O.’s Citizenship Now campaign. “And we will succeed on both fronts because politicians have heard immigrant communities loud and clear: citizenship now.”¶ Still, Randy Johnson, the senior vice president for labor, immigration, and employee benefits at the Chamber of Commerce, cautioned that any official agreement would come from the bipartisan Senate group.¶ “We advise senators on the Hill how to write the bill, and they decide on what bill would make sound legislation,” he said.¶ According to participants in the conversations, after the business-labor talks came close to breaking down last week, some union officials pressed the labor negotiators to show more flexibility to avoid losing momentum over the guest worker issue. At the same time, some business leaders and Republican lawmakers pressed the Chamber to be more flexible on the guest worker issue so as not to derail the overall immigration overhaul.

#### Immigration will pass – momentum, bipartisan consensus, close to a vote, and political capital investment

Latinos Post 3-28 (“Immigration Reform 2013 News: Obama Says He Expects Congress to Have Immigration Bill Ready By April “, http://www.latinospost.com/articles/15446/20130328/immigration-reform-2013-news-obama-expects-congress-bill-ready-april.htm)

Continuing his recent push to have Washington pass comprehensive immigration reform into law, President Obama told Univision Wednesday that he expects a bill on immigration overhaul to be ready by April.¶ Obama sat down with the Latino TV network to talk about the recent developments on the immigration reform front, including the progress of the bipartisan senate group known as the "Gang of Eight," which has been working on a compromise bill on immigration.¶ Amid reports that the group has reached an impasse, President Obama assured that the group was still making progress and are actually very close to finalizing a deal on a formal immigration bill.¶ "I'm actually optimistic that when they get back they will introduce a bill," Obama said during the interview. "My sense is that they have come close and my expectation is that we'll actually see a bill on the floor of the Senate next month."¶ The forecast stayed true to the senate panel's desire to have a bill issued soon after the Senate reconvenes after Easter vacation.¶ If a bill is presented by the start of April, President Obama expressed confidence that the bill could be passed and signed into law by the end of the summer. However, with his own proposal on immigration law ready as a backup, the president reiterated a previous promise to submit his version of the bill to Congress should they fail to come up with a feasible immigration plan.¶ The March interview was the latest in a string of public appearances that Obama has made since January, when he began his push for immigration reform as part of his campaign vow to pass comprehensive immigration laws. Both the President and Republicans in Congress have been pressured by Latino voters, who voted for Obama in record numbers during the November elections, to make immigration overhaul a priority after years of delays on Capitol Hill.

#### CIR Will pass – Election, Obama’s capital, GOP compromise, public, and voting statistics

CT Post 3-28 (“Immigration reform gaining support in Congress”, http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/Immigration-reform-gaining-support-in-Congress-4393187.php)

WASHINGTON -- A Republican Party in desperate search for relevance to Latino voters. An expanded Democratic advantage in the Senate. A second-term President with his legacy on the line.¶ Does all that add up to enough to break decades of impasse and produce comprehensive immigration reform? As expectations -- and tensions -- rise, the answer won't be long in coming.¶ A bipartisan bill could be filed in the Senate as early as next week, followed in relatively short order by a House bill, also crafted by a bipartisan group, aiming at a compromise on the key issue of citizenship.¶ The efforts are being applauded by President Barack Obama, who is using every ounce of his political clout to try to get comprehensive reform.¶ Obama said the time has come "to work up the political courage to do what's required to be done."¶ "I expect a bill to be put forward. I expect a debate to begin next month. I want to sign that bill into law as soon as possible," Obama said at a White House naturalization ceremony.¶ In addition to the issue of eventual citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants, Congress is expected to address the need for temporary or guest worker programs.¶ Congress last passed comprehensive bipartisan reform legislation in 1986, when President Ronald Reagan signed a law that granted citizenship to several million undocumented immigrants and created a guest worker program.¶ Up until now, Republicans have opposed citizenship programs as an "amnesty" for lawbreakers who entered the country illegally, and labor has chafed at guest worker programs.¶ But Republican losses in the 2012 elections and increased public support for reform have many in the GOP talking compromise.¶ "If there is one issue that the two parties could produce something meaningful on in this Congress, it would be immigration," said Stephen Hess, a political expert at The Brookings Institution.¶ Hess said an eventual bill "will have lots of provisos, and it will go back and forth, but it would be hard not to produce something given the general feeling that something has to be produced."¶ More and more Republicans are moving toward immigration-reform measures as the party seeks to reach out to Latinos, the nation's largest -- and growing -- minority voting bloc.¶ Public opinion is behind them.¶ A recent poll showed 63 percent of Americans supported a path to citizenship for undocumented workers provided they meet certain requirements, according to a survey by the Public Religion Research Institute.¶ Notable Republicans who have recently spoken in favor of compromise on citizenship proposals include Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky.; former Mississippi Gov. Haley Barbour; and Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis.¶ And a March report by the National Republican Committee, considered a "post mortem" on the 2012 elections, recommended the GOP embrace comprehensive immigration reform to shore up its shaky standing with minorities -- Latinos, in particular.¶ Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, which advocates lower numerical numbers on immigration, predicted a majority of Republican senators would oppose citizenship.¶ Groups like Numbers USA are working to hold GOP senators in line. They sent 13,000 emails to Kentucky voters that claimed Paul's position was "more radical and pro-immigration than anything proposed by President Obama."¶ The group has targeted Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., one of the "Gang of Eight" senators writing the Senate bipartisan bill, as a lawmaker who favors foreign workers over unemployed South Carolinians.¶ Democrats from conservative-leaning states could also feel political heat.¶ Beck said if five to 10 Democrats in the Senate oppose a bill, proponents would need 10 to 15 Republicans to reach the 60 votes needed to cut off debate and vote on legislation.¶ "You do the math," Beck said.¶ In 2007, an effort to cut off debate on a Senate immigration reform bill died on a 46-53 vote.¶ But immigrant reform proponents, such as America's Voice, say there is a "tectonic shift" in the GOP, and the Democrats also have expanded their Senate majority to 53-45, plus two independents who caucus with them. They predict the Senate will muster the votes necessary to pass a reform bill.

### AT: Guns

#### Obama’s effectively picking his battles – Immigration he recognizes as the most practical

Chicago Tribune, March 28th [2013, Obama makes impassioned plea for gun control legislation, ¶ http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/sns-obama-makes-impassioned-plea-for-gun-control-legislation-20130328,0,1291257.story

Biden seemed to acknowledged the challenge when he said on a conference call on Wednesday organized by Mayors Against Illegal Guns that the administration will keep pressing for action regardless of what Congress does in the immediate future.¶ "Let me say this as clearly as I can: This is just the beginning," Biden said.¶ Obama had hoped at the outset of his second term to use his re-election mandate to make rapid progress on three major issues: gun violence, deficit-reduction and immigration reform.¶ All are moving slowly, however.¶ Immigration may offer the best prospect for action as Republicans seek to attract more Hispanic Americans who voted overwhelming for Obama and his Democrats in the 2012 elections.¶ Republicans insist that any pathway to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants be preceded by certification that U.S. borders are secure.¶ The biggest stumbling block to an immigration bill concerns creation of a guest-worker program to allow immigrants to cross the U.S.-Mexican border legally for temporary jobs.¶ U.S. labor unions, which worry such a program would lead to a loss of jobs for Americans, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have yet to arrive at a formula acceptable to both. Their agreement is considered crucial to bringing Congress along.¶ Obama has said he is encouraged by the progress, and he believes the dispute over the guest-worker program can be resolved. After first declaring the U.S.-Mexican border sufficiently secure, Obama now says it can be improved, a position that may permit him to make a deal with Republicans.¶ "I'm actually optimistic about this, in part because I think both Republicans as well as Democrats are now recognizing that it's the right thing to do," Obama told Univision, a Spanish-language network, in an interview on Wednesday.

#### Not spending Political Capital – only rallying public support

Rucker, March 23¶ Philip Rucker, Washington Post, “Obama to Congress: Finish the job on gun control” 2013 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2013/03/23/obama-to-congress-join-me-in-finishing-the-job/

Before departing on his trip to Israel and Jordan, Obama spoke with lawmakers from both parties about the gun measures under consideration, according to a White House official. The president plans to continue pressuring Congress on the issue, including additional travel outside of Washington designed to mobilize public support, said the official, who spoke only on the condition of anonymity.

### AT Mcarthy

#### Obama is heavily investing political capital into Immigration – functional campaigning

New American 3-28 (“Obama Predicts Immigration Bill Passage by Summer”, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/immigration/item/14939-obama-predicts-immigration-bill-passage-by-summer>)

During a swearing-in ceremony for 28 new citizens (including 13 members of the military) in the East Room of the White House on March 25, the president noted:¶ Immigration makes us stronger — it keeps us vibrant, it keeps us hungry, it keeps us prosperous.¶ We need to do a better job welcoming them.¶ We’ve known for years that our immigration system is broken…. After avoiding the problem for years, the time has come to fix it once and for all.¶ “Everyone pretty much knows what’s broken. Everyone knows how to fix it. We’ve just got, at this point, to work up the political courage to do what’s required to be done.¶ Obama did not make a distinction between legal and illegal immigrants during the ceremony, or state whether he believed that granting a “path to citizenship” to the latter also “makes us stronger.”

### Link Debate

#### SMR subsidies are uniquely unpopular now

Greenwire 12 <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3> “DOE Funding for Small Reactors Languishes as Parties Clash on Debt”

Likewise, top energy officials in the Obama administration have hailed the promise of the new reactors, and they haven't shown any signs of a change of heart. DOE spokeswoman Jen Stutsman said last week that the department is still reviewing applications, but she did not say when a decision will be made. "This is an important multiyear research and development effort, and we want to make sure we take the time during the review process to get the decision right," she wrote in an email. That the grants haven't been given out during a taut campaign season, even as President Obama announces agency actions ranging from trade cases to creating new national monuments to make the case for his re-election, may be a sign that the reactors are ensnared in a broader feud over energy spending.Grant recipients would develop reactor designs with an eye toward eventually turning those into pilot projects -- and the loan guarantees that these first-of-a-kind nuclear plants are using today to get financing would be blocked under the "No More Solyndras" bill that passed the House last week ([Greenwire](http://www.eenews.net/Greenwire/2012/09/14/archive/2%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), Sept. 14). Congress has given the grant program $67 million for fiscal 2012, shy of the amount that would be needed annually to reach full funding. If the "sequester" kicks in at year's end and slashes DOE funding or the balance of power changes in Washington, the amount of money available could dwindle yet again. Even the staunchest supporters of the federal nuclear program are acknowledging it is a tough time to promise a $452 million check. Former Sen. Pete Domenici, a New Mexico Republican who pushed for new reactors as chairman of both the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, said during a brief interview Tuesday that well-designed loan guarantees won't cost too much because they get repaid over time. The cost could be borne by a "tiny little tax" on the nuclear industry, he said. But when it comes to straight-up spending, like the grants that would support getting these cutting-edge reactors ready for their first demonstrations, the solution may not be so clear. While some Republicans remain staunch supporters of funding for the nuclear power industry, there are others who label the government subsidies as a waste of taxpayer dollars. "It's awful hard, with the needs that are out there and the debt that haunts us, to figure out how you're going to establish priorities," said Domenici, who has advocated for the deployment of new nuclear reactors as a fellow at the Bipartisan Policy Center. "I can't stand here and tell you that I know how to do that."

#### SMR debates are polarizing

Carper and Schmid 11 Ross Carper (rosscarper@gmail.com), a writer based in Washington state, is the founding editor of the creative nonfiction project BeyondtheBracelet.com. Sonja Schmid (sschmid@vt.edu) is an assistant professor in Science and Technology Studies at Virginia Tech. “The Little Reactor That Could?” Issues in Science and Technology, http://www.issues.org/27.4/carper.html

Historically, nuclear energy has been entangled in one of the most polarizing debates in this country. Promoters and adversaries of nuclear power alike have accused the other side of oversimplification and exaggeration. For today’s industry, reassuring a wary public and nervous government regulators that small reactors are completely safe might not be the most promising strategy. People may not remember much history, but they usually do remember who let them down before. It would make more sense to admit that nuclear power is an inherently risky technology, with enormous benefits that might justify taking these risks. So instead of framing small reactors as qualitatively different and “passively safe,” why not address the risks involved head-on? This would require that the industry not only invite the public to ask questions, but also that they respond, even—or perhaps especially—when these questions cross preestablished boundaries. Relevant historical experience with small compact reactors in military submarines, for example, should not be off limits, just because information about them has traditionally been classified.

#### SMR’s incredibly unpopular—popular culture frames SMRs as dangerous

Deal-Blackwell 7/23 (Deborah, works with Los Alamos, founder of Hyperion Power Generation, ““Dark Knight Rises” Batman movie does infant SMR industry no favors” <http://ixpower.com/tag/small-modular-reactors/>)

But, I couldn’t believe it …Holy Plot Twist Batman! I cringed when we got to the part where they introduced the little nuclear reactor. ACK! The Nolan Brothers had written in Wayne Enterprises Applied Science Division developing an SMR (Small Modular nuclear power Reactor) that was used by the bad guys to threaten Gotham. In the movie, the bad guys gain access to the SMR and had a scientist magically presto changeo TURN IT INTO A FUSION NUCLEAR BOMB in what seemed like a turn of a screw, and in the space of a few minutes. As the movie progressed, and I became sore from my date nudging me with his elbow, darn it if the characters didn’t flip the sucker onto the back of the truck and drive around Gotham with it …!¶ GROAN! CRINGE! I know it’s just a movie and YOU know it’s just a movie, but golly, gosh darn, The Dark Knight Rises sure doesn’t help the rise of the fledging SMR industry! ¶ Fusion?! Ack! Fusion bomb?! Ack! Quickly retrofitting a power reactor to be a bomb?! Ack! Throwing it in a truck and driving it around the city?! ¶ Double Ack! The fairy tale spun further and further out of control. I wanted to bang my head on the seat in front of me. I don’t recall any other recent movies featuring a small nuclear power being turned into a bomb, and I sure wish this one had not.¶ Misconceptions about nuclear power abound today. Misconceptions and fear about SMRs, I’m afraid, will no doubt skyrocket after everyone gets around to seeing this movie. If you ask me, the release of this Batman flick hands the Union of Concerned Scientists a loaded Batpistol to scare the uninformed majority into opposing the development of SMRs. ¶ This movie could be a pain in the collective butts of those of us who believe SMRs have a place in the future of clean energy for our planet and may come back to haunt the nuclear industry – for both big and small power reactors. I’m pretty sure it will – just as sure as at the end of every Batman movie, the dark knight rises.¶

#### The public will backlash to SMR—prefer our ev, compares perceptions of supporters and opponents of SMRs

Baker 6-22-12 (Matthew, “Do Small Modular Reactors Present a Serious Option for the Military’s Energy Needs?” <http://americansecurityproject.org/blog/2012/do-small-modular-reactors-present-a-serious-option-for-the-militarys-energy-needs/>)

Congressman Bartlett also pointed out that current military bases such as Guam – which is fueled by the transport of diesel – are extremely vulnerable should the energy transport system be disrupted. Fuel supplies are even more unstable in Afghanistan, where one out of every twenty-four convoys results in a casualty. According to Congressman Bartlett, SMRs could make such bases energy self-sufficient.

Unfortunately all the hype surrounding SMRs seems to have made the proponents of SMR technology oblivious to some of its huge flaws. Firstly like large reactors, one of the biggest qualms that the public has to nuclear is problems associated with nuclear waste. A more decentralized production of nuclear waste inevitably resulting from an increase in SMRs production was not even discussed. The danger of transporting gas into some military bases in the Middle East is already extremely volatile; dangers of an attack on the transit of nuclear waste would be devastating. Secondly, SMRs pose many of the same problems that regular nuclear facilities face, sometimes to a larger degree. Because SMRs are smaller than conventional reactors and can be installed underground, they can be more difficult to access should an emergency occur. There are also reports that because the upfront costs of nuclear reactors go up as surface area per kilowatt of capacity decreases, SMRs will in fact be more expensive than conventional reactors. Thirdly, some supporters of SMR technology seem to have a skewed opinion of public perception toward nuclear energy. Commissioner of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, William C. Ostendorff, didn’t seem to think that the recent Fukushima disaster would have any impact on the development on SMRs. Opinion polls suggest Americans are more likely to think that the costs of nuclear outweigh its benefits since the Fukushima disaster. For SMRs to be the philosopher’s stone of the military’s energy needs the public needs to be on board.

#### SMRs unpopular – the public doesn’t differentiate the risk based on size

Locatelli and Mancini 10 (Giorgio and Mauro, Politecnico di Milano, Dept. Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering, “The role of the reactor size for an investment in the nuclear sector: An evaluation**¶** of not-ﬁnancial parameters”, Progress in Nuclear Energy 53, 2011)

This is because, in the public’s mind, a system with small probability of failure and large consequences is seen as more risky than the opposite, as the common fear of air crashes (Sjoberg, 1999). Fischoff’s law (Slovic et al., 1978) bears that level of acceptable risk is inversely related to the number of people exposed to that risk. Slovic (Fischoff et al., 1980) concluded that belief about the catastrophic potential of nuclear power is the major determinant of public opposition. Other main factors inﬂuencing the attitude toward NPPs are: trust in government and institutions (Slovic, 1993); knowledge and competences on nuclear topics, which are tightly related to active nuclear power generation in the country (Fischoff et al., 1980); timing and level of public involvement in the decision. Public accepts risks from voluntary activities roughly 1000 times greater than from involuntary activities that provide the same level of beneﬁt (Slovic et al., 1978); risk perception about waste management and disposal (Sjoberg, 2009). Considering different sizes: 1. public competences are not sufﬁcient to understand safety improvements. Deliberately SMRs have a lower Core Damage Frequency (CDF) thanks to their design, but public has not an education which makes him able to appreciate a reduction of CDF from 10 7 to 10 8 (as in the comparison between Westinghouse’s AP1000 and IRIS (Carelli, 2003; Matzie, 2008)); 2. public perception of a severe accident is not size-dependant because, in the people’s mind, both SMRs and LRs involve the same catastrophic consequences; 3. III/IIIþ GEN SMRs and LRs do not produce different quantity or toxicity of waste. These issues will become differential only with the exploitation of IV GEN disruptive technologies. Considering near-term technologies, overall population’s attitude is not differential.

### AT: DOD Shields

#### Obama is the Commander in Chief, so DoD actions LIKE THE PLAN are intrinsically blamed on him

#### DoD action links—Causes congressional backlash

Erwin, 12 [Sandra I., National Defense “Amid Political Backlash, Pentagon Pushes Forward With Green Energy,” April, [http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/archive/2012 /April/Pages/AmidPoliticalBacklash,PentagonPushesForwardWithGreenEnergy.aspx](http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/archive/2012/April/Pages/AmidPoliticalBacklash%2CPentagonPushesForwardWithGreenEnergy.aspx), ALB]

Maybe the problem with the Defense Department’s renewable energy efforts is that they are called “green.”¶ And anything green these days can be radioactive on Capitol Hill. Republican lawmakers see funding requests for Defense Department clean-energy programs and cringe. Here we go again, another Solyndra, more ethanol subsidies, more government waste, more taxpayer dollars thrown at political cronies.¶ Military and civilian defense officials responsible for green initiatives increasingly are flummoxed and frustrated by the demonization of renewable energy. When did efforts to save lives and money become cheap partisan fodder?¶ “I think it’s sad” that the military’s campaign to burn less fuel and to secure alternative sources of energy is being politicized, one three-star general said in a private conversation.¶ Several industry insiders who work with the Pentagon’s most visible champion for green energy, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, said they were aghast at the amount of badgering he received last month during a House Armed Services Committee hearing. By their account, Mabus was quite upset by the grilling from several congressmen (SIC), who insinuated that the secretary was being too aggressive in promoting the Navy’s green fleet at the expense of more urgent force-readiness priorities. ¶ “Now, look, I love green energy,” said Rep. Randy Forbes, R-Va. But he questioned why the Navy is cutting its budget for ships but increasing spending on biofuels that cost $15 per gallon. “You’re not the secretary of energy. You’re the secretary of the Navy,” Forbes griped. Mabus was hit by similar unfriendly barbs from other HASC members.

#### Hagel’s nomination ensures any DOD action links to politics.

Gur 2/22/2013 (HAVIV RETTIG GUR, Hagel’s damaged brand, http://www.timesofisrael.com/hagels-damaged-brand/)

By opposing Hagel’s nomination so stridently, his opponents have already forced the former senator to publicly retract and apologize for past statements and views. And by continuing the fight, they have almost guaranteed that Hagel’s tenure as secretary of defense will be hopelessly politicized. Both Republicans who dislike him and Democrats who grudgingly backed him will be watching the new secretary closely for signs of weakness or a return to his unpopular past views. It’s an especially inauspicious start following the widely celebrated and largely apolitical tenures of the past and current defense sectaries, Bob Gates and Leon Panetta. Hagel will begin his tenure with a level of partisan suspicion and dislike unknown since the end of Donald Rumsfeld’s term in 2006. As one astute Republican observer told the Times of Israel this week, “the relationship is totally poisoned. I can’t imagine that Chuck Hagel can be a successful secretary of defense. Here’s a guy who over half of the Senate gave a vote of ‘no confidence’ to last week. The feeling was his personal heroism would enable him to go into the Pentagon with the political capital to cut the budget. He may in fact be confirmed, but it’s hard to see how he will be able to work. He’s going to be limping into the Pentagon.” And a veteran Democratic activist: “Hagel’s already lost. Democrats will be relieved if he’s gone; they don’t like him on Israel, on Iran and because he’s a Republican.” As several observers have noted, Obama’s very insistence on Hagel as his defense chief suggests that Hagel’s opponents are right to be worried, that the nomination means something. When it comes to foreign and defense policy, Obama’s first term was marked by continuity with the Bush policy. The timetables for withdrawal from Iraq and Afghanistan largely followed those established before Bush left office. They were driven by the professional planning staff rather than any change in thinking in the Oval Office. Hagel’s nomination matters because it signals to many in Washington, and around the world, that Obama is looking to dramatically reshape US foreign policy. The fight over Hagel won’t end before the the formal vote on Tuesday — and not even then. The forces opposing him, like those who have come out in his favor, including J Street and a handful of “realist” former ambassadors and foreign policy officials, are engaged in a battle over policy, not personality. Republican senators, together with a few Democratic colleagues who will grudgingly vote for his confirmation, will be watching him closely for any perceived missteps in the years to come. All in all, not an ideal starting point for a defense secretary, especially one whose chief responsibility will be the unenviable task of drastically reducing the budget and size of the department he has been asked to run.

### AT: Link Turn

#### Only a risk of the link – public massively opposed to nuclear expansion and there’s no constituency to lobby for the plan.

CSI 12. [Civil Society Institue, “SURVEY: CONGRESS, WHITE HOUSE FOCUS ON FOSSIL FUELS, NUCLEAR POWER IS OUT OF TOUCH WITH VIEWS OF MAINSTREAM AMERICA” November 3 -- http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/110311release.cfm]

If Congress thinks it has found a winning issue in trashing wind and solar power ... and if the Obama Administration believes that voters will reward it for boosting coal, gas and nuclear power ... then both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue are making serious miscalculations about the sentiments of mainstream Americans - including Republicans and Tea Party supporters -- one year before the 2012 elections, according to the findings of a major survey of 1,049 Americans conducted October 21-24, 2011 by ORC International for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI).¶ Documenting a major gulf between the views of Americans and the Congress/White House on energy policy, the CSI survey includes the following key findings:¶ • If Washington had to choose between fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies and wind/solar subsidies, "clean energy" aid would get support from three times more Americans than fossil fuel/nuclear energy subsidies. Only a bit more than one in 10 American adults (13 percent) - including just 20 percent of Republicans, 9 percent of Independents, 10 percent of Democrats, and only 24 percent of Tea Party supporters - are in favor of concentrating federal energy subsidies on the coal, nuclear power and natural gas industries. When it comes to focusing federal subsidies on wind and solar, 38 percent of all Americans are supportive -- about three times the support level for fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies. Only about one in 10 Americans (13 percent) - including just 26 percent of Tea Party supporters -- believes that "no energy source should receive federal subsidies."¶ • Fossil fuel subsidies are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. Six in 10 Americans - including a strikingly uniform 59 percent of Republicans, 65 percent of Independents, 59 percent of Democrats, and 59 percent of Tea Party members -- oppose "federal subsidies for oil and gas, coal, natural gas and other fossil fuel companies."¶ • Nuclear reactor loan guarantees are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. More than two out of three Americans (67 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 66 percent of Independents, 68 percent of Democrats and 62 percent of Tea Party backers - disagree that "taxpayers and ratepayers should provide taxpayer-backed loan guarantees for the construction of new nuclear power reactors in the United States through proposed tens of billions in federal loan guarantees for new reactors."¶ • Most Americans want the U.S. to shift federal loan guarantee support from nuclear power to wind and solar energy. About seven in 10 Americans (71 percent) - including 55 percent of Republicans, 72 percent of Independents, 84 percent of Democrats, and almost half (47 percent) of Tea Party backers -- strongly or somewhat support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors and towards clean renewable energy such as wind and solar."¶ • A strong majority of Americans want the U.S. to make the investments needed to be a clean energy leader on a global basis. More than three in four Americans (77 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 75 percent of Independents, 88 percent of Democrats, and 56 percent of Tea Party members -- agree with the following statement: "The U.S. needs to be a clean energy technology leader and it should invest in the research and domestic manufacturing of wind, solar and energy efficiency technologies."¶ Pam Solo, founder and president, Civil Society Institute, said: "Americans of all political stripes have moved ahead of Washington and want our nation to make smarter choices about cleaner and safer sources of power. Common sense is the driving force in American opinion, which focuses not on whether Washington should help usher in a renewable, clean energy future, but how it should proceed in doing so. Americans believe that the energy industries have an undue influence over decisions made by Washington. They want leadership and problem solving from Washington for a clean energy future. Americans understand that we can no longer have our economy and environment tethered to 'old' energy solutions that are unsafe, unhealthy and simply unable to meet our long-term needs."¶ Graham Hueber, senior researcher, ORC International, said: "One clear message of this survey sit that there is no clear 'Old Fuel Constituency' in the sense of a large number of unified Americans who favor fossil fuels and nuclear power over wind and solar power. In fact, Republicans and Tea Party supporters who might seem like the most logical place for such a constituency are somewhat more likely than others to support federal subsidies for fossil fuels and nuclear power, but they also would prefer development of cleaner sources of energy. These are actually quite striking findings in the context of the 2012 election campaign."¶

#### GOP Base being united in favor of CIR now – we control uniqueness

LA Times 3-28 (“GOP primary voters not opposed to immigration reform”, http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-gop-primary-voters-immigration-reform-20130328,0,3595182.story)

According to a Republican research group, recent discussions with Republican voters in Iowa and South Carolina indicated that conservatives are inclined to support the party’s involvement in fixing immigration and may well reward potential presidential candidates, like Florida Sen. Marco Rubio, who have taken a prominent role in that effort.¶ “It’s clear that Senator Rubio’s presence in this debate creates a significant amount of goodwill among the Republican base,” concludes a memo from Ed Gillespie, a former national Republican chairman, and pollster John McLaughlin, whose firm conducted the focus-group sessions. “As one Des Moines woman said when commenting on a potential pathway to citizenship, “I’d like to see what Marco Rubio comes up with. I trust him.’”¶ Some prominent conservatives remain hostile to any efforts to grant legal status to the nation’s estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants, arguing that such moves provide a form of amnesty that rewards illegal behavior. ¶ The focus-group findings appear in line with other recent survey research about voter attitudes on immigration, although the report merely provides an interpretation of the discussions. They were not open to monitoring by the news media, and it’s unknown if comments from the groups could have led to a different overall conclusion.¶ The sponsoring organization, Resurgent Republic, is a moderate conservative organization. Its most prominent members are associated with a still-evolving effort to revive the Republican Party in the aftermath of popular vote losses in five of the last six presidential elections.¶ “President Obama’s re-election victory, and Republicans’ shrinking support among non-white voters, is a seminal moment for conservatives,” says the four-page memo. “[I]mmigration reform should not be viewed as a one-step panacea guaranteeing Republican inroads among Hispanic voters. Yet it is a critically important step in a long-term effort.”¶ Securing the border as a first step in providing a pathway to legal citizenship for those already in the country was a prominent feature of the discussions with conservative Republican voters. Such “triggers” are a feature of legislation being drafted by a bipartisan group of eight senators that includes, in addition to Rubio, Republicans John McCain and Jeff Flake of Arizona, and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina.¶ The report says immigration reform is “not on the radar” of the Republican base, but that GOP voters believe their party should not simply leave the issue to Democrats in Congress or President Obama. They also want any immigration reform plan to include tougher security on the borders, while barring undocumented immigrants from receiving welfare or other government benefits.

### AT: PC Kills

### AT Political Capital bad

#### Obama push inevitable, only question is whether he has the *influence* to make it effective- ongoing negotiations prove it’s working now- any ideologically negative reactions to “anything Obama related” is assumed by our ev

Washington Post 3/15/2013 (House and Senate groups working on immigration, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-03-15/politics/37745233\_1\_legal-immigration-house-group-senate-works)

Two groups of bipartisan lawmakers in the House and the Senate are racing to put the finishing touches on massive and complex legislative proposals for immigration reform that could be introduced shortly after Easter.¶ A bipartisan group of eight senators has been meeting virtually daily to hammer out details of the bill, including how to structure new visa programs that would fundamentally alter legal immigration, as well as the politically treacherous issue of extending legalization and eventual citizenship to the nation’s estimated 11 million illegal immigrants.¶ “We’ve had good meetings,” said Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), a member of the group, on Thursday. “There are tough issues, but we’re moving.”¶ The secret bipartisan negotiations are delicate and fragile, a point put in stark relief Friday as a top official with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce warned that the organization’s efforts to come to terms with labor unions on the contentious issues of a new visa program for foreign workers has stalled.¶ Randel Johnson, the chamber’s vice president for labor, immigration and employee benefits, said the chamber has been pushing for 400,000 new visas for foreign workers, which has been met with fierce resistance by labor officials, who propose a far lower number.¶ The high-stakes negotiations are central to President Obama’s pledge to push a comprehensive immigration bill through Congress this year. The White House has said it supports the Senate’s effort to craft a bill, and the administration has been trying to give the group time to work out a compromise proposal. But Obama has vowed to offer his own detailed legislation if the efforts in Congress get bogged down.¶ The Senate group has received most of the public attention on the issue because the group unveiled its effort with great fanfare. But there is also progress in the Republican-led House, long seen as the tougher political challenge for any immigration proposal.

#### Here’s conclusive ev he’s *already involved,* and *having a positive impact*

Reuters 3/14/2013 (Senators aim to reach bipartisan immigration deal next week, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/14/us-usa-congress-immigration-idUSBRE92D1B120130314)

The eight senators - four Democrats and four Republicans - announced a "framework for comprehensive immigration reform" in January and have been working to flesh it out.¶ There are an estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States, many of them living in the shadows while seeking work and trying to avoid detection.¶ The eight senators have tried to draft a plan that would include a pathway toward U.S. citizenship for undocumented immigrants while strengthening border security.¶ They also want to create a more effective system to guard against U.S. employers hiring undocumented immigrants, and develop a program to better forecast and meet future U.S. workforce needs in a bid to curb illegal immigration.¶ The eight senators came together shortly after the November 2012 election results reflected the growing power of Hispanic voters and their pleas for immigration reform.¶ "There have been hard and tough negotiations, but it has been done all in the spirit of achieving the goal, in which compromise has been made on both sides," Menendez said.¶ The senators have worked with the encouragement of the White House and reached out to members of the Republican-led House of Representatives.¶ This week Obama met separately with Republican and Democratic lawmakers, mainly to talk about budget deficit concerns. But immigration reform also was discussed.¶ On Wednesday, Obama told a closed-door meeting of Senate Democrats that immigration was "'something that we can get done,'" Democratic Senator Benjamin Cardin of Maryland said.¶ On Thursday, Republican Senator Jeff Flake of Arizona, a member of the group of eight, said he thanked Obama for "playing a role that's behind the scenes."¶ Flake said the issue of future immigration to the United States is a sticking point for Democrats, and that Obama could build support for that part of the pending immigration bill.

#### PC is effective- builds GOP support

Washington Post 3/23/2013 (White House’s outreach is yielding modest benefits, lawmakers say, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/white-houses-outreach-is-yielding-modest-benefits-lawmakers-say/2013/03/23/676dad42-924c-11e2-bdea-e32ad90da239\_story.html)

Before departing for Israel last Tuesday, for example, Obama called Republican Sens. John McCain (Ariz.) and Lindsey O. Graham (S.C.) to discuss immigration reform and other issues. The White House legislative affairs office reached out to Rep. Tom Cole (R-Okla.) last week after he spoke of being ignored. And Obama counselor Pete Rouse worked with Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) on resolving the impasse over Interior Secretary-designate Sally Jewell’s nomination. Lawmakers and aides say the effort has begun to yield modest dividends. Last week, Congress managed to pass a continuing resolution averting another potential government shutdown.¶ “It’s sort of like the two sides are looking across the table and thinking, ‘We really are going to have to live in this house for the next four years. Let’s divide up who does the dishes: I’ll take Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday,’ ” said Cole, who has broken ranks with his party on occasion. “I sort of see the CR as a confidence builder.”

#### Skilled worker shortage blocks solvency-

Battaglia 3/23/2013 (Sarah, one of the in-house Copywriters and the Social Media Specialist for Energy Curtailment Specialists since 2011, BA in Marketing from SUNY-Buffalo, writer for the Energy Collective, Energy Industry Faced with a Possible Workforce Shortage, http://theenergycollective.com/sbattaglia/201836/energy-industry-faced-possible-workforce-shortage)

The energy industry may be booming, but the amount of skilled workers seems to be dwindling. The industry is looking at a possible shortage of employees within the next decade, a huge inconvenience with many major projects soon to be underway.¶ Daniel Lumma, senior vice president of Kiewit Oil, Gas, and Chemical North America, confirmed that the North American oil and gas industry is made up of roughly five million skilled trade workers, which is about one million fewer than it was during the mid 2000s. Lumma also described his concern that about half of these workers will likely retire within the next 10 years, leaving millions of gaps to fill.¶ With the current oil and gas boom happening in the United States, a great number of projects are in progress and many will be starting shortly. “If all those projects happen, the peak workforce would have to multiply five to six times about what it is right now. The fact is, that’s not going to happen,” stated Lumma. He continued, “We’re heading into a very, very significant demographic issue.”¶ There is a solution to every problem, and in this case, there may be a few options. Planning is crucial. Making sure each project has enough workers to be efficient will be beneficial if done in advance. Joining forces with local union halls could also act as a solution to the worker shortage. Unions can assist with recruiting and employee training for any major project. Lumma recommends employers set up extensive training in non-union areas, and consider expanding recruiting initiatives to veterans.¶ Large-scale projects will require the work of thousands of employees, and the Keystone XL pipeline is a great example. TransCanada states,¶ Construction of the 1,179-mile pipeline will require 9,000 skilled American workers. The project will provide jobs for welders, mechanics, electricians, pipefitters, laborers, safety coordinators, heavy equipment operators and other workers who rely on large construction projects for their livelihoods. In addition to construction jobs, an estimated 7,000 U.S. jobs are being supported in manufacturing the steel pipe and the thousands of fittings, valves, pumps and control devices required for a major oil pipeline.¶ Oil and gas projects are not the only ones that require skilled workers. The Obama administration recently approved three large renewable energy projects in the U.S. These projects include NextEra Energy’s 750-megawatt McCoy Solar Energy Project in southern California, EDF Renewable Energy’s 150-megawatt Desert Harvest Solar Farm also in California, and the 200-megawatt Searchlight Wind Energy Project in Nevada. Each of these developments will need to employ thousands of workers.¶ With so many large energy projects in the works for the U.S., companies will certainly be conducting extensive recruiting, hiring, and training for potential employees. The need for skilled workers continues to grow, and with these projects, companies can only hope they don’t run out of talent.

### Heg

#### **Heg doesn’t solve war**

Maher 10 Richard Maher, Ph.D. in Political Science at Brown University, November 12, 2010,“The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World”, http://dl2af5jf3e.scholar.serialssolutions.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/?sid=google&auinit=R&aulast=Maher&atitle=The+paradox+of+American+unipolarity:+Why+the+United+States+may+be+better+off+in+a+post-unipolar+world&id=doi:10.1016/j.orbis.2010.10.003&title=Orbis+(Philadelphia)&volume=55&issue=1&date=2011&spage=53&issn=0030-4387

The other way to think about power is the ability to realize one's own preferences or preferred outcomes, or the ability to influence other actors—usually other states but not always—to do what you want them to do. When we think of power this way, we realize that the United States’ vast resources alone often are not sufficient to realize its preferred ends. There is no perfect correlation between the resources at one's command and the ability to realize preferred outcomes. Perhaps no other period of world politics in recent memory represents this discrepancy more acutely than today. U.S. capabilities dwarf those of any other state. Politically, diplomatically, and economically the United States remains in a preeminent position. While it hardly gets everything it wants, no other country can match U.S. influence in these realms. At the same time, from Iran, to North Korea, Pakistan, Iraq, and Afghanistan, not to mention Russia and China, the United States is seemingly not getting its way on issues central to its interests. More states are unafraid to challenge the United States (if only at the margins), ignore its blandishments, or seek to decrease their reliance or dependence on American security guarantees.

### Prolif

#### Nuclear leadership now- solves spillover and science advantages

The Hill 10/25/2012 (Regulatory chief: Edge on nuclear power shifting to US, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/264113-nrc-chief-us-nuclear-industry-in-good-position)

U.S. nuclear innovation is on the rise as nuclear heavyweights Germany and Japan head toward a possible decline in technical expertise, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Chairwoman Allison Macfarlane said Thursday.¶ After the March 2011 nuclear reactor meltdown at Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi power plant, Germany decided to phase out nuclear power by 2022. Japan’s government also said it plans to eliminate nuclear power, though it is unclear whether that will materialize.¶ Curtailing nuclear power in those two leading nuclear nations will “probably” result in a shortage in technical proficiency there, Macfarlane said at a discussion hosted by the Center for American Progress, a left-leaning think tank.¶ “You’re probably not going to see a lot of young people becoming nuclear engineers. And so this is a concern not only to the nuclear industry, but to the regulators because you want to make sure that you have adequate staff to ensure that these facilities operate safely,” she said.¶ Macfarlane emphasized the U.S. “is not in that situation.” She likened Germany’s position to that of the United States in the 1990s.¶ “There was definitely a concern that we didn’t have adequate folks being trained, especially in nuclear engineering departments,” Macfarlane said. She added, “That changed a lot in the 2000s with the sort of nuclear renaissance.”¶ Macfarlane said that resurgence has helped the U.S. forge ahead with new types of reactors. She said those reactors are smaller, and therefore could cost less than the “extra large” legacy models.