### Perm CP

Perm- do the counterplan

Should isn’t mandatory

Words and Phrases ‘2 [“Words and Phrases: Permanent Edition” Vol. 39 Set to Signed. Pub. By Thomson West, p. 369]

C.A.6 (Tenn.) 2001. Word “should,” in most contexts, is precatory, not mandatory.----U.S. v. Rogers, 14 Fed.Appx. 303.----Statut227

Resolved is an opinion

Webster’s ‘98Revised Unabridged Dictionary, 1998 [dictionary.com]

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

“Reduce” does not mean immediate

Kumamoto 2k (Hiromitsu, and Ernest J. Henley, Professors of Informatics – Kyoto University, “Basic Risk Concepts”, Probablistic Risk Assessment and Management for Engineers and Scientists,

http://media.wiley.com/product\_data/excerpt/76/07803601/0780360176.pdf)

Note that the term reduce does not necessarily mean an immediate reduction; rather it denotes registration into a reduction list; some risks in the top layer or some risks not justified in the middle layer are difficult to reduce immediately but can be reduced in the future; some other risks such as background radiation, which carries no benefits, are extremely difficult to reduce in the prescreening structure, and would remain in the reduction list forever.

#### Lenses you should use- aff define our own plan text- negative clarification kills aff ground- force to defend specific senators- Aff ground outweighs ALL their offense- makes it impossible- other things solve neg ground argument- we can’t read offense AGAINST ourselves- makes it impossible to win- CP is plan plus

#### Cross-X embarrassing- ONLY a certainty CP- certainty CP’s horrible- unique to Kentucky and Harvard tournaments- the delay for a month post-election CP would devastate every aff-

#### Leads to worse policy option- discuss the PROCESS of the plan- not its MERITS- the CP does not exclude any part of the plan- proves it’s a good idea- discussion over process is infinitely regressive- could go to what pen should the plan be signed with- turns best policy making AND topic education- re-hash every year

#### Our interpretation is A CP must be functionally AND textually competitive- the CP is neither- no functional difference- and no textual difference- includes the entire plan text at the end- functional PLUS textual solves all their offense

Certainty not a mandate- plan text in a vacuum

Still resolved

Not key to neg ground-

Even if important- doesn’t justiy as a counterplan

Increase isn’t in our plan text

DOD subset of USFG- not a different actor

ANY reason why the CP isn’t 100% of the aff means it doesn’t solve

1. Uncertainty jacks investors-Rosner evidence- impacted by case- no one will agree to the PPA- commission cards overly generic
2. DOD says no- that was Cross-X- already said they would say no to the CP- our specific SMR
3. Dod wouldn’t enforce the CP- they do not implement recommendation
4. Other actors in the discussion preclude DOD specifications- impact is our heg impact

# 1ar – certainty key

**Certainty key to private investment**

**Siu 11**, Brian energy policy analyst with NRDC's air and energy program [Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Small Nuclear Reactors and Alternate Fuels, June 7th, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112shrg68432/html/CHRG-112shrg68432.htm]

Current regulations limit the Department of Defense from entering into fuel procurement contracts that exceed a five year period. But there has been growing interest in extending the contracting window. This is because many emerging technologies pose high risk due to initial technology costs and lack of commercial experience. In the past, long term fixed price contracts have been viewed as a way to mitigate those risks by establishing a known and stable revenue stream. It is believed that this certainty will help attract private capital for the project.

**It’s key to price estimates**

**Trembath, 11** [2/4/11, [Nuclear Power and the Future of Post-Partisan Energy Policy](http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/), Alex Trembath is a policy associate in the Energy and Climate Program at Breakthrough. He is the lead or co-author of several Breakthrough publications, including the 2012 report "Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence" and "Where the Shale Gas Revolution Came From." Alex is a graduate of University of California at Berkeley, <http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/>]

If there is one field of the energy sector for which certainty of political will and government policy is essential, it is nuclear power. High up front costs for the private industry, extreme regulatory oversight and public wariness necessitate a committed government partner for private firms investing in nuclear technology. In a new [report](http://www.thirdway.org/publications/370) on the potential for a “nuclear renaissance,” Third Way references the failed cap-and-trade bill, delaying tactics in the House vis-a-vis EPA regulations on CO₂, and the recent election results to emphasize the difficult current political environment for advancing new nuclear policy. The report, “The Future of Nuclear Energy,” makes the case for political certainty: “It is difficult for energy producers and users to estimate the relative price for nuclear-generated energy compared to fossil fuel alternatives (e.g. natural gas)–an essential consideration in making the major capital investment decision necessary for new energy production that will be in place for decades.” Are our politicians willing to match the level of certainty that the nuclear industry demands? Lacking a suitable price on carbon that may have been achieved by a cap-and-trade bill removes one primary policy instrument for making nuclear power more cost-competitive with fossil fuels. The impetus on Congress, therefore, will be to shift from demand-side “pull” energy policies (that increase demand for clean tech by raising the price of dirty energy) to [supply-side “push” policies](http://leadenergy.org/2010/09/supply-demand-energy-innovation/), or industrial and innovation policies. Fortunately, there are signals from political and thought leaders that a package of policies may emerge to incentivize alternative energy sources that include nuclear power. One place to start is the recently deceased American Power Act, addressed above, authored originally by Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman. Before its final and disappointing incarnation, the bill [included](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/12/american-power-act-photos_n_573643.html#s90041&title=undefined) provisions to increase loan guarantees for nuclear power plant construction in addition to other tax incentives. Loan guarantees are probably the most important method of government involvement in new plant construction, given the high capital costs of development. One wonders what the fate of the bill, or a less ambitious set of its provisions, would have been had Republican Senator Graham not abdicated and removed any hope of Republican co-sponsorship. But that was last year. The changing of the guard in Congress makes this a whole different game, and the once feasible support for nuclear technology on either side of the aisle must be reevaluated. A New York Times [piece](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/business/energy-environment/17NUCLEAR.html) in the aftermath of the elections forecast a difficult road ahead for nuclear energy policy, but did note Republican support for programs like a waste disposal site and loan guarantees. Republican support for nuclear energy has roots in the most significant recent energy legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which passed provisions for nuclear power with wide bipartisan support. Reaching out to Republicans on policies they have supported in the past should be a goal of Democrats who wish to form a foundational debate on moving the policy forward. There are also signals that key Republicans, notably [Lindsey Graham](http://washingtonindependent.com/99171/graham-circulating-clean-energy-standard) and [Richard Lugar](http://www.plattsenergyweektv.com/story.aspx?storyid=132784&catid=293), would throw their support behind a clean energy standard that includes nuclear and CCS. Republicans in Congress will find intellectual support from a group that AEL’s Teryn Norris coined [“innovation hawks,”](http://leadenergy.org/2011/01/the-rise-of-innovation-hawks/) among them Steven Hayward, David Brooks and George Will. Will has been [particularly outspoken](http://www.newsweek.com/2010/04/08/this-nuclear-option-is-nuclear.html) in support of nuclear energy, writing in 2010 that “it is a travesty that the nation that first harnessed nuclear energy has neglected it so long because fads about supposed ‘green energy’ and superstitions about nuclear power’s dangers.” The extreme reluctance of Republicans to cooperate with Democrats over the last two years is only the first step, as any legislation will have to overcome Democrats’ traditional opposition to nuclear energy. However, here again there is reason for optimism. Barbara Boxer and John Kerry bucked their party’s long-time aversion to nuclear in a precursor bill to APA, and Kerry continued working on the issue during 2010. Jeff Bingaman, in a speech earlier this week, reversed his position on the issue by calling for the inclusion of nuclear energy provisions in a clean energy standard. The Huffington Post [reports](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/01/sen-jeff-bingaman-backs-n_n_816864.html) that “the White House reached out to his committee [Senate Energy] to help develop the clean energy plan through legislation.” This development in itself potentially mitigates two of the largest obstacle standing in the way of progress on comprehensive energy legislation: lack of a bill, and lack of high profile sponsors. Democrats can also direct [Section 48C](http://leadenergy.org/2010/12/clean-energy-financing-first-steps-towards-post-partisan-effort/#more-3320) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 towards nuclear technology, which provides a tax credit for companies that engage in clean tech manufacturing. Democrats should not give up on their policy goals simply because they no longer enjoy broad majorities in both Houses, and Republicans should not spend all their time holding symbolic repeal votes on the Obama Administration’s accomplishments. The lame-duck votes in December on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the tax cut deal and START indicate that at least a few Republicans are willing to work together with Democrats in a divided Congress, and that is precisely what nuclear energy needs moving forward. It will require an agressive push from the White House, and a concerted effort from both parties’ leadership, but the road for forging bipartisan legislation is not an impassable one. The politician with perhaps the single greatest leverage over the future of nuclear energy is President Obama, and his rhetoric matches the challenge posed by our aging and poisonous energy infrastructure. “This is our generation’s Sputnik moment,” announced Obama recently. Echoing the calls of presidents past, the President used his [State of the Union](http://www.slate.com/id/2281847/) podium to signal a newly invigorated industrialism in the United States. He advocated broadly for renewed investment in infrastructure, education, and technological innovation. And he did so in a room with many more members of the opposition party than at any point during the first half of his term. The eagerness of the President to combine left and right agendas can hopefully match the hyper-partisan bitterness that dominates our political culture, and nuclear power maybe one sector of our economy to benefit from his political leadership.

**Certainty key post Fukushima**

**Whitefield, 11** [5/4/11, STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ED WHITFIELD CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND POWER, “The Role of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in America’s Energy Future, http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/Media/file/Hearings/Energy/050411/Whitfield.pdf

While the NRC may not be the direct cause of this uncertainty – the Obama Administration’s policy is - the NRC’s actions will contribute to the uncertainty one way or another. Beyond open adjudicatory issues, the NRC has recently taken administrative action to close down its review of Yucca Mountain, which will deprive the public of the first independent government assessment of the merits of Yucca Mountain’s construction. That doesn’t bode well for a nuclear renaissance. On the front end of nuclear power development, I’m very interested to hear about whether the NRC can develop and provide more regulatory certainty in its licensing and re-licensing programs. As in other energy sectors, regulatory certainty, such as keeping to decision schedules, is essential for ensuring the investments necessary to develop nuclear energy. Additionally, I think it is worth reviewing the Commission’s organizational structure, and whether an agency rightly focused on safety is suitably structured to also facilitate the advancement of new nuclear generation. And connected with regulatory certainty, are clear and well developed safety engineering evaluations. As mentioned, the safety record of NRC is unparalleled. But recent events in Japan have raised questions in the public’s mind about how well the NRC does its job. We need to be confident the NRC is up to the task. I believe the agency is, but scrutiny is helpful to maintain the public trust. We do not want to overreact to events based on poor and faulty information or other political agendas. Nuclear power is critical to this nation. We should recognize its importance for a growing economy and not lose sight of the tremendous value a reliable, affordable power supply will mean for the future health and wealth of the United States.

**Key to private investment**

**Jamal, 12** [March, Renewables and Nuclear: Different Signals from Germany and Britain, [Carbon Clear Blog](http://carbonclear.blogspot.com/) Carbon management consultants, emission reductions, carbon footprints and carbon offsets. Expert advice for a low-carbon future. <http://carbonclear.blogspot.com/2012/03/renewable-energy-will-britain-surrender.html>]

On 11 March, one year on from the [Fukushima Daiichi nuclear reactor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fukushima_Daiichi_nuclear_disaster) meltdown in Japan, [Germany has reaffirmed its decision](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/13/world/europe/merkel-offers-defense-of-her-policy-on-energy.html) to abandon nuclear power. The Germans shut down their eight oldest reactors shortly after the Japanese earthquake, tsunami and reactor core breach, and pledged to shut the remaining reactors by 2022. In the short term, this has meant an increase in greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel power stations in Germany and neighboring countries. Over the longer term, however, Germany's leaders want to replace the country's nuclear output with renewables. Critics doubt the nation's electric grid can transport power from new renewable energy generators to power-hungry factories hundreds of miles away, but the initiative has the support of 76% of the public and Chancellor Angela Merkel has pledged to redouble her government's efforts. The very next day, the Guardian newspaper reported that [the British government wants to](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/mar/11/uk-renewable-energy-target-nuclear-power?INTCMP=SRCH) reduce the relative priority given to renewables over nuclear. The Guardian reports that the UK has proposed to the European commission that explicit renewable energy targets for 2030 be dropped in favour of targets for "low carbon power". This label would allow countries to choose whether they wish to reach climate change - related power targets with renewables, nuclear power, carbon capture and storage or a combination of the three. While this change doesn't necessarily mean the British government would back away from its support of renewables, it leaves the door open for such a move. In fact, this policy pressure would not make sense otherwise. Just the possibility could have a chilling effect on investment in renewables in the UK. Most renewable energy technologies are characterized by high capital costs and low operational costs. The cost of renewables-based electricity can be cost-competitive or even superior to that from fossil fuels, but only when those up-front costs and long-term savings are averaged over many years. Without certainty that government will maintain its support for years or decades, investors are less likely to provide the millions, or even billions of pounds required to bring renewables to market on a large scale. Nuclear power generates significantly lower carbon emissions than fossil fuel fired power stations and - despite Fukushima - it is a proven technology with a global track record. However, it is by no means certain that the government will be able to overcome long-term opposition to nuclear power and nuclear waste in time to ensure that nuclear can play a significant role in Britain's lower-carbon future.

### Elections

**No impact—at worst they’ll just punt the deadline**

**Reuters**, 9/21/**12**, Lawmakers May Delay 'Fiscal Cliff' Deadlines, www.foxbusiness.com/2012/09/21/lawmakers-may-delay-fiscal-cliff-deadlines/

Slowly and quietly, the U.S. Congress may be arriving at a consensus on how to avoid falling off the "fiscal cliff" on December 31 - by simply putting off its own deadline for most of the major year-end budget and tax decisions. That approach would delay the day of reckoning while also allowing more time for compromise in a Congress that has battled for two years over how best to reduce huge budget deficits. No formal agreements have been reached, however, and turning a consensus into an actual deal that avoids jolting the markets or economy will depend on the results of the November 6 general election. The "cliff" refers to the year-end deadline for the expiration of hundreds of billions of dollars worth of tax cuts and the triggering of $109 billion in across-the-board spending cuts. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has said the scenario could throw the country into recession. Congress created the hazardous end-of-year deadline in August 2011 when it agreed to a deficit deal as a way out of a deadlock over raising the U.S. debt ceiling. In recent weeks, lawmakers of all political stripes, from conservative Republicans to liberal Democrats in the Senate and House of Representatives, have alluded to surprisingly similar hopes for the high-stakes "lame-duck" work session that will follow the November presidential and congressional elections. They would put aside the $109 billion in "automatic" across-the-board spending cuts that otherwise would hit military and domestic programs equally. They would make some new, possibly smaller down payments on deficit-reduction for the near-term. Then they would write a new deadline - maybe March 31 or June 30 - to come up with a grand, $4 trillion deficit-reduction program over 10 years; and devise a new method for forcing a divided Congress to act. The entire exercise would be aimed at finding a long-term fix for U.S. fiscal problems without the jolt of indiscriminate spending cuts and tax hikes that would occur under current law. RUNNING FOR COVER The threat of a possible recession after such blanket spending cuts now preoccupies Washington. Among the fearful are the big-company CEOs represented by the Business Roundtable, for example, and Ben Bernanke, the chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve, who briefed members of Congress this week after declaring that "I don't think our tools are strong enough to offset the effects of a major fiscal shock" of the cliff. The most vocal Democrats and Republicans in Congress have turned the floors of the House and Senate into pre-election spin rooms as each side tries to pin the blame on the other. But a stream of ideas to delay the December 31 day of doom floats through Capitol Hill brainstorming sessions. \* Liberal Democrat Dick Durbin, the second-ranking Senate Democrat, has alluded to a six-month delay, coupled with a $40 billion to $50 billion deficit-reduction down payment for the first half of the year. \* Conservative Republican Senator Lindsey Graham has touted a "mini deal" in November or December to delay decisions through March. It would contain a $20 billion deficit cut. \* Senate Budget Committee Chairman Kent Conrad, a longtime Democratic deficit hawk, said the "optimum outcome" would give Congress six more months to work out details on revamping the tax code and big government programs like Social Security and Medicare.

#### Relations low – simultaneous presidential elections, foreign policy, Syria, Georgia and Iran

Nordic Intel 10/2 – Nordic Intel is based in Helsinki, Finland, and provides a professional research and analysis service focused on the Nordic Region and surrounding countries in Northern Europe, specifically: Denmark (including Greenland and the Faroe Islands), Finland (including the Åland Islands), Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Estonia, Russia (“Sources of tension between the United States and Russia,” http://nordicintel.com/sources-of-tension-between-the-united-states-and-russia/)

The sources of tension between the United States and Russia reflect an increasingly assertive Russia that seeks power and influence enjoyed during the Cold War and currently enabled by its rapid economic growth. The United States meanwhile has no intention of giving up its role as the world’s only superpower and seeks to limit Russia’s resurgence as it simultaneously deals with conflict and instability in the Middle East and a rising China. This has been a difficult year in US and Russian relations given both countries had or will have presidential elections (Russia: March, US: November). Given a substantial number of Russians and Americans are mutually suspicious, both Putin and Obama/Romney cannot appear weak in their foreign policies, which limits opportunities for rapprochement. This of course may subside after the US elections. This year also saw ongoing conflict in Syria, elections in Georgia and continued uncertainty about Iran, all of which form points of tension between the US and Russia. The outcome of the US presidential election and how these current conflicts and points of tension develop over time will define the future of US and Russian relations and whether both countries can eventually find policies that are compatible with their respective interests. We predict, however, more of the same over the next few years and whilst economic ties will continue to grow, strategic political and military differences will cause both the US and Russia to continue viewing each other with suspicion and motivate them to usurp each other’s interests, either through their veto in the UN Security Council or economic, political and/or military support to their allies or proxies around the world.

#### Relations low – Magnitsky

What The Papers Say 10/3 – Russian newspaper ("RELOAD COULD NOT LAST LONG," Lexis)

Sergei Lavrov: That's a wrong premise, you know. Whatever happens to the Jackson-Vanick amendment, the Magnitsky Bill will be adopted in any event. In fact, it's wrong to reckon that its adoption is the price to be paid for abolition of the amendment. There is the opinion on the Capitol Hill that the bill in question is a must in itself. Moreover, a good deal of its promoters maintain that abolition of the Jackson-Vanick amendment is nothing Russia has deserved yet. It is the people who do not really know what they are talking about who claim that the USAID situation became the last straw compelling American legislators to pass the Magnitsky Bill. The bill in question is a symbol for everyone who would like to sour the American-Russian relations. These people mean to o what they can to accomplish their objective. We warned the U.S. Administration that adoption of the Magnitsky Bill would complicate the bilateral relations. Our partners there replied that they knew it and they were sorry but President Barack Obama could not help backing the bill when its time came.

# 1ar – SMR now thumper

**Incentives now**

**Kramer 12**

David Kramer, Physics Today, Sept 2012, Romney, Obama surrogates spell out candidates’ energy policies, www.physicstoday.org/resource/1/phtoad/v65/i9/p20\_s1

Both candidates favor growth in nuclear energy, and both support loan guarantees to back the initial deployment of advanced reactors. Stuntz said Romney would take steps to lower the cost of building new plants, “whether that means modular reactors that can be approved and rolled out in more cookie-cutter fashion . . . or whether that means smaller reactors.” The Obama administration’s support for nuclear power is evident from the $7 billion loan guarantee from DOE to back construction of two new reactors at an existing nuclear power plant in Georgia, Reicher noted. “**There’s serious money going into small modular reactors** and serious policy work going on in how to reform the licensing process” at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to expedite approval.

**Federal SMR loans coming—announced in September**

**Energy Collective 12**

Energy Collective, 7/26/12, Race for DOE SMR money heats up, theenergycollective.com/dan-yurman/97081/race-doe-smr-money-heats

The Department of Energy is reviewing proposals from B&W and several other SMR firms to be granted up to $452 million over five years to support SMR engineering and licensing work. The agency will make up to two awards by the end of September this year.

**Incentives now—announcement coming**

**WNA 12**

World Nuclear Association, September 2012, Small Nuclear Power Reactors, www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf33.html

In January 2012 the DOE called for applications from industry to support the development of one or two US light-water reactor designs, allocating $452 million over five years. Four applications were made, from Westinghouse, Babcock & Wilcox, Holtec, and NuScale Power, the units ranging from 225 down to 45 MWe. **DOE is expected to announce its decision in September 2012**. Other SMR designs will have modest support through the Reactor Concepts RD&D program. In March 2012 the US DOE signed agreements with three companies interested in constructing demonstration SMRs at its Savannah River site in South Carolina. The three companies and reactors are: Hyperion with a 25 MWe fast reactor, Holtec with a 140 MWe PWR, and NuScale with 45 MWe PWR. DOE is discussing similar arrangements with four further SMR developers, aiming to have in 10-15 years a suite of SMRs providing power for the DOE complex. DOE is committing land but not finance. (Over 1953-1991, Savannah River was where a number of production reactors for weapons plutonium and tritium were built and run.)

# 1ar – uniqueness

**Romney winning – winning Florida, Ohio, Virginia**

**Chambers 10-5**, Dean, writer for the Arlington Conservative Examiner “Mitt Romney vs. Barack Obama: New poll numbers in three key swing states,” 10-5, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-vs-barack-obama-new-poll-numbers-three-key-swing-states

New poll numbers released today by two different polling firms tell the story, that Mitt Romney will likely defeat President Obama in November. Rasmussen Reports, regarded by many as the most accurate polling firm in the business, released today new surveys of Florida, Ohio and Virginia. WeAskAmerica has also surveyed the same three state and released those results in this report. The Rasmussen survey of Florida shows Mitt Romney leading Obama by a 49 to 47 percent margin with three percent undecided. The WeAskAmerica survey of Florida shows a similar Romney lead of 49 percent to 46 percent. Averaging these two polls and allocating three-quarters of the undecided voters to Romney (which is likely, they are undecided because they've already decided against voting for Obama) results in a projection of 52.38 percent for Romney and 47.63 percent for Obama in Florida if the election closed today. The polls for Ohio tell a similar story. The WeAskAmerica survey of Ohio shows Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent while the new Rasmussen survey of Ohio released today shows a 50 percent to 49 percent edge for Obama. Averaging these two polls and allocating three-quarters of the undecided voters to Romney results in a projection of 51.00 percent for Romney and 49.00 percent for Obama in Ohio if the election closed today. Both the surveys of Virginia show Romney leading in that state. Rasmussen shows a 49 percent to 48 percent lead for Romney while the WeAskAmerica survey shows the race in Virginia at Romney 48 percent, Obama 45 percent. An average of these three results, along with the allocation of three-quarters of the undecided voters to Romney indicates he would win the state 52.25 percent to 47.75 percent if the election closed today.

# 1ar – military shields

**DoD shields**

**Gardner 12**, Tim, correspondent for Reuters “Obama seeks clean energy, pipeline funds in budget,” Feb 13th, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/13/us-usa-budget-energy-idUSTRE81C17V20120213

The White House put more focus on clean energy in the DOD program as it seeks to put the Solyndra controversy behind it. Including funding for clean energy in the Pentagon’s budget could help shield the administration from Republicans who say the government should not be in the business of picking technologies. Few lawmakers would argue the country does not need to reduce the energy dependency of military aircraft, tanks and ships.

**They’re insulated**

Binyamin **Appelbaum 12**, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R%26D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8-12, http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said the Defense Department had been more successful than other federal agencies because it is the main user of the innovations that it finances. The Pentagon, which spends billions each year on weapons, equipment and technology, has an unusually direct stake in the outcome of its research and development projects. "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes." Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda in controversial areas. No matter which party is in power, the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy technology, for example, in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

**They’re politically invincible**

Maddow, 11 -- MSNBC show host, political commentator

(Rachel, Rachel Maddow Show for March 25, 2011, MSNBC, 3-25-11, l/n, accessed 9-30-12, mss)

Case in point: there is a magic word in Washington politics. The well-earned common wisdom about this word is that if you attach this special magic word to a proposal, to something the government could spend money on, it doesn`t really matter how bad an idea it is, how many smart people think it`s a stupid thing, if it has this magic word attached to it, it becomes politically invincible, indestructible, it can`t be killed. The magic word is "defense." And it is well-earned common wisdom in Washington that any spending that is labeled "defense" is pretty much untouchable spending. It can`t be killed. Dollars spent by the military or on things that seem military-esque just don`t compete with other kinds of spending in the United States. And there`s a million reasons why. Defense contractors figured out that spreading to lots of different congressional districts the jobs associated with a particular airplane or vehicle or weapon system earns you a champion in Congress for keeping those jobs from every district you have larded yourself into. Defense spending is untouchable because calling a politician weak on defense in the 2000s is the equivalent of calling them soft on communism in the 1950s. Defense spending is untouchable because civilian lawmakers defer so deeply to the military, and to the former military officers laced through the contractor world, that if you squint, you would swear that Congress is some lackey puppet parliament in a country where the government has taken over by a junta. Defense spending, since the mammoth defense-funded, spend thrifty arms race build up of the Reagan years has been unquestionable in America.

**plan spun as a pro-troop**

**Merchant, 10**

(Political & Environment Columnist-Discovery, 10/21, “How the US Military Could Bring Solar Power to Mass Market,” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/how-the-us-military-could-bring-solar-power-to-mass-market.html)

Furthermore, **Congress is infinitely more likely to approve funding for R&D**; and infrastructure **if the projects are military-related**. Which is depressing, but true -- the one thing that no politician can get caught opposing is the safety of American troops**.** In fact, the whole premise of the article is rather depressing, on point though it may be: The only way we may end up getting a competitive clean energy industry is through serious military investment, which is of course, serious government spending. Which **under** any other guise **would be vehemently opposed by conservatives.**

**If it links the squo triggers – massive DoD renewable investment now**

**Dimugno 9/27**, Laura, experienced editor and writer with a strong background in journalism, digital-media and magazine publishing “Bidding On The Army's Renewable Energy RFP: What You Need To Know,” 9/27, http://www.nawindpower.com/naw/e107\_plugins/content/content.php?content.10465

Last month, the U.S. Army issued a 7 billion renewable energy request for proposals (RFP) as part of its goal to procure 25% - or approximately 1 GW - of its power from renewables by 2025. The Army is seeking to buy, under long-term power purchase agreements (PPAs), the output of wind, solar, geothermal and biomass projects to be built at or near its bases, and has already identified over 180 sites it says are suitable for renewable energy production.

# 1ar – plan popular

**Newest surveys go aff**

**Westenhaus 9/30/12**

Brian, editor of the popular energy technology site New Energy and Fuel, "Confidence in Nuclear Power is on the Rise Again," http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Confidence-in-Nuclear-Power-is-on-the-Rise-Again.html-http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Confidence-in-Nuclear-Power-is-on-the-Rise-Again.html, AM

The Nuclear Energy Institute announced a September telephone survey in a press release suggesting almost two thirds of U.S. adults favor the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the United States. This latest survey found that Americans strongly favoring nuclear energy outnumber those strongly opposed by a two-to-one ratio, 29% versus 14%. The new numbers improve on a poll conducted in September 2011, six months after the Fukushima accident, when 62% of American favored nuclear energy, with 35% opposed. The new survey shows confidence is improving. Just over three quarters of respondents agree that nuclear energy facilities operating in the United States are ‘safe and secure,’ while only 19% think they are not. Eighty percent of Americans opposed to 16% believe “we should learn the lessons from the Japanese accident and continue to develop advanced nuclear energy plants to meet America’s growing electricity demand.” In a shock to the political system and the anti nuclear crowd a large majority (81%) of those surveyed favor the renewal of operating licenses of facilities that continue to meet federal safety standards, while 74% believe electric utilities should prepare now so they will be ready to build new nuclear power plants in the next decade if needed

.

**Romeny winning on econ now**

Sullivan 10-4. [Andy, Reuters reporter, "Obama-Romney Debate: Poll Shows Mitt Romney Gaining Ground After Strong Performance" Huffington Post -- www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/04/obama-romney-debate-poll\_n\_1940835.html?utm\_hp\_ref=elections-2012]

Republican presidential challenger Mitt Romney gained ground on Democratic President Barack Obama after a strong performance in their first debate heading into the Nov. 6 election, according to a Reuters/Ipsos poll taken after their prime-time face-off.¶ Romney is now viewed positively by 51 percent of voters, the first time he has enjoyed a net positive in the U.S. presidential race, the poll found. Obama's favorability rating remained unchanged at 56 percent, according to the poll.¶ Romney moved ahead of the president on several core issues after Wednesday's debate, which was widely seen as a victory for the Republican candidate.¶ Voters now see Romney as a better bet to boost the economy, spur job creation and manage the budget deficit, the poll found. He narrowed Obama's advantage on taxes, the Social Security retirement program and the Medicare health insurance program for the elderly and disabled.¶ Romney's strong performance could make the race more competitive, Ipsos pollster Cliff Young said.

**Plan’s spun as a job creator**

Hartmann, 12 -- SLM co-owner (Ray, "Think Again," St. Louis Magazine, June 2012, www.stlmag.com/St-Louis-Magazine/June-2012/Think-Again-Nuclear-Power-Debate-Returns-to-Missouri-Politics/, accessed 9-4-12, mss)

Yes, nuclear power is back as a political issue, and again it’s the Democrats making the most noise. But this time, the party is anything but anti-nuke: Not only is the erstwhile party of the political left beating the drums for nuclear reactors, it also wants the state to become the global kingpin of the nuke-building business. Poor Republicans. Try positioning yourselves to the right of that in an election year. What are they supposed to do? Call for a nuclear reactor in every pot? They ought to sue the Democrats for identity theft. What happened? Here’s what: Nuclear power became a **job creator**. And since we all know that the most important function of government is to create jobs—an **article of faith** to which Democrats and Republicans join at the hip in pledging their daily allegiance—then how can any voter-fearing politician be anything but pro-nuke in 2012? I know your next question: “No, really, what happened?” What really happened is that the very notion of government’s purpose has transformed since a generation of Americans just said no to nuclear generators. Back in the ancient ’70s, concern over the environment might have actually trumped concern over the plight of a multinational giant missing a corporate-welfare opportunity—especially among Democrats. Back then, Democrats didn’t sound like chamber of commerce presidents on the stump; they actually talked about attacking poverty and housing needs and welfare for children, among other issues. Today, they **dare not express concern** about anyone lower on the economic ladder than the middle class. Far too often, today’s message from the party of President John F. Kennedy is: “Ask not what government can do for you. Ask what government can do for your company.” Even the Republicans of yesteryear weren’t as bullish on business as Democrats are today. They campaigned for less regulation and for other policies that chamber of commerce presidents would like, but they didn’t pretend that the mission of the government itself was to create jobs. There’s a reason for this, radical as it might seem: Government in our democratic republic was never intended to fulfill the mission of job creation. That’s why there isn’t a constitution in the land that references the subject. None of that matters now. With precious few exceptions, people running for public office must convince voters that they will create jobs and repair what’s broken in the economy, all the while professing their belief that government isn’t the answer to anything. It’s a ridiculous premise. State and local governments don’t create jobs—other than public ones, which have now fallen out of public favor—and the entire economic development/tourism game is about nothing more than outbribing one’s state- and local-government counterparts with special tax breaks and other corporate-welfare gifts to new and expanding companies. In this context, if building nuclear power plants can be sold as economic development, **no self-protecting politician** would trivialize the subject with peripheral detail such as environmental-safety or public-health concerns.

**That’s key**

Rasmussen 9-11. ["Job Creation? 47% Trust Obama, 45% Romney" -- www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/business/jobs\_employment/september\_2012/job\_creation\_47\_trust\_obama\_45\_romney]

Following another dismal jobs report, voters overwhelmingly rate job creation as important to their vote but are almost evenly divided when it comes to which presidential candidate they trust more on the issue.¶ The latest Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey finds that 95% of Likely U.S. Voters rate the issue of job creation as important to how they will vote in November. That includes 69% who consider it Very Important. Only three percent (3%) view job creation as not very or Not At All Important to their vote. (To see survey question wording, click here.)

**Romney winning florida**

The Hill 10-5. ["Polls show Romney making headway in swing states" -- thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/polls/260511-polls-show-romney-making-swing-state-charge]

In Florida, We Ask America found Romney with a 49-46 percent lead, good for a six-point swing in the Republican nominee's favor from the polling firm's survey conducted in late September.¶ The RCP average now shows Obama and Romney tied in Florida.¶ Florida and Ohio are two of the biggest swing-state prizes, with 29 and 18 electoral votes at stake, respectively.

**Plan’s key to Florida**

Whitman, 12 -- former New Jersey governor (Christine Todd, former EPA administrator, CASEnergy co-chair, and Karen Avilla, Hispanic Elected Local Officials president, "Nuclear energy = green jobs, economic growth in Fla., beyond," Orlando Sentinel, 6-22-12, articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621\_1\_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community, accessed 9-4-12, mss)

We all know how critical Florida is to the outcome of this year's election. This week, as Orlando hosts the annual conference of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, all eyes are on the presidential candidates as they speak to Hispanic elected officials — and by extension, to their constituents — about the issues that are top of mind for voters. Notably, the conference addresses two issues also **of paramount concern to all Floridians**: energy and the economy. From our perspective, these issues are deeply intertwined — and one way that Floridians and the state's thriving Hispanic community can advocate for economic growth through renewed investment in clean energy is by supporting nuclear energy. We need to let the candidates know that Americans are relying on the next president for clean, sustainable energy policies that benefit us all. As we look toward diversifying America's energy portfolio and building out the energy generated by renewables, **candidates should look to nuclear energy** as one proven way to effectively meet growing demand. In doing so, they are **registering their support** for well-paying jobs, sustained economic growth and clean, affordable energy options. Florida is one of many states exploring opportunities to expand capacity at existing facilities, which would mean the creation of new jobs and added economic impact. By showing our support for Florida's five nuclear-energy reactors, as well as paving the way for the expansion of the infrastructure that supports them in the state and beyond, we can help create and sustain green jobs and work to reduce unemployment. Florida needs jobs. While overall U.S. unemployment rates stand at 8.2 percent, unemployment in Florida is slightly higher, at 8.6 percent. National unemployment among Hispanics is higher still, at 11 percent. At present, the U.S. nuclear-energy industry supports 100,000 American jobs. Each new nuclear facility creates an average of 1,400 to 1,800 high-paying jobs, often reaching as many as 3,500 jobs during peak construction periods. Once operational, these facilities create 400 to 700 direct and permanent jobs.

**Florida’s key**

Falconer ‘11 [Matthew, member of the statewide Workforce Florida board of directors. The Workforce Florida Board seeks to improve workforce issues – Florida Political Press – http://www.floridapoliticalpress.com/2011/08/21/election-2012-and-the-swing-states/]

Many Democrats feel Obama is a lock to win reelection. History has shown most incumbent presidents win reelection. The economy and the 2010 election suggest a Republican victory. But the presidential election of 2012 will come down to “swing states.” It is a numbers game. The winner of the United States presidency needs 270 “electoral votes.” The number of votes each state receives is based on population. Because of the large populations in coastal cities the Democrats have a “base” of approximately 215 electoral votes. In that group are Wisconsin and Minnesota that can go Republican. The Republicans have a “base” of 155 electoral votes. This means they need to win most of the swing states to take back the White House. These swing states include; Florida (29), Ohio (18), Pennsylvania (20), Iowa (6), Virginia (13), North Carolina (15), Georgia (16), Oregon (7), Nevada (6), Arizona (11), New Mexico (5) and Colorado (9). This group represents 155 electoral votes. Obama needs just 55 and the Republicans need 115. For the sake of this analysis let’s assume the parties split Pennsylvania and Ohio, and Virginia and North Carolina. Nevada and Colorado lean left so these four victories give the Democrats 50 electoral votes. We know anything can happen because Reagan won 49 states. With the economy on the brink and “hope” is becoming “despair” the Democrat base is in jeopardy. But given the electoral math it is difficult to see the Republicans winning back the White House without a victory in Florida. The biggest swing state is the biggest prize in 2012 and will decide the fate of our nation.

**Romney winning North Carolina**

Rasmussen 10-3. ["Election 2012: North Carolina President" -- www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/politics/elections/election\_2012/election\_2012\_presidential\_election/north\_carolina/election\_2012\_north\_carolina\_president]

The presidential race in North Carolina is tighter this month, but Mitt Romney still earns over 50% of the vote in the key battleground state.¶ The latest Rasmussen Reports telephone survey of Likely North Carolina Voters finds Romney with 51% support to President Obama’s 47%. One percent (1%) prefers some other candidate, while another one percent (1%) is still undecided. (To see survey question wording, click here.)

**Plan’s key to North Carolina**

Downey, 12 -- Charlotte Business Journal senior staff writer (John, "Poll: NC voters support ‘advanced’ energy," Charlotte Business Journal, 8-30-12, www.bizjournals.com/charlotte/blog/power\_city/2012/08/poll-nc-voters-support-advanced.html, accessed 9-4-12, mss)

A new poll by a national energy organization says more than 75 percent of likely N.C. voters surveyed want the next president to put a priority on developing what the group calls “advanced energy” such as alternative-fuel cars, and electricity from renewable and nuclear resources. And almost **90 percent** of the voters surveyed told the group such energy sources are “very important or somewhat important to America’s future.” The survey was conducted two weeks ago for Advanced Energy Economy by John Zogby’s JZ Analytics firm. It got responses from 600 N.C. voters and has a margin of error of 4.1 percentage points.

**North Carolina’s key**

**PR Web, 12** -- citing Allan Lichtman, distinguished professor of history at American University

("American University Professor Says North Carolina Still a Swing State for Election 2012," 8-27-12, news.yahoo.com/american-university-professor-says-north-carolina-still-swing-130503198.html, accessed 9-4-12)

North Carolina, host to the 2012 Democratic National Convention, was key to Barack Obama winning the presidency in 2008, making him the first Democratic president since Jimmy Carter to win the “Old North State.” But Obama’s victory in North Carolina was narrow—he won by about 14,000 votes—and the African-American vote was a central component of Obama’s success. Now fast forward to 2012. In May, the state overwhelmingly passed a ban on same-sex marriage with 61 percent of voters in favor of the ban; 39 percent against it. That 61 percent, too, included a large number of African-American votes. The day after the ban passed, President Obama publicly announced his support of same-sex marriage, raising the question of whether Obama can count on winning the state again in 2012. Numerous early polls in North Carolina show Republican Presidential candidate Mitt Romney in the lead. Is North Carolina still a swing state? Most definitely, says Allan Lichtman, distinguished professor of history at American University in Washington, D.C., and an expert on presidential elections. “Same-sex marriage is clearly an unpopular issue in North Carolina,” Lichtman said. “However, it is not an important voting issue in this election. It could slightly affect turnout, but many other factors will influence turnout as well.”