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**T – Not Efficiency**

***Interpretation --- efficiency measures are distinct from energy production***

**Wilbanks et al ‘06**
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Chapter 6. Energy Extraction and Conversion

<http://cdiac.ornl.gov/SOCCR/pdf/SOCCR_Chapter06.pdf>, jj

(2) The market competitiveness of fossil energy sources compared with supply- and demand-side alternatives. In some cases reinforced by policy conditions, production costs of electricity from coal, oil, or natural gas at relatively large scales are currently lower than other sources besides large-scale hydropower, and production costs of liquid and gas fuels are currently far lower than other sources, though rising. These conditions appear likely to continue for some years. In many cases, **the most cost competitive *alternative* to *fossil fuel production* and use is not *alternative supply sources* but from *efficiency* improvement.**

***And, “for” requires a direct relationship, it can’t be something that just affects the object***

**Words and Phrases, 4** (Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “For,” Volume 17, p. 338-343 November 2004, Thomson West)

WD Tenn 1942. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 uses the words “production for commerce” as denoting an intention to deal in a restricted way with question of coverage in connection with those employed directly in production of articles to be sold, shipped or transported across state lines in commerce, producing **goods “for” a certain purpose implying a direct relation as distinguished from producing something which only “affects” a certain purpose which implies an indirect relation.**

***Violation --- the aff increases efficiency measures, not production --- the aff decreases demand, it doesn’t directly increase incentives for a new source of energy***

***Net zero is energy efficiency***

**Army Energy Program, no date** (“Net Zero: An Evolution,” <http://army-energy.hqda.pentagon.mil/netzero/>, ts)

**A Net Zero Energy Installation** (NZEI) **is an** installation that produces as much energy on site as it uses, over the course of a year. To achieve this goal installations must first implement **aggressive conservation and efficiency effort**s while benchmarking energy consumption to identify further opportunities. **The next step is to utilize waste energy or to "re-purpose" energy**. Boiler stack exhaust, building exhausts or other thermal energy streams can all be utilized for a secondary purpose. Co-generation recovers heat from the electricity generation process. The balance of energy needs then are reduced and can be met by renewable energy projects. More information on NZEI can be found in the DOE publication: [Net Zero Energy Military Installations: A Guide to Assessment and Planning](http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy10osti/48876.pdf)

***Ground --- efficiency is neg CP ground --- and efficiency affs independently robs the neg of all core DA’s because the aff can decrease US energy use***

***Limits --- they make the topic bidirectional by allowing the aff to both increase and decrease energy usage --- explodes the topic --- err neg because the words “incentives” and “restrictions” serve no limiting function***

***Extra T --- Includes cutting water use, geothermal and converting trash to energy.***

**Galbraith, 4/27/12** (Kate, reported on clean energy for The New York Times from 2008 to 2009, serving as the lead writer for the Times' Green blog. She began her career at The Economist in 2000 and spent 2005 to 2007 in Austin as the magazine's Southwest correspondent, The Texas Tribune: “Texas Army Bases Go Green, but Challenges Remain,” <http://www.texastribune.org/texas-energy/energy/texas-army-bases-go-green-challenges-remain/>, ts)

Prices for solar remain expensive, and cost-cutting has become a watch-word for the government. Tomlinson hopes that construction will start next year on a 20-megawatt solar project that would be two-thirds of the size of the largest existing solar array in Texas. The army is trying to arrange private financing for the multimillion-dollar project. **Solar alone will not get the base to net zero energy,** Tomlinson said, **so he is considering a range of other technologies, including** wind turbines, **geothermal wells and a plant that would convert garbage into energy**. But those projects would have to go through multi-layered permitting processes. Some outside experts are impressed with the Army’s efforts. “When the military makes up its mind to do something, I think they can get it done,” said Doug Lewin, executive director of the South-central Partnership for Energy Efficiency as a Resource, who visited Fort Hood in February. The projects at Fort Bliss, he added, are “really exciting.” Cutting water use will be a particular challenge for Fort Bliss. El Paso is the driest big city in Texas, and the ongoing drought resulted in just 5 inches of rain last year compared with the normal 10 inches.

***And it’s extra T to specify where your funding comes from***

***Extra T’s a voter --- causes unpredictable advantages and steals neg ground***

**1nc – Renewables**

***A) Absent external factors like the plan, multiple factors ensure Romney wins a tight race --- this card answers all their warrants***

**Trende 9-20** Sean Trende is Senior Elections Analyst for RealClearPolitics, 9-20-12, State of the Race, Part 2: Why Romney Wins <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/20/state_of_the_race_part_2_why_romney_wins_115513-3.html>, jj

The basic argument for why Romney is being written off far too early is pretty simple. He trails the incumbent president by 48.2 percent to 45.3 percent in the RCP Average seven weeks before the election. **There are very few races that have been this close**, this far out from Election Day, **that would be characterized as anything other than a tossup.** Of course, we can dig quite a bit deeper than that: **1) The economy is still lousy**, but as I noted yesterday, it is not so bad as to make Obama an automatic loser, as many pundits assumed. The years that have been catastrophic for presidential parties -- 1980 and 2008 -- have been years when the economy has actually been contracting during the election year. At the same time, **most years with economies similar to this one** -- 1960, 1976, 1992, 2000, 2004 -- **see party power transfer**, albeit in a reasonably close election. The one outlier here is 2004, where an incumbent president won by a healthy share in a mediocre economy. But Bush lost voters who cast their ballots based on the economy by over 60 points that year. What saved him was that 47 percent of voters either voted on moral issues (such as gay marriage) or terrorism or taxes. Those were the only issues that Bush beat Kerry on in the exit polls, but it was enough. Again, Obama probably gets graded on a curve here given the mess he inherited. Whether that is the equivalent of the War on Terror in 2004 remains to be seen. **2) Most of what we’re seeing in the polls is consistent with a close race**. Rather than cherry-picking favorite polls (“Obama is up 8 in Pew -- landslide!” “Obama is down 2 in Rasmussen -- he’s doomed!”), let’s just look at simple poll averages. Obama is up 2.9 points in the RCP Average. **His bounce peaked at 49 percent, which is just barely below the threshold he probably needs in order to win.** If we assume that the average is his “true” value -- and we should note that Gallup, Rasmussen and AP/GfK are the only national polls to include data from any of the last three days -- then we should expect to see a bunch of polls showing an Obama lead of between one and five points, a poll or two showing a slight Romney lead, and a poll or two showing a high single-digit lead for the president. That’s exactly what we see. When a Democrat is up three points, we expect to see decent Democratic leads in the two-to-four-point range in swing states like Ohio, Colorado, Iowa and Nevada, expect to see close races in places like Florida, and expect to see mid-to-high-digit Democratic leads in places like Pennsylvania and Michigan. This is what we tend to see. Since state polling is more sparse than national polling, we’re more susceptible to the outliers: Obama isn’t up 14 in Wisconsin (he wouldn’t be campaigning there if he were), but I don’t think he’s only up one in Colorado, either. Taken as a whole, the state polling is consistent with the national polls. And of course, when you have a bounce such as this one, which is driven by increased Democratic enthusiasm, you expect to see down-ticket races for House and Senate move toward the Democrats, as more Democrats push through the likely-voter screens. Which is again exactly what we are seeing -- it isn’t accidental that we’ve seen a flood of polling from Democratic House candidates in the past few days, while their Republican counterparts have been relatively silent. **3) History suggests the race will tighten further**. Yesterday I mentioned an article by Nate Cohn of The New Republic in which he observed that that “[i]f Romney can’t take a lead over the next week or so, he will be forced to do something never successfully attempted: mount an unprecedented comeback against an incumbent president.” Cohn is absolutely correct: No challenger who trailed at this point in September has ever won. But if we look at the data a different way, we realize that **Obama has to pull off some unprecedented feats of his own if he hopes to win**. The September time frame is a bit tricky for comparison purposes, because the incumbent party convention occurred in mid-August until 2004. So a challenger who trailed his opponent in September was doing so after the convention bounces had pretty much settled. So let’s instead use data that Nate Silver has helpfully compiled identifying where candidates stood a given number of weeks before and after a convention, regardless of when that convention occurred. Table 1 shows the incumbent party’s lead in the polls two weeks after its convention -- roughly where we are today -- and the ultimate result. Years with incumbents are in boldface: As you can see, **no incumbent party has ever held on to the White House while leading by fewer than four points two weeks after its convention**; **no incumbent president has ever won re-election while leading by fewer than five points** (more on the 2004 comparisons later). In other words, **winning under these circumstances would be unprecedented** (note also that Ronald Reagan was actually tied with Jimmy Carter in a simple poll average at this point in 1980). Perhaps an even better way to look at this is Table 2: This lists the races where incumbent presidents sought re-election since 1968. It then shows how those races broke between two weeks after the incumbent president’s convention and Election Day. On average, they moved 3.7 points toward the challenger (positive numbers indicate movement in that direction; negative numbers show movement toward the incumbent). If you eliminate 1976, as Cohn suggests (since Jerry Ford was a pseudo-incumbent), the average movement is six points toward the challenger. Indeed with the exception of 1992 -- a difficult race from which to draw conclusions given Ross Perot’s on-again/off-again participation in the race -- every contest with an incumbent has broken at least three points toward the challenging party from this point in the race through Election Day. And given the frequent comparisons to 2004, it’s worth bearing in mind where that race stood at this point. George Bush led by 6.8 points as opposed to Barack Obama’s current 2.9 percent. His bounce peaked at 50.4 percent, as opposed to Obama’s 49 percent. **If Obama continues to run behind Bush on either metric by similar margins through Election Day, *he loses*.** In fairness, we can’t be that precise with such a small number of observations. But it would also be foolish to ignore such a consistent trend. ***Absent some external shock, we can probably expect that the tendency will be for this race to tighten further.* 4) Romney actually has led -- you just couldn’t see it**. Much is made of the fact that Romney has never led in the RCP Average. But remember, throughout this cycle, most of the polls were using registered, rather than likely-voter, screens. There are good reasons for this, but if we’re going to do an apples-to-apples comparison, we have to take account of this fact. **Had pollsters turned on their likely-voter screens throughout, Romney and Obama probably would have been trading leads throughout the spring and summer**. After all, **Romney’s poll numbers would have been two-to-three points higher** (given the average movement we saw when pollsters activated their likely-voter screens), and Obama’s lead fluctuated between 0.2 points and 3.8 points. **5) Obama’s job approval is still low**. As I mentioned yesterday, it is significant that the president’s job approval is approaching 50 percent, as job approval and election outcomes correlate strongly. Put differently, **presidents almost never receive a higher percentage of the vote than their approval percentage with the electorate.** But remember, Obama is still on a bit of a bounce. It is significant that he was able to approach the type of approval that he needs in order to win. It just isn’t clear that this is enough. Again, the 2004 example is instructive. In early September, Bush’s average job approval was 51.4 percent, almost two points higher than Obama’s is today. And Bush’s convention was a full week earlier than Obama’s, so his bounce had already really faded by this point. Remember, **the strong tendency is that presidents run a few points behind their job approval numbers with the electorate**. Bush’s job approval in the RCP Average on Election Day was 49.8 percent, but his job approval with the actual electorate according to the exit polls was 53 percent (this is also what Bush’s internal tracking numbers were showing). Had his job approval with the electorate been 49.8 percent, he probably would have lost. Remember too that **Obama** probably **has a bit of a higher hurdle to surmount than Bush had**. While Republicans typically run ahead of polls of registered voters and adults, Democrats typically run behind them. Because job approval polling contains a mixture of these types of polls, Obama’s job approval with the actual electorate is probably a touch below his average right now. **6) Romney’s spending is just starting**. This is something that everyone mentions, but then seems to forget: **Romney and his allies will probably outspend the president heavily** in the next two months. I don’t think that matters in and of itself. After all, both candidates will have plenty of cash to make their cases, well past the point of diminishing returns. What does matter, however, is how this disparity was attained. The Obama campaign spent heavily over the summer trying to soften up Romney. It’s unclear how well this worked -- the polls were pretty steady and Romney's favorables actually improved a bit -- but a large portion of the basic case against Romney has been made. In the meantime, the Romney campaign had been very constrained in how it could spend its money; it was limited to primary funds until recently. That means the campaign has largely been outsourced to 527s and campaign committees. This explains a lot of the Romney campaign to date. During the convention, a parade of people telling tear-jerking stories about how the nominee had helped them out made their way across the stage at the RNC. Stu Rothenberg wondered on Twitter why they hadn’t appeared in ads. I suspect now that Romney can spend freely, they will appear. Quite frankly, they’ll probably be more effective in the fall, when people are paying attention. Whether this moves the dial is an unknown, but it is something of a contingency with substantial upside for Romney, which you have to figure in to any calculus about how the fall will play out. Of course, the Romney campaign may just try to dump $250 million in negative ads on the president’s head. I think that would be foolish -- and ineffective -- but we have to acknowledge the possibility there. **7) The gaffes don’t matter**. Everyone interested in elections should read this post from John Sides at The Monkey Cage. It makes an important point: Though **gaffes** set political analysts scurrying to their keyboards, they **tend not to affect the average voter.** We see this with the now-infamous “47 percent” comment. Gallup described the statement and asked how it would affect respondents’ votes. Twenty percent said it would make them more likely to vote for Romney, 36 percent said less likely, and 43 percent said it would make no difference. Drilling down to self-described Independents, 15 percent said it would make them more likely to support Romney, 29 percent less likely, and 53 percent said it would make no difference. You can try to sex that up (as Gallup did) to read that Independents say it makes them less likely to vote for Romney by a 2-1 margin, but you could just as easily say that three-quarters of independents say the gaffe makes no difference or helps Romney. **8) People haven’t made up their minds.** Finally, it is important to remember that all the claims about people’s minds being set in stone don’t jibe with what respondents tell pollsters. Table 3 shows when voters have made up their minds over the past four elections. Though the percentage of late-undecideds is diminishing, unless there is a major drop-off this cycle, we can safely say that **the decisions of a fairly wide swath of the electorate are not yet firm.** So **if the election were held today**, President **Obama would probably win comfortably**. ***But the election isn’t today***. **In the next seven weeks, the economy, the president’s tepid job approval ratings, and Romney’s spending campaign will continue to exert gravitational forces on Obama’s re-election efforts, along with the typical gravitational forces that drag down a post-convention bounce. Can these forces move things three points in seven weeks? It’s not a particularly tall order.**

***B) New renewable energy policy key to motivating the base and Obama win***

**Rothkopf ‘12**

David Rothkopf, CEO and editor at large of Foreign Policy, is author of Power, Inc.: The Epic Rivalry Between Big Business and Government -- and the Reckoning That Lies Ahead. JUNE 11, 2012, Foreign Policy, 5 Big Ideas That Can Save Obama's Presidency <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/11/five_big_ideas_that_can_save_obamas_presidency?page=full>, jj

The refrain from each of them was the same: **The president needs to step it up in the next few months and articulate a clear vision for the future of the U.S. economy. Perplexingly, Obama has yet to do that.** Indeed, one of the striking problems associated with the Obama administration is that its disciplined, process-driven "team of rivals" approach to national security stands in stark contrast with a spluttering, low-grade, uncoordinated approach to economic policymaking that has left most of the economic cabinet on the sidelines, reserved big decisions for a small group of pols in the White House, and ignored some of the really substantial resources that exist within the administration. Strange that we are in the midst of an economic crisis and this White House still can't muster among its own cabinet a team of visible surrogates who are out on the hustings, delivering a coordinated message. Can you imagine George W. Bush's Treasury secretary, Hank Paulson, or Clinton Treasury chief Bob Rubin being as invisible as Obama Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner is in the midst of such a crisis moment? If there's a second term, this must be addressed. But for now, what the president needs to do is recognize that **he needs policy ideas that are as bold in 2012 as the prospect of the first African-American president was in 2008. He needs to fill the creativity void that has sucked the enthusiasm from many of his core supporters. It's not impossible. Even at this late date, he can sketch out a vision of American renewal that is plausible and built around a few big ideas to restore real enthusiasm among his supporters. The basic argument is simple: America is on the verge of a new period of great growth built around three once-in-a-lifetime realities: a new energy paradigm fueled by the recent boom in U.S. oil and natural gas production**, an exceptional head start in being able to lead the world in the intellectual capital that will drive the industrial revolution 3.0, and a great opportunity to use the low price of dollars to invest in a new American infrastructure. Add to this some courage to set America's fiscal priorities straight, including distinguishing between investment and spending, focusing on growth now and fiscal tightening later, fixing the broken U.S. tax code, and cutting spending where it must be cut. Finally, build it all upon a commitment to restoring the American Dream, focusing on reducing inequality, enhancing social mobility, and working hard for our children's interests rather than feathering the nest for ourselves. **Here are a few examples of how Obama could pull it off:** 1. Taxes. The president should steal the jump on the Republicans and propose a massive simplification of the tax code. Loopholes should be eliminated. Filing should be made easier. And tax rates for the wealthy should go back up to reasonable rates -- say the historically low levels of Bill Clinton's administration. New revenue that the country will need should come from the promise of a value-added tax and perhaps a carbon tax to be introduced once the recovery has started more vigorously in, say, three to five years. 2. Trade. Obama set audacious goals for doubling American exports and is on track to reach them. He should take more credit for this. As for the future of trade reform -- with the Doha round of negotiations to expand global trade dead and the Trans-Pacific Partnership resonating only with wonks -- it's time for a new big idea. How about a U.S.-EU Free Economic Zone? Together, they're the biggest market in the world. What's more, both need growth; the Europeans pay their workers well enough that usual labor arguments shouldn't adhere; and we could make it about regulatory coordination (on financial markets, say) as well as removing remaining trade obstacles (on agricultural trade, the Euros are going to have a hard time maintaining historically high subsidies, so now is the time to strike). And coordination and closer ties will help us more effectively pressure emerging markets to remove barriers and raise their standards. 3. Defense. The administration should own defense reform, not tiptoe around it. While the Republican Party seeks to demagogue fears about pending military cuts, ignoring the waste, redundancies, obsolete systems, and fat in the current budget, the White House has been timid about embracing the other side of the argument. That would entail noting how failing to rationalize the military's enormous budget after a decade of massive spending will itself weaken the country. But more importantly, there is a way to make the case that the country can make substantial cuts to spending while simultaneously strengthening its force -- provided it comes with a vision for what a 21st-century military looks like. A revolution is afoot -- from unmanned aircraft to ever-more-precise munitions to cyberweapons to a greater focus on rapid-deployment, special-ops teams -- at a time when most branches of the U.S. military are built around 20th-century concepts and systems. So Obama should talk about investing in new systems, not cutting old ones, and what kind of jobs that will create. And he should commit to preserving the jobs of those in the military. The president has helped create a new doctrine for conflict -- he should own it and expand upon it. 4. Jobs. Take the pillars described above -- energy, high-value-added manufacturing, and infrastructure -- and you can describe how the United States can fill the 30 million job openings it needs to between now and 2025. We need big ideas -- and real ones. But they're there. Education is a big part of this. Obama should get behind major immigration reform to let people who come and earn advanced degrees get green cards. Have one big memorable idea on education that sets the president apart. How about saying teachers don't pay taxes on their first $100,000 of income? Immediately double their salaries; the cost is manageable, and America starts attracting better people to teach our kids. Or use technology to advance a national curriculum -- standing up to teachers' unions on this would be a Sistah Souljah moment that the country would cheer. 5. ***Energy***. The idea of real **energy independence** once seemed like a dream. It **should** now **be a national goal**. The United States is already an energy exporter. According to a recent Citibank report, by 2020 "the U.S. should see combined domestic supply and Canadian imports of oil reach over 20 million barrels per day, while U.S. oil demand falls 2 million to below 17 million barrels per day, leaving a 3 million barrel per day surplus available for export." And **with new gas discoveries, alternative energy technologies, offshore resources**, and the promise of huge Canadian reserves, **we ought to be able to say that** North **America can be energy independent by 2030**. Certainly, we can set the goal of no longer depending on a drop of oil from the volatile, dangerous Middle East. Tom Friedman has been right about this "moon shot" for many years now, and with each month new discoveries suggest it is more rather than less achievable. **Start with a commitment to framing** in the next 12 months **a** whole-of-the-economy, whole-of-government **energy policy --** just the kind of strategy **the United States has never had until now.** Will this cure what ails the Obama campaign? Not instantly. But here's the most important point: **The Obama team needs to accept that its legitimate distaste for the Republican theme of economic Darwinism** (campaign slogan: Let's make Americans work harder to make the 1 percent even richer) **is not enough around which to build a campaign. The White House has to offer a real alternative, not just to Romney but to many of the sometimes disappointing, business-as-usual, Obama results of the past three and a half years.**

***C) Impact --- Obama pushes defense cuts that collapse heg --- Romney solves***

**Boot ‘11**

Max Boot​ is the Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. He is completing a history of guerrilla warfare and terrorism. This article is adapted from testimony he delivered to the House Armed Services Committee on September 13, 2011.

Commentary Magazine, January 12, Slashing America's Defense: A Suicidal Trajectory <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/slashing-americas-defense-a-suicidal-trajectory/>, jj

**The United States’ armed forces have been the greatest force for good the world has seen during the past century.** They defeated Nazism and Japanese imperialism, deterred and defeated Communism, and stopped numerous lesser evils—from Slobodan Milosevic’s ethnic cleansing to the oppression perpetrated by Saddam Hussein in Iraq and the Taliban in Afghanistan. **Imagine a world in which America is not the leading military power. It would be a brutal, Hobbesian place in which aggressors rule and the rule of law is trampled on**. And yet **Congress will be helping to usher in such a New World Disorder if it continues to slash defense spending at the currently contemplated rate**—just as previous Congresses did with previous rounds of “postwar” budget cuts going back to the dawn of the Republic. **But there is nothing inevitable about the outcome**. The first tranche of sequestration cuts is not scheduled to take effect until the 2013 fiscal year. That means Congress has most of 2012 to find an alternative. **Unfortunately**, President **Obama has threatened to veto any bill that tries to exempt the defense budget from sequestration**. But that should not prevent pro-defense Democrats and Republicans from pushing such a bill anyway. If even one year of sequestration were to occur, major weapons systems (which will be costly and difficult to restart) might be cancelled—and great numbers of veterans (whose experience would be lost forever) might be layed off. **In the long run, the question of whether or not**—and to what extent—**we will cut defense will be decided in the 2012 elections**. Obama appears sanguine about the impact of defense cuts, but his Republican challengers are not. Mitt **Romney has promised to protect the defense budget and expand naval shipbuilding**. Rick Perry has called on Leon Panetta to resign rather than accept massive cuts. Even Newt Gingrich, who has been critical of wasteful Pentagon spending, has said that **sequestration would be “totally destructive” and “very dangerous to the survival of the country.” It is commonly said that every election is a turning point in our history. In many cases that’s nothing more than partisan hype. In the case of the 2012 election, it’s true: The future of the U.S. armed forces, and of American power in general, could depend greatly on the outcome.**

***Heg solves extinction***

**Barnett**, Professor, Warfare Analysis and Research Dept – U.S. Naval War College, 3/7/’**11**

(Thomas, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” )

Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended.** Indeed, **it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace.** We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.

**Oil**

***Oil prices will stabilize now – prices will stick above OPEC break-even levels without significant changes***

Irina **Rogovaya August 2012**; writer for Oil and Gas Eurasia, Oil Price Changes: Everyone Wants Stability <http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/-http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/>

According to the current base forecast for the Eurozone prepared by Oxford Economics, **within the next two years oil prices will continue to drift lower, but not beyond the bounds of the “green” corridor for the world economy – $80-100 per barrel**. This forecast coincides with the expectations of the World Bank (see Fig. 4). Meanwhile, S&P analysts presented three scenarios for the energy market in June. In the base scenario, **oil will remain at $100 per barrel**. S&P calculates that the likelihood of a stressful scenario in which the price of oil drops below $60 per barrel (the bottom in 2009) is 1:3. Analysts believe that **given today’s state of economic and geopolitical affairs, strong political will would be needed to force the price of oil below $70-80** (the current level of effective production). So far, **that will is nowhere to be seen**. Recent events have shown that nobody is interested in the Eurozone breaking apart. And nobody wants a war in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, nobody today intends to force the production of less valuable oil. At least that is what OPEC leaders promised during the recent summit. “Stability on the market should be at the center of our attention,” General Secretary Abdalla El-Badri said. Even Saudi Arabia, which consistently violates OPEC discipline in over-producing its quotas, announced at the beginning of July that it would review its margins to determine a higher price for Saudi supplies ordered on August contracts. Analysts noted that the average price of oil supplied to Europe and Asia had jumped (by $0.85 and $0.66 per barrel respectively), a fact which could be seen as proof that **the collective members of the cartel will not let prices fall under $100 per barrel.**

***The plan decreases global oil prices***

**Bartis and Bibber 11** (James Bartis, senior policy researcher at the RAND Corporation, and Lawrence Van Bibber, RAND Corporation, National Research Defense Institute, Prepared for the Secretary of Defense, "Alternative Fuels for Military Applications", <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2011/RAND_MG969.pdf>)

Nevertheless, despite the absence of a specific military benefit, **there are nationally important benefits to be gained from the use of alternative fuels**. If the Department of Defense were to encourage early production experience**, government decisionmakers, technology developers, and investors would obtain important information about the technical, financial, and environmental performance of various alternative fuel options**. If favorable, **that information could lead to a commercial alternative-fuels industry producing strategically significant amounts of fuel in the United States**. Once established, a large, **commercially competitive alternative fuel industry in the United States** and abroad **would weaken** the ability of the **O**rganization of the **P**etroleum **E**xporting **C**ountries to assert its cartel power. Lower world oil prices would yield economic benefits to all fuel users—civilian and military alike. **Lower prices would** also **decrease the incomes** of “rogue” oil producers, and thereby likely decrease financial support to large terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hizballah.

***Drop in oil demand causes Russian economic instability --- risks nuclear war***

**Miller 10**—assistant professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma (Gregory D., April 2010, © Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Quarterly 33:2, “The Security Costs of Energy Independence,” http://www.twq.com/10april/docs/10apr\_Miller.pdf)

**Russia is another** potential **danger spot because it is the only nuclear state**, at least for now, **that has significant revenue from the sale of oil, roughly** 8—**20 percent of its GDP**. Losing that income will have less dramatic effects on Russia than on many OPEC states more heavily reliant on oil sales, at least partly because of recent attempts to diversify the Russian economy. **Its economy**, however, **is still too fragile to handle a major drop in demand for oil**. **Given the existing tension between Russia and states such as Georgia and Ukraine, neither the United States nor Russia’s neighbors can afford the risk of a nuclear Russia suffering economic instability**.19

***Extinction***

**FILGER 2009** (Sheldon, author and blogger for the Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356)

**In Russia** historically, **economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major** industrialized **economies**. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, **Medvedev and Putin**, both intimately acquainted with their nation’s history, **are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia’s economic crisis will endanger the nation’s political stability**, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. **Should the Russian economy deteriorate** to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, **the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis**. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, **Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability** to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that **a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing** social and political **upheaval**. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama’s national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. **During the years** Boris **Yeltsin ruled** Russia, **security forces** responsible for **guarding the** nation’s **nuclear arsenal went without pay** for months at a time, **leading to fears that** desperate **personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain?** It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

***Reduced dependence collapses the Saudi monarchy***

**Lippman ’12** (Thomas W, former Middle East bureau chief for the Washington Post, award-winning journalist who has written about Middle Eastern affairs and American foreign policy for more than three decades, former adjunct senior fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations and an adjunct scholar at the Middle East Institute in Washington, author of 5 previously published books on the Middle East and diplomacy, appeared frequently on national TV and radio, SAUDI ARABIA ON THE EDGE: The Uncertain Future of an American Ally, A Council on Foreign Relations Book, pg 38-39, jj)

The Saudis were not surprised Council, in a projection that reflected the agencies, said in 2009 that “the most likely occurance by 2025 is a technological breakthrough that will provide an alternative to oil and natural gas but implementation will lag because of the need for longer replacement time. However, whether the breakthrough occurs within the 2025 time frame or Iater, **the geopolitical implications of a shift away from oil** and natural gas **will be immense**. **Saudi Arabia will absorb the biggest shock**.”2 This intelligence assessment noted that **if oil** will **revenue declines substantially, Saudi Arabia’s leaders “will be forced to tighten up on the costs of the royal establishment,” but that is the least of their worries. Without oil money, they cannot maintain the schools, hospitals, power plants, mosques, and subsidized services that form the foundation of the princes’ contract with the people, let alone support the armed forces and the police and border guards.**

***Global wars***

Gregory **Copley**, Defense & Foreign Affairs Daily editor, Defense & Foreign Affairs Daily, "The Kingdom at a Crossroads," 5/22/20**02**,

Nonetheless, **Saudi Arabia's problems have become the** problems of virtually the entire Muslim ummah (nation), and are perhaps the **real core of the schism between Western and Muslim societies**. The danger exists that **the Saudi leadership could still collapse** in the near future **and the** integrity of the **Saudi State could come into question**. The problems in Saudi Arabia -- decades in the making -- are at the geopolitical heart of Islam, thus affecting most of the Muslim world and the relationship between Islamic societies and the West. The phenomena of Osama bin Laden's worldwide terrorism network, the radical Islamist anti-state activities under Sudan's Dr Hassan al-Turabi, the related and parallel evolution of the Taliban in Afghanistan, the direction of the Chechen rebellion, and so on, all owe much to the evolving problems in Saudi Arabia as well as to the radical clerics in Iran. Not even Saudi Arabia's leadership has acknowledged the extent of the crisis, although privately many leading Saudi princes have admitted the prospect of an imminent collapse of the House of Sa'ud. **Saudi Arabia's problems have an immediate bearing on whether major war occurs between Israel and its neighbor**s, and whether Saudi Arabia survives with its present form of government. **They are therefore critical to** the global economy and **global strategic stability**.

**CP**

CP Text: **The United States Department of Defense should increase financial incentives for energy production from one or more of the following: coal, crude oil, natural gas, solar power, or wind power by cutting funding from Ground Combat Vehicle program and reallocating funds toward the NetZero Program.**

***NetZero includes nuclear***

**Barattino, 1/23/12** (William J. is the chief executive officer at Global Broadband Solutions, LLC. He has more than 30 years experience in program management and systems engineering and integration for telecommunications, space systems, lasers, imaging, facilities engineering, and applied mechanics, ANS Nuclear Café, “Small Modular Reactors on Military Installations?,” <http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/01/23/small-modular-reactors-on-military-installations/>, ts)

Federal agencies have been directed by public laws and executive orders to reduce energy consumption, increase usage of clean energy sources, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs). The U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) is working with the U.S. Department of Energy to develop a long-term strategy to embrace and implement these directives for military installations that includes [small modular reactors (SMRs)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Small_modular_reactor) in the mix of clean energy technologies. This blog post provides an initial assessment of the market size of SMRs on U.S. Army installations located in the United States that includes background factors driving the shift to clean energy sources; characterization of energy consumption and costs for Army installations; maximum [overnight costs](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Overnight_cost) for breakeven based on offsets of current base electricity costs; and reductions in GHGs with use of SMRs. The DOD is moving toward “NetZero” energy installations serviced by utility sources that are secure, reliable, and cost effective. NetZero energy implies power systems located within the boundaries of a military installation (or possibly on federal land to service a number of agencies within a region) for providing secure and uninterruptable power supplies for mission-critical base facility energy requirements.

***Military procurement of SMRs triggers resentment that accelerates and legitimates new prolif***

Terrence P. **Smith**, CSIS, 2-16-20**11** <http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations>

**The reactors are purely for energy purposes, but in a world that seems to be growing tired of U.S. military intervention, the idea of ensuring our ability to do so through the proliferation of mobile nuclear reactors will hardly quell any hostile sentiment.** **In addition, it can only add fire to the “nuclear = good” flame**. So, **while even under best case scenario, the reactors are completely proliferation proof and pose no direct threat to the nonproliferation cause (ignoring the spreading of nuclear tech and knowledge in general), I have a tough time seeing how it helps.** The report concludes that the DoD “should seriously consider taking a leadership role on small reactors.” Since the 1970s, the report says, “in the United States, only the military has overcome the considerable barriers to building nuclear reactors. This will probably be the case with small reactors as well.” **For now, the plans for small nuclear reactors are “unfortunately,” for the most part, “caught between the drawing board and production.” My point is, maybe that is where they should stay.**

***Prolif causes extinction***

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

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

**K**

***Energy Policy is a product of capitalism’s attempt to increase productivity and profit. This allows for exploitative working conditions and leads to extinction.***

**ICC ’11** (Nuclear Energy, Capitalism and Communism, August 16, 2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear)

The revolution in the form and quantity of energy available to humanity underpinned the industrial revolution and opened the door from the realm of want to that of plenty. But this revolution was driven by the development of capitalism whose purpose is not the satisfaction of human needs but the increase of capital based on the appropriation of surplus value produced by an exploited working class. **Energy is used to drive the development of productivity** but it is also a cost of production. It is part of the constant capital alongside raw materials, machines and factories and, as such, tends to increase in relation to the variable capital that is the source of capitalism’s profits. It is this that dictates capitalism’s attitude to energy.

Capitalism has no regard for the use of energy, for the destruction of finite resources, other than as a cost of production. Increased productivity tends to require increased energy, so the capitalists (other than those in the oil industry) are driven to try and reduce the cost of this energy. On the one hand this results in the profligate use of energy for irrational ends, such as transporting similar commodities back and forth across the world and the ceaseless multiplication of commodities that meet no real human need but serve only as a means to extract and realise surplus value. On the other, it leads to the denial of access to energy and to the products of energy for millions of humans who lack the money to be of interest to the capitalists. This is illustrated in Nigeria where Shell pumps out billions of dollars worth of oil while the local people go without or risk their lives by trying to illegally tap the oil from the pipeline. The price is also paid by those working in the energy industries in lives lost and bodies maimed or poisoned and by the environment and all that lives in it, from the polluted, toxic waters of the Thames that characterised 19th century London to the warming of the globe that threatens the future of humanity today.

***Vote neg on ethics - resisting this reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility***

**Zizek and Daly 2004**

(Slavoj, professor of philosophy at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana, and Glyn, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, Conversations with Zizek, page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

***The alternative is to withdraw from the ideology of capital. Capitalism only survives because we believe it is a truth claim.***

**Johnston ’04** (Adrian, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory, The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Žižek’s recent writings isn’t a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Žižek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance ( Žižek, 2001d, pp 22–23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Žižek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of ‘‘magic,’’ that is, the belief in money’s social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance’s powers. The ‘‘external’’ obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, ‘‘internally’’ believe in it – capitalism’s life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others’ belief in the socio-performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism’s frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic’s fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism, makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Žižek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing). Or, the more disquieting possibility to entertain is that some people today, even if one succeeds in exposing them to the underlying logic of their position, might respond in a manner resembling that of the Judas-like character Cypher in the film The Matrix (Cypher opts to embrace enslavement by illusion rather than cope with the discomfort of dwelling in the ‘‘desert of the real’’): faced with the choice between living the capitalist lie or wrestling with certain unpleasant truths, many individuals might very well deliberately decide to accept what they know full well to be a false pseudo-reality, a deceptively comforting fiction (‘‘Capitalist commodity fetishism or the truth? I choose fetishism’’).

**Solvency**

***Can’t change behavior***

**Galbraith, 4/27/12** (Kate, reported on clean energy for The New York Times from 2008 to 2009, serving as the lead writer for the Times' Green blog. She began her career at The Economist in 2000 and spent 2005 to 2007 in Austin as the magazine's Southwest correspondent, The Texas Tribune: “Texas Army Bases Go Green, but Challenges Remain,” <http://www.texastribune.org/texas-energy/energy/texas-army-bases-go-green-challenges-remain/>, ts)

**Achieving these goals will be tough**, officials at both bases said. “**It’s really as much about behavior change as it is about technology,**” said Dosa. **Recycling rates** **at soldiers’ housing complexes**, for example, **are low,** he said. In addition to recycling, Fort Hood wants to reduce packaging and encourage reuse of materials like household goods. (See YouTube video from Fort Hood at the bottom of this article.) Fort Bliss’s **plans are** especially **ambitious**. It is the only base besides Fort Carson in Colorado selected by **the Army** to achieve “net zero” in three categories — energy, water and waste. And it **must do this by 2018 despite a massive increase in size**: Due to the First Armored Division’s return from Germany, **the number of soldiers** assigned to Fort Bliss **is more than tripling** to about 30,000. **Electricity usage**, for example, **could jump by up to 60 percent** between fiscal 2010 and 2015.

***Combat Ground Vehicles Program k2 effective fighting***

**Baglole, no date given** (Joel, A former journalist, I currently work in government relations and strategic communications. As a government relations consultant, I have worked for U.S. and international aerospace and defence companies that sell their military weapons and equipment to governments around the world. This experience has given me insights into the defense industry, government procurement process, and the requirements that militaries have for current weapons and equipment, “Bradley Fighting Vehicle – Performing Scout Missions,” <http://usmilitary.about.com/od/armyweapons/a/bradleyfighting.htm>, ts)

Tough, fast and heavily armed, **the Bradley Fighting Vehicle is ideal for performing scout missions in combat zones**. A Transport Vehicle and More Although **it has served a number of different roles** over the years, **the latest version of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle is most often used for conducting scout missions.** The vehicle is named after General Omar Bradley who served as a U.S. Army field commander in North Africa and Europe during the Second World War. The Bradley is classified as an "Infantry Fighting Vehicle" and was originally designed to transport soldiers in hostile environments. However, with its armor plating and weapons, the Bradely Fighting Vehicle has also been used as an Armored Personnel Carrier and to attack tanks. Current versions of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle can hold as many as nine soldiers – including a commander, driver and gunner. Chain Gun and Other Weapons The main weapon on Bradley Fighting Vehicles is the M242 25 millimeter chain gun, which fires 200 rounds per minute. The M242 chain gun can also fire a variety of bullets ranging from armor piercing rounds to high explosive incendiary tracer rounds. The vehicles are also armed with a M240C machine gun, a TOW anti-tank missile system, and M231 Firing Port Weapons. With its multiple armaments, **the Bradley Fighting Vehicle destroyed more Iraqi armored vehicles than the M1 Abrams Tank during the 1991 Gulf War**. The Bradley has also proved tough and durable due to its armor. In recent years, the vehicles have been equipped with steel skirts to provide additional protection. Current versions of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle weigh as much as 33 tons. Speed across Rugged Terrain The Bradley Fighting Vehicle was developed to provide the U.S. military with a troop transport. As such, **the vehicle was designed to be fast**. One design requirement was to ensure that the Bradley Fighting Vehicle was as quick as the M1 Abrams Tank. **The vehicles have proven to be extremely good at traveling over rugged, open terrain.** The Bradley Fighting Vehicles entered service with the U.S. Army in 1981. To date, about 6,700 of the vehicles have been produced. Each Bradley Fighting Vehicle costs $3 million to manufacture. The U.S. Army has announced its intention to replace the Bradley Fighting Vehicle with the Brigade Combat Team Ground Combat Vehicle Program. A previous plan to replace the Bradleys with the U.S. Army Future Combat System manned ground vehicles was cancelled in 2009 over cost issues.

***SQ solves Bradley’s.***

**DID, 8/13/12** (Defense Industry Daily, “The US Army’s Bradley Remanufacture Program,” <http://www.defenseindustrydaily.com/the-us-armys-bradley-remanufacture-program-updated-02835/>, ts)

In the 1970s, middle eastern wars demonstrated that tanks without infantry screens were vulnerable to infantry with anti-tank missiles. Unfortunately, armored personnel carriers were easy prey for enemy tanks, and sometimes had trouble just keeping up with friendly tanks like America’s 60+ ton, 50+ mph M1 Abrams. In response, the **Americans rethought the armored personnel carrier**, taking a page from the Soviet book. They created a more heavily armored, faster “Infantry Fighting Vehicle” named after WW2 General Omar “the soldier’s general” Bradley, and gave it an offensive punch of its own. [M2/M3 tracked, armored IFVs](http://www.army-technology.com/projects/bradley/) can carry infantry – but they also have 25mm Bushmaster cannons, networked targeting sensors, and even TOW anti-armor or Stinger anti-aircraft missiles at their disposal. wear, however, and the pace of electronics breakthroughs is far faster than the Army’s vehicle replacement cycle. **The US Army plans to keep its Bradley fleet for some time to come, and new technologies have made it wise to upgrade part of that fleet while renewing the vehicles. Hence the remanufacture program, which complements the restore-only** [**RESET programs**](http://www.defenseindustrydaily.com/reset-of-the-us-armys-vehicle-fleet-continues-02493/)**.**

***Tech and reliability hurdles and high price means NetZero fails***

**Kaften 9/25/12** (Cheryl, PV Magazine: “US military to spend $1.8 billion on clean energy by 2025, with 'net zero' results,” <http://www.pv-magazine.com/news/details/beitrag/us-military-to-spend-18-billion-on-clean-energy-by-2025--with-net-zero-results_100008596/#ixzz27s16Un5F>, ts)

Renewable energy technologies can be divided into 3 main applications: power generation and energy efficiency at U.S. bases; transportation; and soldier power. **Cleantech military applications**, in general, **face the same opportunities and obstacles as those in the civilian U.S. market**. **While significant cost and reliability hurdles remain, technology cost reductions**, and the use of Power Purchase Agreements and Enhanced Use Leases as contracting vehicles **will enable mature techn**ologies **such as photovoltaics, biomass, wind and geothermal power to be** rapidly and cost-effectively **deployed at scale during the next 12 years**, according to the report.

**Heg/Blackouts Frontline**

***Grid is resilient and sustainable***

**Clark 12**, MA candidate – Intelligence Studies @ American Military University, senior analyst – Chenega Federal Systems, 4/28/’12

(Paul, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University)

**In 2003, a simple physical breakdown occurred** – trees shorted a power line and caused a

fault – **that had a cascading effect** and caused a power blackout across the Northeast (Lewis

2010). **This** singular occurrence **has been used as evidence that the electrical grid is fragile and**

**subject to severe disruption** through cyber-attack, a disruption that could cost billions of dollars,

brings business to a halt, and could even endanger lives – if compounded by other catastrophic

events (Brennan 2012). A power disruption the size of the ***2003*** blackout, the worst in American¶ history at that time (Minkel 2008), ***is a worst case scenario*** and used as an example of the¶ fragility of the U.S. energy grid. ***This perceived fragility is not real when viewed in the context*¶ *of the robustness of the electrical grid.*¶** When asked about cyber-attacks against the electrical grid in April of 2012, the¶ **intelligence chief of U.S. Cyber Command** Rear Admiral Samuel **Cox stated that an attack was**¶ **unlikely to succeed because of the “*huge amounts of resiliency built into the*** [electrical] ***system***¶ ***that makes that kind of catastrophic thing very difficult***” (Capaccio 2012). **This optimistic view**¶ **is supported by an electrical grid that has proven to be robust in the face of large natural¶ catastrophes.** **Complex systems like the electrical grid** in the U.S. **are prone to failures and the**¶ **U.S. grid fails frequently.** Despite efforts to reduce the risk out power outages, the risk is always¶ present. **Power outages** that affect more than 50,000 people **have occurred steadily over the last**¶ **20 years** at a rate of 12% annually and the frequency of large catastrophes remains relatively¶ high and outages the size of the 2003 blackout are predicted to occur every 25 years (Minkel¶ 2008). In a complex system that is always at risk of disruption, **the effect is mitigated by policies**¶ **and procedures that are meant to restore services as quickly as possible. The most visible of these policies is the interstate Emergency Management** Assistance **Compact**, a legally binding¶ agreement **allowing combined resources to be quickly deployed in response to** a **catastrophic**¶ disaster such as **power outages** following a severe hurricane (Kapucu, Augustin and Garayev¶ 2009).¶ **The electrical grid suffers service interruptions regularly**, it is a large and complex system¶ supporting the largest economy in the world, and yet commerce does not collapse (Lewis 2010).¶ **Despite blizzards, earthquakes, fires, and hurricanes** that cause blackouts, ***the economy*** is¶ affected but ***does not collapse*** and **even after massive damage** like that caused by Hurricane¶ Katrina, ***national security is not affected*** because U.S. military capability is not degraded (Lewis¶ 2010).¶ **Cyber-security is an ever-increasing concern** in an increasingly electronic and¶ interconnected world. **Cyber-security is a high priority “economic and national security**¶ **challenge**” (National Security Council n.d.) because cyber-attacks are expected to become the¶ top national security threat (Robert S. Mueller 2012). **In response to the threat Congress is**¶ **crafting legislation to enhance cyber-security** (Brito and Watkins 2012) and **the Department of**¶ **Homeland Security budget** for cyber-security **has been significantly increased** (U.S. Senate¶ Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs 2012).

***Squo solves—all bases have backups***

**Kwartin et. al 12** (Vice president of ICF International, consulting firm that partners with government and commercial clients to deliver professional services and technology solutions in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets, Robert Kwartin, Sarah Alexander, Martin Anderson, Donald Clark, John Collins, Chris Lamson, Garrett Martin, Ryan Mayfield, Lindsay McAlpine, Daniel Moreno, Jeffrey Patterson, Craig Schultz, and Emily Stiever, "Solar Energy Development on Department of Defense Installations in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts", January, Pdf)

**The potential sources of on-site power generation are: 1) diesel generators tied to the existing microgrid** in the cantonment area, **2) remote third party owned solar not tied to microgrid, and 3) cantonment third party solar that is tied to the existing microgrid**. ***Most DoD facilities already have some level of emergency backup power that is supplied by diesel generators***. **Many of the installations also currently host third-party owned solar projects, either adjacent to the cantonment or in other areas, or have the technical and economic capability to do so**, as discussed in the Solar Potential Assessment chapter.

***Alt causes to readiness – equipment and cuts***

**Graham, 8/21**/12 (Owen, search coordinator for national security and foreign policy in the Davis Institute for International Studies at The Heritage Foundation, “Cuts Will Cripple Military and Make it 'Hollow Force' of '70s,” http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2012/08/cuts-will-cripple-military-and-make-it-hollow-force-of-70s, bgm)

**After 10 years of war and major wear and tear on military equipment, the military is in dire shape and needs to be modernized**. While **defense expenditures** did rise **after 9/11,** they **were** largely **spent on** operations in **Iraq** **and** **Afghanistan** – **not** **on** **modernization** (i.e., new weapon systems).

**The U.S. military is facing a readiness crisis**, one confronting not only its soldiers but also **pushing its military equipment to the breaking point.** Across all services, **readiness problems are worsening. Breakdowns are happening more frequently. The Navy deploys ships that are barely able to sail, and members of the Army have had to tape body armor to their SUVs. The U.S. military needs to be modernized, not subjected to additional cuts.**

***Alt cause – obesity***

**Almond, et al. ’08** (LCDR Nathaniel Almond, MC USN, NEPMU Five, Naval Station San Diego; Leila Kahwati, MD MPH VA National Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention; Linda Kinsinger, MD MPH VA National Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention; Deborah Porterfield, MD MPH Department of Social Medicine, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Military Medicine, July 15, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3912/is\_200806/ai\_n27995834)

The epidemic of obesity significantly affects the military. First, the potential pool of recruits is decreased due to the increasing proportion of young adults who do not meet military entry standards for weight, estimated at 13 to 18% of U.S. men and 17 to 43% of U.S. women in the general population. Retention of active military personnel is also decreased secondary to the disease burden, with 1,419 personnel discharged in 2002 due to failing the body weight standard. Lastly, overweight and obesity add to health care costs for the Department of Defense, whose total health care budget is currently estimated at $36 billion with projected costs in 5 years to be $61 billion annually.

***1) Military reducing reliance on fossil fuels***

ELISABETH **ROSENTHAL**, NYT, October 4th **2010**, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/05/science/earth/05fossil.html?adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1306084754-flJ2Mg6ul2Po4LpzlLT1kw&pagewanted=1(BJN)

With insurgents increasingly attacking the American fuel supply convoys that lumber across the Khyber Pass into Afghanistan, **the military is pushing aggressively to develop, test and deploy renewable energy to decrease its need to transport fossil fuels**. Last week, **a Marine company from California arrived in the rugged outback of Helmand Province bearing novel equipment: portable solar panels that fold up into boxes; energy-conserving lights; solar tent shields that provide shade and electricity; solar chargers for computers and communications equipment.** The 150 Marines of Company I, Third Battalion, Fifth Marines, will be the first to take renewable technology into a battle zone, where the new equipment will replace diesel and kerosene-based fuels that would ordinarily generate power to run their encampment. **Even as Congress has struggled unsuccessfully to pass an energy bill and many states have put renewable energy on hold because of the recession, the military this year has pushed rapidly forward. After a decade of waging wars in remote corners of the globe where fuel is not readily available, senior commanders have come to see overdependence on fossil fuel as a big liability, and renewable technologies** — which have become more reliable and less expensive over the past few years — **as providing a potential answer. These new types of renewable energy now account for only a small percentage of the power used by the armed forces, but military leaders plan to rapidly expand their use** over the next decade.

***2) Military accounting for price spikes in 2012 budget***

Jeff **Siegel** is the managing editor of Green Chip Stocks, March 4th **2011**, http://commoditiesreporter.com/alternative-energy/pentagon-oil-prediction/ (BJN)

**Based on the Pentagon’s** latest fiscal **2012 budget, this means the Navy is already gearing up to spend another $900 million** next year! You see, **the Pentagon report that was recently sent to Congress plans on the price of oil coming in at $131 a barrel**. Of course, **the military has been preparing for these price hikes for some time now. The U.S. Navy already has a plan in place to ensure that half of all the energy it uses by 2020 comes from non-fossil fuel sources.**

***3) Pentagon insulated – they get subsidized fuel***

Marcus **Weisgerber**, Defense News, April 7th **2011**, http://www.tsjonline.com/story.php?F=6030207 (BJN)

**The Defense Logistics Agency buys fuel for the military**. **The services are insulated from price swings and market volatility because they pay a standard price for the fuel**, a DLA spokeswoman said. “**The standard price is used as a cost-stabilizing tool for the Department of Defense by allowing the DoD agencies to budget for and pay the standard price rather than the market price during times of volatility in the global fuel market**,” she said. “**The standard price is reviewed and may be changed during the fiscal year to ensure that the defense working capital fund, which is used by DLA to purchase the fuel, remains solvent.”**

## 2nc

### Impact

***Heg turns and solves every aff impact***

Robert **Kagan** is a senior fellow in Foreign Policy at Brookings. His most recent book is "The World America Made." 3-14-**12**, America has made the world freer, safer and wealthier, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/03/14/opinion/kagan-world-america-made/index.html?hpt=hp_c2>, jj

(CNN) -- **We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today** -- the widespread **freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity** (even despite the current economic crisis), ***and the absence of war among great powers.* In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are more than 100. For four centuries prior to 1950, global GDP rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the 20th century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past 60 years no great powers have gone to war. This is the world America made when it assumed global leadership** after World War II. Would this world order survive if America declined as a great power? **Some American intellectuals insist that a "Post-American" world need not look very different from the American world and that all we need to do is "manage" American decline**. ***But that is wishful thinking*. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other powers, the world order will inevitably change to suit their interests and preferences. Take the issue of democracy**. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. **In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great power autocracies. Both China and Russia already protect dictators like** Syria's Bashar al-**Assad**. **If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. What about the free market, free trade economic order?** **People assume China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it**. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. **But China's form of capitalism is heavily dominated by the state, with the ultimate goal being preservation of the ruling party. Although the Chinese have been beneficiaries of an open international economic order, they could end up undermining it simply because, as an autocratic society, their priority is to preserve the state's control of wealth and the power it brings**. They might kill the goose because they can't figure out how to keep both it and themselves alive. **Finally, what about the long peace that has held among the great powers** for the better part of six decades? Many people imagine that American predominance will be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But **multipolar systems have historically been neither stable nor peaceful. War among the great powers was a** common, if not **constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. The 19th century was notable for** two stretches of great-power peace of roughly four decades each, punctuated, however, by **major wars among great powers** and **culminating in World War I, the most destructive and deadly war mankind had known** up to that point. ***The era of American predominance has shown that there is no better recipe for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand.*** **Many people view the present international order as the inevitable result of human progress**, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government -- forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But **there was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. International order is not an evolution; it is an imposition. It is the domination of one vision over others -- in America's case, the domination of liberal free market principles of economics, democratic principles of politics, and a peaceful international system that supports these, over other visions that other nations and peoples may have. The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it. If and when American power declines, the institutions and norms American power has supported** will decline, too. Or they **may collapse** altogether **as we transition into** another kind of world order, or into **disorder**. **We may discover then that the United States was essential to keeping the present world order together and that the alternative to American power was not peace and harmony but chaos and catastrophe -- which was what the world looked like right before the American order came into being.**

***Obama will cut five hundred billion dollars of defense spending --- Romney checks.***

**O’Hanlon ‘12**

MICHAEL O'HANLON, senior fellow at Brookings, is co-author, with Martin Indyk and Kenneth Lieberthal, of “Bending History: Barack Obama’s Foreign Policy.” 8-13-12, Politico, Obama vs. Romney on foreign policy <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0812/79652.html>, jj

**New conventional wisdom has emerged** about the 2012 presidential race: President Barack **Obama and** former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt **Romney**, The New York Times recently explained, **aren’t all that far apart in how they see the world or frame U.S. foreign policy strategies.** But ***this is a wrongheaded view*** of the choice voters face in November. **Obama and Romney’s prescriptions for U.S. foreign policy diverge substantially on several key issues that involve crucial choices for the nation.** To be sure, Romney and Obama are both smart, pragmatic men with seasoned advisers. And they do share many foreign policy views. For example, neither wishes to stay in Afghanistan forever or pull out immediately; neither has a radical proposal on global trade or financial matters, and Obama, chastened by his 2009 and 2010 experiences, is no longer pushing hard for a major new approach to energy and climate. Both seem willing to use U.S. military power to stop Iran from getting the bomb — though neither is in a hurry to take on that hornet’s nest until absolutely necessary. Indeed, Romney went to great pains while in Israel recently, to support a possible military strike against Iranian nuclear facilities—by Israel. He was adamant that Iran not get the bomb, but less adamant that the United States act to prevent it. This ambivalence is understandable in light of the complications involved — and resembles Obama’s own complex policies on the subject. But while the two may agree on perhaps half to two-thirds of the U.S. foreign policy portfolio, it does not make their remaining differences less important. Consider: DEFICITS AND DEBT: **Obama**, as part of his deficit reduction and economic renewal strategy, **supports nearly $500 billion in defense spending reductions over 10 years**, as laid out the Budget Control Act. **Romney opposes this**. Both oppose “sequestration,” which would cut defense another $500 billion over 10 years, starting in January, if Congress can’t take action before. Anyone who doesn’t view this as a major foreign policy issue is not thinking broadly enough about what foreign policy really means. No great power can remain great without a strong economy. Obama is basically saying the deficit and debt are such urgent threats to our economic foundations that they must be addressed — even at the price of a somewhat smaller military. Romney is saying that **the risks to the armed forces, in the short term, are too great** — even if that leaves him with a less persuasive message about how to address the debt over the longer term. **This is a *vivid distinction* — and a valid debate**.

***Obama will hollow out the military***

**Dreazen ‘12**

Yochi Dreazen is a senior correspondent (military affairs and national security) for National Journal. 6-8-12, the Atlantic, How Obama and Romney Differ—and Don't—on Foreign Policy <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/06/how-obama-and-romney-differ-and-dont-on-foreign-policy/258283/>, jj

National-security and foreign-policy issues are taking a clear backseat to the economy in this year's presidential election. That's a shame, because **the candidates offer voters clear choices on issues like the size of the armed forces** and whether the U.S. should go it alone in dealing with Syria. At the same time, there is little daylight between them on the two most important national-security questions of the moment: the pace of the troop drawdown in Afghanistan and how far Washington should go to restrain Iran's nuclear ambitions. DOLLARS AND CENTS Romney and Obama have clashed over a pair of fundamental and complicated questions. First, in this era of diminished resources, what kind of role should the U.S. military play in the world? And second, can--or should--the United States continue to shoulder its long-standing duty as the world's policeman? Obama offers one set of answers to those questions. In December 2009, the president traveled to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point to announce his plan to surge 33,000 troops into Afghanistan. He promised, though, that he wouldn't keep troops there indefinitely because, simply put, the financial costs were too high. "I refuse to set goals that go beyond our responsibility, our means, or our interests," he said, noting that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan had already cost the United States $1 trillion that could have been spent at home. "We've failed to appreciate the connection between our national security and our economy.... We can't simply afford to ignore the price of these wars." **The president has since announced plans to shave $487 billion from the Pentagon's budget over the next decade, partly by cutting 100,000 ground troops and buying fewer next-generation Air Force fighters and Navy warships. The "sequester**," or across-the-board automatic budget reductions, slated to kick in at the end of the year **will slice another $500 billion from Defense Department coffers**. **Obama has made it clear that he doesn't want to see those cuts take effect, but he says he's willing to suffer the consequences rather than let Congress off the hook on a deficit-reduction deal**. **He says he would veto Republican efforts to remove the defense cuts from the sequester. Romney has a starkly different national-defense philosophy**. **He has promised to reverse what he calls Obama's "massive" defense cuts and boost the Pentagon's budget.** **The presumptive GOP nominee says he wants to add 100,000 ground troops, increase the Navy's ship-buying budget from nine to 15 vessels a year, and maintain the current fleet of carrier battle groups, the most powerful--and most expensive--weapon in the U.S. seaborne arsenal**. **The Republican also wants to purchase more F-35s, a next-generation model of amazingly advanced, but staggeringly expensive, stealth warplanes.**

**UQ**

***Voter economic perception key, not hard economic data***

**Lux 2-20-12** (Mike, Co-founder & CEO – Progressive Strategies, Huffington Post, “2012 Scenarios: What if the Economy Heads Back Downhill?” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mike-lux/obama-jobs-2012_b_1289076.html>, jj)

So if the economy starts moving in the wrong direction because of either or both of these factors, are things lost for the Obama re-election effort? They sure don't help, but the answer is no. Here's what **the Obama team needs to** focus on with these dangers in mind: 1. **Keep the focus firmly on fighting for the middle class**. **Most voters** don't blame Obama for the tough times, and they are well aware that the Republicans in Congress aren't doing anything to help, but they **will blame the president if they think he is not fighting hard for them while they are suffering through these bone-crunching times for the middle class**. **The Obama team's shift in messaging toward the Teddy Roosevelt style populism he has exhibited in the last few months is working**. I am firmly convinced that ***this message -- in contrast to the of the rich, by the rich, for the rich campaign of Mitt Romney -- is what has driven his poll numbers in the right direction, not the modestly improving economic numbers most voters don't feel yet.***

***Its not just economic performance – voter perception on economic issues swings key battleground states***

**Teixeira and Halpin, 11**

Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin, Center for American Progress, November, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/11/pdf/path_to_270_execsumm.pdf>

Obviously, much could change between now and then but **at the outset of the election campaign it is clear that two large forces will ultimately determine the outcome**: the shifting demographic balance of the American electorate, and **the objective reality *and voter perception* of the economy in key battleground states**. The central questions of the election are thus fairly straightforward. Will the rising electorate of communities of color, the Millennial generation, professionals, single women, and seculars that pushed Obama to victory in 2008 be sufficient and mobilized enough to ensure his re-election in 2012? Or will the Republican Party and its presidential nominee capitalize on a struggling economy and greater mobilization from a conservative base that holds the president in deep disdain?

***Prefer the direction of the link --- election’s too close to call***

**Spencer 9-27** Dan Spencer has been blogging at, and as, California Yankee since 2003. He lives in Connecticut and practices law in New York.

9-27-12, Washington Examiner, Romney vs. Obama still too close to call <http://www.examiner.com/article/romney-vs-obama-still-too-close-to-call>, jj

**Romney vs. Obama still too close to call Rasmussen** Reports' daily presidential tracking poll for Thursday, Sept. 27, 2012, **finds the presidential race tied at 46 percent for both Governor Romney and President Obama. If you count "leaners," it’s tied at 48 percent.** The Rasmussen tracker has had Romney and Obama tied or within a point of each other for each of the seven days since we reported that Obama's seven point lead went up in the smoke of burning U.S. flags and diplomatic missions. **Rasmussen's Electoral College projections also show a close race -- Obama: 237, Romney: 196, and nine states representing 105 electoral votes still toss-ups**. Obama has a small lead in Florida, Nevada, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin. Romney is similarly ahead in Colorado, Iowa, Missouri and New Hampshire. **This race is far from over.** Before you criticize my reliance on Rasmussen, consider the organization's record. In 2004, Rasmussen was the only firm to project totals for both President George W. Bush and Senator John Kerry within half a percentage point. In 2008, Rasmussen was again right on the money. If you don't want to take Rasmussen's word for it you can go to Wikipedia. And while we are discussing polls, get over the skewed poll issue. I have also been guilty of complaining about the over sampling of Democrats in most of the major polls. I have now gone back and looked at the 2004 campaign and discovered that in September 2004, the lefties were complaining bitterly about major polls over sampling Republicans. **Forget the polls and the main stream media's effort to convince everyone Obama has already won.**

***Could still swing***

**Enid News and Eagle 9-17**

The heated presidential election is too close to call <http://enidnews.com/opinion/x1052803813/The-heated-presidential-election-is-too-close-to-call>, jj

ENID, Okla. — **With less than two months** remaining before the election, President Barack **Obama** **and** Republican nominee Mitt **Romney are eyeing** some **pivotal swing states** to win the election. Besides Colorado and New Mexico, Oklahoma virtually is surrounded by red — or red-leaning — states in most electoral projections. We’re entering the home stretch, and **the heated presidential election is too close to call.** The presidential debate schedules have been announced: Jim Lehrer of PBS will moderate a debate on domestic issues on Oct. 3. CNN’s Candy Crowley will coordinate a town hall debate Oct. 16 at Hofstra University. Bob Schieffer of CBS News will moderate a foreign policy-focused debate on Oct. 22 at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Fla. What will voters decide? Meena Bose, a presidential scholar at Hofstra University, told Newsday the magic number of 270 electoral votes is what really matters in the election … not the popular vote. **Romney got some good news Friday when Obama announced an added travel stop to Wisconsin. That confirmed the traditionally Democratic state is in play**, according to the Wall Street Journal. All of the news isn’t as favorable for Romney, however. You can blame the “liberal media,” but even the conservative Washington Times reported on NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist College polls that show Obama leads Romney in Florida, Ohio and Virginia. (Romney’s camp dismissed the post-convention bump as a “sugar high.”) Still, **the Washington Post isn’t ready to move the bellwether state of Ohio in Obama’s direction for three reasons: the aforementioned bump, the Buckeye State’s ongoing political division and the fact Romney won’t give up on the Midwest’s electoral crown jewel.**

**2nc Link Extension**

***We control uniqueness ---- dems avoiding the renewables debate now --- the plan spotlights this issue and generates momentum***

**Kilgore ‘12**

Ed Kilgore is a contributing writer to the Washington Monthly. He is is managing editor for The Democratic Strategist, a senior fellow at the Progressive Policy Institute, and a Special Correspondent for The New Republic. 1-26-12, Washington Monthly, Beyond Solyndra, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/political-animal-a/2012_01/beyond_solyndra035024.php>, jj

Over at Grist, David Roberts has an interesting piece that argues **the Solyndra brouhaha and general defensiveness have blinded Democrats to the strong public support, across party lines, for “clean energy” and government efforts to promote it**. **Citing** both Stan **Greenberg’s focus-group findings** during the SOTU address, **and more general polling data, Roberts suggests** **this could actually become a “wedge issue” for Democrats: Americans know that clean energy is the future. They want to embrace the future**. They want to, well, win it. They certainly don’t want to fend it off for the sake of oil companies. **Americans hate oil companies!** (Almost as much as they hate congressional Republicans.) They don’t want to subsidize oil companies any more. Even Republicans support ending oil subsidies by a 2-to-1 margin. The underlying point I’d make about David’s argument is that people in politics, and especially **Democrats, have long had an unfortunate tendency to avoid whole topics that they perceive as “enemy territory” or “the other party’s issues**.” **That may be happening with Democrats on energy and the environment right now.** It’s true that some sub-issues in this area remain tough —there’s no question progressives have lost ground with the public on dealing with global climate change during the last few years, and will always have trouble with policy prescriptions that deliberately aim at raising energy prices. But while it’s always appropriate to emphasize or de-emphasize this or that issue on strategic or tactical grounds at some particular moment, **there’s something fundamentally wrong about an ideology or a political party that is unwilling to offer its own distinctive “take” on subjects the public cares about.** David’s right **there is a progressive opportunity on “clean energy” that ought to be fully exploited.** Even if he was wrong, though, it’s a terrible habit to shut down thinking and talking about major national challenges just because “the other side” seems to have an advantage.

***This is the central question of the election --- the candidate that wins the energy debate wins the race***

**Rothkopf ‘12**

David Rothkopf, Visiting Scholar, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 4-2-12, Dear Ayatollah Khamenei: Go Ahead, Shut Down That Strait <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/04/02/dear-ayatollah-khamenei-go-ahead-shut-down-that-strait/a68e>, jj

**It's fascinating how energy policy has become so central to the 2012 elections**. I spend a lot of time talking to senior people in energy companies of one sort or another, and pretty much the conventional wisdom among them has been that this would be a year when precious little got accomplished on the big energy issues. But instead, **energy has become not only a top issue in the campaign but perhaps *the central question* -- tied as it is not only to gas prices** (which are a domestic as well as a foreign-policy issue) **but also to the question of how to create the next American economic renaissance and new jobs along with it.** Already, **the list of energy issues rating politically in 2012 is longer than it has been in any recent year, from** the impact of new domestic **shale-gas** supplies and debates over **pipelines** connecting us to vast oil sands reserves in the Canadian North to the promise of **new technologies** or **offshore reserves and** the controversies over the role of **the** ***E***nvironmental ***P***rotection ***A***gency (**which has become** perhaps **the leading** non-health care **symbol of "big government**") **and Energy Department loan programs**. And of course, **there are the global implications of the energy debate, from political upheaval in the Middle East to the impact spiking oil prices might have on Europe's fragile social dynamic or that in China. Make a list of the big issues in the world and put a check next to the ones that have an important energy component. The list is long: Iran; Iraq; the Arab Spring; terrorism; the rise of China; resource competition worldwide; the focus in our pivot to Asia on keeping open sea lanes for the shipment of energy through the Indian Ocean, Straits of Malacca, and the South China Sea; the future of the Japanese economy; our concerns about instability in Africa; the rise of the BRICS and other emerging powers.** Then think for a minute about the huge impact that growing American energy independence, fueled by a dramatic increase in U.S. oil and gas production from previously inaccessible or newly discovered sources, might have on geopolitics. **Despite all this, we remain a country without a coherent** whole-of-government, whole-of-the-economy **energy policy** -- or even a responsible debate about what such a policy would look like. **The candidate who comes closest to remedying this long-lamented vacuum and who seems best able to seize our burgeoning new energy opportunities and reduce our enduring energy risks will likely win the upcoming election**. **Which one is it? For now, it's not yet clear**: While Obama emphasizes alternative energy somewhat more than his presumptive GOP challenger Mitt Romney, both have essentially adopted 2008 Republican nominee John McCain's "all of the above" approach. Obama is likely to go after Big Oil as a theme and Romney is likely to protect the oil companies in the name of keeping prices low. But **the x-factor is that until now, neither has built a compelling, specific, realistic vision for the future of our economy with a comprehensive energy policy at its core.**

***Obama losing the youth vote now --- they want stronger action on climate change***

**DiBenedetto ‘12**

Bill DiBenedetto, 5-2-12, Triple Pundit, Obama: Focus on Climate Change to Bolster the Economy <http://www.triplepundit.com/2012/05/obama-focus-climate-change-bolster-economy/>, jj

From Jimmy Kimmel Live to Jon Stewart to Rolling Stone, President **Obama’s re-election campaign is gearing up with a strong emphasis on youth and particularly the left-leaning, activist youth vote. Tapping into the same coalition that was instrumental in securing his victory in 2008 is a crucial part of the plan for 2012**. **It might be a harder sell this time around because of a fragile economic recovery, stubbornly high unemployment — especially for grads and younger workers trying to enter the workforce — and a well-financed opponent in Mitt Romney who will say just about anything true or not, including blaming the president for** the **economic disasters** wrought by the Bush Administration, Wall Street and an obstructionist Republican Party dedicated blocking Obama’s every move. **Obama has** also **received mixed reviews on his approach to climate change, basically because he is a left-of-center politician and not the highly progressive one that many dreamed they were electing in 2008.**

***Youth vote is on the fence now --- absent new leadership on clean energy they’ll stay home or devote resources to congressional races***

**Hill ‘11**

Ben Geman - 08/20/11, The Hill, Obama faces big green tests in 2012 <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/177607-obama-faces-big-green-tests-heading-into-2012>, jj

“**He still has the opportunity to regain some footing with young people**,” said Hight, the Obama campaign’s Florida youth vote director in 2008. “By all means, **everybody is hungry for leadership**.” According to the Pew Research Center, **Obama** scored a whopping 66 percent of the vote among voters under 30 in 2008. Next year, he **needs young voters to turn out in large numbers again in what is expected to be a tighter election.** Polls show other issues – notably the economy – are a bigger priority than the environment, but **the president** still **can’t afford widespread political disenchantment in the green movement that could suppress turnout.** “**The risk he has in turnout is environmental issues tend to play the strongest among voters under 30**,” said political analyst Ron Faucheux, who is president of the Clarus Research Group and teaches at George Washington University. **While environmentalists won’t throw their weight behind a GOP White House hopeful, Obama’s choices could affect the work of green groups with political field organizations**, notably the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters (LCV). Navin Nayak, LCV’s senior vice president for campaigns, pointed to Obama’s decision to significantly boost auto mileage requirements, and create first-time efficiency standards for heavy trucks, in arguing that Obama’s standing with environmentalists remains generally good. But Nayak also took a shot across Obama’s bow: he notes that **the White House can’t “coast” given the “magnitude of decisions they have in front of them.”** “**We are certainly going to be watching closely how these decisions play out in terms of our resources and investment in the presidential race,” said Nayak, whose group is also active in congressional races. “It is all a matter of prioritizing resources.”**

***Even if the link is small --- Obama’s margin for error is smaller***

**TNF ‘12**

1-3, The New Fuelist, Obama’s tall environmental task in 2012 <http://www.newfuelist.com/blog/obama-coal-regulations-keystone-pipeline>, jj

In case you can’t see it, **that’s a treacherous tightrope Barack Obama is walking on these days whenever he steps into the circus-like national energy and environmental policy debate**. **And his margin for political error on environmental issues will shrink even more during this election year**. **To avoid alienating environmentalists who supported him in 2008, he must not forget to occasionally—and substantially—lean to the left.** But if he wants to hold on to coveted independent voters who are more worried about the slumping economy than they are about pollution, he must also periodically shift back to the middle and right.The proposed Keystone XL pipeline embodies the President’s conundrum. From the right, calls for increased “energy security” and for the creation of (a disputed number) of pipeline-related jobs make it hard for him to say no. On the left, a large and organized anti-pipeline contingent has taken pains to turn the decision on the pipeline—which will carry crude made from Canadian oil sands, the extraction and production of which makes the fuel much more greenhouse gas-intense than conventional oil—into a political make-or-break for Obama on climate change. The administration spent 2011 establishing what it must view as a politically necessary middle ground on the environment. It engineered a drastic ratcheting up of fuel efficiency standards for automakers, and sold it as a way to both reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the burden on the consumer. It also introduced landmark regulations on air pollution from power plants, while placating utilities—and outraging many supporters—by delaying the EPA’s proposed tightening of the nation’s standards for smog. And it earned at least temporary relief from pressure to decide on the Keystone XL by punting the issue past the election, to 2013. But **it’s going to be tougher to maintain balance on the tightrope this year**. Congressional Republicans, by demanding a much-earlier Obama decision on the Keystone XL in exchange for their support of the recent payroll tax extension, have hinted at their party’s desire to force the President’s hand on environmental issues. **The GOP’s presidential nominee will undoubtedly attempt to paint Obama as an over-regulator and irrational environmentalist—an attack line which will warrant a defense**. **And therein lies Obama’s tall task:** to defend his administration’s substantial forays into environmental regulation in terms that resonate with independents whose main concern is the economy—all while simultaneously **ensuring that his frustrated environmentalist supporters don’t completely lose their patience.**

**Blame**

***Obama will get the blame***

**Nicholas and Hook 10**(Peter and Janet, Tribune Washington Bureau, July 30, "Obama the Velcro president", http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730)jn

Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC’s “The View,” drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. “Stylistically, he creates some of those problems,” Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. “His favorite pronoun is ‘I.’ When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn’t get fixed or things happen.” A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable – such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Il.) said: “The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It’s naïve to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office.”

***The President is a lighting rod***

**Connor** 7-31-**11** (Richard. CEO of MaineToday Media. Kennebec Journal 7-31-11 ([Captain of the shipneeds to take wheel](http://www.kjonline.com/opinion/captain-of-the-shipneeds-to-take-wheel_2011-07-30.html). http://www.kjonline.com/opinion/captain-of-the-shipneeds-to-take-wheel\_2011-07-30.html)

Our government, with its checks and balances and need for consensus makes for difficult navigation, even if you are captain of the ship.One of the interesting questions to ponder is assessing how much power [a president](http://www.kjonline.com/opinion/captain-of-the-shipneeds-to-take-wheel_2011-07-30.html) really has to resolve critical issues. The rest of us have the luxury of being out of the line of fire while this country's leaders face the threat that we will soon be out of money and unable to pay our bills. President Harry Truman said "the buck stops here" -- at the president's desk -- and he was right. Perhaps it's too simplistic to view the presidency this way, but the person in the Oval Office is the ultimate decision-maker for the government of our country. He takes the lion's share of the blame or the credit for events that unfold during his administration.

**2nc Link Wall – Market Perception**

***Oil futures are overshot by speculation – lowering demand would set off a price collapse***

Alexei **Bayer** 7-26-20**12**; Alexei Bayer is head of KAFAN FX Information Services. His monthly “Global Economy” column in Research has received an excellence award from the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants for the past six years, 2004-2009 “Pop That Bubble Policies should aim at pushing oil prices down” http://www.advisorone.com/2012/07/26/pop-that-bubble?page=3

A Soft Market **Demand for oil**, then, **is softening** because the global economy is weakening and consumers are reducing their oil use on a more lasting basis, **even as greater supply is coming on line, from** projects begun before 2008 and from **producers eager to protect their market shares. Oil prices are set by futures markets and *therefore fluctuate with traders’ psychology, speculation and liquidity.* That means oil prices tend to overshoot**. **Just as they rocketed prior to 2008 and again in early 2012, driven by rising demand as well as various political concerns and fears, so a softening demand could push oil even below its long-term inflation-adjusted equilibrium price range of around $20-40 per barrel.**

**2NC/1NR**

***Group the Saudi debate – decreased dependency collapses the Monarchy – extend Lippman – it depends on US oil revenue – the impact is global wars – stability is key to Middle East Peace***

***Goes nuclear***

**Jain 11**—August, Ash, visiting fellow at the Washington Institute, JD and Masters from Georgetown SFS, formber member of the State Department’s Policy Planning Staff, "Nuclear Weapons and Iran’s Global Ambitions", The Washington Institute, <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PolicyFocus114.pdf-http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PolicyFocus114.pdf>

■■ **Increased risk of violence and military conflict. As it looks for** plausibly deniable **ways to intimidate and subvert Gulf monarchies, an emboldened Iran could decide to direct terrorist attacks** in the Gulf, possibly even **targeting U.S. interests**. Moreover, **Gulf efforts to contain and deter Iran could escalate tensions in the region and increase the risk of violence and conflict. A military confrontation between Iran and the Gulf states**—both potentially **armed with nuclear weapons—could have drastic consequences**. While crisis diplomacy might succeed in containing its impact, **any such confrontation could seriously undermine regional security, disrupt global energy supplies, and threaten global economic and financial stability**. **U.S. military intervention might also be necessary** at some point—**though this could be complicated in the face of a nuclear Iran**.

***Mid East war outweighs --- most likely and fastest impact***

**Russell, ‘09** [James, senior lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Nava Postgraduate School, Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prosepects for Nuclear War and Escalation in the Middle East, in collaboration with the Atomic Energy Commission, <http://www.nps.edu/academics/sigs/ccc/people/biolinks/russell/PP26_Russell_2009.pdf>]

**Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors:** (1) **asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors**; (2) **the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists;** (3) **incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable**; (4) **perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack**; (5) the prospect that **Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States;** (6) **the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any (of) the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance.** Given these factors, **it is** disturbingly easy **to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways**. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent **such an outcome**, which **would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.**

**Squo solves**

***Diesel solves and is commonly used***

**Kwartin et. al 12** (Vice president of ICF International, consulting firm that partners with government and commercial clients to deliver professional services and technology solutions in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets, Robert Kwartin, Sarah Alexander, Martin Anderson, Donald Clark, John Collins, Chris Lamson, Garrett Martin, Ryan Mayfield, Lindsay McAlpine, Daniel Moreno, Jeffrey Patterson, Craig Schultz, and Emily Stiever, "Solar Energy Development on Department of Defense Installations in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts", January, Pdf)

While a solar plant can provide an important energy security contribution to a military installation, **alternatives such as diesel generators are in common use** and should be considered in designing an optimum system. **Traditional engine-generator sets can provide energy security in most scenarios, even taking into account the need to store large quantities of fuel**. **A hybrid system allows development of a more robust solution and, depending on the mission requirements a more cost effective solution.**

***DOD mandates already lock in a baseline level of solar generation***

S.B. **Van Broekhoven et al 12**, Technical Staff at MIT Lincoln Laboratory, 6/18/12, "Microgrid Study: Energy Security for DoD Installations," MIT Lincoln Laboratory Technical Report ~%231164

As will be discussed in Section 4.3.2, **the DoD is operating under a number of renewable energy mandates**. In order to meet these goals, **the military has started looking at the significant deployment of renewable generation, particularly solar PV on select installations.** Currently all of the renewable generation systems on an installation must be disabled when that installation loses grid power. **There are**, however, **several installations that are in the process of implementing islandable, renewable generation systems**, including Ft. Bliss, Twentynine Palms, and the SPIDERS microgrids at Ft. Carson and JBPHH. **Through this ongoing research, a better understanding of the cost-effectiveness of integrating renewable generation onto installation microgrids will be achieved**. The integration of high penetrations of renewable generation onto an installation microgrid will require a higher degree of sophistication, including advanced controls and energy storage systems. It is possible, however, that **much of the additional cost of these more advanced systems can be offset by participating in the ancillary services market, thereby using these technologies for financial benefit during grid-tied operation**. A project starting at Air Force Base Los Angeles in FY12 will be the first demonstration of assets on a DoD installation participating in the ancillary services market. This project is not planned to be a microgrid demonstration, and instead focuses on the integration of plug-in electric vehicles on DoD installations.

***Military adoption of greentech solves the impact***

**Hargreaves 11** (Steve, CNN Money, "For the military clean energy saves lives", 8/17, <http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/17/technology/military_energy/index.htm>)

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- **One out of eight U.S. Army casualties in Iraq was the result of protecting fuel convoys**. **This statistic**, derived from an Army study looking at fuel convoys in Iraq from 2003 to 2007, **is a powerful incentive for the military to move away from oil and toward renewable energy, and *that's exactly what it's doing***. **From experimental solar-powered desert bases for the Marines to Navy robots that run on wave energy, the military is quickly becoming a leading buyer of cutting-edge renewable energy technology**. For the armed services, the benefits extend beyond reducing fuel convoy casualties. A fighting force that isn't restricted by the reach of a tanker truck or weighted down by heavy batteries is more nimble and, as a result, more lethal. **For renewable energy companies, the military is proving to be a vital customer, buying the latest in clean energy gadgets and encouraging private investment**. **The hope is the armed services can shepherd this technology to the point where it becomes commercially viable, much like it did a generation ago for GPS systems or the Internet.**

***All branches of the military diversifying energy sources now***

**King 11** (Marcus King, Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team at Center for Naval Analyses, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>)

Finally, **the military departments are developing detailed strategic energy plans to meet the goals established** by Presidential and DoD orders [16].

• **The Navy has set a goal of meeting 40 percent of its energy needs for operations and shore installations, with alternative sources by 2020** [32].

• **The Army is incorporating sustainability into planning, training, equipping, and operations, and it has established a goal to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 30 percent by 2025** [33].

• **The Air Force** is the largest consumer of energy in DoD. Like other services, it **has made investments in sustainable energy**. **At the end of 2007, the Air Force was the number one purchaser of renewable energy in the federal government and number three in the United States**. **The Air Force continues to invest in renewable energy sources, including geothermal, wind, biomass, and solar power** [34].

**2NC / 1NR Heg Backline - Ext #1-2 – Military Not Dependent**

***Military is increasing fuel efficiency***

ELISABETH **ROSENTHAL**, NYT, October 4th **2010**, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/05/science/earth/05fossil.html?adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1306084754-flJ2Mg6ul2Po4LpzlLT1kw&pagewanted=1 (BJN)

**While setting national energy policy requires Congressional debates, military leaders can simply order the adoption of renewable energy**. And **the military has the buying power to create products and markets**. That, in turn, may make renewable energy more practical and affordable for everyday uses, experts say. Last year, **the Navy introduced its first hybrid vessel**, a Wasp class amphibious assault ship called the U.S.S. Makin Island, which at speeds under 10 knots runs on electricity rather than on fossil fuel, **a shift resulting in greater efficiency that saved 900,000 gallons of fuel on its maiden voyage** from Mississippi to San Diego, compared with a conventional ship its size, the Navy said. **The Air Force will have its entire fleet certified to fly on biofuels by 2011** and has already flown test flights using a 50-50 mix of plant-based biofuel and jet fuel; **the Navy took its first delivery of fuel made from algae this summer.** **Biofuels can in theory be produced wherever the raw materials, like plants, are available, and could ultimately be made near battlefields.**

**2NC / 1NR Heg Backline - Ext #3 – Military insulated**

***Here’s more evidence – the Pentagon is insulated and if prices did get too high Congress would pass supplemental spending***

Nathan **Hodge**, WSJ, December 30th **2010**, http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2010/12/30/pentagon-keeps-eye-on-oil-prices/ (BJN)

In a statement, **Pentagon spokeswoman** Cheryl **Irwin said current prices “will not affect current operations or internal fuel prices, because the department’s working capital fund can absorb some effects of price fluctuations**.” But, Ms. Irwin added, “further market increases could become problematic.” Here’s how it could potentially be an issue: **The Pentagon forecasts fuel prices one year in advance, based on data provided by the Office of Management and Budget**. **The department then fixes a standard composite fuel price for the fiscal year based on those projections**. **The price is supposed to insulate military operations from normal market price fluctuations. If prices surge unexpectedly**, however, it could cut into operations and maintenance accounts – meaning **the Pentagon might have to ask Congress for more money.** **That kind of price squeeze happened in 2008; and in fiscal year 2010, the Pentagon sought some supplemental funding to cover higher than anticipated fuel costs**. Thus far, however, the military has been spared any impact from the current price increase. “So far **this year, the military units are shielded from the effects of minor pricing fluctuation,” said Ms. Irwin.**

## 1nr

***Limits are a voting issue – the alternative is vague generics which decimate the depth of education – key to participation***

**Rowland, 84** (Robert C., Debate Coach – Baylor University, “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective, Ed. Parson, p. 53-54)

**The first major problem i**dentified by the work group as relating to topic selection **is the decline in participation** in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. **Programs** which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, **are diminishing in scope and size**.4 **This decline in policy debate is tied**, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. **The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath**. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal **debate topics have not always been so broad**. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 **The move from narrow to broad topics has had**, according to some**, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate**. First, **the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate**. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that **broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience**. **They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”**7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, **the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost**: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that **broad topics** also **discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate**. Here, **the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity**.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 **The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens**. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, **it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.**

***Depth of education – a smaller narrow topic is a precursor to substantive education – studies prove that outweighs***

**WP, 09** [Washington Post, “Will Depth Replace Breadth in Schools?” <http://voices.washingtonpost.com/class-struggle/2009/02/will_depth_replace_breadth_in.html>]

The truth, of course, is that students need both. Teachers try to mix the two in ways that make sense to them and their students. But **a surprising study** — certain to be a hot topic in teacher lounges and education schools — **is providing new data that suggest educators should spend much more time on a few issues and let some topics slide**. **Based on a sample of 8,310 undergraduates, the national study says that students who spend at least a month on just one topic** in a high school science course **get better grades in a freshman college course in that subject than students whose high school courses were more balanced**. The study, appearing in the July issue of the journal Science Education, is “Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Science Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework.” The authors are Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington, Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and Robert H. Tai of the University of Virginia. This is more rich ore from a goldmine of a survey Sadler and Tai helped organize called “Factors Influencing College Science Success.” **It involved 18,000 undergraduates, plus their professors, in 67 colleges in 31 states.** The study weighs in on one side of a contentious issue that will be getting national attention this September when the College Board’s Advanced Placement program unveils its major overhaul of its college-level science exams for high school students. AP is following a direction taken by its smaller counterpart, the International Baccalaureate program. IB teachers already are allowed to focus on topics of their choice. Their students can deal with just a few topics on exams, because they have a wide choice of questions. AP’s exact approach is not clear yet, but College Board officials said they too will embrace depth. They have been getting much praise for this from the National Science Foundation, which funded the new study. Sadler and Tai have previously hinted at where this was going. In 2001 they reported that students who did not use a textbook in high school physics—an indication that their teachers disdained hitting every topic — achieved higher college grades than those who used a textbook. Some educators, pundits, parents and students will object, I suspect, to sidelining their favorite subjects and spending more time on what they consider trivial or dangerous topics. Some will fret over the possibility that teachers might abandon breadth altogether and wallow in their specialties. Even non-science courses could be affected. Imagine a U.S. history course that is nothing but lives of generals, or a required English course that assigns only Jane Austen. “Depth Versus Breadth” analyzes undergraduate answers to detailed questions about their high school study of physics, chemistry and biology, and the grades they received in freshman college science courses. **The college grades of students who had studied at least one topic for at least a month** in a high school science course **were compared to those of students who did not experience such depth**. The study acknowledges that the pro-breadth forces have been in retreat. **Several national commissions have called for more depth in science teaching and other subjects**. A 2005 study of 46 countries found that **those whose schools had the best science test scores covered far fewer topics than U.S. schools.**

***Net zero is not only about energy production – also increase water and waste issues***

**Censer, 3/4/2012** (Marjorie, Washington Post: “Army seeking ‘net zero’ energy use at bases,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/capitalbusiness/army-seeking-net-zero-energy-use-at-bases/2012/02/22/gIQAPusrqR_story.html>, ts)

At the same time, contractors are also bracing for a related contract vehicle expected to be worth up to $1.5 billion. **That program would address** sustainable **energy, water and waste issues** at Fort Bliss, Tex., said Thomas, and a solicitation is expected later this month or next month. Nearly 100 Deltek users have marked it of interest. **Contracts related to water sustainability might address conservation or desalinization, while those related to waste might focus on repurposing waste or new recycling options**. And Thomas said Deltek is expecting additional contract vehicles related to the Army’s net zero efforts. **The service has said it will seek to achieve net zero as it relates to water, energy and waste** at at least six bases for each, and will look at all three at both Fort Bliss as well as Fort Carson, Colo.

***NetZero includes biomass, geothermal, waste to energy, hydrokinetic and ocean energy, and fuel cells***

**Kaften 9/25/12** (Cheryl, PV Magazine: “US military to spend $1.8 billion on clean energy by 2025, with 'net zero' results,” <http://www.pv-magazine.com/news/details/beitrag/us-military-to-spend-18-billion-on-clean-energy-by-2025--with-net-zero-results_100008596/#ixzz27s16Un5F>, ts)

The report, "Renewable Energy for Military Applications," examines the current status and future direction of renewable energy technology at military bases and other DOD facilities. It also analyzes major military renewable energy programs by technology, including solar, wind, biomass, geothermal, waste-to-energy, hydrokinetic and ocean energy, and fuel cells. Profiles of major defense contractors and other providers of renewable energy technology to the DOD are included as well.

***This is infinitely regressive—***

There is no bright line for determining what is and isn’t “reasonable.” The **combination** of all “reasonable” interpretations would saddle the neg with a massive research burden. The term “reasonable” is **vague** and **arbitrary**.

**Stone 1923**—Justice in the Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit [Sussex Land & Live Stock Co. v. Midwest Refining Co., 294 F. 597; 1923 U.S. App. LEXIS 2531; 34 A.L.R. 249, No. 6192; No. 6193, Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, December 5, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis]

Where the use of land affects others, the use must be "reasonable" to escape liability for resultant damage to others. **What is "reasonable" depends upon a variety of considerations and circumstances. It is an elastic term which is of uncertain value in a definition. It has been well said that "reasonable," means with regard to all the interest affected, his own and his neighbor's and also having in view public policy**. But, elastic as this rule is, both reason and authority have declared certain limitations beyond which it cannot extend. One of these limitations is that it is "unreasonable" and unlawful for one owner to physically invade the land of another owner. There can be no damnum absque injuria where there is such a trespass.
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**1nc**

***A. Incentives are negotiated offers linked to a particular outcome – they are distinct from policies that motivate behavioral change***

**Grant, 02** - professor of political science at Duke University (Ruth, “THE ETHICS OF INCENTIVES: HISTORICAL ORIGINS AND CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDINGS,” Economics and Philosophy, 18 (2002) 111, proquest)

**We** are now in a position to **identify** **a *core understanding*** or a distinctive meaning of the concept **of incentives;** what we might call incentives `strictly speaking'. **Incentives are employed in a particular *form of negotiation*. An offer is made which is an extrinsic benefit** or a bonus, **neither the** natural or **automatic consequence of an action nor a deserved reward** or compensation. The offer is usually made in the context of an authority relationship - for example, adult/child, employer/employee, government/citizen or government/organization. **The offer is a discrete prompt expected to *elicit a particular response***. Finally and most importantly, **the offer is intentionally designed to alter the status quo by motivating a person to choose differently than he or she would in its absence**. If the desired action would result naturally or automatically, no incentive would be necessary. **An incentive is the added element *without which the desired action would not occur*.** For this reason, it makes sense to speak of `institutional incentives' when referring to arrangements designed to encourage certain sorts of responses. `Perverse incentives' is also an expression that implies that incentives are meant to direct people's behavior in particular ways. Central to the core meaning of incentives is that they are an instrument of government in the most general sense. The emergence of the term historically within discourses of social control is illustrative of this point.

***B. Violation – contextual ev proves loan guarantees aren’t incentives***

**Kubert and Sinclair, 11 -** Clean Energy States Alliance – paper produced for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (Charles and Mark, “State Support for Clean Energy Deployment: Lessons Learned for Potential Future Policy” April, http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/49340.pdf) EE/RE = Energy Efficiency/Renewable Energy

**Align Tools with Program Goals**: If the primary goal is to maximize GHG emission reductions per dollar invested, then **credit enhancement tools (e.g., loan guarantees and interest rate buydowns) could be more effective than direct incentives because of the manner in which they leverage private capital markets.** If the goal is to maximize near-term energy savings, then broad EE incentives could be preferable to RE support. Note that programs can have multiple goals and that optimizing design for certain goals can subordinate others, so program design will need to reflect overall priorities.

***C. This is a voting issue –***

***1. Limits – if they don’t have to tie the plan directly to energy production, it explodes the topic to include anything in the world that affects energy consumption***

***2. Negative ground – their interpretation means they don’t have to defend an increase in production --- nullifying core DA’s like oil prices and tradeoff***

**CP**

***Text: Text: the United States federal government should offer to host the Gulf Cooperation Council’s multinational consortium to provide enriched uranium to states looking to build their own nuclear power program.***

***Only an international fuel bank solves virtual proliferation – Countries will say yes***

Harold **Feiveson**, Senior Research Policy Analyst, Program on Science and Global Security, “Can Future Nuclear Power Be Made Proliferation Resistant?”, Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, July 20**08**, http://www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/files/future\_nuclear\_power.pdf

It is treacherous to imagine the institutional framework that would be relevant in fifty to one hundred years. But as an initial cut, **let us consider** three sorts of situations: • a world where there has been a significant proliferation of nuclear weapons, to say 20 to 30 states, and where there no longer is an effective Nonproliferation Treaty constraining other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons; • a world where there has been substantial nuclear disarmament, with most or all of the nuclear weapons under the authority of an international agency, possibly under the UN Security Council; • **a world more or less like the present, in which a few countries still have nuclear weapons** **and where most of the non-nuclear countries do not aspire to acquire them.** In the first case, the spread of nuclear power would have significance mainly if it led to proliferation to countries that the international community considered unfit to manage nuclear power or unfit to manage nuclear weapons. For countries such as those, states or combinations of states might try to prevent the proliferation of nuclear technology on an ad-hoc basis. In this situation, the dangers associated with nuclear power would flow from the great difficulty of assuring that nuclear power programs remain safe, and that terrorist groups are not able to get fissile material. Since some of the countries with nuclear weapons and nuclear power program could have shoddy safety and security systems, and could conceivably have ties to terrorist groups, these dangers would be evident. It is difficult to see how nuclear power could prosper in this kind of world and could be adequately safeguarded. The second case would provide the best basis for a flourishing of nuclear power. Without question, if we wished to construct a future most compatible with a robust expansion of nuclear power worldwide, it would be one marked by very substantial nuclear disarmament. In such a world, the incentives for a few rogue countries to acquire nuclear weapons would be lessened, as would the myriad of discriminatory features that now dominate non-proliferation institutions. International authorities could oversee the safety and security of nuclear facilities, and, as explained further below, any move by a country to acquire nuclear material for weapons would be confronted by strong international measures to secure compliance with international agreements. **The** third **case is probably the most likely**, and in any event the one requiring the most analysis. Much of what is discussed below would be relevant to the second case as well. Even if we focus only on the third case, a large range of alternative futures is still possible, and there is great difficulty in latching on to any one of these. Nevertheless, it is necessary to start somewhere. And so we assume the following as a first order approximation: • That **the world will not be free of nuclear weapons,** and that something like the fundamental structure of the current nonproliferation regime as defined by **the NonProliferation Treaty** (NPT), **will remain in place**. In other words, **there will remain two classes of states—declared nuclear weapon states** allowed to keep nuclear weapon **and non-nuclear weapon states that have forsworn them**. The declared nuclear weapon states under the NPT are the U.S., Russia, China, France, and the UK. India, Pakistan, and Israel also have nuclear weapons and stand outside the treaty. North Korea also at present has nuclear weapons, but may be in the process of giving them up and rejoining the NPT. The nuclear states may be different and possibly more numerous in fifty years – but let’s assume that the number of nuclear states will stay limited to on the order of ten say, and more important that most countries will not be seeking a nuclear weapons capability. • That **all, or almost all, civilian nuclear facilities will be under international safeguards, such as those now implemented by the International Atomic Energy Agency** (IAEA). **Such safeguards will include inspections at declared nuclear facilities and the universal implementation** of the so-called Additional Protocol, which authorizes the IAEA to look for undeclared, clandestine nuclear facilities. Given the flows of material in a robust nuclear future, we would add the following stipulations for an international institutional framework necessary (though not necessarily sufficient) to safeguard nuclear energy. • **The nuclear power system is non-discriminatory. Any reactor or fuel cycle facility allowed in any country must be allowed in all**. **• All enrichment and reprocessing will be under international authority; and that an international authority will guarantee fuel supply to all reactors**. At present, the NPT is supplemented by agreements among suppliers not to export certain specified materials or technologies to non-nuclear countries, and to ensure that whatever nuclear material or equipment that is exported is under safeguards. This is a discriminatory arrangement and is not likely to be sustainable. • All uranium mining and milling and possibly also all spent fuel will also be under international authority. • Countries will not be able to withdraw from the NPT (or its functional follow-on), at least in the sense that they could withdraw and appropriate fissile material and facilities that they enjoyed while in the treaty; and that there will be clear provisions for enforcing compliance with all nuclear undertakings. • **Physical security standards for all nuclear facilities will be set and imposed by international authority**. This is essential since a lapse of security anywhere will endanger every country. • No research reactors will use nuclear-explosive materials. At present, many research reactors and some reactors producing medical isotopes are using highly enriched uranium (HEU) as fuel. But scores of reactors once running on HEU have already been converted to low enriched uranium, and it seems straightforward for the international community to work toward agreements that no reactors use HEU. We elaborate briefly on the first two points. The issues here that most need clarification are: the character and scope of an international authority; the reasons for insistence on non-discrimination; and the emphasis on enforcement and compliance**. In this context, there has been renewed interest in restricting national access to enrichment and reprocessing via multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle**. At present all enrichment and reprocessing are located in “safe” states — either countries that are already nuclear weapon states or industrialized countries that have forsworn nuclear weapons. While much of the envisioned expansion of nuclear power to midcentury would probably occur in states that already have reactors, some of the new growth and sustained growth after that would necessarily involve states that do not now have such facilities. **It is conceivable that these states would be willing to rely upon existing market mechanisms supplemented by additional assurances of fresh fuel supply on favorable terms and** (especially) **by the willingness of other countries to accept spent fuel– that is, to rely on fuel cycle services done elsewhere**. To the extent that this strategy is viewed by non-nuclear weapons states as adding an additional layer of discrimination to that inherent in the NPT’s division of the world into weapons and non-weapons states, though, it will certainly encounter significant opposition despite its practical advantages. Considerable skepticism already exists about the commitment of the NPT weapons states to fulfill their commitments under the NPT, and a discriminatory market-oriented strategy to make the world safe for nuclear power could be viewed as another attempt by the nuclear weapon states and their friends to maintain a nuclear status quo that largely favors the existing weapons states, their closest allies, and their nuclear industries. The prospect that non-nuclear weapon states will willingly forgo a right that is inherent in Article IV while nuclear weapon states continue to retain, and in some cases enhance their arsenals with weapons seen to be developed for use rather than deterrence, is remote. **The only way to persuade non-nuclear weapon states to accept tighter restrictions on their peaceful nuclear programs is through some kind of multilateralization of the fuel cycle** — **an arrangement that somehow levels the playing field with respect to tightening controls over the nuclear fuel cycle, but does so in a way that is non-discriminatory, placing the same obligations and constraints on all parties while assuring all of equitable and timely access to required nuclear fuel for a civil nuclear program**. If the objective is to have states give up a right in a treaty, the result should not be further distinction between classes of states and discrimination, but rather the opposite. For this reason, we think that **the only way that nuclear power can achieve the level of political acceptability needed to permit its expansion on a significant scale for the long-term is to implement a non-discriminatory institutional framework involving multilateral ownership and operation of all enrichment, reprocessing,** a**nd possibly other fuel cycle facilities, especially for spent fuel or high-level disposal.** The way to get this strategy off the ground is for the nuclear weapon states, especially the U.S., to commit to implementing a non-discriminatory, multilateral framework for nuclear power. 19 No doubt, many in the U.S. and elsewhere in the nuclear industry take it for granted that a future nuclear system will in fact be discriminatory. For example, in a recent overview of the long-term future of nuclear power emanating from the U.S. Department of Energy, one of the authors of GNEP, Victor Reiss, notes that “the level of engagement [with nuclear power] must be dependent upon the relative national trustworthiness” of countries. Thus he envisions South Korea with a full fuel cycle and full control of the fuel cycle, Iran with reactors only and leasing fuel made elsewhere, North Korea limited to leasing and nuclear batteries, and Sudan with no nuclear power at all. 20 This understanding that certain technologies will be out of bounds for some countries, but not others is a widely shared assumption in the U.S. As already remarked, this paper assumes that the nuclear weapon regime will remain discriminatory, at least for the foreseeable future. But we believe that hoping to add another dimension involving nuclear power to this discrimination is illusory. **In a future nuclear system, technical barriers alone cannot prevent countries from obtaining nuclear-explosive materials and eventually nuclear weapons**. 21 **Therefore, the critical safeguard to country proliferation will be the certainty of enforcement and the likelihood of enforcement will depend upon the strength of international consensus in support of the regime.** If many countries view a nuclear power regime as discriminatory and illegitimate, it is difficult to imagine a sufficient consensus on enforcement being achieved. Still more telling, **even if one adopted the thinking of those who do not wish to trust advanced and sensitive nuclear technologies to certain countries, one must realize that countries that might at one point be considered “safe” may not be considered safe at later times**. **Since ready access to fissile materials could for some countries constitute a real threat, we should not allow national control over sensitive nuclear facilities.** At various times in the past, the IAEA considered regional and other alternatives to national control of sensitive nuclear facilities. For example, in the 1970s, the IAEA endorsed the idea of regional nuclear fuel cycle centers, primarily with reprocessing in mind. This concept soon faded in the wake of a slowdown in the growth of nuclear power, a sharp drop in uranium prices, and the emergence of strong U.S. resistance to reprocessing the plutonium recycling. Similarly, in the late 1970s, countries considered for a time the idea of an International Plutonium Storage, a concept that also fell out of favor. The idea of the IPS is based on Article XII.A.5 of the IAEA statute that specifies circumstances in which the Agency can require that excess special fissionable materials from peaceful uses be deposited with the Agency to prevent stockpiling by states. In addition to the the same kinds of arguments that worked against the regional nuclear fuel cycle centers, the IPS foundered on the inability of countries to define the exact conditions under which contributing countries could withdraw fissionable material deposited with the Agency. 22 Regional and **multinational arrangements appear achievable and would represent a significant improvement over a multiplicity of national enrichment and reprocessing facilities, offering economies of scale and reduced risk of proliferation**. In the longer term, to achieve a nuclear power system that is seen as truly non-discriminatory and even more supportive of nonproliferation, the establishment of an international authority to oversee and manage all sensitive nuclear fuel cycle facilities for all countries would be preferable. The initial attempt to sketch a framework for safeguarding nuclear power, the Acheson-Lilienthal Report, included these activities among the “dangerous” activities that an international authority would have to control. The Report also included uranium mining and milling as dangerous activities. Although the extent of uranium deposits are far wider spread than the authors of the Acheson-Lilienthal Report imagined, we believe it worth considering including these under the activities controlled by an international authority. We also would include spent fuel as part of the auspices of an international authority. See Appendix B for an overview assessment of several regional and international arrangements that have been suggested. We do not here analyze the details of how an international authority would operate – how exactly it would control or manage enrichment, reprocessing, uranium mining, and spent fuel. Researchers have recently forwarded some ideas ranging from reliance on existing market mechanisms supplemented by additional assurances of fresh fuel supply and spent fuel return provided by governments and the IAEA, to coownership and operation of both existing and new fuel cycle facilities. 23 Whatever the institutional arrangements, **civilian nuclear power will provide a country the basis eventually for a dedicated weapons program – by allowing a country to train scientists and engineers, to build research facilities, and to learn techniques of reprocessing and enrichment that could later be turned to weapons uses. A civilian program could, in this manner, impel a country along a path of “latent proliferation,” in which the country moves closer to nuclear weapons without having to make an explicit decision actually to take the final step to weapons, or at least to make transparent its intention to take such a step**. **Latent proliferation is particularly germane to consideration of the spread of civilian nuclear power to countries that do not now have any, and which, therefore, would not today have a ready infrastructure to support a dedicated route to nuclear weapons.** In our view, this situation cannot be helped. **Civilian nuclear power will always present some degree of latent proliferation**. For many countries today, this does not represent a serious concern, since the countries can always undertake a dedicated route to nuclear weapons, with no need to rely upon the civilian fuel cycle. **In the future, with many new countries entering into nuclear power, we cannot so easily wave away the latent proliferation inherent in nuclear power programs**. But, as we have also emphasized, **in a world where most countries simply do not want nuclear weapons and where nuclear power is not constructed on a discriminatory basis, a complex of safeguards, international control of key fuel cycle elements, and well accepted compliance provisions could provide a reasonable degree of proliferation resistance.**

***And, revival of US nuclear leadership causes prolif of civilian nuclear tech --- spurs arms race***

**Fuhrmann, ’9**

~[Matthew, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, Summer, "Spreading Temptation: Proliferation and Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation," International Security Vol. 34, No. 1. MIT Press Journals~]

**This article examines the relationship between peaceful nuclear cooperation and nuclear weapons proliferation**. Specifically, it explores whether **countries receiving civilian nuclear aid over time are more likely to initiate weapons programs and build the bomb**. The conventional wisdom is that civilian nuclear cooperation does not lead to proliferation. Most scholars argue that nuclear weapons spread when states have a demand for the bomb—not when they have the technical capacity to proliferate.4 Those who recognize the im-portance of the supply side of proliferation argue that certain types of nuclear assistance enable countries to build nuclear weapons but that others are innocuous or even positive from a nonproliferation standpoint. Nuclear suppliers, for instance, generally restrict the sale of uranium enrichment or plutonium reprocessing facilities because these can be used directly to produce fissile material for a bomb, but suppliers routinely build research or power reactors in other countries and train foreign scientists.5 A recent study finds that countries receiving enrichment and reprocessing facilities, bomb designs, or significant quantities of weapons-grade fissile material are more likely to acquire the bomb.6 The implication of this research is that other forms of atomic assistance do not lead to the spread of nuclear weapons. **This article argues that the conventional wisdom is wrong—and dangerous. All types of civilian nuclear assistance raise the risks of proliferation. Peaceful nuclear cooperation and proliferation are causally connected because of the dual-use nature of nuclear technology and know-how**.7 **Civilian cooperation provides technology and materials necessary for a nuclear weapons program and helps to establish expertise in matters relevant to building the bomb**. I develop four hypotheses based on this general insight. First, **receiving civilian nuclear assistance over time increases the likelihood that states will begin nuclear weapons programs because it reduces the expected costs of such a campaign and inspires greater confidence among leaders that the bomb could be successfully developed**. Second, militarized disputes with other countries condition the effect of civilian nuclear assistance on program initiation. **The likelihood that nuclear assistance causes countries to begin weapons programs increases as their security environments worsen.** Third, **peaceful aid increases the probability that countries will successfully build nuclear weapons.** Fourth, **this is especially true when a country’s security environment deteriorates**. To test these hypotheses, I produced a data set on civilian nuclear assistance based on the coding of all NCAs signed from 1945 to 2000.8 **A combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis yields support for my arguments, even when controlling for the other variables thought to influence proliferation**. The results from my statistical analysis indicate that other factors, such as industrial capacity and membership in the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), also have significant effects on proliferation. But **peaceful cooperation is among the few variables that is *consistently salient* in explaining both nuclear weapons program onset and weapons acquisition.**

***Nuclear power plants encourage a virtual arms race – leads to nuclear war***

Joseph **Cirincione**, Senior Fellow and Director for Nuclear Policy at the Center for American Progress, and Andrew Grotto, Senior National Security Analysts at the Center for American Progress, “Contain and Engage”, CAP, March **2007**, http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2007/02/pdf/iran\_report.pdf

Regardless of how Iran behaves with a nuclear- or near nuclear-weapons capability, the leaders of predominantly Sunni Arab countries in the region, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, will feel varying degrees of pressure to develop nuclear programs of their own. Like Iran, they would not necessarily need to build and test a weapon in order to match Iran’s perceived capabilities; a nuclear energy industry and its supporting infrastructure—specifically fuel cycle technology—could be enough. This is already happening. In September 2006, Gamal Mubarak, son of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak and the presumed successor for Egypt’s presidency, suggested that Egypt develop nuclear power. He also wryly noted that Egypt “is not the only country that is thinking about this alternative to save on energy sources.” Indeed, Turkey has also indicated renewed interest in nuclear power, and the IAEA has reported that up to a dozen Arab countries have expressed similar interest. Most recently the states of the Gulf Cooperation Council announced plans for developing nuclear power for a water desalinization project. And Jordan’s King Abdullah has suggested that his country, too, should explore nuclear energy. Iran could even share nuclear technology with other countries, as Pakistan’s A.Q. Khan did. Iran’s leaders have already suggested they would be prepared to share nuclear technology with other Muslim countries as energy development aid. While this is a far cry from sharing nuclear fissile materials or weapons with Hezbollah, these statements could be interpreted as a commitment to export uranium enrichment technology and thereby enable other countries to move to the brink of having nuclear weapons. Iran might do this in an attempt to broaden its sphere of influence, drive a wedge between the United States and Muslim countries, or reassure Saudi Arabia and other Sunni nations that the rise of predominantly Shia Iran as a regional power with a “near nuclear” capability does not threaten them. Whether from cooperation or competition, though, Iran’s regional rivals are likely to pursue their own nuclear options. All these nations will insist their programs are purely peaceful, and yet all of them would be laying the basis for future nuclear weapons development. This “virtual” arms race in the Middle East, where countries have the ability to build a weapon on relatively short notice, could quickly lead to a Middle East with not one nuclear weapon state (Israel), but four or five such states. With so many existing territorial, political and ethnic conflicts unresolved, this is a recipe for nuclear war.

**Da 2**

***Oil prices will stabilize now – prices will stick above OPEC break-even levels without significant changes***

Irina **Rogovaya August 2012**; writer for Oil and Gas Eurasia, Oil Price Changes: Everyone Wants Stability <http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/-http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/>

According to the current base forecast for the Eurozone prepared by Oxford Economics, **within the next two years oil prices will continue to drift lower, but not beyond the bounds of the “green” corridor for the world economy – $80-100 per barrel**. This forecast coincides with the expectations of the World Bank (see Fig. 4). Meanwhile, S&P analysts presented three scenarios for the energy market in June. In the base scenario, **oil will remain at $100 per barrel**. S&P calculates that the likelihood of a stressful scenario in which the price of oil drops below $60 per barrel (the bottom in 2009) is 1:3. Analysts believe that **given today’s state of economic and geopolitical affairs, strong political will would be needed to force the price of oil below $70-80** (the current level of effective production). So far, **that will is nowhere to be seen**. Recent events have shown that nobody is interested in the Eurozone breaking apart. And nobody wants a war in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, nobody today intends to force the production of less valuable oil. At least that is what OPEC leaders promised during the recent summit. “Stability on the market should be at the center of our attention,” General Secretary Abdalla El-Badri said. Even Saudi Arabia, which consistently violates OPEC discipline in over-producing its quotas, announced at the beginning of July that it would review its margins to determine a higher price for Saudi supplies ordered on August contracts. Analysts noted that the average price of oil supplied to Europe and Asia had jumped (by $0.85 and $0.66 per barrel respectively), a fact which could be seen as proof that **the collective members of the cartel will not let prices fall under $100 per barrel.**

***Nuclear power reduces oil dependence – displaces oil power generation, powers maritime and ground transportation, and causes hydrogen transition***

**ANS** 20**12**; American Nuclear Society, Top 10 Myths about Nuclear Energyhttp://www.new.ans.org/pi/resources/myths/

Myth # 10: Nuclear energy can't reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Truth: **Nuclear-generated electricity powers electric trains and subway cars as well as autos today. It has also been used in propelling ships for more than 50 years**. **That use can be increased since it has been restricted by unofficial policy to military vessels and ice breakers**. **In the near-term, nuclear power can provide electricity for expanded mass-transit and plug-in hybrid cars**. Small **modular reactors can provide power to islands** like Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Nantucket and Guam **that currently run their electrical grids on imported oil**. **In the longer-term, nuclear power can directly reduce our dependence** on foreign oil **by producing hydrogen for use in fuel cells and synthetic liquid fuels**.

***Oil futures are overshot by speculation – lowering demand would set off a price collapse***

Alexei **Bayer** 7-26-20**12**; Alexei Bayer is head of KAFAN FX Information Services. His monthly “Global Economy” column in Research has received an excellence award from the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants for the past six years, 2004-2009 “Pop That Bubble Policies should aim at pushing oil prices down” http://www.advisorone.com/2012/07/26/pop-that-bubble?page=3

A Soft Market **Demand for oil**, then, **is softening** because the global economy is weakening and consumers are reducing their oil use on a more lasting basis, **even as greater supply is coming on line, from** projects begun before 2008 and from **producers eager to protect their market shares. Oil prices are set by futures markets and *therefore fluctuate with traders’ psychology, speculation and liquidity.* That means oil prices tend to overshoot**. **Just as they rocketed prior to 2008 and again in early 2012, driven by rising demand as well as various political concerns and fears, so a softening demand could push oil even below its long-term inflation-adjusted equilibrium price range of around $20-40 per barrel.**

***Drop in oil demand causes Russian economic instability --- risks nuclear war***

**Miller 10**—assistant professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma (Gregory D., April 2010, © Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Quarterly 33:2, “The Security Costs of Energy Independence,” http://www.twq.com/10april/docs/10apr\_Miller.pdf)

**Russia is another** potential **danger spot because it is the only nuclear state**, at least for now, **that has significant revenue from the sale of oil, roughly** 8—**20 percent of its GDP**. Losing that income will have less dramatic effects on Russia than on many OPEC states more heavily reliant on oil sales, at least partly because of recent attempts to diversify the Russian economy. **Its economy**, however, **is still too fragile to handle a major drop in demand for oil**. **Given the existing tension between Russia and states such as Georgia and Ukraine, neither the United States nor Russia’s neighbors can afford the risk of a nuclear Russia suffering economic instability**.19

**DA**

***A) Obama winning but it’s close --- best data***

**Silver 9-27** Nate Silver, 9-27-12, NYT, Sept. 26: Could 2012 Be Like 2008?, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/27/sept-26-could-2012-be-like-2008/>, jj

Accounting for all of the data, including the Rasmussen Reports poll, **the FiveThirtyEight forecast showed Mr. Obama making gains. His probability of winning the Electoral College is now listed at 81.9 percent**, his highest figure of the year and up from 79.7 percent on Tuesday. We’re at a point in the race, however, when it’s important to contrast what we think might happen on Nov. 6 with what we’re seeing in the polls at the moment. Right now, there is a gap between these two things. Although Mr. **Obama is now the clear favorite** in the Nov. 6 forecast, his advantage is larger in the FiveThirtyEight “now-cast,” which projects what would happen in an election held today. The “now-cast” estimates that Mr. **Obama would have a 97.8 percent chance of winning an election held today**. Further, **it pegs his advantage at five and a half percentage points in the national popular vote.** By contrast, **the Nov. 6 forecast expects Mr. Obama to win by a smaller margin, 3.6 percentage points, on Election Day itself**. Two things account for this disparity. First, there are still some effects from the convention bounce penalty that the Nov. 6 forecast applies to Mr. Obama’s polls, but which the “now-cast” does not. The convention bounce adjustment is phasing out of the model, but it hasn’t done so completely. Second, **the Nov. 6 forecast is still using economic data along with the polls**. By design, **the economic component of the forecast receives less and less weight over the course of the year, since it becomes less and less likely that there will be predictable effects from economic news that are not already priced into the polls**. (By Election Day itself, the economic component of the model will phase out completely, meaning that the forecast will become equivalent to the “now-cast.”) For the time being, however, the economic index still accounts for about 30 percent of the forecast. **The way that the economic index evaluates the data, Mr. Obama is the favorite in the race. However, he is only a slight one, and the economic index has been declining recently, following a poor report on manufacturing activity and a decline in the stock market over the last week on renewed investor concerns about Europe.** Mr. **Obama is considered a modest favorite by the economic model because he is the incumbent president, and incumbents are favored given average economic conditions**. The economy is decidedly below-average, but it is not recessionary, and **there have been just enough bright spots in the data that Mr. Obama remains in the buffer zone where his incumbency advantage could outweigh it.** However, the economic index would point toward a two- or three-point win for Mr. Obama in the popular vote, rather than the five- or six-point advantage that he has enjoyed in the most recent polls. Thus, **the economic index is exerting some downward pressure on Mr. Obama’s Nov. 6 forecast.** If the election were held today, however, it could look pretty ugly for Mr. Romney. The “now-cast” has Mr. Obama favored in all the states he won in 2008 except for Indiana, where he is several points behind, and North Carolina, which it shows as an almost exact tie. It would project Mr. Obama to win 337 electoral votes, slightly fewer than the 365 that he won in 2008. Beneath the surface, however, there are some bigger differences in the individual states. In the table below, I’ve compared how Mr. Obama performed in each of the 50 states in 2008 against what the “now-cast” estimates would happen in an election held today. In 14 of the 50 states, the “now-cast” would bet on Mr. Obama winning by a larger margin than he did in 2008. They are an eclectic mix and include the following: · Two states, Arizona and Alaska, that were home to the Republican presidential and vice-presidential candidates in 2008. · Three states in New England: Vermont, Maine and Rhode Island. There is an interesting split this year among the six New England states, with Mr. Obama running very well in these three, which are poorer, but not as well in Connecticut, New Hampshire and Massachusetts, where voters are better off. · Several states in the upland South, like Kentucky and Tennessee, where polls have sometimes shown Mr. Obama running ahead of his 2008 numbers. This is a region of the country where a higher-than-average number of voters said in exit polls that the race of the candidates played a role in their voting decision. It is possible that some of these racial effects have abated as Mr. Obama has become more of a familiar presence. It is also possible that this is a region of the country where polls still exaggerate the standing of African-American candidates. (This phenomenon, termed the Bradley Effect, no longer seems to hold in most parts of the country.) · New York, where Mr. Obama’s numbers have been quite strong in the polls, and which has gone from a state where Republicans could sometimes compete into one that seems completely lost for them. · Finally, two swing states: Florida and Ohio. The utter weirdness of this mix – how often do you see Ohio, New York, Kentucky and Vermont on the same list? – is one reason to be skeptical that either candidate has all that much of an advantage in the Electoral College relative to his position in the popular vote. With Mr. Obama’s strong run of polling in the swing states recently, the model has reverted to figuring that he would have just the slightest Electoral College edge in an election in which the popular vote were exactly tied. But it is a slight advantage indeed: the model estimates that Mr. Obama would have a 53 percent chance of winning the Electoral College under those conditions. If Mr. Obama were to choose any two states in which to overperform, Ohio and Florida are pretty good picks, and both represent huge problems for Mr. Romney. It is too late in the race, and there are too many polls there, to write off Mr. Obama’s polling in these states as a fluke – although the set of Quinnipiac polls certainly present a rather optimistic case. Mr. Obama is also polling fairly close to his 2008 levels in Minnesota and Pennsylvania, two states that Mr. Romney has not contested as vigorously as John McCain did four years ago. Some recent polls also show Mr. Obama near his 2008 numbers in Virginia and North Carolina, where demographic and cultural shifts seem to be working in favor of Democrats. But there are a number of other swing states in which Mr. Obama is still polling well off his 2008 pace. Mr. **Obama’s numbers have perked up in Iowa and Colorado**, for instance – but polls are suggestive of a lead for him in the mid-single-digits there, when he won both states by nine percentage points in 2008. Mr. **Obama is a heavy favorite in Michigan, but is highly unlikely to replicate his 2008 performance**, when Mr. McCain pulled out of the state early and he won it by more than 16 points. He is also unlikely to duplicate his 12-point margin of victory in Nevada, where economic conditions are so poor as to be almost depressionary (Nevada’s median household income fell to $47,043 in 2011 from $54,744 in 2008) — or in Wisconsin, in which Paul D. Ryan should help Mr. Romney at least a little bit.

***B) Link --- plan drives a wedge into Obama’s base --- they’re key to re-election***

**Mick ‘10**

Jason Mick, 6-19-10, Daily Tech, Obama Fights For Nuclear, Environmentalists Label Him a Shill <http://www.dailytech.com/Obama+Fights+For+Nuclear+Environmentalists+Label+Him+a+Shill/article18781.htm>, jj

Despite these small victories, President **Obama's nuclear vision faces many impending obstacles**. Despite the fact that you could tear down one of the nation's old reactors, replace it with a dozen modern clean reactor designs and still have less net waste, some **environmentalist groups remain adamantly opposed to new plant construction.** **They have vowed to bury the bid for clean nuclear power under a flood of lawsuits. If the suits succeed, they will raise the cost of nuclear so high, that it can't even compete with the most expensive forms of nuclear energy, like solar power.** And perhaps **the biggest obstacle to Obama's nuclear vision will come in 2012**. That is the year when he will face reelection. **That may prove challenging given that** one of **his** former **key constituent groups -- the environmental lobby -- has become one of his staunchest critics**. Regardless, the U.S. is making its first true nuclear progress in 30 years, and that is among the many factors that will already make President Obama's presidency noteworthy.

***Obama’s margin for error is small --- plan deflates democrat enthusiasm***

**TNF ‘12**

1-3, The New Fuelist, Obama’s tall environmental task in 2012 <http://www.newfuelist.com/blog/obama-coal-regulations-keystone-pipeline>, jj

In case you can’t see it, **that’s a treacherous tightrope Barack Obama is walking on these days whenever he steps into the circus-like national energy and environmental policy debate. And his margin for political error on environmental issues will shrink even more during this election year. To avoid alienating environmentalists who supported him in 2008, he must not forget to occasionally—and substantially—lean to the left.** But if he wants to hold on to coveted independent voters who are more worried about the slumping economy than they are about pollution, he must also periodically shift back to the middle and right.The proposed Keystone XL pipeline embodies the President’s conundrum. From the right, calls for increased “energy security” and for the creation of (a disputed number) of pipeline-related jobs make it hard for him to say no. On the left, a large and organized anti-pipeline contingent has taken pains to turn the decision on the pipeline—which will carry crude made from Canadian oil sands, the extraction and production of which makes the fuel much more greenhouse gas-intense than conventional oil—into a political make-or-break for Obama on climate change. The administration spent 2011 establishing what it must view as a politically necessary middle ground on the environment. It engineered a drastic ratcheting up of fuel efficiency standards for automakers, and sold it as a way to both reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the burden on the consumer. It also introduced landmark regulations on air pollution from power plants, while placating utilities—and outraging many supporters—by delaying the EPA’s proposed tightening of the nation’s standards for smog. And it earned at least temporary relief from pressure to decide on the Keystone XL by punting the issue past the election, to 2013. But **it’s going to be tougher to maintain balance on the tightrope this year.** Congressional Republicans, by demanding a much-earlier Obama decision on the Keystone XL in exchange for their support of the recent payroll tax extension, have hinted at their party’s desire to force the President’s hand on environmental issues. **The GOP’s presidential nominee will undoubtedly attempt to paint Obama as an over-regulator and irrational environmentalist—an attack line which will warrant a defense. And therein lies Obama’s tall task:** to defend his administration’s substantial forays into environmental regulation in terms that resonate with independents whose main concern is the economy—all while simultaneously **ensuring that his frustrated environmentalist supporters don’t completely lose their patience**.

***C) Romney attacks Iran***

**Wickham** 12-19-**11** (DeWayne Wickham is a columnist for USA Today, Iraq War is over; will GOP replace it with Iran?

<http://www.statesmanjournal.com/article/20111220/OPINION/112200303/Iraq-War-over-will-GOP-replace-Iran->, jj)

On the day the Iraq War officially ended, **seven Republicans who are champing at the bit to be their party's standard bearer in next year's presidential race were** on a stage in Sioux City, Iowa, **debating the possibility of Iran joining the world's nuclear weapons club**. And **all but one of them** — in that setting, or on other recent campaign stages — **threatened to launch a new Middle East war to keep that Islamic republic from becoming a nuclear power. Only** Rep. Ron **Paul**, R-Texas, **a long shot to win the GOP nomination**, **sounds like an adult when it comes to Iran. Iran is destined to become a nuclear state**. While that's not a thought I relish, it's a reality the pragmatists in the bowels of the U.S. government surely understand. **If Iran hadn't made an irreversible decision to obtain nuclear weapons before an American-backed NATO force helped Libyan rebels topple Moammar Gadhafi, it must have done so after he was chased from power and summarily executed**. **The government in Tehran**, which has threatened the annihilation of Israel, **knows it could end up like Gadhafi's regime without the protection that a nuclear arsenal would give it**. **Indeed, even the world's most erratic states like North Korea understand the relative defensive comfort that even a few nuclear weapons assures**. Iranian leaders understand this, too. **They know their survival depends on their ability to ward off a foreign-assisted regime change attack from within, or a direct assault from an outside force, like the U.S. invasion of Iraq. And a nuclear bomb will give them that blocking power.** **To say, as** even President **Obama does, that no options have been taken off the table is one thing. To publicly proclaim a determination to make war on Iran to keep it from getting a nuclear weapon is an unequivocal commitment to a new and more costly Middle East conflict**. In nearly nine years of fighting, the Iraqi War took the lives of 4,487 American men and women, and wounded 32,226. While nothing approaches the human toll wrought by that war, **the financial cost — approximately $800 billion — has taken a big bite out of our national treasury. If one of the hawkish Republican contenders becomes president, the human and financial costs of the war they've threatened to launch against Iran will pale in comparison with the price we paid in Iraq**. **The Republican hawks**, no doubt, **will argue this is a cost we must pay to stop Iran from using a nuclear weapon against Israel — our most reliable ally in the region**. But unless Iranian leaders want to turn their entire nation into a suicide bomber, they won't risk the nuclear retaliation Israel would rain down upon them at the first sign of an Iranian nuclear-tipped missile heading toward the Jewish state.

***Iran attack will cause a global nuclear war that leads to human extinction***

**Hirsch** Professor at the University of Califorina at San Diego 20**08**

(Seymour Hirsch, Professor of physics @ the University of California @ San Diego, 4/10/2k8 http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=HIR20060422&articleId=2317)

**Iran is likely to respond to any US attack using its considerable missile arsenal against US forces in Iraq and elsewhere in the Persian Gulf**. Israel may attempt to stay out of the conflict, **it is not clear whether Iran would target Israel in a retaliatory strike but it is certainly possible. If the US attack includes nuclear weapons use against Iranian facilities,** as I believe is very likely, rather than deterring **Iran it will cause a much more violent response. Iranian military forces and militias are likely to storm into southern Iraq and the US may be forced to use nuclear weapons against them, causing large scale casualties and inflaming the Muslim world. There could be popular uprisings in other countries in the region like Pakistan, and of course a Shiite uprising in Iraq against American occupiers.** Finally I would like to discuss the grave consequences to America and the world if the US uses nuclear weapons against Iran. First, **the likelihood of terrorist attacks against Americans both on American soil and abroad will be enormously enhanced after these events. And terrorist's attempts to get hold of "loose nukes" and use them against Americans will be enormously incentivized after the US used nuclear weapons against Iran. , it will destroy America's position as the leader of the free world. The rest of the world rightly recognizes that nuclear weapons are qualitatively different from all other weapons, and that there is no sharp distinction between small and large nuclear weapons, or between nuclear weapons targeting facilities versus those targeting armies or civilians.** It will not condone the breaking of the nuclear taboo in an unprovoked war of aggression against a non-nuclear country, and the US will become a pariah state. **Third, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty will cease to exist, and many of its 182 non-nuclear-weapon-country signatories will strive to acquire nuclear weapons as a deterrent to an attack by a nuclear nation. With no longer a taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, any regional conflict may go nuclear and expand into global nuclear war. Nuclear weapons are million-fold more powerful than any other weapon, and the existing nuclear arsenals can obliterate humanity many times over. In the past, global conflicts terminated when one side prevailed. In the next global conflict we will all be gone before anybody has prevailed.**

**Solvency**

***Nuclear expansion is structurally impossible:***

***1) NG prices will be low for decades – makes nuclear impossible***

**Crawford, 7/24/2012** (Jonathan, SNL Generation Markets Week: “Former Senator, DOE Official Urge Continued Federal Support for Nuke Support,” LexisNexis, ts)

Beyond these recommendations, the report called for federal support to assist a nuclear energy industry besieged by low natural gas prices. **Together with depressed electricity demand and heightened safety and security requirements, low natural gas prices have led to the suspension in the past few years of up to 20, or more, proposed reactors.** **The report said the ability to tap vast shale gas reserves through hydraulic fracturing is likely to keep natural gas prices low for decades**. **This, in turn, is expected to make financing for new reactors "very difficult for at least the next decade, if not longer**," it said. "Market signals alone are unlikely to result in a diverse fuel mix, so helping to maintain and improve a range of electricity supply options remains a role for federal policy. In particular, U.S. policy should be aimed at helping to preserve nuclear energy as an important technology option for near or longer-term deployment," the report said**. The hurdles presented by low natural gas prices and tepid growth in electricity demand are compounded by an aging nuclear fleet**. According to the report, 73 reactors, representing well over half of the nation's reactor fleet, have received a 20-year extension on top of their original 40-year operating license, while 13 additional license-extension applications are under review. The report estimates that in 2029 and thereafter, about one-third of the fleet will reach its 60-year operation limit, with a "significant fraction" likely to retire and be replaced by newer-generation resources.

***2) Supply chain bottlenecks, skills atrophy and labor shortage***

**Squassoni ‘09**

Sharon Squassoni is a senior associate in the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment and has been analyzing nonproliferation, arms control, and national security issues for two decades. Her research focuses on nuclear nonproliferation and national security. Ms. Squassoni came to Carnegie from the Congressional Research Service (CRS). As a specialist in weapons of mass destruction proliferation, she provided expert analyses on proliferation trends and expert advice on policy and legislation to members of the United States Congress. Prior to joining CRS, she served for nine years in the executive branch, beginning her government career as a nuclear safeguards expert in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Her last position at the State Department was director of Policy Coordination in the Nonproliferation Bureau. Squassoni has contributed to journals, magazines, and books on nuclear proliferation and defense. Recent relevant publications include: “The Iranian Nuclear Program,” a chapter in Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Future of International Nonproliferation Policy (University of Georgia Press, 2009),“Looking Back: The 1978 Nuclear Nonproliferation Act,” Arms Control Today, December 2008, and “Risks and Realities: The ‘New Nuclear Revival,’” Arms Control Today, May 2007.

2009, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Nuclear Energy: Rebirth or Resuscitation? <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/nuclear_energy_rebirth_resuscitation.pdf>, jj

**Assuming that all these significant hurdles could be surmounted, could the nuclear industry infrastructure sustain the kinds of expansion envisioned?** In the last twenty years, there have been fewer than ten new reactor construction starts in any given year worldwide. Table 8, reproduced from the Power Reactor Information System of the IAEA, shows annual construction starts and connections to the grid from 1955 to 2006. A 2007 Keystone Center report pointed out that to build 700 GW of nuclear power capacity “would require the industry to return immediately to the most rapid period of growth experienced in the past (1981– 1990) and sustain this rate of growth for 50 years.”72 Even China’s command economy is only envisioning building four reactors a year through 2020. Some analysts are skeptical that this is possible, and that such growth could be accomplished with manufacturing safety standards that others would find acceptable. **A significant expansion will narrow bottlenecks in the global supply chain, which today include ultra-heavy forgings, large manufactured components, engineering, and craft and skilled construction labor**. **All these constraints are exacerbated by the lack of recent experience in construction and by aging labor forces**. Though these may not present problems for limited growth, **they will certainly present problems for doubling or tripling reactor capacity**.73 **In the United States, the problems may be particularly acute.** The chief operating officer of Exelon told a nuclear industry conference in early 2008 that **the lack of any recent U.S. nuclear construction experience, the atrophying of U.S. nuclear manufacturing infrastructure, production bottlenecks created by an increase in worldwide demand, and an aging labor force could all prove to be constraints on major expansion**.74 **Lack of construction experience translates into delays, which mean much higher construction costs**. For example, AREVA has had trouble pouring concrete for its new reactors in Olkiluoto, Finland, and Flammanville, France. The eighteen-month delay caused by faulty construction of Olkiluoto-3 was estimated to cost 1.5 billion in overruns in a project with a fixed cost of 3 billion.75 This was before a fire occurred in July 2008 that probably caused further delays.76 In an analysis for a nuclear industry conference, the consulting firm Booz Allen Hamilton prioritized fifteen different risks in new reactor construction. The most serious ones entailed engineering, procurement and construction performance, resource shortages, and price escalation.77 **The atrophying of nuclear manufacturing infrastructure is significant** not only in the United States but also **worldwide**, except in Japan. The ultraheavy forgings for reactor pressure vessels and steam generators are the most significant chokepoint. Japan Steel Works (JSW) is currently the only company worldwide with the capacity to make the ultralarge forgings (using 600-ton ingots) favored by new reactor designs. Other companies—such as Sfarsteel (formerly Creusot Forge) in France and Doosan Industry in South Korea—have smaller capacities. The purchase of Creusot Forge by AREVA in 2005 means that Creusot’s former customers reportedly are shifting to JSW, lengthening the twoyear waiting list. According to World Nuclear Industry Status 2007, AREVA has stated that . . . the annual capacity at the Chalon plant is limited to 12 steam generators plus “a certain number of vessel heads” and small equipment, or the equivalent of between 2 and 2.5 units per year, if it did manufacture equipment for new plants only. In reality, the Chalon capacities are booked out, in particular for plant life extension measures—steam generator and vessel head replacement—also for the U.S. market. In July 2007 AREVA announced that the heavy forgings it had ordered in 2006 from JSW for a US-EPR had begun to arrive at its Chalon facility. AREVA claims that the order of forgings made the company the only vendor to have “material in hand to support certainty of online generation in 2015.”78 Recently, AREVA negotiated with JSW to ensure that its orders through 2016 would be filled. AREVA also reportedly invested in JSW to help with the costs of expansion. According to JSW officials, it now produces 5.5 sets of forgings per year; this will expand to 8.5 sets in 2010. Even then, nuclear forgings at JSW compete with orders for forgings and assembly from other heavy industries—for example, oil and gas industries, which can be more profitable. In time, new suppliers are likely to emerge to support nuclear expansion. According to JSW officials, the availability of alternative ultraheavy forging supply is not necessarily a question of manufacturing capabilities but rather of business decisions to focus on more profitable industrial projects. Currently, Toshiba reportedly can produce one nuclear steam supply system (the “nuclear” part of the reactor that includes the reactor pressure vessels, moisture separator/reheater, steam generator, steam turbine generators, fuel assemblies, and so on) per year, and Doosan Heavy Industries in South Korea can produce one and a half systems per year.79 Doosan will assemble reactor pressure vessels for the four Westinghouse reactors (AP-1000s) under construction in China. Russia’s Uralmash-Izhora Group (or OMZ) reportedly stated in October 2007 that it would double its production of large and ultralarge forgings for the VVER-440 and VVER-1000 pressurized water reactors from two to four per year. However, it is not clear whether these reactors have certification from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, which can take five to ten years and is desirable for exports.80 **A few factors will influence how quickly and successfully nuclear reactor construction capacity could expand: technical challenges, quality assurance and certification requirements, and the uncertainty of new business**. In forging, **there are considerable technical challenges in melting, forging, heat treatment, and machining operations that new entrants into the ultralarge forging business would need to overcome**. 81 Quality assurance could play an important role in whether or not new ultralarge forging capabilities succeed. According to Nuclear Regulatory Commission chairman Dale Klein, quality assurance by Chinese firms in producing other nuclear-related components has been a concern.82 Finally, the nuclear industry appears wary of expanding too quickly, lest expansion not proceed as planned. JSW suffered financially ten years ago when Germany canceled its orders for new nuclear power plants.83 China was set to open new ultraheavy forging plants in 2008, to produce possibly as many as six sets per year. If its own production takes up four per year, this could allow the Chinese to supply two others for reactor projects abroad through 2020. In the meantime, it is possible to use smaller-capacity forgings, but this means more components, with more weld seams, and therefore will require more safety inspections. Here again, time is money, and one estimate is that the cost of shutdowns for inspections or other reasons is $1 million a day.84 In addition to the major nuclear reactor vendors, supporting industries will also either need to be rebuilt or recertified to nuclear standards. In the United States, the decline of supporting industries is significant. In the 1980s, the United States had 400 nuclear suppliers and 900 holders of N-stamp certificates from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.85 Today, there are just 80 suppliers and 200 N-stamp holders.86 In addition, certain commodities used in reactor construction may also present supply problems, such as alloy steel, concrete, and nickel. The costs of these inputs, according to Moody’s, have risen dramatically in recent years.

***3) Peak uranium***

**Tech Review ‘09**

Technology Review – Published by MIT, 11-17, The Coming Nuclear Crisis <http://www.technologyreview.com/view/416325/the-coming-nuclear-crisis/>, jj

Perhaps **the most worrying problem is the misconception that uranium is plentiful**. **The world's nuclear plants today eat through some 65,000 tons of uranium each year**. **Of this, the mining industry supplies about 40,000 tons. The rest comes from secondary sources such as civilian and military stockpiles, reprocessed fuel and re-enriched uranium**. "But without access to the military stocks, the **civilian western uranium stocks will be exhausted by 2013**, concludes Dittmar. **It's not clear how the shortfall can be made up since nobody seems to know where the mining industry can look for more.** That means **countries that rely on uranium imports** such as Japan and many western countries **will face uranium .shortages**, possibly **as soon as 2013**. **Far from being the secure source of energy that many governments are basing their future energy needs on, nuclear power looks decidedly rickety. But what of new technologies such as fission breeder reactors which generate fuel and nuclear fusion? Dittmar is pessimistic** about fission breeders. "**Their huge construction costs, their poor safety records and their inefficient performance give little reason to believe that they will ever become commercially significant,**" he says. And the future looks even worse for nuclear fusion: "**No matter how far into the future we may look, nuclear fusion as an energy source is even less probable than large-scale breeder reactors."** Dittmar paints a bleak future for the countries betting on nuclear power. And his analysis doesn't even touch on issues such as safety, the proliferation of nuclear technology and the disposal of nuclear waste. **The message if you live in one of these countries is to stock up on firewood and candles.**

***4) Waste siting blocks solvency – nuclear development is illegal in many states and regulatory issues will prevent reactor construction***

**HOLT 7** -CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, (Mark, COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS SYMPOSIUM; SUBJECT: "AMERICAN NUCLEAR ENERGY IN A GLOBALIZED ECONOMY" SESSION II: WHAT IS THE INVESTMENT CLIMATE FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY?; June 18, L/n

**We talked a little bit about nuclear waste** last night. **Obviously, a big factor** **too in the viability of nuclear power, primarily because a number of states still do have laws on the books that unless there's a repository for nuclear waste** that -- and including -- and California being the notable one -- **that they will not allow a nuclear power plant to be built**. So that factor is out there. I think the Keystone report they do make the point that **most experts do not see it as a major physical problem dealing with the physical waste** -- at least in the short term. So if there's no Yucca Mountain, if Yucca Mountain is delayed for decades even, that's a relatively short period of time as far as interim storage goes. **It's not really a technical and safety issue,** but the concern about surface storage being permanent, meaning -- we talked also last night about the millions of years. Once you get into that time frame, obviously, surface storage is not nearly as secure as a repository. So that would be a concern there. **But as far as the near-term policymaking issue, it often is more of a legal and regulatory problem than perhaps a real physical safety problem.**

***Plant construction is impossible even with loan guarantees and subsidies***

**Cooper ‘12**

Mark Cooper is a senior research fellow for economic analysis at the Center for Energy and the Environment at Vermont Law School. He has over 30 years experience as a public policy analyst and expert witness for public interest clients. As such, he has appeared more than 300 times before public utility commissions, federal agencies, and state and federal legislatures in more than 40 jurisdictions in the United States and Canada. He first analyzed nuclear power economics in 1984 before the Mississippi Public Service Commission in regard to the construction of the second unit at the Grand Gulf nuclear power station.

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 68(4) 61–72, Nuclear safety and affordable reactors: Can we have both? ONLINE, jj

Too expensive to build A brief review of the economics of new nuclear reactor construction is helpful, because the pattern of construction costs is one indicator of the pattern of subsequent capital expenditures particularly for the repair or replacement of major components. From the point of view of an investor in a market economy, the decision to build or buy a nuclear reactor involves a financial analysis of risk and reward (Cooper, 2009b). Although that calculation has historically been heavily influenced by a number of policies and large subsidies that affect the prospects of nuclear power, it remains, at root, an economic decision. Shortly after the start of the twenty first century, **nuclear enthusiasts began to hype a renaissance in nuclear power that would lead to the construction of hundreds of new reactors**, based on bold assumptions about the dramatically reduced cost of construction for standardized, modularized reactors. As shown in Figure 2, **those projections proved to be as far off the mark as the projections that typified the building boom of the 1970s and 1980s.** **During the US construction boom, nuclear reactors suffered severe cost escalation** (Cooper, 2010). **The final reactors cost more than seven times as much as the initial reactors brought online and exceeded the original projections by an even wider margin**. **The result was a series of lengthy regulatory and court proceedings that contested large potential rate increases and made nuclear power a lot less profitable than the utilities had hoped**. **The pattern repeated itself in the cost projections offered during the past decade**. **Rising cost estimates in the United States**, and uncertainty surrounding several projects undertaken by the French, seem to have **derailed the** so-called **renaissance** (Cooper, 2009a). As a result, **in the United States, more than 80 percent of the license proceedings that were opened at the NRC during this time period are dormant, if not dead, and more than half of those that are still active appear to be unlikely to result in actual construction of new reactors** (Cooper, 2009b). The current difficulties of nuclear reactor construction are reflected in the fact that, **despite the long-standing socialization of liability for a nuclear accident** (Cooper, 2011e) **and efforts to streamline the licensing process, utilities require a combination of federal loan guarantees, early cost recovery from ratepayers, and public entity support to proceed with projects** (Cooper, 2011a). **Even then, it is not certain a project will be successful**. Aside from the socialization of liability, the other subsidies are not generally available to support retrofit or repair costs for existing reactors. Also, **it’s likely there will be more regulatory scrutiny in the future, not less, for both old and new reactors.**

***Defaults likely- most plants won’t be built***

**Clayton 07** (Mark Clayton, Staff Writer, Christian Science Monitor, Nuclear power surge coming, Sept. 28, 2007, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0928/p01s05-usgn.html>)

The nuclear industry has already put Congress on notice that it could require loan guarantees of at least $20 billion for planned projects – and more later, NEI officials told The New York Times in July. The reason is that **nuclear power plants are far more expensive to build than coal- or gas-fired facilities.** For example: On Monday, New Jersey-based NRG Energy Corp. filed its application with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to build two reactors in Texas at a cost between $5.4 and $6.7 billion. That huge startup cost might make financial sense, given a reactor's low operating expenses, especially if government begins to charge utilities for the greenhouse gases they produce. Nuclear power is virtually emission-free. But **the last time that the nuclear industry was on a building spree** – in the 1980s – **roughly half of the power plants proposed were never finished**, in part because of fears caused by the accident at Three Mile Island. **Those that were finished were delayed for years and cost far more than estimated. A number of power companies went bankrupt**. In late 2003, NRG – the company that filed Monday's permit application – emerged from bankruptcy caused by overexpansion in the 1990s. **If defaults occur in the new round**, critics worry **federal costs will be huge**. "**This is the second or third 'nuclear renaissance' I've seen," says** Tyson **Slocum, director of energy program at Public Citizen**, Ralph Nader's consumer-protection group. "**When you look at the cost of these plants and the massive financial subsidies by US taxpayers, I think that money would be better invested in cheaper sources of emissions-free power that don't have the fatal flaws nuclear power does."** In 2003, **a Congressional Budget Office analysis warned of potential default rates of 50 percent or more on new plants.**

***Nuclear energy low globally***

**Tickell ‘12**

Oliver Tickell [of Tickell ’08 warming impact fame] for Resurgence & the Ecologist, part of the Guardian Environment Network, 8-20-12, the Guardian, Does the world need nuclear power to solve the climate crisis? <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/20/world-need-nuclear-power-climate-crisis?newsfeed=true>, jj

**Given that nuclear power generation has flatlined over the last decade, and has sharply declined in the last few years, that looks like a tall order**. **There are currently plans for about 200 new nuclear reactors around the world, mainly in China, the Middle East and the USA. But few observers expect** all of **these to be built, since the economics of nuclear power are unattractive to private investors, owing to high construction cost, long lead time, electricity price uncertainty, political hazard and long-term liabilities**. **Realistically the world might build 100 or so new reactors over the coming decade** or so – perhaps one every 35–50 days. **Over this same period a similar number of existing reactors will reach the end of their lives and close, leading to a net growth rate *close to zero*.** That does not mean it's impossible to build 11,000 reactors in 35 years if the world dedicates sufficient resources to the task. **At a construction cost of about US$10 billion per reactor, we would need to dedicate US$110 trillion, or about two years' gross world product, while also providing for long-term liabilities**. But before we seriously consider doing so, we should ask what an 11,000-reactor world would be like.

**1nc China Adv**

***No China construction now***

**NEIG ‘12**

NEIG is a specialist investment firm focused on global nuclear energy.

8-14-12, Seeking Alpha, Waiting For Catalysts: What's Ahead For Nuclear Energy And Uranium Stocks? <http://seekingalpha.com/article/805071-waiting-for-catalysts-what-s-ahead-for-nuclear-energy-and-uranium-stocks>, jj

**Much-awaited resumption of nuclear construction in China is yet to materialize.** On May 31, 2012, **China's State Council announced that it had, in principal, approved the nuclear safety plan.** Shortly after this, Deputy Chair of the National Development and Reform Committee, Zhang Guobao, indicated that China is getting ready to start the construction of the four pre-approved nuclear plants. Yet **one of the most important catalysts - the long-term nuclear development target and broader scale nuclear resumption of new projects - has not been confirmed. Further delay in new project approval may dampen investor sentiment even more.**

***No Indian construction***

**Malholtra ‘12**

Inder Malhotra, 8-8-12, Deccan Chronicle, India’s nuclear fix <http://www.deccanchronicle.com/editorial/dc-comment/india%E2%80%99s-nuclear-fix-461>, jj

How things change! In 2008 when the Indo-US nuclear deal was signed and sealed — and was followed by the “clean waiver” to this country by the 45-nation Vienna-based Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) from all its restrictive guidelines — **there were great expectations here of a speedy spurt in the installation of nuclear reactors with foreign collaboration and investment. Four years later the picture is far less rosy. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the much-needed expansion of India’s nuclear power industry could be gravely delayed, if not disrupted.** Both the nature and timing of the obstruction that has arisen could not have been more ironic. **The first of the two nuclear power plants** constructed by Russia at Koodankulum in Tamil Nadu (KK-1 and KK-2) is due to become operational in a matter of weeks, and the second a little later. In fact, both **would have been functioning now but for an emotional but misguided agitation against nuclear power that was only partially the result of Fukushima.** Since these units have been constructed under a 1988 Indo-Soviet agreement, this country’s Nuclear Liability Act could not be applied to them retroactively. In a joint memorandum signed by the two countries in 2008, Russians are to set up six nuclear plants at Koodankulum. The agreement on the third and fourth plants (KK-3 and KK-4) are, in fact, ready for signatures, and this is expected to be done during Russian President Vladimir Putin’s visit to New Delhi in October. There is little time, therefore, for the Manmohan Singh government to decide on a thorny issue. The Russians insist that KK-3 and KK-4 are also spawned by the 1988 deal, like the first two plants, and are, therefore, exempt from the liability law. To the Atomic Energy establishment this was acceptable on the understandable ground that this is precisely the position of China, which is setting up successive nuclear plants in Pakistan at Chashma, claiming that the new installations are “grandfathered” by a Sino-Pak deal entered into long before China committed itself to any of the NSG guidelines. Some others in the government do not agree because the new plants will be built when the liability law is in force. The Russians have two other arguments in their favour that cannot be dismissed out of hand as some tend to do. The first is that to change the original terms of the Indo-Russian 1988 agreement would render them uncompetitive. **Imposition of the liability law would force them to incur huge costs of insurance though critics argue that to extend the exemption to four other Russian plants would make rival suppliers, such as the US and France, protest against unfairness and put our nuclear power plans into jeopardy.** The second is that the only other foreign-supplied nuclear plant in this country at present is the Tarapore atomic power station. If under the 1963 agreement America and Canada want to set up a new reactor there, will they agree to be subject to nuclear liability? The critically important point in this connection is that the United States thought nothing of throwing the agreement and contractual obligations on Tarapore to the winds after the first underground nuclear explosion by this country in 1974. When New Delhi pointed out to the Carter administration that under the Vienna Convention on international treaties no national law passed retroactively can override an existing international agreement, the American side brushed it aside disdainfully. Had Russia not come to our help then and provided us with the fuel for Tarapore we would have been in the deepest trouble. Secondly, although India has been producing Russian military equipment under licence since 1960s the Russians never felt the need to put these arrangements under the Intellectual Property Law. This was done only after we entered into military cooperation with Israel. All previous collaborations are exempt. To talk of the resentment in the US against the Indian liability law would be to stress the obvious. Washington and the American nuclear industry that were looking forward to partaking of the lucrative Indian nuclear market have been expressing their feelings bluntly. They say that the obligations the Indian law places on foreign suppliers are unfair and, in any case, not in consonance with the international convention on the subject that India is willing to sign. They make no bones about their demand that the Indian law be diluted. They ought to know that in a country still shuddering because of the Bhopal Gas Tragedy no Parliament would agree to water down this legislation. Nor have the hopes of the suppliers’ concerns being addressed by the contracts signed with the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Limited (NPCIL) proved realistic. The other side of the coin is that the rejection of the Russian request on KK-3 and KK-4, and possibly KK-5 and KK- 6, would greatly annoy Russia and create a major crisis in a crucial relationship. Our relations with the US and France are equally important. It is virtually a catch-22 situation. It is in this context that the Prime Minister has asked the law ministry to clarify the exact legal position about the Russian demand that, like KK-1 and KK-2, the next two nuclear power plants at Koodankulam should also be exempt from the liability law. The ministry has to give its verdict in a matter of days, and no matter what the final finding, it would place the government in a very tight spot. Does this mean that all the plans about the expansion of the country’s nuclear programme should be rolled up and put aside? Not really. All the three major powers involved know that India is a responsible nation. All of them also have a stake in investing in the Indian nuclear industry. The real problem will be that **in a country where things move at a snail’s pace even at the best of times, the delay may become unconscionable.**

***Fukushima weakens Russian nuclear expansion***

**Brooke ‘11**

James Brooke, 3-23-11, Voice of America, Russian Support for Nuclear Power Weakens as Chernobyl Anniversary Nears <http://www.voanews.com/content/russian-support-for-nuclear-power-weakens-as-chernobyl-anniversary-nears-118605639/137018.html>, jj

**Japan’s nuclear accident comes as Russia prepares for the 25th anniversary of** the **Chernobyl** nuclear explosion. **This combination may weaken support for nuclear energy in Russia, long a major nuclear advocate. A Soviet official hysterically bellowing that there is no accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant is not the face the Russia nuclear power industry would like to project to the world at this time of Japan’s nuclear leak in Fukushima.** But the scene is featured in Innocent Saturday, a docudrama about the Chernobyl nuclear disaster that opened in movie theaters across Russia one month before the 25th anniversary of the explosion and fire at the Soviet power plant. The movie is banned in Belarus, the country that most suffered from the Chernobyl disaster. Last week, Belarus authorities signed a $9.4 billion deal with neighboring Russia to build two nuclear reactors. The export deal is part of a drive to make Rosatom, Russia’s state-owned nuclear-power company, the leading builder of nuclear reactors around the world. Building plants in Turkey, Bulgaria, India, China and Iran, Rosatom says it is building one quarter of the 60 nuclear power plants under construction worldwide. To help this sales effort, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev posted an eight-minute video on his website saying Russian designs offered "maximum safety barriers." He called for restrictions on construction of power plants in earthquake zones. But Russian environmentalists say that nuclear reactors are already in use in earthquake prone areas of the former Soviet Union, in Armenia, and in Rostov in Southern Russia. Domestically, Russia plans to build another 11 reactors during the next decade, raising the nuclear portion of the nation’s electricity from 16 to 25 percent. Overseas, Rosatom wants triple sales, to $50 billion by 2030. The head of Russian environmental group Eco-Defense, Vladimir Slivyak, led an anti-nuclear protest Wednesday outside the headquarters of Rosatom in central Moscow. He says of the company’s sales forecasts: "That is government propaganda. I do not believe they are able to sell that amount of reactors per year or even per decade," he said. "The Russian government now needs to spread as much propaganda as possible to make Russian people believe that Russian nuclear industry is great, and much better than Western nuclear industry." Slivyak says that 11 of the 32 nuclear reactors working in Russia are of the Chernobyl era, built with designs from the 1970s. One outside St. Petersburg, just had its working life extended for 15 years. Last week, in light of the nuclear accident in Japan, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin ordered an across the board review of nuclear safety in Russia. But with electricity prices slated to rise by 15 percent this year, an election year, the government does not want to retire old reactors. Aging reactors are part of a wider problem. Modern day Russia is coasting on infrastructure investments made during the final decades of the Soviet Union. A wakeup call came two summer ago, when turbine bolts broke at Sayano Shushenskaya Dam, the largest hydroelectric plant in Russia. The ensuing water hammer pushed a 1,000-ton turbine into the air like a toy. The accident took 75 lives and caused damage that will take four years to repair. The accident was blamed on sloppy maintenance and metal fatigue in a plant installed 40 years ago. In Germany, Chancellor Merkel is suspending operation of seven aging nuclear plants pending the outcome of "stress tests." The German leader made the move to head off a brewing anti-nuclear campaign. But Germany is far more densely populated in Russia. Here, in the world’s largest nation, the attitude toward nuclear power is often: out of sight, out of mind. Greenpeace Russia Campaign Director Ivan Blokov says local opposition is often strong. "Something like 75 percent to 92 percent of the population is totally against. But when people do not see a nuclear power station in their backyard, they simply do not care," he said. But **with the Chernobyl anniversary coinciding with balmy spring weather, bigger anti-nuclear protests may be in store for Russia.** "On April 26th, when the 25th anniversary of Chernobyl will happen, we are planning to organize bigger protests and probably more radical," says Vladimir Slivyak of Eco-Defense. **The mix of radiation leaking from Japan’s damaged reactor compounded by the Chernobyl anniversary may shift public attitudes in Russia, currently one of the world’s strongest advocates of nuclear power.**

***No impact to Asia heg***

**Parent & MacDonald ’11** (Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College, Foreign Affairs. New York: Nov/Dec 2011. Vol. 90, Iss. 6; pg. 32, 16 pgs

The Wisdom of Retrenchment: America Must Cut Back to Move Forward

Proquest, jj)

**Asia is** also **ready for a decreased U.S. military presence, and Washington should begin gradually withdrawing its troops**. **Although China** has embarked on an ambitious policy of military modernization and **engages in periodic saber rattling** in the South China Sea, **its ability to project power remains limited**. **Japan and South Korea are already shouldering greater defense burdens** than they were during the Cold War. **India, the Philippines, and Vietnam are eager to forge strategic partnerships with the United States**. **Given the shared interest in promoting regional security, these ties could be sustained through bilateral political and economic agreements, instead of the indefinite deployments and open-ended commitments of the Cold War**. **In the event that China becomes domineering, U.S. allies on its borders will act as a natural early warning system and a first line of defense, as well as provide logistical hubs and financial support for any necessary U.S. responses.** Yet **such a state of affairs is hardly inevitable**. For now, **there are many less expensive alternatives that can strengthen the current line of defense, such as technology transfers, arms sales, and diplomatic mediation**. **Defending the territorial integrity of Japan and South Korea and preventing Chinese or North Korean adventurism demands rapid-response forces with strong reserves, not the 30,000 soldiers currently stationed in each country.** Phasing out 20 percent of those forces while repositioning others to Guam or Hawaii would achieve the same results more efficiently.

***Your Japan prolif arg is profoundly nonsensical post-Fukushima***

**Sieg 12** Linda Sieg, 2-13-12, Reuters, Japan atomic power defenders: keep ability to build nuclear weapons <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/13/japan-nuclear-arms-idUSL4E8DA2ZK20120213>, jj

Once, **merely the public suggestion that Japan should debate ending its ban on such weaponry was enough to get a politician fired**. But worries about North Korea's nuclear ambitions and an expanding Chinese military are eroding that taboo . **Last March's disaster at the Fukushima** atomic plant, which spewed radiation and forced mass evacuations, **has already prompted Japan to scrap a plan to boost nuclear power to over 50 percent of electricity demand by 2030 from 30 percent before the accident.** But **politicians,** experts and officials **are** still **arguing over what role -- *if any* -- nuclear power should play** in a new energy mix programme to be unveiled in the summer. **Even the rationales for keeping atomic energy are proving contentious.** "There are people who say that one reason we need nuclear power is in order to have the latent capability for nuclear weapons, from the perspective of national defence," Tatsuo Hatta, an economist who is on an expert panel discussing Japan's future energy mix, told Reuters in a recent interview. "I think that is one idea but if that is the case, we don't need so many reactors. And the objective should be made clear," he said. "This is not something that should be debated by the trade ministry." **Japan has 54 nuclear reactors, all but three now off-line mainly for safety checks**. **The rest are due to shut down soon** while the government tries to persuade a wary public that it is safe to restart those that pass newly-imposed stress tests. Shigeru Ishiba, a former defence minister from the now- opposition Liberal Democratic Party, laid out the argument for a latent nuclear deterrent in a magazine article late last year. "If we had to start from basic research, it would take 5-10 years to create nuclear weapons, but since we have nuclear power technology, it would be possible to create nuclear weapons in the relatively short time of several months to a year," he said. "And our country has globally leading-edge rocket technology, so if we put these two together, we can achieve effective nuclear weapons in a relatively short time." PUBLIC ATOMIC ALLERGY **Japan's post-World War Two constitution prohibits going to war and, if taken literally, bans the maintenance of a standing army**. But successive governments have interpreted the pacifist Article Nine as allowing a military for self-defence. Since 1957, the official interpretation has also held that Article Nine is not an obstacle to developing nuclear arms even though the concept has long been a political taboo. "People used to be more reserved about saying it," said Koichi Nakano, a Sophia University political science professor. "Ishiba isn't saying that Japan should have nuclear weapons but that having the potential is very important to stay in the big leagues and if you don't want to be pushed around by China." Suggestions Japan might someday use its civilian nuclear technology and stockpile of plutonium -- now totalling about 45 tonnes at home and overseas -- to arm itself with atomic bombs risk fanning concerns by an already suspicious Beijing. Critics have questioned why Japan stays committed to developing costly nuclear waste reprocessing facilities unless it wants to be able to make atomic bombs should it so decide. **The idea that Japan should have its own nuclear arms, however, is unlikely to gain traction with the majority of the public, whose collective psyche remains scarred by memories of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the final days of World War Two, experts say. "Japan is the only country that suffered from nuclear weapons. It is a sort of shared understanding that we should use nuclear power only for peaceful uses," said** Masakazu **Toyoda, head of the Institute of Energy Economics, Japan and a member of the expert panel, who believes Japan needs atomic energy.** As Toyoda's remark suggests, **not all supporters of nuclear power** -- whose reasons range from the need for energy security in a resource-poor land to a desire to lead in atomic power safety technology, **find the latent deterrent argument appealing. "If Japan considers arming itself with nuclear weapons, then it will find itself in the same situation as Iran and North Korea**," Jitsuro Terashima, chairman of the Japan Research Institute and another member of the expert panel, told Reuters. "**Japan's isolation would quickly deepen**." (Additional reporting by Kentaro Hamada and Shinichi Saoshiro, Editing by Jonathan Thatcher)

***No Indo Pak war***

**Economic Times 5-17-11** (“No chance of Indo-Pak nuclear war despite 'sabre rattling': Pak nuclear scientist A Q Khan” <http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-05-17/news/29552014_1_nuclear-blackmail-nuclear-secrets-india-and-pakistan>, jj)

NEW YORK: Pakistan's disgraced nuclear scientist A Q Khan has said that **despite "sabre rattling" between Islamabad and New Delhi, there is no chance of a nuclear war between the two neighbours**. Khan, who has been accused of selling nuclear secrets to Iran, Libya and Syria, wrote in Newsweek magazine that **nuclear weapons in both countries had prevented war for the last 40 years**. "**India doesn't need more than five weapons to hurt us badly, and we wouldn't need more than 10 to return the favour**," he said. "**That is why there has been no war between us for the past 40 years." "India and Pakistan understand the old principle that ensured peace in the Cold War: mutually assured destruction,**" he said. "The two (**India and Pakistan) can't afford a nuclear war, and despite our sabre rattling, there is no chance of a nuclear war** that would send us both back to the Stone Age," he said. He claimed that **Pakistan had to invest in a nuclear programme "to ward off nuclear blackmail from India**".

**“Nuclear Weapons”**

***( ) Deterrence failure inevitable --- START and atrophy***

**Bendikova 12** Michaela Bendikova, 5-15-12, Heritage Foundation, Protect America, Not New START <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/05/15/protect-america-not-new-start/>, jj

**New START mandates U.S. unilateral reductions and does not serve U.S. interests**. Both authors assert that if the National Defense Authorization Act passes in its entirety—that is, including provisions tying the treaty’s implementation funding with funding for the nuclear weapons complex—Russia would be allowed to rebuild “its nuclear forces above the treaty ceiling of 1,550 deployed strategic warheads and increase the number of nuclear weapons aimed at the U.S.” This is just not so. The State Department’s own data exchanges indicate that Russia was under New START’s limits when the treaty entered into force and built above its limits while **the U.S. keeps unilaterally reducing its nuclear arsenal. Russia intends to build up to New START’s limits regardless how much the U.S. spends on modernization of its nuclear weapons complex.** **The treaty’s degraded verification regime does not provide for the strategic insight that the U.S. needs, given that Moscow launched the most robust nuclear modernization program since the end of the Cold War after the treaty entered into force.** Kimball and Collina complain about levels of spending for **the U.S. nuclear weapons complex**. In fact, this complex **has been under-funded for years**. Even the Obama Administration acknowledged the importance of this funding. It committed to request funding for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement facility, the very facility Kimball and Collina criticize as too expensive and of little value. Indeed, the Administration’s enduring commitment has not endured for a year since the treaty entered into force. Since the end of the Cold War, U.S. nuclear weapons have contributed to global stability and prevented attacks on the U.S. homeland, forward-deployed troops, and U.S. allies. **It is essential that the U.S. provides funding for its nuclear weapons complex and avoids “disarmament by atrophy**.” As the numbers of U.S. nuclear weapons go down, other countries will be incentivized to develop their own capabilities or build up nuclear weapons to achieve “parity” with the U.S. **Instead of unilaterally disarming, the U.S. should move toward a “protect and defend” strategy** combining offensive, defensive, conventional, and nuclear weapons. This is the best way the U.S. could respond to the challenges of today’s environment.

***( ) No solvency --- lack of R & D, testing and new weapons guts deterrence***

**Monroe**-Retired Vice Admiral & Director of Defense Nuclear Agency-20**07** (Robert, “Nonproliferation, Deterrence, and Nuclear Strategy,” Center for Security Policy, Occasional Papers Series, October, No. 27, <http://204.96.138.161/related_articles.xml?type=1&cat_id=110&&media=print&media=print&_offset=72&_order=1>, Kel)

**Today some thirty states, such as Germany in Europe and Japan** in Asia, **live** daily **under our strategic umbrella. But all is not well on these fronts. Two factors of recent origin are causing growing anxiety within these allies and friends. • The first is the imminent cascade of nuclear proliferation** discussed in the above section. North Korea and Iran are well along to developing and producing nuclear weapons. They’ve both been at it for well over a decade, and to date neither the U.S. nor the world has been able to stop them. North Korea’s nuclear weapon test last year was the first ever by a rogue state or terrorist organization. If these states succeed in their goal, the probable ultimate result would be a global proliferation cascade, leading to frequent use of nuclear weapons.• **The second cause of concern among states which depend upon us is the credibility of our nuclear deterrent. Can they continue to count on us** when the chips are down**? *We’ve let every aspect of our nuclear weapons program deteriorate for the past sixteen years***. We have not transformed our nuclear strategy from one of massive retaliation against the Soviets to the surgical needs of today’s distributed threats. **Our stockpile** of high-yield, dirty nuclear weapons, designed for the Cold War, **is aged and becoming more irrelevant by the day**. The nation’s nuclear infrastructure has seriously deteriorated. **Our advanced nuclear technology R&D effort is practically nonexistent. We’ve designed no new nuclear weapons, tested no weapons, and produced no new weapons**. **Our Defense Department has virtually “denuclearized” itself,** disestablishing one nuclear weapons center after another. It has specified no requirements for new nuclear weapons, stopped conducting realistic nuclear exercises, and let nuclear weapons specialists wither away in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Executive Branch of government has shown little support for nuclear weapons programs for almost two decades. Members of Congress today have almost no nuclear weapons knowledge, and they’ve allowed a small number of anti-nuclear activists to kill the few tentative nuclear initiatives that have reached the Hill. Individual **U.S. political leaders have flatly stated that the U.S. will not use nuclear weapons. In sum, states under our** nuclear **umbrella may be worried over both our capability and our will to protect them.** The bottom line is, unless we take action, **the** U.S. nuclear **umbrella may shrink as state after state decides that to secure a reliable deterrent they must develop their own independent nuclear weapons programs.** Thus our global security alliances will shrink, and more proliferators will join the cascade.

***( ) No impact --- conventional deterrence solves***

**Perkovich 9**  
(Adviser to the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations Task Force on US Nuclear Policy, “Extended Deterrence on the way to a nuclear free world” International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, May 2009, pg. [www.icnnd.org/research/Perkovich \_Deterrence.pdf](http://www.icnnd.org/research/Perkovich%20_Deterrence.pdf))

**The most credible** and perhaps least dangerous **way to assure allies of U.S. commitments to defend them is to station U.S. conventional forces on allied territories**, as is already the case in original NATO states and in Japan and South

Korea. **With U.S. conventional forces in harm’s way, an adversary attacking a U.S. ally would draw the U.S. into the conflict with greater certainty than if nuclear weapons were directly and immediately implicated**. Indeed, the greater credibility that U.S. conventional forces bring to extended deterrence is one reason why Poland has been keen to have U.S. missile defense personnel based on Polish soil. **Were U.S. personnel attacked, the U.S. would respond forcefully. Arguably the best way to strengthen the credibility of U.S. extended deterrence would be to stress that conventional capabilities of the U.S. and its allies alone are sufficient to defeat all foreseeable adversaries in any scenario** other than nuclear war. And as long as adversaries can threaten nuclear war, the U.S. will deploy nuclear weapons to deter that threat. Of course, basing U.S. conventional forces on allied territory also invites controversy in many places, including Japan. Such controversies are much less intense than would flow from proposals to base nuclear weapons, but they point to the fundamental underlying political-psychological challenge of extended deterrence. Allies want the protection that the U.S. can provide, and worry about abandonment, but they also don’t want to be implicated in U.S. policies that could entrap them in conflicts not entirely of their making. This tension is the heart of the extended deterrence challenge. To repeat, **rather than focusing on nuclear weapons, the U.S. and its allies should concentrate on building cooperation and confidence in overall political-security strategies in each region**. Indeed, it is worthwhile to honestly consider whether in Northeast Asia and CentralEurope and Turkey the recently expressed concerns over the future credibility of extended U.S. nuclear deterrence is a proxy for deeper concerns that are more difficult to express. For example, in Poland, Russia’s rhetoric and foreign policy, including the conflict with Georgia, elicit private worries that NATO would not actually risk confrontation with Russia to defend Poland against Russian bullying. Can NATO as a collection of 26 states with diverse interests and capabilities be relied upon stand up forcefully in behalf of Poland (and other new NATO states)? Doubts about the answer to this question at least partially explain why Poland has sought special guarantees from the U.S. **It is not clear that focusing on the nuclear element of extended deterrence in this situation helps produce policies and capabilities that actually would deter or dissuade Russia from bellicosity.** **The types of scenarios in which Russia might bully Poland are not likely to include credible threats of Russian coercion that would make countervailing use of nuclear weapons realistic or desirable. Indeed, raising the specter of nuclear threats could undermine the credibility of extended deterrence because allied states**, including the American public, **would probably become alarmed in ways that would weaken resolve to push back firmly against Russian pressure. This resembles the credibility problems of extended nuclear deterrence during the Cold War.**

**Clean tech**

***Status quo solves --- renewable transition coming now***

**Bowen ‘12**

Currently a businessman, Robert Bowen served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980s as a moderate Democrat. He was also appointed by three different governors to serve on various boards and commissions. He has followed political news, national news headlines and international news closely for almost five decades.

8-22-12, Examiner, US carbon emissions are declining due to clean energy <http://www.examiner.com/article/us-carbon-emissions-are-declining-due-to-clean-energy>, jj

US carbon emissions are declining due to clean energy

A new report that studied 2,500 electrical power plants owned by 100 utilities in the United States was released this week and it shows that **harmful carbon pollution is on the decline. This is due to a transition to clean energy**. The report is out just before the science-deniers open their national convention in Tampa next Monday. The 2012 Benchmarking Air Emissions report looked at 2010-2011 data from the US Energy Information Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency to determine trends in four power plant pollutants: carbon dioxide (CO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen oxide (NOx) and mercury (Hg). The report looked at 100 utilities operating 2,500 power plants. These plants account for 86% of electricity generation and 88% of all emissions in the nation. The good news is that three of the pollutants studied have declined significantly. **The primary reason** is that coal power plants have been closing and are replaced by natural gas. Another factor **is the increase of electrical generation from wind and solar.** These **utilities have doubled their use of renewable energy since 2004. Renewables now account for 5% of the US electricity supply according to the report.** Natural gas now supplies 32% of all US electrical generation which is about the same as coal. Natural gas consumption by the electric power sector has risen an average of 4% annually for the past 10 years Power plants in 2010 were responsible for about 65% of SO2 emissions overall, 16% of NOx emissions, 68% of mercury air emissions and 40% of CO2 emissions. Because of this transition to gas and renewables, SO2 emissions are down 40% and NOx emissions are down 35% since 2008. More coal power plants are slated to close this year. These moth-balled plants produce about 40 gigawatts (GW) of electricity representing 12% of the US coal-fired capacity. Even though this trend began in earnest under the Bush administration, Mitt Romney is running ads accusing President Obama for waging a “war on coal.” If such a war exists, the result seems to be cleaner, healthier air and fewer greenhouse gas emissions. Maybe it is a good thing. **Southern Company**, a utility in the Southwest with more than 4.4 million customers and 43,000 MWs of generating capacity is one of the nation's most coal-intensive power producers. Southern, will use more natural gas than coal in 2012 for the first time in its 100-year history. The utility **owns a 30 MW solar PV plant** with Ted Turner **in New Mexico - the partnership just made a second solar acquisition. Its subsidiary**, Alabama Power, **buys wind energy from a farm in Oklahoma, and another unit, Georgia Power, is working on its first utility-scale project. Colorado’s Xcel Energy brought 68MW of new solar on line so far this year.** CO2 emissions from power plants are down 9% in the United States since 2008, more than any country or region. This decline occurred despite a global rise in emissions to record levels in 2011, largely due to a 9.3% leap in greenhouse gas emissions in China. The authors of the report were optimistic. "**This is an historic transition for the electric power industry**," says Mindy Lubber, president of Ceres, which prepared the report with M.J. Bradley & Associates, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Entergy, Exelon, Tenaska and Bank of America. "**More and more power producers are shifting away from coal-fired generation in favor of lower-emitting** natural gas-fired plants, **renewable power and energy efficiency**. **The economic case for cleaner energy is better than it's ever been, and this report shows that the industry is adapting to stronger Clean Air Act emissions standards, state-driven efficiency and renewable energy incentives** and the dynamics of the current natural gas market." The data shows that an **energy policy that shifts to** cleaner gas and **renewables does in fact make a difference**. The problem is, Congress wants to put an end to renewable energy, and Mitt Romney seems to be a big fan of coal. Should he win, no one but the Almighty knows what his energy agenda will be, but odds are that he will slow if not reverse the trend to clean energy that is showing results in our air quality.

***Nuclear dries up renewable investment --- hurts innovation***

**Charman, 6** – Karen, environmental journalist and managing editor at the Capitalism Nature Socialism journal (“Brave Nuclear World?/Commentary: Nuclear revival? Don’t bet on it!”, July/august, Vol. 19, pg. 12, Proquest)

**Governments and markets are beginning to recognize the potential of renewable energy and its use is growing rapidly**. According to Worldwatch Institute's Renewables 2005, global investment in renewable energy in 2004 was about US$30 billion. **The report points out that renewable sources generated 20 percent of the amount of electricity produced by the world's 443 operating nuclear reactors in 2004**. Renewables now account for 20-25 percent of global power sector investment, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development predicts that over the next 30 years one-third of the investment in new power sources in OECD countries will be for renewable energy.

**Alternative energy guru Amory Lovins says the investment in alternatives is currently "an order of magnitude" greater than that now being spent on building new nuclear plants**. Lovins has been preaching lower-cost alternatives, including energy conservation, for more than three decades, and the realization of his vision of sustainable, renewable energy is perhaps closer than ever. He **argues that the current moves to re-embrace nuclear power are a huge step backwards, and that contrary to claims that we need to consider all options to deal with global warming, nuclear power would actually hinder the effort because of the high cost and the long time it would take to get enough carbon-displacing nuclear plants up and running**. "In practice, **keeping nuclear power alive means *diverting private and public investment* from the cheaper market winners-cogeneration, renewables, and efficiency-to the costly market loser**. Its higher cost than competitors, per unit of net CO2 displaced, means that **every dollar invested in nuclear expansion will worsen climate change**," he writes in his 2005 paper "Nuclear Power: Economics and Climate-Protection Potential."

***Heg high and sustainable now – overwhelming power***

**Tufts Daily 2-23-11** (Prashanth Parameswaran, master's candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, writer for the New Strait Times, Strait Times and China Post, and former CSIS intern, “America is not in decline” <http://www.tuftsdaily.com/op-ed/prashanth-parameswaran-the-asianist-1.2478466>, jj)

I don't. **Very little about "American decline" is real or new. Similar predictions of U.S. decline have surfaced every decade or so** since Washington rebuilt the international system after World War II, from the aftermath of Sputnik in the 1960s to the economic distress of the 1980s. Foreign Policy is also hardly the only peddler of the latest declinism fetish. Everyone from [Newsweek's](http://newsweek.com) Fareed Zakaria to former Singaporean diplomat Kishore Mahbubani to American intelligence agencies themselves has parroted a version of it. But every myth has a grain of truth. In this case it's the fact that — God forbid — other powers are rising. Goldman Sachs says China will overtake the U.S. economy by 2027 and that the BRIC nations (**Brazil, Russia, India and China) will emerge as major world players**. But **so what? Other powers have been rising for decades**. **Yet,** to take one statistic**, the American economy in 2004 was the same size relative to the world's total GDP as it was in 1975 — 20 percent.** The real and more useful questions about decline are therefore not who is growing and by how much, but whether emerging powers can dent American power sufficiently and whether the United States will lose the key advantages that have sustained it as the world's sole superpower. **For all the fretting, the United States,** as Mr. Rachman himself admits, **remains the leader across the board. U.S. military power is still unmatched and vastly technologically superior to any other nation. Military spending is almost as much as the rest of the world combined. The American economy dominates futuristic industries like biotechnology and nanotechnology with a potent combination of technological prowess and entrepreneurial flair.** According to China's own Jiao Tong University's rankings, **17 of the world's top 20 universities are American. Millions still flock here to pursue the American Dream, while America's melting pot of cultures bodes well for its exceptional innovative capacity**. Provided the United States continues to encourage immigration and starts controlling its debt, **there is little reason to believe that such a *resilient colossus* will see its vast advantages perish**. **There are also few signs of a "global multipolar system" emerging anytime soon.** Despite doomsday realist predictions, **no country has attempted to balance Washington's hegemony since 1991**. And while the future rise of Asian powers may boost the case for eventual American decline, the truth is that **each of the United States' potential balancers also faces significant challenges going forward. For China, it is the growing disparity between its coastal and inland areas, its physical isolation and the risk that it will get old before it gets rich. For India and the European Union, the challenge will be to painfully negotiate the divergent interests of states in a noisy democratic system. As for Iran, Russia and Venezuela, they are flexing their muscles as proud spoilers, not global powers. It is also quite unlikely that these states will soon form a coalition to confront the United States, given their own divergent interests.** Even China and Russia compete ferociously in Central Asia today. Don't get me wrong. I don't believe we've reached Francis Fukuyama's "end of history," particularly with the slowing of democracy's progress during the last decade. Nor do I think the United States will be able to dominate and dictate terms to others all the time in the future. Still, **I just don't see the irreversible decline in U.S. power and the rise of a new world order that many seem to reflexively accept.**

**Prolif**

***No solvency:***

***( ) The US can’t influence global nuclear trade — international actors will resist influence.***

**Kerr et al, ’11**

~[Paul K, Analyst in Nonproliferation — CRS, Mark Holt, Specialist in Energy Policy, Mary Beth Nikitin, Specialist in Nonproliferation, 8-10, "Nuclear Energy Cooperation with Foreign Countries: Issues for Congress," <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/171374.pdf~~>]

**The ability of the United States to influence regulations for international nuclear commerce have** arguably **diminished**. As discussed above, the U.S. nuclear industry’s market power has declined and **foreign competitors have been concluding nuclear supply agreements with other countries**. Moreover, some **influential governments have demonstrated limited enthusiasm for such regulations.**

For example, as noted, some **members of the NSG displayed resistance to proposals that would restrict the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technology**. Furthermore, **the NSG decided in 2008 to exempt India from some of its export guidelines—a step which many observers argued would assist New Delhi’s nuclear weapons program**.85 **Some suppliers may use the 2008 decision to justify supplying other states that do not meet NSG guidelines; indeed, China has agreed to supply Pakistan with two additional nuclear reactors**.86 It is also possible that **Israel and Pakistan, which, like India, do not have full-scope safeguards and have not signed the NPT, may continue to ask for exemptions from NSG guidelines**. For its part, **Israel proposed export criteria in 2007 that would have had the effect of exempting Israel from the current NSG guidelines**87 **and is widely believed to have sought a nuclear cooperation agreement with the United States**.88

***( ) Nuclear leadership is impossible -- US arsenal creates hypocrisy and international resentment.***

**Perkovich, ‘8**

[George, vice president for studies and director of the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Abolishing Nuclear Weapons: Why the United States Should Lead,” October, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/abolishing\_nuclear\_weapons.pdf]

This Brief summarizes four security interests that would be served by making the **longterm project of abolishing nuclear weapons a central purpose of U.S. policy: preventing proliferation**; preventing nuclear terrorism; reducing toward zero the unique threat of nuclear annihilation; and fostering optimism regarding U.S. global leadership. Each of these objectives can be (and has been) pursued without the larger purpose of eliminating nuclear weapons. However, the **chances of success will steadily diminish if the few nuclear-armed states try to perpetuate a discriminatory order based on haves and have-nots and if they enforce it firmly against some states and hollowly against others. *Such inequity breeds noncooperation and resistance when what is needed now is cooperation to prevent proliferation, nuclear terrorism***, and the **failure of deterrence. Why should everyone cooperate in enforcing a system that looks like it was designed to favor just a few?**

**Econ**

***Job benefits of nuclear are tiny***

**Tucker ‘12**

William Tucker is the author of Terrestrial Energy: How Nuclear Power Will Lead the Green Revolution and End America's Energy Odyssey.

8-24-12, The American Spectator, Nuclear's Dilemma: Few Jobs, Just Energy <http://spectator.org/archives/2012/08/24/nuclears-dilemma-few-jobs-just>, jj

So the great Presidential battle over the future of energy is shaping up -- which can create more jobs, coal or wind? What about nuclear, which might also be said to have a potential role in the nation's energy future? Well, **nuclear energy has one great weakness. It doesn't create many jobs**. All it creates is lots of energy. And in the contest for which form of energy can employ the most people, that doesn't seem to count for much at all. Let it be said first that the other players missing in action here are gas and oil. **New drilling techniques for shale gas and tight oil are now creating more jobs and useful energy than all the other technologies combined**. Production from the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania and Ohio is up 82 percent over last year. **North Dakota's Bakken shale has created the lowest unemployment rate in the nation.** **Oklahoma gas fields are complaining they can't find enough workers**. Any healthy, working-age male could head for any of these states and find themselves making close to a six-figure income. But all this is happening in the private sector so it doesn't draw much attention in presidential campaigns. Most of the Marcellus shale lies under private lands so -- blessedly -- it can be done without federal interference. Only New York State has stopped the show -- which is just another reason why upstate New York, if separated from New York City, ranks as the second-poorest state in the nation behind only Mississippi. What attracts politicians to coal and wind is that they involve the federal government. The EPA is on a campaign to close down 10 percent of the nation's coal plants and so Romney can win votes by promising to intervene. The President, on the other hand, continues his efforts to "harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories," as he put it in his Inaugural Address. Wind's production tax credit -- which makes it profitable to erect windmills even if they never produce a kilowatt of electricity -- will be extended into the foreseeable future. Corn ethanol, which now consumes 40 percent of the corn crop, will continue to be mandated, even though it is driving up world food prices and international officials are accusing us of starving the world's poor. (The EPA showed its defiance last week by announcing that sorghum, the nation's third largest crop, will also be converted into ethanol.) The military is being instructed to substitute biofuels for jet fuel, even though it will cost $59 a gallon. And with nearly half the land west of the Mississippi still owned by the federal government, the President is able to commission a 350-square-mile wind farm in Wyoming and several 20-square-mile solar plants in the Mojave Desert. All this will create jobs, jobs, jobs. **So how does nuclear stack up against all this? Not very well.** Take the matter of coal mining. **There are an estimated 88,000 coal miners in this country working 1,300 coal mines**, most of them in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky. There are 400 mines in Kentucky alone. More than half a dozen states identify themselves as "coal states," with Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, Alabama, Colorado, and Wyoming filling out the list. Montana, the state with the biggest coal reserves, hasn't really started developing them yet. To this must be added the jobs in the railroad industry. A 1,000-megawatt (MW) coal plant must be replenished by a 110-car coal train arriving at the plant every 30 hours. A fully loaded coal "unit" train now leaves the Powder River Basin in Wyoming every eight minutes. Coal constitutes almost half the freight aboard the railroads and it is a moot question as to whether the railroads really own the coal companies or the coal companies own the railroads. In any case, **there are close to 200,000 railroad workers in the U.S., half of them dedicated to moving coal.** Now compare this to the mining and transport needed to fuel a nuclear reactor. **Because uranium has an energy density almost 3 million times that of coal, not much is required.** The Uranium Producers Association reports **there are 13 operating uranium mines in the country, employing 1,360 workers**. **The annual output of uranium mining would fill two railroad cars so no railroad traffic either**. Actually, domestic uranium production has been depressed over the last two decades because of the Megatons-to-Megawatts program that has recycled 18,000 former Soviet warheads in the greatest swords-into-plowshares effort in history. (Never heard of it? I wonder why.) But the treaty ends in 2014 and domestic uranium production may increase a little. The Russians are now proposing to supply the entire world with uranium out of one mine in Siberia. **Because uranium mining is such a small-scale operation, there are no "nuclear states**." New Mexico's Pete Domenici was once the leading advocate in the Senate because of the presence of the Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories. His mantle has been picked up by Senator Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, who has Oak Ridge. But nuclear has no real constituency in either state and plays very little in their politics. Then there is the matter of **enriching uranium and preparing it for use in reactors**. That **is done at the nation's only plant in Paducah, Kentucky, which employs 1,200 people**. The U.S. Enrichment Corporation (USEC) is trying to replace it with a more modern facility in Piketon, Ohio, but that will employ about the same amount. **How about transporting the fuel rods to the reactors? That requires a fleet of six trucks making the trip once every 18 months.** Now compare all this with **wind**, an even bigger vote-getter. Each 45-story windmill produces about 2 MW, which means you need 500 of them to equal the capacity of a nuclear reactor. These have to be manufactured and trucked to remote sites across the country. You've probably seen them on the highway. Each windmill blade is half the length of a football field. But wind farms only produce electricity 20 percent of the time so you need five times that number to equal one 1000-MW nuclear plant. That's 2,500 45-story windmills, which **translates into lots of manufacturing jobs, lots of transport, and lots of on-site construction. Wind is nothing if not labor intensive**. **The job requirements for solar are on the same scale**. Each PV panel or highly polished mirror -- several square miles of them -- demands extensive manufacturing and high maintenance. If they are located in the desert, solar facilities are going to require constant cleaning and polishing so they do not become covered with dirt and lose their efficiency. **We may have to employ half of Mexico to do the job**. That means even more votes on the way. **Where nuclear does create jobs is in the construction and operation of reactors. Building a new plant will employ 5,000 construction workers over five years**, probably double or triple the number required for coal or wind. Forbes just published an article saying that a 1000-MW reactor creates 500 highly skilled operating positions while coal produces 220 less-skilled jobs, wind 90 and natural gas only 60. **But these jobs are highly localized**. Bisconti research has found that support for nuclear regularly exceeds 80 percent in towns where reactors are located but the benefits do not spread to neighboring areas. The town of Vernon, population 2,000, which hosts Vermont Yankee, is almost 100 percent in favor of keeping the reactor operating. But its interests are swamped by 323,000 other Vermonters who see no benefits and think they can produce the same amount of energy by covering the Green Mountains with windmills.

***Turn --- Jobs go overseas, not the US & massive financial burden hurts the economy***

**Smith ‘11**

GAR SMITH—Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War.

International Forum on Globalization

NUCLEAR ROULETTE, International Forum on Globalization, <http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear_Roulette_book.pdf>, jj

**Taxpayer-backed nuclear loan guarantees are promoted as a means to create U.S. jobs but the truth is that all of the 18 currently pending U.S. reactors would be designed and built by Toshiba and AREVA and the high-paid engineering and construction jobs would go to workers in Japan and France**. The **bailouts** planned for Maryland’s Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 and South Texas Units 3 and 4 **would mainly benefit Japanese and French nuclear companies**. As the Nuclear Information and Resource Service notes: “If **American taxpayers** were upset about bailing out U.S. banks and car companies, they **should be furious about being put at risk in order to fatten the bottom line of overseas nuclear companies**.” (In another taxpayer-giveaway to these foreign corporations, the DOE announced in May 2010 that a $2 billion loan guarantee would be provided to France’s AREVA to build a uranium enrichment facility in Idaho.)89 **The total cost to taxpayers of these Nuclear Renaissance loan guarantees could hit $1.6 trillion**.90 During the 2008 presidential race, Sen. John McCain called for **building 45 new nukes by 2030**. Factoring in the industry’s potential for 250% cost overruns, that **could cost more than $1 trillion, with taxpayers taking a hit for billions of dollars worth of tax breaks, subsidies, loan guarantees, insurance breaks and bailouts if the builders default.** **The actual cost of constructing a nuclear reactor can be many times the initial estimate.** While the nuclear industry cites construction costs of about $2,000 per installed kilowatt (kW), out in the real world, Florida Power & Light has tagged the cost for building its two new Turkey Point units at $8,000 per installed kW. 91 The Energy Information Agency found that the **average construction cost for 75 U.S. reactors**—originally estimated at $45 billion—**had ballooned by more than 300% to $145 billion**.92 **Very few U.S. commercial reactors have proven profitable**93 **and even with federal support, any utility embarking on the nuclear path risks facing a lowered credit rating since cost overruns remain the norm**.94 In January 2011, in an attempt to reduce the financial burden of nuclear power, North Carolina’s Duke Energy and Progress Energy announced a planned merger to help finance three nuclear plants. (On a parallel track, the utilities are continuing to seek new laws to shift financial risk onto customers and taxpayers.) Moody’s Investor Service called the merger plan “a ‘bet-the-farm’ type of project.” **No nuclear plant has ever been completed on budget.**95 (One of the most embarrassing cost overruns occurred when the seismic supports for California’s Diablo Canyon reactor were installed backwards and upside down. Even worse, New York’s Shoreham plant went ten times over budget and never even opened.)96 **U.S. utilities stopped ordering reactors when it became clear that nuclear power’s business risks and costs were excessive**. **The industry’s “Generation IV” reactors rely on designs that have never been built or tested. Even with federal loans, these new reactors still would rank among the costliest private projects ever undertaken**.97

***1. Jobs aren’t important – productivity gains will sustain a recovery and US competitiveness***

Paul **Wiseman 2011** , U.S. productivity gains stifle job creation, The Associated Press, April 4, <http://www.usatoday.com/money/economy/2011-04-04-us-economy-jobs.htm>, KEL

**The U**nited **S**tates **is out of step with the rest of the world’s richest industrialized nations: Its economy is growing faster than theirs but creating far fewer jobs.** The reason is that **U.S. workers have become so productive that it’s harder for anyone without a job to get one. Companies are producing and profiting more than when the recession began, despite fewer workers**. They’re hiring again, but not fast enough to replace most of the 7.5 million jobs lost since the recession began. **Measured in growth, the American economy has outperformed those of Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Japan** — every Group of Seven developed nation except Canada, according to the Associated Press’ new Global Economy Tracker, a quarterly analysis of 22 countries representing more than 80% of global output. **Yet the U.S. job market remains the group’s weakest**. U.S. employment bottomed and started growing again a year ago, but there are still 5.4% fewer American jobs than in December 2007. That’s a much sharper drop than in any other G-7 country. The U.S. had the G-7’s highest unemployment rate as of December.

***2. Long time-frame and no solvency - High job growth cannot solve for a decade and too many people lack the education to fill the jobs created by plan***

James **Manyika et al 2011** (Director at McKinsey Global Institute, An economy that works: Job creation and America’s future June 2011 McKinsey Global Institute <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CD4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mckinsey.com%2F~%2Fmedia%2FMcKinsey%2Fdotcom%2FInsights%2520and%2520pubs%2FMGI%2FResearch%2FLabor%2520Markets%2FAn%2520economy%2520that%2520works%2520Job%2520creation%2520and%2520Americas%2520future%2FMGI_US_job_creation_executive_summary.ashx&ei=_qgpUIynO8WLywHO6oCoDg&usg=AFQjCNFcGlD4_zeDa-6SuPNk0nCABL-2Bw>, KEL

The results of our analysis are sobering: **only in the most optimistic scenario will the United States return to full employment1 before 2020**. Achieving this outcome will require sustained demand growth, rising US competitiveness in the global economy, and better matching of US workers to jobs. Among our key findings: ƒƒ The United States has been experiencing increasingly lengthy “jobless recoveries” from recessions in the past two decades. It took roughly 6 months for employment to recover to its prerecession level after each postwar recession through the 1980s, but it took 15 months after the 1990–91 recession and 39 months after the 2001 recession. At the recent pace of job creation, it will take more than 60 months after GDP reached its prerecession level in December 2010 for employment to recover.2 ƒƒ **The United States will need to create a total of 21 million new jobs in this decade to put unemployed Americans back to work and to employ its growing population**. We created three possible scenarios for job creation, based on sector analyses, and find that they deliver from 9.3 million to 22.5 million jobs. **Only in the high-job growth scenario will the United States return to full employment in *this decade.*** ƒƒ **Six sectors illustrate the potential for job growth in this decade: health care, business services, leisure and hospitality, construction, manufacturing, and retail.** These sectors span a wide range of job types, skills, and growth dynamics. They account for 66 percent of employment today, and we project that they will account for up to 85 percent of new jobs created through the end of the decade. ƒƒ **Under current trends, the United States will not have enough workers with the right education and training to fill the skill profiles of the jobs likely to be created**. Our analysis suggests **a shortage of up to 1.5 million workers with bachelor’s degrees or higher in 2020**. At the same time, **nearly 6 million Americans without a high school diploma are likely to be without a job.** ƒƒ **Moreover, too few Americans who attend college and vocational schools choose fields of study that will give them the specific skills that employers are seeking**. **Our interviews point to potential shortages in many occupations, such as nutritionists, welders, and nurse’s aides—in addition to the often-predicted shortfall in computer specialists and engineers.**

***Low natural gas prices solve your energy prices internal link***

**Reuters**, **9/21**/2012. “U.S. Export Surge Could Add 5 Million Jobs By 2020: Report,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/21/us-exports-jobs\_n\_1902803.html.

**Rising U.S. factory productivity, spurred by falling natural gas prices, could help the nation boost exports** of products such as locomotives and factory machinery **and add as many as 5 million manufacturing and support jobs by the decade's end, a new analysis found**. **High worker productivity and low energy prices driven by a surge in shale gas production will give the United States a cost advantage in exports against** Western European **rivals** and Japan in the coming years, **according to** a **Boston Consulting Group** report set for release on Friday. By 2015, those factors will make average manufacturing costs in the United States lower by 15 percent than in Germany and France, 8 percent than in the United Kingdom and 21 percent than in Japan, the study projects. Factories' costs in China will remain 7 percent cheaper than those in the United States, however. The competitive gap in some ways reflects the open U.S. labor market, where companies can quickly add or cut workers to meet changes in demand, said Hal Sirkin, a senior partner at the BCG consultancy and author of the report. "In Europe and Japan, it's relatively hard to lay people off, and because of that you have employees for a long period of time that you may not be able to use," Sirkin said. "In the United States, there's much more flexibility." Besides the ease of adding or firing workers, lower wages and Americans' readiness to move for work will make U.S. factory labor costs 20 percent to 45 percent lower than prevailing costs in Western Europe and Japan by 2015, the study found. **BCG forecast that a glut of natural gas production in the United States would keep the nation's prices of the fuel 50 percent to 70 percent below those in Europe and Japan, as well as hold down electricity costs**. BEYOND ONSHORING **U.S. factory employment has grown by about 3.6 percent to roughly 12 million people from a 2010 post-recession low, a trend that could accelerate as the United States becomes a more competitive exporter**, BCG said. The increase in part reflects a realization by manufacturers that rising shipping costs and wage inflation in China and other countries have made it cheaper to make products at home. The recent growth in U.S. factory employment follows a drop of about 40 percent over three decades as many businesses concluded that high wages made the country too costly for manufacturing and economists predicted that Americans would turn away from assembly jobs in favor of work in the service sector. Over the past year, though, major U.S. exporters General Electric Co and Caterpillar Inc have both added U.S. factory jobs. The study also noted that **foreign-owned companies including Japan's Toyota Motor Co and Germany's Siemens AG were also making products in the United States and exporting them to other countries**. BCG said the United States could boost its exports by about $90 billion by the end of the decade by winning orders currently filled by Western European and Japanese factories. Total U.S. exports came to $1.48 trillion in 2011, according to the Census Bureau. Based on the export forecast and current worker productivity figures, BCG projects that the U.S. could add 2.5 million to 5 million jobs by 2020, an estimate that includes jobs in both factories and related services, such as trucking and construction. **The biggest export gains could come in the industrial machinery, transportation and chemicals sectors -- slices of manufacturing that are both highly energy-intensive and automated, requiring fewer workers**, BCG said. One wild card is the euro currency, which fell fairly steadily in value from mid-2011 though July as the region's policymakers struggled with a debt crisis. This slide made European factories relatively more competitive than their U.S. rivals. That advantage has begun to fade over the past two months, with the euro trading at $1.29 on Thursday, up about 7.5 percent from its July 24 low. Sirkin said little short of an outright collapse in the euro would change BCG's analysis. "Obviously currency matters," Sirkin said, "but over the range that the euro's been over the last reasonable period of time, the fundamentals don't change."

***1. Global economy resilient***

**Zakaria ‘9 -** PhD Poli Sci @ Harvard, Zakaria, Editor of Newsweek, 12/12/’9 (Fareed, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425>)

**A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets.** So consider this: **the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year**. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but **it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled**. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "**We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual**?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, **governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s,** when governments played a tiny role in national economies**. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles:** the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. **Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force.** When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.**

***2. Economic collapse doesn’t cause war***

Fareed **Zakaria** was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 20**09**, “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html>

**Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries.** At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. **One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks** (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). **Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran.** Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But **overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**.

***3. US isn’t key to the world economy***

John **Curran, 9-2-2010,** “Can World Economy Keep Growing If U.S. Doesn’t?” Time,<http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/can-world-economy-keep-growing-if-u-s-doesnt/?xid=rsstopstories&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed:+time/topstories+%28TIME:+Top+Stories%29>

A worrying economic question these days is the possibility of a return to negative GDP growth in the U.S, the dreaded double dip. If it happened it could pull much of the world back into recession, possibly triggering another round of financial crisis. Though all but a few consider this a low possibility, it's not so low as to be off the radar. Economists I follow generally put the risk of a U.S. double dip at somewhere between 20% and 35%. There's ample evidence that the U.S. economy is not out of the woods yet. U.S. consumers picked up spending slightly last month, but they are still tentative and their debt levels remain high. Businesses are watching consumers closely because managers are reluctant to commit to new hiring and investment while so many people are out of work. Consumer spending picked up slightly in July, but confidence is weak and retailers are hurting. The latest signs of this come from back-to-school shopping, where price cutting ruled, and tumbling U.S. auto sales (down 21% in August). There is talk of a second federal stimulus but nobody can count those chickens until they hatch. The chicken you can count on, though, is the economic energy coming from developing markets, specifically the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China). Though the BRICs will advance in fits and starts—for more on this, see Michael Schuman's insightful [post](http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/is-red-hot-india-too-hot/) on India and China—the fact of their increasing consumption power now feeds into the global growth calculation in a meaningful way. **The good news is that BRIC growth increasingly makes U.S. growth shortfalls in the years ahead less of a threat for the world economy**. According to work by Jim O'Neill, who heads Goldman Sachs' global economics team, the current value of consumption in the BRIC countries is roughly $4 trillion, still less than half of the $10.5 trillion that U.S. consumers spend. But **O'Neill sees a powerful lift from these countries in the years just ahead. With BRIC consumption growing by roughly 15% per year, he estimates, it should rival that of U.S. consumption by the end of the decade. The world will feel the beneficial effects sooner.**  BRIC consumption is already growing by roughly $600 billion a year and should rise to $1 trillion a year by the middle of the decade, says O'Neill. **Such demand does not all land at the U.S. doorstep but it does flow to the world, providing a nice offset to what is likely to be long-term weakness in U.S. consumption. That's good news for all.**

## 2nc DA

***Mid East war outweighs --- most likely and fastest impact***

**Russell, ‘09** [James, senior lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Nava Postgraduate School, Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prosepects for Nuclear War and Escalation in the Middle East, in collaboration with the Atomic Energy Commission, <http://www.nps.edu/academics/sigs/ccc/people/biolinks/russell/PP26_Russell_2009.pdf>]

**Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors:** (1) **asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors**; (2) **the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists;** (3) **incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable**; (4) **perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack**; (5) the prospect that **Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States;** (6) **the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any (of) the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance.** Given these factors, **it is** disturbingly easy **to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways**. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent **such an outcome**, which **would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.**

**Obama Solves Nuclear**

***Obama re-election key to nuclear power --- solves the aff***

**Holl ‘12**

Nathan Holl, February 15th, 2012, Energy & Capital, Obama Has Big Plans for Nuclear Energy in 2013 <http://www.energyandcapital.com/articles/obama-has-big-plans-for-nuclear-energy-in-2013/2065>, jj

President **Obama has unveiled his fiscal budget for 2013 and it looks like the administration has a clear focus on** investing in alternative energy, **ramping up nuclear energy**, and ending tax subsidies for big oil. **The administration proposed allocating $27.2 billion to the Department of Energy, a 3.2 percent increase of what congress allotted to the department last year.** $2.3 billion of which is to be put towards research and development for increased energy and efficiency, advanced vehicles and biofuels. In a cover letter justifying the push for research and development in alternative energy, federal energy secretary Steven Chu wrote: “The United States is competing in a competing in a global race for the clean energy jobs of the future” Chu went on to write that it would not be prudent of America to allow those jobs to land in the laps of its competitors. Primarily, **Obama intends to reinvigorate the nation's fervor over alternative energy** and revive its perception after the Solyndra debacle, which occurred last year. Obama’s budget will extend key tax credits for renewable-energy production and clean-energy manufacturing. The remaining **$25 billion is to be distributed amongst America’s various nuclear divisions**. ■$**150 million is will go into *r*esearch and *d*evelopment of a new processing facility being constructed by the U.S Enrichment Corp.** ■**The Office of Nuclear Energy would receive $770 million; the money is to promote the research and development of small modular reactors.** ■$**60 million to perform essential research on developing more viable and sustainable battery storage systems.** ■ $11.5 billion to protect Americans by maintaining U.S. nuclear deterrence capabilities, designed to reduce nuclear dangers in an increasingly volatile and unpredictable world. **$8.33 billion is to be allocated to support the Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s issuing of Combined Construction and Operating license to Southern Co**. (NYSE: SO) **to build the nation’s first nuclear reactors in 30 years.**

***Turns every advantage:***

***Obama key to heg***

**Burns ‘11**

Nicholas Burns is a professor of the practice of diplomacy and international politics at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government. His column appears regularly in the Globe.

Boston Globe, December 09, 2011, Our best foreign policy president

<http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2011/12/09/our-best-foreign-policy-president/099kgmi9VkgJIVntKH9j9M/story.html>, jj

What lessons can we draw from Bush’s masterful work in ending the Cold War on our terms? First, that creative and purposeful presidential diplomacy exercised at key moments continues to be a vital national requirement. We lost sight of that at times in the decade after 9/11 when we turned too frequently to the military to respond to fires burning overseas. Second, that **we need a president with a deep and unerring knowledge of the world and the self-confidence to act boldly on the biggest stage imaginable. *As we look to November, we cannot afford to elect a president who requires on-the-job training***. **With a rising China, nuclear challenges from Iran and North Korea, the Arab revolutions, a European financial crisis, and climate change all on the agenda, our nation’s chief diplomat must possess a clear and steady strategic compass**. While **the election** should clearly focus on the economy, it **must** also **be about who best can lead us through the thickets of the most complex strategic landscape we have ever encountered. That is why Republican voters will need to judge which candidate can match President Obama’s impressive international record**. **This just may be a rare election when the Democratic candidate can claim legitimately that he is best prepared to defend the country, given Obama’s string of foreign policy accomplishments.**

***Romney will destroy the economy***

**Dorner 1-2-12** (Josh, is the Communications Director for the ThinkProgress war room. He brings four years of experience heading up communications strategy and media for all of the Sierra Club’s energy and global warming work, as well as its other federal legislative campaigns and political work. He also served as deputy communications director at the Clean Energy Works campaign. Prior to Sierra Club, Josh worked as an account executive at a PR firm that primarily served nonprofits, independent film distributors, and other arts projects. Josh graduated from Grinnell College with honors degrees in political science and French. He also holds a master of science in European politics and governance from the London School of Economics.

Think Progress, REPORT: The Republican Candidates’ Economic Agenda For The 1 Percent

<http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/02/395363/gop-economic-agenda-for-the-one-percent/>, jj)

**Each and every Republican candidate has called for trillions of dollars in new tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans and corporations — all while calling for ending Medicare as we know it and dramatic cuts to Social Security, Medicaid, and countless other programs and services** that Americans depend on each day. **All of the candidates would take us back to the Bush-era policies that** increased income inequality, **resulted in the worst job growth in decades, exploded the deficit and national debt, and ultimately** crashed the economy. Indeed, **the policies proposed by the candidates would not only embrace this failed economic agenda, they would take it even further.**

**A2: Thumper – Econ/FoPo Surprises**

***No major surprises coming now – econ and foreign policy are static***

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/30, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/30/economically-obama-is-no-jimmy-carter/)

**The forward-looking data** was bad as well. The stock market declined in the six months leading up to May 1980 (even without adjusting for inflation), and the consensus of economic forecasters at the time was that conditions would remain recessionary for the six months ahead. By contrast, the data this year **is mediocre, but nowhere near** that **terrible.** Industrial production has picked up quite a bit and is an economic bright spot, which could help Mr. Obama in the manufacturing-intensive economies of the Midwest. Inflation has not been a major problem throughout the economy as a whole, although energy prices have been a periodic threat. However, income growth is very slow, as is the growth in consumption as indicated by the broadest measure of it, personal consumption expenditures. (Growth in retail sales has been more robust, but that is a less comprehensive statistic.) Jobs growth has been decent recently, but many economists expect it to slow some in the subsequent months. Gross domestic product in the final six months of the year, likewise, is expected to grow at a below-average rate. Still, there is really no comparison between Mr. Obama and Mr. Carter, who faced an economy that was still bottoming out into a severe and broad-based recession. Mr. **Obama**, by contrast, **faces numbers that are improving but perhaps too slowly.** It would probably require an economic shock, instead, to put Mr. Obama in Mr. Carter’s shoes. This could happen, of course – for instance, if there were a meltdown in Europe. Economists differ greatly on whether this would have relatively mild or more catastrophic effects on the American economy. But most versions of it would be enough to leave Mr. Obama as a clear underdog for re-election. Even if that were to occur, however, Mr. Obama’s situation might still not be as bad as Mr. Carter’s. For instance, **he does not face an acute foreign policy crisis**, at the moment at least, as Mr. Carter did in Iran, **and a European-driven recession would probably not be associated with high inflation** (although one set off by oil-price instability in the Middle East might). In some ways, in fact, it’s remarkable that Mr. Carter lost his election to Mr. Reagan by only 10 points. Some of this was because the recession of 1980 was extremely unusual: it was severe but also brief, ultimately persisting for only six months. Mr. Carter’s recession technically ended in August 1980, although not in a way that would have been highly visible to consumers and voters at the time. All of this produced some incredibly volatile polling in 1980. Mr. Carter led Mr. Reagan by a wide margin in polls in January and February 1980. The numbers drew closer together in the spring. By the summer, Mr. Reagan had a clear lead, peaking around 25 points in polls conducted immediately after the Republican convention in Detroit. Then, Mr. Carter rebounded, with polls conducted in late October showing him behind Mr. Reagan by only a point or two on average. Mr. Reagan considerably beat his polls on Election Day, however, and won in a landslide. Once we release the election model, we will be a little bit more in “sweat the small stuff” mode, analyzing the trends in the polling and the economic numbers on an almost-daily basis. So far, however, **the 2012 election cycle has been *extremely stable*** as **compared with** some **other years** like 1980.

**A2: UQ overwhelms**

***Uniqueness doesn’t overwhelm in swing states --- it can shift***

**Sabato et al 9-27**

Larry J. Sabato, Kyle Kondik and Geoffrey Skelley, U.Va., Center for Politics, Sabato’s Crystal Ball, 9-27-12, Election Tilts Toward Obama, Senate Democrats <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/election-tilts-toward-obama-senate-democrats/>, jj

So with 40 days to go, **we’re moving several toss-up states in the president’s direction. Our changes push Obama over the magic 270 mark, but we are not calling the race.** **First, the debates are yet to come. There is at least the possibility that, if Romney fares particularly well or Obama does poorly, the drift of this contest could change**. Second, ***other events*** — international (a crisis) or ***domestic*** (dramatically poor economic numbers) — ***could theoretically occur to re-write the narrative of the race***. So **caution is always in order with almost six weeks to go, yet President Obama clearly leads at the moment.**

***Their authors are jumping the gun --- Ohio’s a toss up and could still swing to Romney***

1) Ohio polls are residual convention bump --- race will tighten and become a dead heat

2) Ohio is always super close --- empirically

3) Romney won’t go down without a fight --- will be pouring all resources into Ohio

4)

**Cillizza 9-14**

Chris Cillizza, American political reporter for the Washington Post. He writes The Fix, a daily political weblog for the Post website. He is a regular contributor to the Post on political issues, and is an MSNBC political analyst, September 14, 2012, Washington Post, Why we aren’t moving Ohio to ‘lean Obama’ <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/14/why-we-arent-moving-ohio-to-lean-obama/>, jj

That’s why the poll numbers that have emerged out of the state in recent days are so eye-opening. The latest came from NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist and showed President Obama at 50 percent to 43 for former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney. Viewed more broadly, the Real Clear Politics polling average in Ohio pegs Obama at 48.5 percent to Romney’s 44.3 percent. Take those poll numbers and combine them with the state’s improving economy — it’s gotten better faster than most other swing states — and **all signs point to the fact that this state isn’t a toss up but rather leans toward President Obama. But, we’re not changing our “toss up” rating on Ohio just yet. And here’s why: 1. It’s clear** from the bulk of national and swing state polling that **Obama got something of a bump from his convention**. **But, given how locked in the electorate has been — about 47 percent for Obama and 47 percent for Romney — for months, it’s hard to imagine that bump is a long-term phenomenon. Polling** over the past year or more would **suggest it is much more likely Ohio returns to a *dead heat* than it moves further away from Romney between now and Nov. 6. 2. Ohio has been one of the most closely divided states at the presidential level for the past three decades**. **Since 1980, the GOP nominee has carried it five times** (1980, 1984, 1988, 2000, 2004) **while Democrats have won it three** (1992, 1996, 2008). If you believe that 2012 will look a lot like 2004 in terms of how the electoral map shakes out, then **it’s hard not to imagine that Ohio is going to wind up close.** (In 2004, George W. Bush won Ohio by 118,000 out of more than 5.5 million cast.) **3. Romney’s campaign simply will not walk away from Ohio**. They understand that to pull money out of Ohio would be regarded as something between capitulation and panic — neither words they want associated with their candidate in the final 50 (or so) days between now and the election. **Ohio is the crown jewel** — electorally speaking — of the industrial Midwest, a region hit hard over the past decade by the collapse of the manufacturing sector among other economic hardships. Putting aside the symbolic importance of Ohio, **there is also a practical reason to believe that the Romney campaign will spend every dime they have to try to win the state**. **With neither Michigan or Pennsylvania seemingly where the GOP would like them to be in terms of competitiveness, Ohio’s 18 electoral votes become all the more critical.** To be clear, **you’d rather be** President **Obama in Ohio today than** Mitt **Romney.** But, **the history of close races in the state and the centrality of the Buckeye State to Romney’s winning calculus suggest that moving it out of the toss-up category might amount to jumping the gun.**

***Romney can still come back --- historically true***

**Cassidy 9-25** John Cassidy has been a staff writer at The New Yorker since 1995. He has written many, many articles for the magazine, on topics ranging from Alan Greenspan and Ben Bernanke to the Iraqi oil industry and the economics of Hollywood. He also writes a blog on The New Yorker’s Web site, entitled “Rational Irrationality.” His latest book, “How Markets Fail: The Logic of Economic Calamities,” was published in November, 2009, by Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Cassidy is also a contributor to The New York Review of Books and a financial commentator for the BBC. He came to The New Yorker after working for newspapers on both sides of the Atlantic. He joined the Sunday Times, in London, in 1986, and served as the paper’s Washington bureau chief for three years, and then as its business editor, from 1991 to 1993. From 1993 to 1995, he was at the New York Post, where he edited the Business section and then served as the deputy editor.

9-25-12, the New Yorker, HOW ROMNEY COULD STILL WIN <http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/johncassidy/2012/09/how-romney-could-still-win.html>, jj

Let me be clear: **I remain confident enough that Obama will win** that, if Rove or anybody else is willing to offer me even odds, or even one-to-two, I’d happily bet on it. **But the future is inherently uncertain, and the possibility of a Romney comeback can’t be wholly discounted**. **Opinion polls and betting markets are best regarded as snapshots of the prevailing wisdom at given point in time.** **Even at this relatively late stage of the campaign, the picture can change**. Since 1972, as Silver pointed out, **the average change between the polls in late September and the result on Election Day is close to five per cent. That’s larger than Obama’s lead in the poll-of-polls**. While Truman and George W. were the only victorious candidates to come from behind, others have come close. **In 1968, Hubert Humphrey was trailing Richard Nixon by double digits, and he ended up losing by less than a point. Even** Michael **Dukakis, widely written off in September, rallied late to throw a scare into the Bush camp.**

***Pessimism about Obama can still change the race***

**Horowitz 9-15**

Jake Horowitz 9-15-12 Obama vs Romney Polls: Obama Winning Nationwide On All But One Key Election Issue http://www.policymic.com/articles/14801/obama-vs-romney-polls-obama-winning-nationwide-on-all-but-one-key-election-issue

**The picture of American voters created by the poll seems to suggest that if the election were held today**, President **Obama would be the victor, but the numbers are so close, and things could change quickly, so Romney still has a real chance. If voter pessimism about the economy and direction of the country continues, then his chance gets even bigger.**

***Romney is in striking range***

**Whitesides 9-21**

John Whitesides Sep 21, 2012 Analysis: Romney can still win, but it won't be easy http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/21/us-usa-campaign-romney-analysis-idUSBRE88K06G20120921

So, **seven weeks before the election, is it already over for Mitt Romney? Not yet. Despite the serial gaffes and the many questions about his campaign, Romney remains within striking range of the president.**  **The former Massachusetts governor still has time to change the trajectory of the race -** even though he has not shown an ability to do so for the past several months, as he has cast Obama as a failure in overseeing a struggling economy. There are three presidential debates in October, and Romney - who during the past month lightened his campaign schedule in favor of debate practices - clearly is pointing toward the showdowns with Obama as a chance to show Americans he is a better bet to turn things around. **Obama remains vulnerable thanks to a stubbornly high** 8.1 percent **unemployment** rate, **tepid economic growth and big majorities of voters who believe the U**nited **S**tates **is on the wrong track**.

***Obama’s winning Ohio but it’s a toss up and could still swing***

**Politics Extra 9-18**

<http://cincinnati.com/blogs/politics/2012/09/18/wapo-why-ohio-is-still-a-toss-up/>, jj

**Washington Post reporter Chris Cillizza offers three reasons why Ohio remains a toss-up state for the 2012 election, despite** recent **polls showing** President Barack **Obama ahead**. **First, Cillizza believes the post-Democratic National Convention “bump” in polling for Obama will be temporary.** **Second, Ohio has a long history of closely divided presidential race**s. So, Cillizza thinks that if the 2012 electoral maps look anything similar to 2004’s, **“then it’s hard not to imagine that Ohio is going to wind up close.”** L**astly, Cillizza noted because of the mere fact that Ohio is a political “crown jewel,” the Romney campaign cannot risk giving up winning Ohio**. However, Cillizza says that it all comes down to the simple fact that that if Michigan and Pennsylvania are not as competitive as the GOP wants, then **Ohio’s 18 electoral votes become even more important for Romney.**

**2nc Link Overview**

***Independents are irrelevant it’s a question of base turnout***

**MacAskill ‘12**

Ewen MacAskill, 8-16-12, Democrats' nerves start to show as Ryan fires up conservative voters, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/aug/16/romney-gamble-paul-ryan-vicepresident?newsfeed=true>, jj

But that strategy was not working. **The US is so polarised that there are**, according to the polls, **few undecided voters left.** Compared with 2008, when about 25% of the electorate had still to make up their minds at this stage in the election, **only about 5% are undecided**. Both the Democratic and Republican strategists have concluded that **the winner on 6 November will be the campaign that fires up its own supporters, that gets its base out, rather than the one that wins over the independent swing voters**. Larry Sabato, professor of politics at the University of Virginia, said: "**It is base v base**. **There are hardly any independents**." At the cost of winning over a percentage of that small group in the centre, the campaigns risked alienating their core support, he said.

***Specifically true of young greens --- Obama needs strong turnout and their energetic support --- they wouldn’t vote for Romney but they’d stay home or devote resources to congressional races***

**Hill ‘11**

Ben Geman - 08/20/11, The Hill, Obama faces big green tests in 2012 <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/177607-obama-faces-big-green-tests-heading-into-2012>, jj

“**He still has the opportunity to regain some footing with young people**,” said Hight, the Obama campaign’s Florida youth vote director in 2008. “By all means, **everybody is hungry for leadership**.” According to the Pew Research Center, **Obama** scored a whopping 66 percent of the vote among voters under 30 in 2008. Next year, he **needs young voters to turn out in large numbers again in what is expected to be a tighter election.** Polls show other issues – notably the economy – are a bigger priority than the environment, but **the president** still **can’t afford widespread political disenchantment in the green movement that could suppress turnout.** “**The risk he has in turnout is environmental issues tend to play the strongest among voters under 30**,” said political analyst Ron Faucheux, who is president of the Clarus Research Group and teaches at George Washington University. **While environmentalists won’t throw their weight behind a GOP White House hopeful, Obama’s choices could affect the work of green groups with political field organizations**, notably the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters (LCV). Navin Nayak, LCV’s senior vice president for campaigns, pointed to Obama’s decision to significantly boost auto mileage requirements, and create first-time efficiency standards for heavy trucks, in arguing that Obama’s standing with environmentalists remains generally good. But Nayak also took a shot across Obama’s bow: he notes that **the White House can’t “coast” given the “magnitude of decisions they have in front of them.”** “**We are certainly going to be watching closely how these decisions play out in terms of our resources and investment in the presidential race,” said Nayak, whose group is also active in congressional races. “It is all a matter of prioritizing resources.”**

***Plan unpopular with democrats***

**Reason Foundation ‘12**

Reason. Los Angeles: Jan 2012. Vol. 43, Iss. 8; pg. 50, 2 pgs, Who's More Anti-Science: Republicans or Democrats?, PROQUEST, jj

With regard to nukes, the Pew survey found that **70 percent of scientists are in favor of building more nuclear power plants, compared to** 62 percent of Republicans and **just 45 percent of Democrats**. **This difference reflects divergent views on nuclear safety**: A 2009 Gallup poll reported that **while 73 percent of Republicans are confident in the safety of nuclear power plants, only 46 percent of Democrats agree.**

***Environmental groups hate it***

**Shogren ‘11**

Elizabeth Shogren, March 28, 2011, WBEZ91.5 – NPR, Are Nuclear Plants Safe? Environmentalists Are Split, <http://www.wbez.org/story/energy/2011-03-28/are-nuclear-plants-safe-environmentalists-are-split-84376>, jj

'We Would Oppose' New Nuclear Plants **For** other **environmental groups, the nuclear disaster in Japan is a wake-up call**. **The Sierra Club** declares on its website that the group **has opposed nuclear power for more than three decades**. **But the group supported the climate change bill** that passed the House two years ago, **which included subsidies for** a next generation of **nuclear** power **plants.** **Sierra Club Executive Director** Michael **Brune says that will not happen again. "It would be hard to stomach any further support for additional nuclear power plants in the country**," he says. "**Making the problem worse by throwing taxpayer dollars at new nuclear plants would be something that the Sierra Club would definitely not support**," he adds. "**We would oppose it vigorously**." Brune says **his group will make it a priority to examine existing U.S. nuclear plants for safety risks — and make sure the public is being protected. Greenpeace is one group that never softened its opposition to nuclear plants.** "**We've always believed that it's an inherently dangerous technology that should be phased out and replaced**," says Jim Riccio, a nuclear policy analyst for Greenpeace USA. "**And there are many cheaper, easier and less dangerous ways to generate electricity** that don't threaten our families, homes and communities." **In recent years, public opinion polls had shown growing support for building more nuclear plants** in the U.S., with as many as 60 percent of Americans saying they were in favor of them. But **since the crisis in Japan, polls show support has shrunk to closer to 40 percent.**

**Link UQ – Nuke Power Not Campaign Issue Now**

***Obama distancing himself from nuclear issues in the run-up to the election***

**LEVINE 9/7**/12 (Gregg; Contributing Editor and Former Managing Editor – Firedoglake and Contributing Writer for Truthout, “Obama Drops Nuclear from Energy Segment of Convention Speech,” <http://capitoilette.com/2012/09/07/obama-drops-nuclear-from-energy-segment-of-convention-speech/>)

President **Obama no longer promises to** “**safely harness nuclear power**”–that likely would have sounded like a cruel joke **in a world now contaminated by the ongoing Fukushima disaster**–but beyond that, **he does not promise anything about nuclear power at all**. There was no platitude, no carefully crafted signal to the industry that has subsidized much of Obama’s political career, no mention of nuclear power whatsoever.

That is not to say that the entire 2012 Democratic National Convention was a nuclear-free zone. A few hours before the president took the stage at the Time Warner Cable Arena, James Rogers, co-chair of the Charlotte host committee, and oh, by the way, CEO of Duke Energy, stepped to the lectern and endorsed Obama’s “all of the above” energy “strategy” (they keep using that word; I do not think it means what they think it means):

We need to work even harder toward a future of affordable, reliable and cleaner energy. That means we need to invest heavily in new zero-emission power sources, like new nuclear, wind and solar projects, as well as new technologies, like electric vehicles.

Well, if you are looking for a future of affordable, reliable and cleaner energy, you need look no further than nu–wait, what? If you are looking for those three features in an energy future, it is hard to imagine a worse option than the unsustainably expensive, chronically unreliable and dangerously dirty nuclear power plant. And, as has been discussed here many times, nuclear is not a zero-emission source, either. The massive carbon footprint of the nuclear fuel lifecycle rivals coal, and that doesn’t even consider the radioactive isotopes that facilities emit, even when they are not encountering one of their many “unusual events.”

But the CEO of the Charlotte-based energy giant probably has his eyes on a different prize. Rogers, who has been dogged by questions about a power grab after Duke’s merger with Progress Energy and his lackluster performance as fundraiser-in-chief for the DNC, sits atop a company that operates seven US nuclear power plants, and is partners in a plan to build two new AP1000 reactors in Cherokee County, South Carolina.

That last project, which is under active review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, awaiting a combined construction and operating license, is one of a small handful of proposed new nuclear facilities currently scrambling for financing. The South Carolina plant, along with a pair of reactors in Georgia, two slated for a different site in South Carolina, and possibly one more in Tennessee, represent what industry lobbyists like to call the “nuclear renaissance.”

But completion of any of the above is nowhere close to guaranteed, and even if some of these reactors are eventually built, none will be able to generate even one kilowatt of commercial power until years after President Obama completes his sought-after second term.

Which, if you really care about America’s energy future, is, of course, all for the better. As even James Rogers noted in his speech (and he gets props for this):

[W]e cannot lose sight of energy efficiency. Because the cleanest, most efficient power plant is the one we never have to build.

That Duke’s CEO thought to highlight efficiency is interesting. **That** President **Obama, with his well-documented ties to the nuclear industry, chose not to even mention nuclear power is important**.

**In the wake of Fukushima**, where hundreds of thousands of Japanese have been displaced, where tens of thousands are showing elevated radiation exposure, and where thousands of children have thyroid abnormalities, **no one can be cavalier about promising a safe harnessing of the atom**. And in a world where radioisotopes from the breached reactors continue to turn up in fish and farm products, not only across Japan, but across the northern hemisphere, no one can pretend this is someone else’s problem.

**Obama and his campaign advisors know all this and more**. **They know that most industrialized democracies have chosen to shift away from nuclear since the start of the Japanese crisis**. **They know that populations that have been polled on the matter want to see nuclear power phased out**. **And they know that in a time of deficit hysteria, nuclear power plants are an economic sinkhole**.

**And so**, on a night when the president was promised one of the largest audiences of his entire campaign, **he and his team decided that 2012 was not a year to throw a bone to Obama’s nuclear backers**. **Obama, a consummate politician, made the decision that for his second shot at casting for the future, nuclear power is political deadweight**.

***Nuclear power is politically toxic – Obama’s silent on it now to avoid controversy***

**Wood 12**

Elisa Wood September 13, 2012 What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy <http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/>

Still, **nuclear is unlikely to become a bigger slice of the energy pie in the US over the next two decades** because of the high cost to build new plants, according the US Energy Information Administration. **That may explain** part of **the campaign silence about nuclear**. **Another is lingering public worry about Fukushima, say industry observers. Even those who see nuclear as safe, say they understand why the candidates would want to steer clear of the discussion.**

Daniel **Krueger, a managing director for Accenture's utilities generation and energy markets practice, described nuclear as politically "toxic**," but added, "To me as an industry guy, in my view Fukushima proved the safety of nuclear energy. We had a major plant which was hit by an earthquake and tidal wave, and no one died as a direct result of radiation exposure. And the operator willingly sacrificed a plant worth tens of billions to protect the public. It was unimaginable what hit that plant."

**A2 already alienated**

***Yucca proves Obama is conceding to environmentalists interests now***

**Bookman ‘12**

Jay Bookman is a columnist and blogger at The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, specializing in foreign relations, environmental and technology-related issues and state and local politics. He has won two national awards for outstanding editorial writing, the National Headliner Award and the Scripps-Howard National Journalism Award. In addition, his work on environmental issues has been recognized with the Aldo Leopold Award, granted by the Wilderness Society, and the American Conservation Award, by the National Wildlife Federation. He is an eight-time winner of the Best of Cox Newspapers Awards for columns and editorials. In 2008, he became the only two-time winner of the $75,000 Eugene Pulliam Fellowship for editorial writing, sponsored by the Society of Professional Journalists. He is using the fellowship to study the role of media in modern information warfare. Bookman is also the author of “Caught in the Current,” published by St. Martin’s Press, about the social impact of technology. Bookman is a graduate of Pennsylvania State University with degrees in history and journalism. He has lived in Atlanta since 1990, and previously worked for newspapers in Washington state, Nevada and Massachusetts. He is married with two daughters. His first book, “Caught in the Current,” was published by St. Martin’s Press in July, 2004.

8-9-12, Atlanta Journal Constitution, Obama, Reid block solution to nuke-waste issue <http://blogs.ajc.com/jay-bookman-blog/2012/08/09/obama-reid-block-solution-to-nuke-waste-issue/>, jj

Here’s an area in which President **Obama and his fellow Democrats, led by** Senate Majority Leader Harry **Reid, have allowed local partisan politics to override the clear national interest.** Unfortunately, **it’s** also **an issue on which Mitt Romney has tried to avoid taking any position whatsoever**. **The debate is over** the use of **Yucca Mountain**, a vast piece of federal property deep in the Nevada desert, as a repository for the nation’s growing stockpiles of high-level nuclear waste generated by power plants. Since the early ’80s, the ***D***epartment ***o***f ***E***nergy **has spent** almost **$15 billion** studying and **preparing** the **Yucca** Mountain site **to store** such **waste, but because of opposition from** the **Obama** administration and Reid, Nevada’s senior senator, **those efforts have been abandoned.** Yucca Mountain may not be a perfectly safe solution to handling nuclear waste for the thousands of years necessary. Given the immense time frames involved, a perfectly safe solution probably does not exist. But Yucca is clearly the best and safest option that we have available. Wisely or not, we are creating more and more such waste all the time, and we have an obligation not just to our species but to the planet to handle it as responsibly as we can. However, 30 years ago, as editorial page editor of the Las Vegas Review-Journal, I learned firsthand how deep the opposition in Nevada runs to serving as the nation’s nuclear-waste dump. That opposition was compounded by the state’s experience serving as the site of above-ground nuclear tests during the ’50s and early ’60s, when federal officials repeatedly lied to local residents about the amount of radiation being released and its potential health effects. Maybe **it’s opportunistic politics** for Reid. Maybe his opposition is sincere, a product of growing up in Nevada during the above-ground testing era. Whatever the cause, **Reid has bitterly opposed** the **Yucca** Mountain repository throughout his career. In the 2008 election, **Obama echoed that opposition, helping him to carry the state**.

***Enthusiasm high***

**Bouie 9-26** Jamelle Bouie is a staff writer at The American Prospect. 9-26-12, the Washington Post, Among Obama supporters, enthusiasm hasn’t dimmed, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/post/among-obama-supporters-enthusiasm-hasnt-dimmed/2012/09/26/cb65e624-07e7-11e2-9eea-333857f6a7bd_blog.html>, jj

This sounds persuasive, until you realize that **it’s been nearly three weeks since the Democratic National Convention** ended, **and there’s no sign of diminished enthusiasm among Democrats.** Indeed, **despite wide speculation that Obama will have to worry about lower enthusiasm** and turnout among core groups — like African Americans and Latinos — the **available polling suggests that this is an overblown concern**. According to the most recent Pew poll, blacks are as engaged in the election as they were in 2008. Likewise, Public Policy Polling finds that African Americans are the single most excited group in the electorate — with Latinos a close second. Latino Decisions, which publishes a tracking poll of Latino public opinion, also finds high enthusiasm among the group: 46 percent report greater excitement for 2012 than 2008. Yesterday, Greg interviewed Obama pollster Joel Benenson, who noted the extent to which nonwhites are an increasing share of the vote: “**This will be an electorate that has been as diverse as the previous four presidential elections.” Not only is this probably the case, but in all likelihood, these groups will enter November highly energized, and ready to reelect the president.**

**Extension – Iran**

***All critical advisors for Romney are pro attack***

Ben **Armbruster** on **Oct 7**, 2011, <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2011/10/07/338979/romney-advisers-war-iran/>

Yesterday, GOP presidential front runner Mitt **Romney announced his campaign’s foreign policy team**. While ThinkProgress pointed out that many of **Romney’s advisers helped push the United States into war with Iraq, it might also be interesting to know what the** former Massachusetts **governor will be hearing from his top aides regarding Iran**. Prominent neoconservative Robert **Kagan, who is among Romney’s foreign policy advisers, has actually spoken out in favor of talking to Iran**. However, that view is by far an outlier among Romney’s team. While some of them have tried to push the claim that Iran is working with al Qaeda, **others have said** or written that the U**.S. should take a more militaristic approach toward the Islamic Republic**: ELIOT COHEN: Soon after the 9/11 attacks, **Cohen**, now director of the strategic studies program and Johns Hopkins University, **called for the overthrow of the Iranian government. And that thinking doesn’t appear to have changed**. In 2009, Cohen again called for the overthrow of the Iranian regime and said either attack Iran or it gets nukes. “The choices are now what they ever were: an American or an Israeli strike, which would probably cause a substantial war, or living in a world with Iranian nuclear weapons, which may also result in war, perhaps nuclear, over a longer period of time.” **MICHAEL HAYDEN: On CNN** last year, former CIA director (and prominent torture advocate) Michael Hayden **said attacking Iran over its nuclear program might not be a bad idea.** “In my personal thinking — I need to emphasize that — I have begun to consider that that may not be the worst of all possible outcomes,” he said. ERIC EDELMAN: **Edelman** was a career diplomat and former aid to Vice President Dick Cheney. Earlier this year **in an article in Foreign Affairs**, Edelman, along with two other co-authors, **said that the U.S. will** either **have to attack Iran** or contain its nuclear weapons capability. “The military option should not be dismissed because of the appealing but flawed notion that containment is a relatively easy or low-risk solution to a very difficult problem,” they wrote. NORM COLEMAN: Coleman, the former Republican senator from Minnesota, said in 2007 that if Israel ever attacks Iran, the United States should join in. “If something is taken,” Coleman said, “the United States is going to be part of that. We have to understand that. There is no saying, ‘Israel did it.’” KIM **HOLMES**: In 2005, the Heritage Foundation’s Kim Holmes **worried that the Europeans, by negotiating with Iran** over its nuclear program, **might be preventing the U.S. from using military force to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. Holmes called it a “serious mistake” to allow Iran to obtain the bomb** because “Iran itself is simply too untrustworthy to be trusted with nuclear weapons.” Holmes is referring to the hackneyed right-wing fearmongering talking point which CAP’s Matt Duss has labeled, “The martyr state myth.” The myth is that Iran is hell bent on using nuclear weapons, against Israel, the U.S., etc, should it acquire them and that Iran’s leaders are “uniquely immune to the cost-benefit calculations that underpin a conventional theory of deterrence.” Today in his foreign policy speech at the Citadel military college in South Carolina, which happened to also be “full of ridiculous fear mongering,” **Romney echoed this sentiment.** “In the hands of the ayatollahs, a nuclear Iran is nothing less than an existential threat to Israel,” he said. “Iran’s suicidal fanatics could blackmail the world.” **Romney also said** in his speech today that “**Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon is unacceptable.**” **Now that we know how he will be advised on how to prevent that,** it looks like **Romney’s new American Century** that he called for today, **should he become president, is likely to turn out just like the last new American Century the neocons tried to create under the previous Republican president.**

***It’s not campaign rhetoric***

**Maloney**, 3/5/**2012** (Suzanne – senior fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy, How to Contain a Nuclear Iran, The American Prospect, p. <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0305_nuclear_iran_maloney.aspx>)

**The Republican determination to blunt Iran**’s ambitions **through military strikes** or regime change **should not be dismissed** merely ***as campaign rhetoric***, though. **Over the past four years**, the context for military action against Iran has been transformed, thanks to Tehran’s progress toward nuclear capability and its revived adventurism across a Middle East in flux. **Most of the Republican advisers**, including some who hesitated to endorse direct strikes on Iran during their time in the Bush administration, **have now concluded that an attack is essential**. For that reason, **the Republican support for military strikes** and regime change **deserves consideration**. Most of the candidates have been vague on the mechanics of implementing what they advocate. **When asked for specifics** in the interview with The Wall Street Journal editorial board, **Romney** ruled out the use of ground troops but **added that “the range includes** something of **a blockade** nature, **to** something of **a surgical strike nature**, to something of a decapitate the regime nature, to eliminate the military threat of Iran altogether.”

**Rhetoric Trick**

***Even if they won’t directly attack – Romney will rhetorically bash Iran***

Paul R. **Pillar**, The National Interest, September 19, **2011**, <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/the-consequences-campaign-rhetoric-5905>

Probably more **dangerous is the rhetoric coming out of the Republican campaign about Iran**—more **dangerous because it propels a vicious circle of mutual hostility and threat perception that already has seen many rounds of escalation**. **Republican extremists and Iranian hardline extremists feed off each other's militant rhetoric**. This is a rhetorical line that is likely to get only worse during the general election campaign. As Trita Parsi notes, “Whatever hawkish line Obama adopts, the Republicans will find a way to 'outhawk' him. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.”

***This increases the risk of miscalc***

Heather **Hurlburt**, The Guardian, **November 3rd** 2011, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/nov/03/iran-overheated-rhetoric-us-policy?utm\_source=twitterfeed&utm\_medium=twitter

These developments suggest that **the path of diplomacy is far from exhausted**. At the same time, Ahmadinejad complains that the UN sanctions are biting, and Iran finds itself utterly isolated in front of the UN Human Rights Council – without even the regional support that North Korea and Burma enjoy. But **the overheated political climates** in the Middle East and the nasty politicisation **of security policy in the US make the risk of miscalculation unnervingly high** – **as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen reflected** when he proposed a US-Iran hotline last month. Mullen also called the prospect of a military strike "incredibly destabilising"; the International Campaign for Human Rights in Iran interviewed leading human rights voices inside the country and found them overwhelmingly opposed to a western strike. **This is a mix of spin and substance that really should worry military planners and civilian leaders alike.**

**A2: Israel Strikes Before Election**

***Israel won’t strike before the election***

**Jackson 9-28** David Jackson, USA TODAY, 9-28-12, Obama: Less worry about an Israel-Iran attack? <http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/09/28/obama-less-worry-about-an-israel-iran-attack/70001323/1>, jj

President **Obama and aides may be less worried these days about an Israeli attack on Iran before the Nov. 6 election. In his speech** to the United Nations yesterday, Israel Prime Minister Benjamin **Netanyahu spoke in terms of "spring" and "summer" in demanding that the U.N**. -- and the United States -- **stop Iran** from achieving the means to make a nuclear weapon. "By next spring, at most next summer, at current enrichment rates, they will have finished the medium enrichment and moved on to the final stage," Netanyahu said of the Iranians. "From there it's only a few months, possibly a few weeks, before they get enough enriched uranium for the first bomb." **Netanyahu**, who has clashed with Obama over Iran policy in the past, also **had kind words for the president's pledge to block Iran's path to nuclear weapons.** Said Netanyahu: "I very much appreciate the president's position, as does everyone in my country." Netanyahu also met yesterday with Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, and spoke with Obama by phone today. **It all suggests that any confrontation between Israel and Iran would not happen before spring (and after the election).** All presidents seeking re-election worry about outside events intruding on their campaigns -- and this year, concern about an Israeli attack on Iran's nuclear facilities has been at the top of the list. **Obama and aides have urged Netanyahu to hold off and give sanctions more time to pressure Iran into giving up its nuclear dreams.**

***No strike till mid 2013***

**Williams 9-28** Dan Williams, 9-28-12, Reuters, Israelis see no Iran war this year after Netanyahu's speech <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/28/us-iran-nuclear-israel-idUSBRE88R0GJ20120928>, jj

(Reuters) - Prime Minister Benjamin **Netanyahu's U.N. speech about Iranian nuclear advances has dampened speculation in Israel that he could order a war this year. Analyzing Thursday's address** in which Netanyahu literally drew a "red line" on a cartoon bomb to show how close Iran was to building nuclear weaponry, **commentators saw his deadline for any military action falling in early or mid-2013, well after U.S. elections in November and a possible snap Israeli poll.** "**The 'decisive year' of 2012 will pass without decisiveness**," wrote Ofer Shelah of Maariv newspaper on Friday. Without explicitly saying so, Netanyahu implied Israel would attack Iran's uranium enrichment facilities if they were allowed to process potential weapons-grade material beyond his red line. Maariv and another mass-circulation Israeli daily, Yedioth Ahronoth, said **spring 2013 now looked like Netanyahu's target date**, given his prediction that by then Iran may have amassed enough 20 percent-enriched uranium for a first bomb, if purified further. But **the front pages of the liberal Haaretz and pro-government Israel Hayom newspapers cited mid-2013 -** Netanyahu's outside estimate for when the Iranians would be ready to embark on the last stage of building such a weapon, which could take only "a few months, possibly a few weeks". Iran, which denies it is seeking nuclear arms, said Netanyahu's speech made "baseless and absurd allegations" and that the Islamic Republic "reserves its full right to retaliate with full force against any attack". Israel is widely assumed to have the Middle East's only atomic arsenal. Israeli diplomats were reluctant to elaborate on Netanyahu's speech, saying its main aim was to illustrate the threat from Tehran. Asked on Israel's Army Radio whether Netanyahu had signaled he would strike in the spring if U.S. and European Union sanctions fail to curb Iran's nuclear work, Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman said: "No, no, I would not go that far." "The prime minister clarified a message to the international community (that) if they want to prevent the next war, they must prevent a nuclear Iran," Lieberman added. TRUCE WITH OBAMA Netanyahu's increasingly hawkish words on Iran in recent weeks and months strained relations with U.S. President Barack Obama, who has resisted the calls to set Tehran an ultimatum while fending off charges by his Republican rival, Mitt Romney, that he is soft on Israel's security. **Netanyahu praised Obama's resolve in his U.N. address**, which the prime minister described as advancing their "common goal" - a strong signal that Israel would not blindside Washington with a unilateral attack on Iran. **Israel Hayom pundit** Dan **Margalit said the speech constituted "an almost explicit acknowledgment that he (Netanyahu) is declaring a truce in the public argument between him and the president. At least, until after the (U.S.) election."** Netanyahu has political worries too, given deadlock in his coalition government over the 2013 budget which, if not ratified by December, could trigger an early Israeli election next year. In a broadcast editorial, **Army Radio depicted war with Iran as no longer an imminent dilemma troubling the prime minister.** Instead, the station said, Netanyahu would have to decide "whether he is going to elections sooner, in January, February, or maybe March, or whether he will be able to pass the budget, take care of the Iranian issue and then go to elections in October (2013) as scheduled." U.S. Defense Secretary Leon **Panetta said** this month that **Washington would have "about a year" to stop Iran should it decide to cross the threshold of producing nuclear weaponry** - a more expansive timeline than that put forward by Israel.

**A2: Bain Capital Thumper**

***Bain attacks won’t hurt Romney***

**Blake 9-11** Aaron Blake, covers national politics at the Washington Post, where he writes regularly for the Fix, the Post's top political blog, on September 11, 2012, the Washington Post, Bain is no longer Romney’s bane <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/11/mitt-romney-and-bain-capital-new-poll-shows-the-issue-is-a-wash/>, jj

Mitt **Romney might have lost a little ground on the campaign trail. But don’t blame Bain Capital.** New Washington Post-ABC News polling shows that, **whatever price the Republican presidential nominee might have paid for his work in venture capital, the issue now cuts pretty evenly in swing states.** In July, twice as many voters (32 percent) said Romney’s position at Bain was a major reason to oppose him as said it was a major reason to support him (16 percent). Those numbers are now basically a wash, with **28 percent viewing Bain as a major negative and 27 percent viewing it as a major positive. Democrats went after Bain hard early on, but they found that some in their party** (read: Cory Booker) **were uncomfortable with what they saw as an attack on free enterprise.** Romney’s record at the company remains an issue on the campaign trail, with Democrats bringing it up during several speeches at their convention last week. And a majority of Americans still say it’s a major factor in picking a candidate. But **among that majority, basically the same number of respondents say it makes Romney more attractive as say it is a strike against him.** So, would that be a victory for Republicans or Democrats? **The fact is that Republicans have recovered somewhat from the Bain-bashing through their efforts to change the message, and this poll shows that their progress is significant.** But Romney’s business background is supposed to be his major asset in this campaign. And if just as many people see it as a liability as see it as an asset, then Democrats have had some success in blunting a major reason touted for electing Romney. (The new poll also shows more Americans believe Romney did more to cut jobs — 45 percent — than create jobs — 38 percent — while in the private sector.) Clearly, his past at Bain is still hurting Romney among a significant number of voters. Either way, **the Bain issue appears to have fallen victim to this election campaign’s notably polarized environment. Those who are apt to support Romney probably see Bain as a plus, while those who oppose him see it as a minus.** In the middle are the very few undecided voters who probably also haven’t decided whether Romney’s business career is a plus or a minus. Their decision will have a big impact on the final result this November.

## 1nr

**Ext #2 – No Solvency – General**

***Quick expansion is impossible -- lack of recent construction experience, atrophy of US nuclear manufacturing industry, production bottlenecks, skilled labor shortage.***

**Squassoni, ‘8**

[Sharon, Senior Associate, Nonproliferation Program -- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3-12, “The Realities of Nuclear Expansion” Congressional Testimony: House Select Committee for Energy Independence and Global Warming, Washington, DC]

***There are significant questions about whether nuclear expansion*** that could affect global climate change ***is even possible*. In the United States,** as the chief operating officer of Exelon recently told an industry conference, **constraints include: the lack of any recent U.S. nuclear construction experience; the atrophy of U.S. nuclear manufacturing infrastructure; production bottlenecks created by an increase in worldwide demand; and an aging labor force**. **Lack of construction experience translates into delays, which translate into much higher construction costs.** Although **reactors typically take at least four years to build,** ***delays can increase finance costs considerably.*** A recent example – the construction of Okiluoto-3 in Finland – demonstrates that an 18-month delay cost 700 million Euros in a project with a fixed cost of three billion Euros.18 **In an analysis for a nuclear industry conference, the consulting firm Booz Allen Hamilton prioritized 15 different risks in new reactor construction. The most significant risks and those most likely to occur included engineering, procurement and construction performance, resource shortages and price escalation.**19 **The atrophy of nuclear manufacturing infrastructure is significant in the United States, but also worldwide. The ultra-heavy forgings for reactor pressure vessels and steam generators constitute the most significant chokepoint. Japan Steel Works** (JSW) **is currently the only company worldwide with the capacity to make ultra-large forgings** (using 600-ton ingots) **favored by new reactor designs. Other companies** – such as Sfarsteel (formerly Creusot Forge) in France and Doosan Industry in South Korea – **have smaller capacities**. The purchase of Creusot Forge by AREVA in 2005 means that former customers of Creusot reportedly are shifting to Japan Steel Works, lengthening the two-year waiting list. **According to JSW officials, it can now only produce 5.5 sets of forgings per year; this will expand to 8.5 sets in 2010. Even then, nuclear forgings at JSW compete with orders for forgings and assembly from other heavy industries**, for example, oil and gas industries, **which can be more profitable**. China will open new plants, possibly this year, to produce ultra-heavy forgings. In the meantime, **using smaller capacity forgings means more components, with more weld seams, and therefore will require more safety inspections, costing utilities more money when the reactors are shut down and not generating electricity.** One AREVA estimate is that **the daily cost of shutdowns (for inspections or other reasons) is $1 million**. **In the United States, a significant portion of supporting industries needs to be rebuilt or recertified. In the 1980s, the United States had 400 nuclear suppliers and 900 holders of N-stamp certificates from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers**.20 **Today, there are just 80 suppliers and 200 N-stamp holders.** The Nuclear Energy Institute **(NEI) notes** that some of the decline in N-stamp holders is due to consolidation of companies, but nonetheless is encouraging firms to get recertified. In addition, **certain commodities used in reactor construction may also present supply problems, such as alloy steel, concrete and nickel. The cost of these inputs**, according to Moody’s, **has risen dramatically in recent years.** Competition from other electricity and construction projects According to a 2008 Bechtel estimate, if electricity demand grows in the United States 1.5% each year and the energy mix remains the same, the United States would have to build 50 **nuclear reactors**, 261 coal-fired plants, 279 natural-gas-fired plants and 73 renewables projects by 2025. All of these **will require craft and construction labor.** In addition, **electricity generation projects will compete with oil infrastructure projects**. In addition, **nuclear power construction competes with other large investment projects for labor and resources. Rebuilding from Hurricane Katrina and big construction projects in Texas will continue to place pressure on construction labor forces. A Bechtel executive recently stated that *the U.S. faced a skilled labor shortage of 5.3 million workers in 2010,* which could rise to a shortage of 14 million by 2020. Adding to this is the retirement of baby boomers, and much slower growth in the number of college graduates.**21 ***A typical nuclear power plant in the United States takes about 4 years to build, and requires 1400 to 2300 construction workers***.

**Ext #3 – Peak Uranium**

***Uranium production down and won’t recover***

**Oil Drum ‘12**

8-27, A Few Insights Regarding Today's Nuclear Situation <http://www.theoildrum.com/node/9419#more>, jj

**Uranium Production is a Problem World uranium production fell** a bit in 2011, relative to 2010, according to the World Nuclear Association. Production from Kazakhstan is becoming an increasingly large share of the total. **Production in both the US and Canada declined** in 2011. Spot prices have tended to stay low, in spite of the fact that **an agreement that allowed the US to buy recycled Russian bomb material reaches an end in 2013**. There are no doubt some stockpiles, but the **WNA estimates 2011 production to equal to only 85% of current demand** (including military demand). **A person would think that prices would rise higher, to incentivize increased production, but this doesn’t seem to be happening yet**, at least. The uranium consulting firm Ux Consulting offers the following comment on its website: The market that we now find ourselves in is like no other in the history of uranium. **Production is far below requirements, which are growing. HEU** [highly enriched uranium] **supplies and the enrichment of tails material make up a large portion of supply, but the fate of these supply sources is uncertain**. **Supply has become more concentrated, making the market more vulnerable to disruptions** if there are any problems with a particular supply source. **Another source of market vulnerability is the relatively low level of inventory held by buyers and sellers alike.** The consulting firm ends the section with a pitch for its $5,000 report on the situation. **A person would like to think that additional production will be ramped up quickly, or that the US military would find some inventory. Markets don’t always work well at incentivizing a need for future production, especially when more or less adequate current supplies are available when Russian recycled bomb material is included. The discontinuity comes when those extra supplies disappear.**

**Ext #4 – Waste Siting Blocks**

***Lack of waste storage guts investor confidence --- comparatively swamps guarantees***

**Spencer ‘11**

Jack Spencer, Research Fellow for Nuclear Energy Policy at The Heritage Foundation, June 3, 2011, Testimony before Subcommittee on Energy and Power Committee on Energy and Commerce United States House of Representatives <http://www.heritage.org/research/testimony/2011/06/the-american-energy-initiative>, jj

REFORMING SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL MANAGEMENT

Despite growing political and public support for nuclear power, **progress toward actually building any new plants has been a struggle. While the blame for this stagnation often goes to inefficient government subsidy programs, the real problem lies in why those subsidies are necessary to begin with.** Chief among these structural problems is **the nation’s incoherent nuclear waste policy**. Ultimately, **the lack of a pathway to waste disposal creates substantial unpredictability for nuclear investors. That risk must be offset to allow investment to move forward.** This was a problem prior to the Obama Administration. **The federal government** was legally obliged, according to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) of 1982, as amended, to begin collecting nuclear waste in 1998. Despite collecting approximately $30 billion (fees plus interest) from electricity ratepayers and spending nearly $10 billion, it **has not collected one atom of nuclear waste**. The one bright spot was the progress on Yucca Mountain made by President George W. Bush’s Department of Energy (DOE). The **Obama Administration’s anti-Yucca policy destroyed this progress**. It ignored existing statute, such as the NWPA and the Yucca Mountain Development Act of 2002, which stated clearly that Yucca Mountain shall be the location of the nation’s nuclear materials repository. **It unilaterally requested the withdrawal of the DOE’s permit application for Yucca to the** Nuclear Regulatory Commission (**NRC**). Questions over the legality of this policy are currently under review by the courts. Meanwhile, in October 2010, former advisor to Senator Harry **Reid** and current NRC Chairman Gregory Jaczko **ordered a stop to all Yucca-related NRC activities**. He argued that his authority to close out the Yucca program was derived from President Obama’s 2011 budget request. The problem is that neither the House nor the Senate passed that proposed budget. Further, the order ignores the fact that the NRC’s own Atomic Licensing and Safety Board agreed unanimously that the DOE lacked authority to withdraw the application. The chairman’s actions were so unusual and contentious that fellow NRC commissioners were compelled to publicly denounce the decision. **The combination of federal promises to store nuclear waste, the Obama Administration’s policy, and the NRC’s actions has resulted in a complete lack of direction on nuclear waste management and a dereliction of responsibility on the part of the federal government. This creates substantial government-imposed risk on the nuclear industry, which is the primary obstacle to an expansion of U.S. nuclear power.**

**\*2nc Incentives Fail**

***\*\*Loan guarantees fail -- current allocated funds aren’t used up -- industry slowdown means no demand.***

**Wald, ‘11**

[Matthew L., NYT, 4-28, “Despite Bipartisan Support, Nuclear Reactor Projects Falter,” http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/29/business/energy-environment/29utility.html]

WASHINGTON — **In an effort to encourage nuclear power, Congress voted in 2005 to authorize $17.5 billion in loan guarantees for new reactors.** Now, **six years later, with the industry stalled by poor market conditions and the Fukushima disaster, *nearly half of the fund remains unclaimed.*** And **yet Congress, at** **the request of** the **Obama** administration, **is preparing to add $36 billion in nuclear loan guarantees to next year’s budget. *Even supporters of the technology doubt that new projects will surface any time soon to replace those that have been all but abandoned.*** “My gut feeling is that **there is going to be a delay,” said** Neil **Wilmshurst, a vice president of the Electric Power Research Institute**, a nonprofit utility consortium based in Palo Alto, Calif. News on Thursday that Exelon Corporation, the nation’s largest reactor operator, planned to buy a rival, the Constellation Energy Group, only reinforces the trend; until late last year, Constellation wanted to build, while Exelon was firmly against it. Mr. **Wilmshurst said the continued depressed price of natural gas had clouded the economics of new reactors**, and **he predicted that construction activity would “go quiet” for two to five years. His group has shifted its efforts to helping figure out how existing plants can extend their licenses to 80 years from the current limit of 60.** **Of the four nuclear reactor construction projects** that **the Energy Department identified in 2009 as** the **most deserving for the loans, two have lost major partners and seem unlikely to recover soon**. In addition to low prices for natural gas, **the demand for electricity is down, and** the March 11 earthquake and tsunami that damaged the **Fukushima** Daiichi nuclear power plant **could bring new rules**. **Only $8.8 billion of the 2005 guarantee has been allocated** — to a twin reactor project in Georgia. Ground has been broken on the fourth candidate, a twin reactor project in South Carolina, but its sponsors may get a better deal in the commercial finance market.

***\*\*\*The structure of loan guarantees is the problem -- the aff doesn’t resolve that.***

**Gale et al., ‘9**

[Kelley Michael, the Finance Department Chair of Latham & Watkins‘ San Diego office and serves as global Co-Chair for the firm‘s Climate Change and Cleantech Practice Groups. He has thirty years of experience representing private and public sector clients in the development, regulation, and financing of alternative energy projects and capital intensive infrastructure projects, with Sony Ben-Moshe, Jason J. Crowell, Breton A. Peace, Brett P. Rosenblatt, and Kelly D. Thomason, “FINANCING THE NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE: THE BENEFITS AND POTENTIAL PITFALLS OF FEDERAL & STATE GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES AND THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN CALIFORNIA, ” http://www.felj.org/docs/elj302/19gale-crowell-and-peace.pdf]

The several energy and climate change bills pending before Congress provide the perfect opportunity to re-examine the loan guarantee program. **If properly implemented, the loan guarantee program can be used to incentivize** project level non-recourse financing for **nuclear plant construction and can create lower average costs of construction**. However, ***the loan guarantee program must be structured properly to meet these goals.*** In particular, as specified above and **as recognized by the DOE and the Senate in the proposed amendments to the loan guarantee regulations**, we believe it **is vital to the loan guarantee program‘s efficiency that the federal government be viewed as sharing in the same risks as private lenders** in order to maximize the program‘s ability **to motivate private lenders to invest in projects that present those** very **risks. If the DOE assumes a superpriority position relative to other lenders, private investors** may **feel that the government does not have sufficient** ―**skin in the game**‖ **to give them comfort that the unique risks associated with investing in a new nuclear power project are** perceived by the federal government to be **manageable**. These issues are discussed in more detail in Section II.D.2.c below.

**Ext – Deterrence Down**

***Allies and our enemies already perceive weakened US deterrence***

**Scheber**, VP of the National Institute for Public Policy, 20**09** (Thomas, “Contemporary Challenges for Extended Deterrence,” Air University News, May, [http://www.au.af.mil/au/aunews/archive/2009/0411/Articles/ ContemporaryChallengesforExtendedDeterrenceMay09.pdf](http://www.au.af.mil/au/aunews/archive/2009/0411/Articles/%20ContemporaryChallengesforExtendedDeterrenceMay09.pdf), Kel)

In addition to the three challenges for extended deterrence in the contemporary environment discussed above, **one additional problem is important** to consider—**uncertainty among allies regarding the long-term U.S. commitment to sustain an effective and credible nuclear force. Both allies and potential adversaries carefully watch developments in the U**nited **S**tates. Since the end of the Cold War, **the U**nited **S**tates **has reduced the size of its operationally deployed strategic nuclear force by almost 80 percent and has retired and dismantled most of its nonstrategic nuclear warheads**. In sharp contrast with the other nuclear powers recognized by the Non-Proliferation Treaty (Russia, Britain, France, and China), **the United States has not implemented a nuclear modernization plan for a nuclear force appropriate for the twenty-first century**. **Foreign observers** of U.S. politics **will note the high-profile debates over studies of nuclear weapon concepts and the termination of recent initiatives such as the** Robust Nuclear **Earth Penetrator and the Reliable Replacement Warhead**. **Allies and possibly adversaries alike are watching this trend and questioning the long-term viability of the U.S. nuclear force**.

# Semis vs WVA
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**Framework 1NC**

***Our interpretation – The affirmative has to defend a material action. They can talk about whatever they want, but they must have an action we can negate and an advocacy statement if we win is bad results in a negative ballot.***

***Violation- they offer no stasis point for the debate and won’t defend the consequences of their advocacy statement.***

***Vote Neg:***

***1) Ground - Not defending a specific action, method, or starting point means you can literally say racism is bad and sit down. Our interpretation is key to foster debates on the means they advocate when both sides fundamentally agree on the ends.***

***No stable advocacy statement means we could k your methodology and you could say “we don’t defend that” and sit down. This debate is not productive, and it kills clash and education. Every reason why your aff is good is a reason to prefer our interpretation.***

***We will make coal consumption good arguments on the case – When they no link them it proves abuse***

***2) Clash is predicated off of a stable topic, when there is no stability in a debate, all substantive argumentation is mooted.***

**Shively, 2k** (Assistant Prof Political Science at Texas A&M, Ruth Lessl, Partisan Politics and Political Theory, p. 181-2)JFS

The requirements given thus far are primarily negative. The ambiguists must say "no" to-they must reject and limit-some ideas and actions. In what follows, **we** will also find that they must say "yes" to some things. In particular, they must say "yes" to the idea of rational persuasion. This means, first, that they **must recognize** **the role of agreement in political contest**, or the basic accord that is necessary to discord. The mistake that the ambiguists make here is a common one. **The mistake is** in thinking **that agreement marks the end of contest-that** consensus **kills debate**. But this is true only if the agreement is perfect-if there is nothing at all left to question or contest. In most cases, however, **our agreements are highly imperfect**. **We agree on some matters but not on others**, on generalities but not on specifics, on principles but not on their applications, and so on. And **this** kind of limited agreement **is the starting condition of** contest and **debate**. As John Courtney Murray writes: **We hold certain truths; therefore we can argue about them.** It seems to have been one of the corruptions of intelligence by positivism to assume that argument ends when agreement is reached. In a basic sense, the reverse is true. **There can be no argument except on the premise**, and within a context, of agreement. (Murray 1960, 10) In other words, **we cannot argue about something if we are not communicating: if we cannot agree on the topic and terms of argument or if we have utterly different ideas about what counts as evidence** or good argument. At the very least, **we must agree about what it is that is being debated before we can debate it.** For instance, one cannot have an argument about euthanasia with someone who thinks euthanasia is a musical group. One cannot successfully stage a sit-in if one's target audience simply thinks everyone is resting or if those doing the sitting have no complaints. **Nor can one demonstrate resistance to a policy if no one knows that it is a policy. In other words, contest is meaningless if there is a lack of agreement** or communication **about what is being contested**. Resisters, demonstrators, and **debaters must have** some **shared ideas about the subject** and/or the terms **of their disagreements**. The participants and the target of a sit-in must share an understanding of the complaint at hand. And a demonstrator's audience must know what is being resisted. In short, the contesting of an idea presumes some agreement about what that idea is and how one might go about intelligibly contesting it. In other words, contestation rests on some basic agreement or harmony.

***AND Lack of clash collapses the transformative potential of the 1AC***

**Tonn ’05** (Mari Boor, Professor of Communication – University of Maryland, “Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public”, *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, Vol. 8, Issue 3, Fall)

Perhaps the most conspicuous effort at replacing public debate with therapeutic dialogue was President Clinton's Conversation on Race, launched in mid-1997. Controversial from its inception for its ideological bent, the initiative met further widespread criticism for its encounter-group approaches to racial stratification and strife, critiques echoing previously articulated concerns- my own among them6-that certain dangers lurk in employing private or social communication modes for public problem-solving.7 Since then, others have joined in contesting the treating of public problems with narrative and psychological approaches, which-in the name of promoting civility, cooperation, personal empowerment, and socially constructed or idiosyncratic truths-actually work to **contain dissent**, locate systemic social problems **solely within individual neurosis**, and otherwise **fortify hegemony**.8 Particularly noteworthy is Michael Schudson's challenge to the utopian equating of "conversation" with the "soul of democracy." Schudson points to pivotal differences in the goals and architecture of conversational and democratic deliberative processes. To him, political (or democratic) conversation is a contradiction in terms. Political deliberation entails a clear instrumental purpose, ideally remaining ever mindful of its implications beyond an individual case. Marked by disagreement-even pain-democratic deliberation contains **transparent prescribed procedures** **governing** participation and **decision making** so as to protect the timid or otherwise weak. In such processes, written records chronicle the interactional journey toward resolution, and in the case of writing law especially, provide accessible justification for decisions rendered. In sharp contrast, conversation is often "small talk" exchanged among family, friends, or candidates for intimacy, unbridled by set agendas, and prone to egocentric rather than altruistic goals. **Subject only to unstated "rules**" such as turn-taking and politeness, conversation tends to advantage the gregarious or articulate over the shy or slight of tongue.9 The events of 9/11, the onset of war with Afghanistan and Iraq, and the subsequent failure to locate Iraqi weapons of mass destruction have resuscitated some faith in debate, argument, warrant, and facts as **crucial to the public sphere**. Still, the romance with public conversation persists. As examples among communication scholars, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's 2001 Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture treated what she termed "the rhetoric of conversation" as a means to "manage controversy" and empower non-dominant voices10; multiple essays in a 2002 special issue of Rhetoric & Public Affairs on deliberative democracy couch a deliberative democratic ideal in dialogic terms11; and the 2005 Southern States Communication Convention featured family therapist Sallyann Roth, founding member and trainer of the Public Conversations Project, as keynote speaker.12 Representative of the dialogic turn in deliberative democracy scholarship is Gerard A. Hauser and Chantal Benoit-Barne's critique of the traditional procedural, reasoning model of public problem solving: "A deliberative model of democracy . . . constru[es] democracy in terms of participation in the ongoing conversation about how we shall act and interact-our political relations" and "Civil society redirects our attention to the language of social dialogue on which our understanding of political interests and possibility rests."13 And on the political front, British Prime Minister Tony Blair-facing declining poll numbers and mounting criticism of his indifference to public opinion on issues ranging from the Iraq war to steep tuition hike proposals-launched The Big Conversation on November 28, 2003. Trumpeted as "as way of enriching the Labour Party's policy making process by listening to the British public about their priorities," the initiative includes an interactive government website and community meetings ostensibly designed to solicit citizens' voices on public issues.14 In their own way, each treatment of public conversation positions it as a democratic good, a mode that heals divisions and carves out spaces wherein ordinary voices can be heard. In certain ways, Schudson's initial reluctance to dismiss public conversation echoes my own early reservations, given the ideals of egalitarianism, empowerment, and mutual respect conversational advocates champion. Still, in the spirit of the dialectic ostensibly underlying dialogic premises, this essay argues that various negative consequences can result from transporting conversational and therapeutic paradigms into public problem solving. In what follows, I extend Schudson's critique of a conversational model for democracy in two ways: First, whereas Schudson primarily offers a theoretical analysis, I interrogate public conversation as a praxis in a variety of venues, illustrating how public "conversation" and "dialogue" have been **coopted to silence rather than empower** marginalized or dissenting voices. In practice, public conversation easily can emulate what feminist political scientist Jo Freeman termed "the **tyranny of structurelessness**" in her classic 1970 critique of consciousness- raising groups in the women's liberation movement,15 as well as the key traits Irving L. Janis ascribes to "groupthink."16 Thus, contrary to its promotion as a means to neutralize hierarchy and exclusion in the public sphere, public conversation can and **has accomplished the reverse**. When such moves are rendered transparent, public conversation and dialogue, I contend, risk increasing rather than diminishing **political cynicism and alienation**. **[Continues…]** This widespread recognition that access to public deliberative processes and the ballot is a baseline of any genuine democracy points to the most curious irony of the conversation movement: portions of its constituency. Numbering among the most fervid dialogic loyalists have been some feminists and multiculturalists who represent groups historically denied both the right to speak in public and the ballot. Oddly, some feminists who championed the slogan "The Personal Is Political" to emphasize ways relational power can oppress tend to ignore similar dangers lurking in the appropriation of conversation and dialogue in public deliberation. Yet the conversational model's emphasis on empowerment through intimacy can duplicate the power networks that traditionally excluded females and nonwhites and gave rise to numerous, sometimes necessarily uncivil, demands for democratic inclusion. Formalized participation structures in deliberative processes obviously cannot ensure the elimination of relational power blocs, but, as Freeman pointed out, the absence of formal rules leaves relational power **unchecked and** potentially **capricious**. Moreover, the privileging of the self, personal experiences, and individual perspectives of reality intrinsic in the conversational paradigm mirrors justifications once used by dominant groups who used their own lives, beliefs, and interests as templates for hegemonic social premises to oppress women, the lower class, and people of color. Paradigms infused with the therapeutic language of emotional healing and coping likewise flirt with the type of psychological diagnoses once ascribed to disaffected women. But as Betty Friedan's landmark 1963 The Feminist Mystique argued, the cure for female alienation was neither tranquilizers nor attitude adjustments fostered through psychotherapy but, rather, unrestricted opportunities.102

***3) Anti-Politics – Their “close-to-home” form of politics breeds apathy***

Nina **Eliasoph** is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Southern California –Theory and Society, Vol. 26, No. 5 (Oct., 19**97**), pp. 605-647 – http://www.jstor.org/stable/658024

**If it's not something that** [pause] **effects** [pause] **my** [pause] **family, I don't see** [pause] **me** [pause] **doing it**. [Speeds up] **And-I-mean-of-course-nuclear-war-could-affect-my** [chuckles] **family. But** I still don't - **if it's not local**, **I mean, I'm more - maybe it's small-minded**. (Sherry, a schools volunteer, in an interview) **Was she really as small-minded as she claimed to be? ``I care about issues that are close to home**,'' ``I care if it affects me personally,'' ``I care if it's for my children'': **these are the familiar phrases that many Americans use to explain political involvement and apathy**. Journalists, activists, and theorists often take these phrases at face value; politicians base social policies on them, trying to play to voters whom they imagine to be self-interested and short-sighted, cutting funds for projects that do not seem ``close to home.'' **The phrases are usually interpreted as transparently obvious indications of citizens' self-interest and lack of broad political concern** - their ``small-mindedness.'' **But these instant, extravagant expressions of self-interest do not simply indicate clear, straightforward self-interest or parochial thinking**. **The phrases work hard. Activists, intellectuals, and other concerned citizens often assume that someone** like Sherry **just doesn't care or is self-interested or ignorant; we try to draw people like her into political participation by impressing upon them that they should care (perhaps by telling them how nuclear war might affect their kids**), or telling them not to be so self-interested. **This article shows just how hard someone** such as Sherry **has to work to avoid expressing political concern**. **Penetrating this pervasive culture of political avoidance requires a new way of understanding this thing that sounds like apathy and self-interest**. **Using examples from a two-year fieldwork and interview study among volunteers, activists, and recreation groups in a sprawling West Coast suburb, this article shows how much emotional and interactional weight these common phrases bear**; expanding from the case of ``close to home'' to everyday political speech in general, the article outlines questions about culture, power, and emotions, in order to explore a way of thinking about political engagement, disengagement, and grassroots social change. **If we recognize that producing apathy takes a great deal of work, then we may find an unnoticed reserve of hope; we may begin to draw out the contradictory, tangled, democratic impetus embedded in citizens' everyday interactions - and also the impetus toward self-enclosed, narrowness embedded in these same interactions. In other words, by paying attention to the ways people actually talk in these groups, we can begin to understand the politics of civil society - sometimes participating in civic groups expands citizens' horizons, sometimes it shrinks them, sometimes it does both at once.**

***That cedes the political and links to anti-politics***

Nina **Eliasoph** is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Southern California –Theory and Society, Vol. 26, No. 5 (Oct., 19**97**), pp. 605-647 – http://www.jstor.org/stable/658024

**If the key to the mystery of ``close to home'' is not deformed ``beliefs,'' or absent ``languages,'' perhaps ignorance explains it. Americans are astoundingly ignorant of the most basic historical and political facts** ^ who the vice-president is, which sides we are arming in various wars, and more.43 Given this dismal state of affairs, **many researchers conclude that a large portion of the American electorate is just too uneducated, stupid, or apathetic to participate**. But, again, as Habermas, Mill, and other democratic theorists would argue, memorized lists of facts do not reveal or create political competence; **what could begin to create competence is unobstructed communication that broadens citizens' political imaginations, inspires curiosity and analysis. Ignorance is not just a cause, or precondition, of other kinds of political competence; it is also an effect of this incompetence-inducing cultural work**. In Simonds's model,44 **the three levels of competence ^ understanding of ``what is,'' ``what ought to be,'' and ``what would be possible'' ^ stack up, each presupposing the one below it. But here, volunteers' ``incompetence'' in the second and third level drowned out competence in the first; volunteers' desire to appear optimistic about the future silenced their ability to analyze the present** ^ **a thin optimism of the will drowned out a pessimism of the intellect** (to paraphrase Gramsci). This becomes especially clear if we listen to changes in speech from one context to the next. Displays of ignorance were not equally urgent in all contexts. For example, **in one interview with a wife and husband, the husband, Ron, eagerly displayed scary knowledge to his wife,** Clara. **But when he turned to me, his knowledge and critique vanished; instead he sounded gullible and ignorant**. The interchange began when I asked Clara about the nuclear issue. She responded that a nuclear battleship was different from a nuclear plant, and safer. Ron interrupted, ``A nuclear battleship is a nuclear plant.'' She said she heard there were differences and again Ron interrupted, ``If one of those babies melts down out there in the Sound, there won't be any difference to you!'' **To her, he detailed how a meltdown could happen, drawing on the large store of unspoken fearful knowledge many people in town shared**. Clara then said that they may already have been exposed to radioactivity and would not even know it, since the government would not tell residents. Their twelve year old son, also in the room, silently listening to the interview, mumbled, ``They wouldn't?''45 **Then I turned to Ron himself, to ask him about the nuclear issue.** Suddenly, he sounded very different. He knew ``some sharp people who work on the battleships'' and trusted them not to make mistakes. So I know accidents happen. They's why there're accidents. But you know, **I could stay in my bed, and not cross the street and never get run over by a car, but never do anything.... I don't worry about it**. I don't worry about it .... If the people out there were a bunch of Bozos and they worried me, maybe I'd be over there protesting.... **I think it's run pretty right, so it's not an issue. So I don't do anything about it.** But a moment later Clara said again that she had heard that they cannot melt down, and again, Ron interrupted, ``They told you Three Mile Island wouldn't melt down either, but it did. ''Addressing his wife, Ron wanted to display his knowledge and scare her, but when standing on ceremony, addressing a researcher, **he wanted to avoid appearing worried about something he could not change, so he roped his knowledge in, with a happy summary**. Here was another setting ^ in addition to volunteer group meetings ^ in which a volunteer could let his or her competence roam in one speech context but not another. In volunteer group meetings, ``**close to home'' cheered volunteers up, but made them less able publicly to formulate a moral ideal (of ``what ought to be'') and less able publicly to imagine a better world (of ``what could be''); less able to learn about the wider world together: in short, rendered them less politically competent than they might have been in some other context where hope was less crucial, where displaying and acquiring knowledge would not risk undermining hope**. Cultivating these infinite, acutely context-sensitive varieties of apparent ``incompetence'' took great skill. 4. Coerced privativism in the broader milieu Some recent discussions of the broader cultural milieu defend privatism by saying that official definitions of ``public'' debate make the public arena too dry, abstract, and stuffy for the average person. One argument contends that **prosperous, post-World War II Americans have typically been content just to be left alone, sit in their backyards, play with their kids, and mind their own business, trying to carve out a small space for themselves where they feel free, equal, and comfortable. Richard Flacks**, for example,46 **contends that much political activism in this century, such as the struggle for the two-day weekend, has been aimed at maintaining and enlarging that nice little walled garden, and that intellectuals are fooling themselves if they imagine that the majority of people will ever want to leave that privacy to ``make history'' instead of ``making life'**': making history is just too hard. But **this privatism takes its own toll, it has not just been the unobstructed will of the people, and it is not just human nature; corporate and government policies chased Americans into that little private space, encouraging a trade-off, offering long work hours for high pay if they refrained from mounting big challenges to that system** ^ **commanding them, ``Don't ever leave that tiny little private space**!''47 Volunteers show how hard it is to stay inside the garden wall; they were very aware that their private lives were interlaced with social problems, and they knew there was no wall strong or high enough to keep social ills out. Trying to relax in that green yard meant, among other things, devoting themselves constantly to patching and rebuilding the wall. The wall was the major focus of active inattention. Since engagement with the wider world was inevitable, inattention inevitably had a shape. **Protecting what is ``close to home'' is fine in itself; the problem arises if citizens can never publicly acknowledge that they take anything else seriously, or acknowledge that close and far are inseparable.**

***Anti politics causes extinction***

**Small ‘6**

(Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition,“Moving Forward,” *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, **the new century will present challenges that require collective action**, unity, and enlightened self-interest. **Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates**, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability **will require** cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all **solidarity** – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. ***Our very existence* depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society.**  With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. **We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation.** Unlike any other crisis before**, the** noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. **Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events.** Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, **we need to teach cooperation**, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. **It will require a** radical **transformation of our conception of education**. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, **civic engagement**, and service learning in education **will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty**. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; **today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world.** Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, **part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government** and commerce, **have the potential for positive change.** Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

***Finally, consequences matter and you have to defend against them***

**Isaac 02** (Professor of Political Science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale, Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

**K**

***The aff is wasted energy – fighting particular battles without changing the way the economy works means nothing really changes – the aff just obscures the logic of capitalism***

**Zizek, ’99** (Slavoj, Senior Researcher and professor at the Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana, The Ticklish Subject, page 352-355)

The big news of today’s post-political age of the ‘end of ideology’ is thus the radical depoliticization of the sphere of the economy: the way the economy functions (the need to cut social welfare, etc.) is accepted as a simple insight into the objective state of things. However, as long as this fundamental depoliticization of the economic sphere is accepted, all the talk about active citizenship, about public discussion leading to responsible collective decisions, and so on, will remain limited to the ‘cultural’ issues of religious, sexual, ethnic and other way-of-life differences, without actually encroaching upon the level at which long-term decisions that affect us all are made. In short, the only way effectively to bring about a society in which risky long-term decisions would ensue from public debate involving all concerned is some kind of radical limitation of Capital’s freedom, the subordinated of the process of production to social control – the radical *repoliticization of the economy*. That is to say: if the problem with today’s post-politics (‘administration of social affairs’) is that it increasingly undermines the possibility of a proper political act, this undermining is directly due to the depoliticization of economics, to the common acceptance of Capital and market mechanisms as neutral tools/ procedures to be exploited. We can now see why today’s post-politics cannot attain the properly political dimension of universality; because it silently precludes the sphere of economy from politicization. The domain of global capitalist market relations in the Other Scene of the so-called repoliticization of civil society advocated by the partisans of ‘identity politics’ and other postmodern forms of politicization: all the talk about new forms of politics bursting out all over, focused on particular issues (gay rights, ecology, ethnic minorities…), all this incessant activity of fluid, shifting identities, of building multiple *ad hoc* coalitions, and so on, has something inauthentic about it, and ultimately resembles the obsessional neurotic who talks all the time and is otherwise frantically active precisely in order to ensure that something – what *really matters* – will *not* be disturbed, that it will remain immobilized. 35 So, instead of celebrating the new freedoms and responsibilities brought about by the ‘second modernity’, it is much more crucial to focus on what *remains the same* in this global fluidity and reflexivity, on what serves as the very motor of this fluidity: the inexorable logic of Capital. The spectral presence of Capital is the figure of the big Other which not only remains operative when all the traditional embodiments of the symbolic big Other disintegrate, but even directly causes this disintegration: far from being confronted with the abyss of their freedom – that is, laden with the burden of responsibility that cannot be alleviated by the helping hand of Tradition or Nature – today’s subject is perhaps more than ever caught in an inexorable compulsion that effectively runs his life.

***The aff doesn’t solve neoliberalism --- its still beholden to a market ideology that believes incentive mechanisms can create sustainability***

**Abramsky** (visiting fellow at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Science, Technology and Society; fmr. coordinator of the Danish‑based World Wind Energy Institute) **10**

(Koyla, Racing to "Save" the Economy and the Planet: Capitalist or Post­ capitalist Transition to a Post‑petrol World?, in Sparking A Worldwide Energy Revolution, ed. Koyla Abramsky, pg. 26-7)

The fact that coal and oil are finite resources means that there is a long‑term tendency in the direction of their phase‑out, regardless of what intentional short‑term interventions are carried out or not. Many **proponents of renewable energy** simply **advocate leaving this phase‑6ut process to the market**. It is hoped that rising oil and coal prices will make these fuels increasingly less attractive. **Efforts are focused on developing a renewable energy sector that is able to compete, rather than directly confronting, suppressing, and ultimately dismantling the coal and oil industries**. However, leaving the phase‑out of oil and coal to the market has at least three crucial implications. First, **such a phase‑out is likely to actually prolong the use of fossil fuels**. **As long as these energy sources are profitable to extract and to use, they will be**. **Down to the last** remaining drops of oil or **lumps of coal**. Although resources are finite, they are still relatively abundant Even those analysts who give the most pessimistic (though realistic) perspectives on resource availability, such as those included in this book, do not predict a complete exhaustion of resources in the very near future. And, from the perspective of climate change, a prolongation of fossil fuel use is the exact opposite of what needs to happen, phase‑out must be sped up, not prolonged. Linked to this, the second consequence of a market‑based phase‑out of oil and coal will mean that the remaining oil and coal resources are frittered away for immediate profit rather than to build the infrastructure for a transition process. Given that building a new energy system will require massive amounts of energy inputs in a very concentrated period of time, this is a recipe for disaster. The third important consequence is that **leaving the transition process to the market is likely to be increasingly coercive** and conductive if competition is left to determine who controls the last of these resources and for what purposes they are used. This means competition between workers globally, competition between firnis, and competition between states. **This translates to massive inequalities, hierarchies, and austerity measures being imposed on labor** (both in and outside the energy sectan); **massive bankruptcies of smaller firms and concentration and centralization of capital; and last, but not least, military conflicts between states.** **Accepting a market‑based phase out of** oil and **coal is accepting in advance that the rising price of energy and a transition away from coal and oil is paid by labor and not capital, when in actual fact the question of who pays still remains to be determined**. The answer will only come through a process of collective global struggle, which occurs along class lines within the world‑economy. It is important to correctly identify these lines of struggle at the outset, otherwise it will be a struggle lost before the fight even begins. Collectively planning energy use and fossil fuel phase‑out is proving to be an enormously difficult social process, but **it is likely to be far less socially regressive if based on cooperation, solidarity, and collectively‑defined social needs, rather than if it is based around competition and profit.**

***Liberal multiculturalism’s embrace of narrative cannot be productive because it is inherently limited – their attempt to show the individuals beauty is the ultimate fake gesture based in the desire to see the other suffer***

**Zizek ’08** (Slavoj, senior researcher at the Institute of Sociology, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia and a professor at the European Graduate School, In Defense of Lost Causes, p. 11-13)

The first lesson thus seems to be that the proper way to fight the demonization of the Other is to subjectivize her, to listen to her story, to understand how she perceives the situation —or, as a partisan of the Middle East dialogue put it: "An enemy is someone whose story you have not heard." Practicing this noble motto of multicultural tolerance, Iceland's authorities recently imposed a unique form of enacting this subjectivization of the Other. In order to fight growing xenophobia (the result of increasing numbers of immigrant workers), as well as sexual intolerance, they organized what they called "living libraries": members of ethnic and sexual minorities (gays, immigrant East Europeans or blacks) are paid to visit an Icelandic family and just talk to them, acquainting them with their way of life, their everyday practices, their dreams, and so on — in this way, the exotic stranger who is perceived as a threat to our way of life appears as somebody we can empathize with, with a complex world of her own. . . There is, however, a clear limit to this procedure. Can we imagine inviting a Nazi thug to tell us his story? Are we ready to affirm that Hitler was an enemy because his story hadn't been heard? A Serb journalist recently reported a strange piece of news from the politician who, after long painful talks, convinced Slobodan Milosevic in his villa to surrender to the police and let himself be arrested. Milosevic said yes and then asked to be allowed to go to the first floor of the villa to attend to some business. The negotiator, afraid that Milosevic was going to commit suicide, expressed his doubts, but Milosevic calmed him down, saying that he had given his word to his wife, Mira Markovic, that he would wash his hair before leaving. Does this personal-life detail "redeem" the horrors that resulted from Milosevic's reign, does it make him "more human"? One can well imagine Hitler washing Eva Braun's hair — and one does not have to imagine, since we already know that Heydrich, the architect of the Holocaust, liked to play Beethoven's late string quartets with friends in the evenings. Recall the couple of "personal" lines that usually conclude the presentation of a writer on the back cover of a book: "In his free time, X likes to play with his cat and grow tulips . . ."— such a supplement which "humanizes" the author is ideology at its purest, the sign that he is "also human like us." (I was tempted to suggest for the cover of one my books; "In his free time, Zizek likes to surf the internet for child pornography and to teach his small son how to pull the legs off spiders . . .") Our most elementary experience of subjectivity is that of the "richness of my inner life": this is what I "really am," in contrast to the symbolic determinations and mandates I assume in public life (father, professor, philosopher). The first lesson of psychoanalysis here is that this "richness of our inner life" is fundamentally a fake: a screen, a false distance, whose function is, as it were, to save my appearance, to render palpable (accessible to my imaginary narcissism) my true social-symbolic identity. One of the ways to practice the critique of ideology is therefore to invent strategies to unmask this hypocrisy of "inner life" and its "sincere" emotions, in the manner systematically enacted by Lars von Trier in his films: My very first film, The Orchid Gardener, opened with a caption stating that the film was dedicated to a girl who had died of leukaemia, giving the dates of her birth and death. That was entirely fabricated! And manipulative and cynical, because I realized that if you started a film like that, then the audience would take it a lot more seriously. 3 There is much more than manipulation at work here: in his feminine trilogy {Breaking the Waves, Dancer in the Dark, Dogville), von Trier provokes us in our innermost being, stirring up automatic sympathy with the ultimate archetypal image of the victimized woman who, with her hecirt of gold, suffers pain. Through his "manipulation," **he displays the lie of this sympathy, the obscene pleasure we gain from seeing the victim suffer, and thereby disturbs our self-satisfaction.** Does this mean, however, that my "truth" is simply in my symbolic identity obfuscated by my imaginary "inner life" (as a simplistic reading of Lacan seems to Indicate, opposing the subject of the signifier to the imaginary ego)?

***Vote neg on ethics - resisting this reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility***

**Zizek and Daly 2004**

(Slavoj, professor of philosophy at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana, and Glyn, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, Conversations with Zizek, page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

***Mountaintop removal is only possible because of capitalism***

**Ely, 4/24/12** (Mike, International Journal of Socialist Renewal: “Revolutionising production itself: for humanity and for the world,” <http://links.org.au/node/2848>, ts)

Second: Modern productive capacity allows (for the first time in history) a society of common abundance. Previously poverty and starvation were a result of human helplessness in the face of the natural world — our once-limited ability to triumph over rocky ground, or hurricane devastation, or infection, or drought. Now, however, **the continued existence of hunger and poverty is a result of the current outrageous and unjust structure of human class society** — **the existence of class society itself is the cause of the difficult life of the vast majority of humanity.** Something else is now possible (a mutual flourishing, radically new forms of egalitarianism, a radical redirecting of social surpluses toward actually solving the vast historic problems of the people around the world). Production is marked by class nature Third: The form of modern production (and consumption) are themselves deeply marked by the class nature of the societies that produced them. It is not just that the surplus of production is alienated from the exploited (by the owners of capital). The whole process of production (its forms, its inputs, its purpose, its outputs, its impacts, its physical engineering, its social constructs of hierarchy and punishments) is marked by the class society within which it emerged. And this is deeply important for understanding how socialist sustainability will also need to revolutionise the inherited patterns of production and consumption. One of the major contributions of [China's] Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was the insight that the very form of production is itself marked with capitalist or communist directions. Some examples The very architecture of capitalist factories assumes a specific form of hierarchy — and obstructs different, socialist/communist relations in production. In revolutionary China, factories, docks, shipyards, agricultural villages had to be build differently (with meeting rooms, and open spaces, cafeterias, and structural redundancies to allow the workers to actually participate in their own supposed “rule” over society.) **The very nature of capitalist assembly lines often assumes that workers are merely cogs in the process** (and will not be meeting now and then to make decisions). And it is commonly structured to assume that “work life” for the workers is repetitive, uncreative and subordinate. Just think through how a textile mill in Bangladesh would have to be built differently to better serve society’s revolutionary transformation. (Would there be day care centres? an attached college? A side industry for processing link and toxic waste? Platforms for public speaking in the production buildings**?) The class nature is most obvious in the social structures of capitalist production (hierarchy, enforced obedience, threat of firing, experts in command, managers trained in capitalist efficiency, “attention to the bottom line", reproduction of “the colour line”, inherent separations between plant and community, between work and education, the assumptions of “commuting”, the functioning of rotating shifts, etc. etc.)** But you don’t get far into a socialist revolution without realising that class nature is also embedded in how machines are designed, or the assumptions of inherited processes. The production we inherit is itself (including physically) shaped by class society. And here we have been discussing the accumulating environmental impact of capitalist production (and the parallel crime of continuing such capitalist methods and assumptions in most previously socialist societies). The fact that there are high communications among managers in industry, but little cross communication among farmers in the fields says a lot about how decisions are made, by whom and for what. **The example of coal** Let me take something I know about**: Coal itself is classless.** It is simply a mineral seam in the ground**. But everything about coal production and consumption is marked by class (and class struggle) — and (in our current society) terribly marked by the capitalist nature of decision making over production.** One extreme current US example is **mountain topping — under capitalism it is “profitable” to scar the precious mountains to retrieve coal in small seams — by simply removing the whole top of the mountain.** This destroys something irreplaceable (and brings to mind Marx’s use of the word usufructuaries — i.e. we should be stewards of the world around us, and use its “fruits” in a sustainable way). **The ratio is simple: under current market conditions, one inch of coal can pay for removing one foot of rock. So if the coal is 30 inches high** (which is impossible to mine profitably by underground techniques), **these coal pirate corporate pigs can “profitably” remove a mountain top thataverages 30 feet high.** [Karl Marx wrote](http://kasamaproject.org/2011/04/24/earth-day-to-may-day-karl-marx-on-historic-absurdity-of-owning-the-earth/), Even a whole society, a nation, or even all simultaneously existing societies taken together, are not the owners of the globe. They are only its possessors, its usufructuaries, and, like boni patres familias, they must hand it down to succeeding generations in an improved condition. [[Usufructuraries](http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/usufructuaries) are those that harvest the fruits of what ultimately belongs to someone else. It is a 19th century legal word that captures some of what we now mean by "sustainable".] **Coalmining itself is soaked in the blood of the workers**. In the mine where I worked, [three men died](http://kasamaproject.org/2008/11/24/honoring-lightening-lane/) over the years I was there. And men came out injured daily. Watching the older workers prepare for work you saw them (slowly, painfully) putting on trusses, braces, false legs. You saw missing fingers, or long scars**. Capitalist coalmining uses up humans as a raw material.** Again: This was expressed in “how the mines were run” (i.e. what the processes were, how the bosses were trained, what was considered “safe”, what specific decisions were made) — but **it was also embedded in the very nature of the production process, which had developed and morphed for a century under capitalism.**

***The alternative is to withdraw from the ideology of capital. Capitalism only survives because we believe it is a truth claim.***

**Johnston ’04** (Adrian, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory, The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Žižek’s recent writings isn’t a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Žižek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance ( Žižek, 2001d, pp 22–23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Žižek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of ‘‘magic,’’ that is, the belief in money’s social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance’s powers. The ‘‘external’’ obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, ‘‘internally’’ believe in it – capitalism’s life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others’ belief in the socio-performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism’s frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic’s fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism, makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Žižek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing). Or, the more disquieting possibility to entertain is that some people today, even if one succeeds in exposing them to the underlying logic of their position, might respond in a manner resembling that of the Judas-like character Cypher in the film The Matrix (Cypher opts to embrace enslavement by illusion rather than cope with the discomfort of dwelling in the ‘‘desert of the real’’): faced with the choice between living the capitalist lie or wrestling with certain unpleasant truths, many individuals might very well deliberately decide to accept what they know full well to be a false pseudo-reality, a deceptively comforting fiction (‘‘Capitalist commodity fetishism or the truth? I choose fetishism’’).

**Contention #2 Killing Everything Around**

***Their equation of oppression of rural Americans with the Jewish Holocaust trivializes the meaning of the Holocaust --- reject this***

**Grobman 2000** (Dr. Alex, President of the Brenn Institute, “The Uniqueness of the Holocaust,” The Holocaust Teacher Resource Center Homepage, Nov 29, [www.holocaust-trc.org/uniqueness.htm](http://www.holocaust-trc.org/uniqueness.htm), Retrieved: 5-24-01, KEL)

In ever larger numbers, states throughout the country are mandating that the history of the Holocaust be taught in public schools. At the same time, an increasing number of parochial and private schools are also teaching the subject. An important reason for this emphasis in the schools, in addition to the enormity of the event itself, is the historical uniqueness of the Holocaust. **A key objective of this essay is to overcome a tendency to equate the Holocaust with other modern tragedies.** This is not to disparage the horror and tragedy or the scope of other nightmarish events – some persisting today because of the failure to learn from the lessons of the Holocaust but to clarify distinctions. **By equating the destruction of the Jews of Europe with other events such as the bombing of Hiroshima, the treatment of Native Americans by the United States government, the institution of slavery in America, the deportation and incarceration of Japanese Americans in American concentration camps during the Second World War, the Armenian tragedy of 1915-1917, and the mass murders in Cambodia, Rwanda, the former Yugoslavia, and elsewhere we view everything on the same level as the Holocaust. However, to do so is historically misleading, for it distorts the historical reality of both the Shoah (Hebrew term for Holocaust) and these other crimes, and in the end, trivializes the importance of this unprecedented and unparalleled event in modern history, and minimizes the experiences of all those who suffered.**

***Coal is dead – It can’t compete***

**Roche 5/31/12** [Jacob Roche, “This Is What the Death of Coal Looks Like,” The Motley Fool, Posted 4:15PM 05/31/12, pg. http://www.dailyfinance.com/2012/05/31/this-is-what-the-death-of-coal-looks-like/

**You may have heard recently that *coal is dead***. **Everyone from BusinessWeek to Standard & Poor's has been pointing out the many reasons** to think the coal industry is on its last embers:

**In 1985, coal accounted for 57%** **of** all **power** generated in the United States. **It recently fell to just 34%.**

According to the Energy Information Administration, **Henry hub natural gas fell to $2.22** per million British thermal units in March, **making it a significantly cheaper** power source **than coal**, which sat at $2.41 per million BTUs.

Since just August of last year, **the coal export price index has fallen more than 25%.**

But here's a different stat to think about: revenues at Peabody Energy (NYS: [BTU](http://www.dailyfinance.com/quotes/BTU/usa)) for the past five years. This is what the death of coal looks like:

B-b-but it's unpopular!  
According to the EIA, **natural gas is *rapidly replacing* coal as a source of power generation**. **Southern Co.** (NYS: [SO](http://www.dailyfinance.com/quotes/SO/usa)), the largest electric utility in the U.S. by market cap, **has cut its coal use by more than a quarter over the last five years**, and in that same period, natural gas has risen from 15% to 30%. Peabody gets 82% of its sales volume from such customers, so how can the company's revenues possibly be going up?

Well for one thing, **even as less coal is being used, the *price of coal is rising to compensate***. Southern Co.'s cost of coal fuel per kilowatt-hour has risen 54% over the last five years, easily offsetting its decreased use. It's possible that **domestic generators have been converting the low-hanging fruit** as well. Coal may be on the decline, but it's still the most used fuel source in a massive electric grid. Fellow Fool Sean Williams recently noted that according to the Aspen Environmental Group, [it would cost $743 billion](http://www.dailyfinance.com/2012/04/10/why-now-is-the-time-to-buy-coal/?source=edddlftxt0860001) to convert all of the country's coal power plants into natural gas capable plants -- about 15 times more cash than most of the publicly traded electric utilities in the U.S. have combined.

***Abundant natural gas solves coal use. That prevents tens of thousands of premature deaths a year – solves their aff***

**Spence ‘12**

David B. Spence, Prof. of Law, Politics & Regulation, University of Texas at Austin, Northwestern Law School's Searle Center Conference, Federalism, Regulatory Lags, and Energy Production,

<http://www.law.northwestern.edu/searlecenter/papers/Spence_Federalism_Energy_3-4.pdf>, jj

The environmental impacts of hydraulic fracturing are disputed. Proponents of hydraulic fracturing, and of natural gas more generally, sometimes claim that the many hundreds of thousands of fracking jobs performed in the United States to date have not produced a single confirmed case of groundwater contamination.26 Opponents of fracking dispute that claim, pointing to several cases of alleged contamination of drinking water by methane or fracturing fluid chemicals.27 Disputes over the source of contamination in those cases have triggered a spate of new studies from government and academic sources.28 **Proponents of hydraulic fracturing also tout the relatively low air emissions from natural gas combustion, compared to coal** or oil. As Table 1 indicates, **on a per btu basis natural gas combustion produces significantly fewer greenhouse gas emissions than either coal or oil, and an even smaller fraction of the emissions of the other major pollutants associated fossil fuel combustion**. As **a well-established and reliable fuel source for electric generation, inexpensive, plentiful natural gas could over time lead to the widespread substitution of natural gas-fired electric generation plants for coal-fired plants. Since coal combustion is associated with tens of thousands of premature deaths each year,** 29 **the substitution of natural gas- for coal-fired generation could yield substantial health benefits**.30 **That is why some energy planners see natural gas as a "bridge fuel" in the process of moving from a fossil fuel economy to one fueled by renewable energy resources.**31

***Wind turbines will eliminate bats species***

**Boyles et al 11** (Justin, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology & Entomology, university of Pretoria, “Economic Importance of Bats in Agriculture”, <http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/16441323/226771198/name/Economic_Importance_of_Bats_in_Agriculture.pdf>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

At the same time, **bats of several migratory tree-dwelling species are being killed in unprecedented numbers at wind turbines across the continent** (6, 7). Why these species are particularly susceptible to¶ wind turbines remains a mystery, and several types of attraction have been hypothesized (6). **There are no continental-scale monitoring programs for assessing wildlife fatalities at wind turbines, so the number of bats killed across the entire United States is difficult to assess. However, by 2020 an estimated 33,000 to 111,000 bats will be killed annually by wind turbines in the Mid-Atlantic¶ Highlands alone** (7). Obviously, mortality from these two factors is substantial and will likely have¶ long-term cumulative impacts on both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems (5, 7). Because of these¶ combined threats, **sudden and simultaneous population declines are being witnessed in assemblages of temperate-zone insectivorous bats on a scale rivaled by few recorded events affecting mammals**.

***Lack of coal demand in the US causes exports to China --- turns the aff --- plan doesn’t solve neoliberal coal consumption, it just displaces it to China***

**Wong ’12** Fayen Wong, 4-19-12, Reuters, U.S. coal exports to China may double in 2012: Xcoal <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/19/us-coal-idUSBRE83I0AK20120419>, jj

(Reuters) - **U.S. coal exports to China could more than double** to over 12 million tonnes in 2012 **thanks to** depressed freight rates and **a fall in domestic demand in the United States, the chief of top U.S. coal exporter Xcoal Energy & Resources said. The expected increase in coal shipments could further push down coal prices in Asia** where a supply glut following a deluge from the United States and Colombia has forced prices to slump recently. Australian Newcastle-grade coal has dropped $10 a tonne since end-February, the Indonesian coal reference price is down to its lowest in 16 months and South African coal has shed $5. "Exports to China could reach over 12 million tonnes this year based on the annualized numbers," Chief Executive Ernie Thrasher told Reuters in an interview on Wednesday. "We only have data for January and February now, but all anecdotal evidence so far suggests that there are no signs of that diminishing as the year goes on," he said. "I think there is enough demand in Asia to absorb enough U.S. cargoes to stem a decline in prices." **Many U.S. coal sellers have set their eyes on Asia as a shrinking domestic market** and tepid demand in Europe **have pushed them to look for new customers** outside of their traditional markets. Total U.S. coal exports to China, the world's largest spot coal buyer, stood at about 5 million tonnes in the first two months of the year, with thermal coal shipments up 5.3 percent on year to some 3 million tonnes. China, which relies heavily on coal for power generation, is the world's No. 1 coal producer, but infrastructure bottlenecks have forced many coastal power plants to turn to cheaper and more accessible imports in recent years. Coal imports by the world's second-largest economy rose 11 percent on year to 182 million tonnes in 2011. Shipments from the United States were 4.9 million tonnes, a near 3 percent gain on year. MARGINAL PLAYER Thrasher said **the United States was turning to Asia because of a drop in domestic demand.**

***Chinese coal use causes hundreds of thousands of premature deaths***

**Nagle 11**

John Copeland Nagle, Professor, Notre Dame Law School, 11, “How Much Should China Pollute?” 12 Vt. J. Envtl. L. 591, http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/vermenl12&div=24&g\_sent=1&collection=journals [NOTE: This card includes footnote #8 – it is between the square brackets]

**China is the world's worst polluter. It suffers more from air pollution than any other nation**, hosting most of the world's polluted cities. Nearly two-thirds of the country's 360 million urban residents suffer from unhealthy levels of air pollution.2 Anecdotal reports by visitors to China frequently refer to the alarming nature of the air pollution there.3 China's water is polluted, too. About 100 billion cubic meters of China's water supply is contaminated.4 China is also the leading emitter of greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.5 China's carbon dioxide emissions nearly tripled between 1990 and 2008.6 And China's pollution is only expected to get worse.' It is building unbelievable amounts of coal-fired electric power plants,8 and the number of cars in China is increasing exponentially. China "is expected to release five times more carbon dioxide over the next twenty-five years than the Kyoto Protocol is projected to save."9 [8. As Professor Vandenbergh explains: China's emissions are increasing at a rapid rate in large part because of new construction of coal-fired electric power plants. It added electric power plants with a generating capacity of 102 gigawatts in 2006, an amount equal to all of the electric power generating capacity in France, after adding an amount equal to all of Britain the year before. On average, a new coal-fired electric plant large enough to serve a city the size of Dallas opens in China every seven to ten days. Overall, China and other developing countries are projected to account for 85% of global energy growth between 2003 and 2020. China's emissions are increasing at a rapid rate in large part because of new construction of coal-fired electric power plants. It added electric power plants with a generating capacity of 102 gigawatts in 2006, an amount equal to all of the electric power generating capacity in France, after adding an amount equal to all of Britain the year before. On average, a new coal-fired electric plant large enough to serve a city the size of Dallas opens in China every seven to ten days. Overall, China and other developing countries are projected to account for 85% of global energy growth between 2003 and 2020.] **That pollution creates problems** for three separate entities. First, it is a problem for China itself. **The health of the Chinese people suffers from the polluted air that they breathe and the polluted water that they drink. "Air pollution causes the premature deaths of 750 thousand Chinese people every year**."'0 Just one percent of China's urban residents "breathe[] air considered healthy by the World Health Organization."" China's pollution also has a profound detrimental impact on the nation's economy. Economists suggest that China's staggering economic growth statistics would be much more modest if the economic effects of polluters are included.'2 The health and economic aspects of pollution, in turn, cause domestic unrest that threatens the stability of the Chinese government. There have been numerous protests against pollution from existing or proposed facilities throughout China.'3

***There’s always value to life –Prefer our ev because of Frankl’s subject position.***

Phyllis D. **Coontz,** PhD Graduate School of Public and International Affairs University of Pittsburgh, et al, JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSING, **2001**, 18(4), 235-246 – J-Stor

In the 1950s, **psychiatrist and theorist** Viktor **Frankl (**1963) **described an existential theory of** purpose and **meaning in life. Frankl, a long-time prisoner in a concentration camp, re- lated several instances of transcendent states that he experienced in the midst of that terri- ble suffering** using his own experiences and observations. He believed that **these experi- ences allowed him and others to maintain their sense of dignity and self-worth.** Frankl (1969) claimed that **transcendence occurs by giving to others, being open to others** and the environment, and coming to accept the reality that some situations are un- changeable. **He hypothesized that life always has meaning for the individual; a person can always decide how to face adversity**. Therefore, **self-transcendence provides mean- ing and enables the discovery of meaning for a person** (Frankl, 1963). Expanding Frankl's work, Reed (1991b) linked self-transcendence with mental health. Through a developmental process **individuals gain an increasing understanding of who they are and are able to move out beyond themselves despite the fact that they are ex- periencing** physical and mental **pain. This** expansion beyond the self **occurs through in- trospection**, concern about others and their well-being, and integration of the past and fu- ture **to strengthen one's present life** (Reed, 1991b).

**Solvency**

***Turn – Giroux’s method replicates the binarism he critiques***

Janet **Alsup, 2001**, assistant professor of English education at Purdue University, Review: Contextualizing Critical Pedagogy, Pedagogy, Volume 1, Issue 2, Spring 2001, pp. 429-434, KEL

In chapter 4 **Lee returns to the critical pedagogues** of the past **and engages in some gutsy critique of their work. She pays particular attention to Giroux**, whose landmark books include Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life: Critical Pedagogy in the Modern Age (1988) and Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies (1994), the latter edited with McLaren. Lee writes that **while Giroux pays rhetorical attention to the problematic of a binarism between one's theorizing and one's praxis, there is little to suggest substantive revision has occurred anywhere outside of his theorizing. These reflections on what he did, said, and emphasized in his classroom position the teacher as the agent of critical pedagogy while students are relegated to objects; the teacher works his liberatory magic on them, while students are left to perform as directed, awaiting emancipation and empowerment**. (107) Giroux breaks Lee's rule that "the pedagogy argued for must match the pedagogy of the argument." Lee then calls **his theories "devoid of considerations of the concerns and challenges that accompany any actual pedagogical situation**" (122**). I agree with Lee's indictment of Giroux**, but I cannot say the same for all critical pedagogues who wrote before Lee, Gore, and Ellsworth. For example, Ira Shor writes much about specific interactions in his classroom in [End Page 433] texts such as When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy (1996). But Lee's point is well taken, and **she is correct to criticize critical pedagogues who say that education occurs through an active, reflexive process and then "educate" their readers with theory-heavy, authoritarian prose**. On the other hand, Lee praises Ellsworth (and criticizes Giroux and McLaren's critique of her article "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy" [1989]) because she speaks from the concrete experience of her own classroom and from her own attempts to enact a critical pedagogy with her students.

***Turn – their student voice pedagogy perpetuates domination and exclusion by being open to all voices without rebuttal or response. This proves why we need to refute and respond to these arguments, proving our framework.***

Elizabeth **Ellsworth, 1989**, Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Communications

Technology Program, and Member of the Women's Studies Program, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Why Doesn’t This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy, Harvard Educational Review, 59.3, KEL

In January, 1988, partly in response to this situation, I facilitated a special topics course at UW-Madison called “Media and Anti-Racist Pedagogies,” Curriculum and Instruction 607, known as C&I 607. in this article, I will offer an interpretation of C&I 607s interventions against campus racism and traditional educational forms at the university. I will then use that interpretation to support a critique of current discourses on critical pedagogy.’ **The literature on critical pedagogy represents attempts by educational researchers to theorize and operationalize pedagogical challenges to oppressive social formations**. While the attempts I am

concerned with here share fundamental assumptions and goals, their different emphases are reflected in the variety of labels given to them, **such as “critical pedagogy,” “pedagogy of critique and possibility,” “pedagogy of student voice**,” “pedagogy of empowerment,” “radical pedagogy” “pedagogy for radical democracy,” and “pedagogy of possibility.”2 I want to argue. on the basis of my interpretation of C&I 607, that **key assumptions, goals, and pedagogical practices fundamental to the literature on critical pedagogy — namely, “empowerment ,“ “student voice,” “dialogue,” and even the term “critical”— are repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination.** By this I mean that **when participants in our class attempted to put into practice prescriptions offered in the literature concerning empowerment, student voice, and dialogue, we produced results that were not only unhelpful, but actually exacerbated the very conditions we were trying to work against, including Eurocentrism, racism, sexism, classism, and “banking education.**” To the extent that our efforts to put discourses of critical pedagogy into practice led us to reproduce relations of domination in our classroom, these discourses were “working through” us in repressive ways, and had themselves become vehicles of repression. To the extent we “worked through” and out of the literature’s highly abstract language (“myths”) of who we “should” be and what “should” be happening in our classroom, and into classroom practices that were context specific and seemed to be much more responsive to our own understandings of our social identities and situations.

## 2nc

**\*Block Overview – Anti Politics**

***Only political engagement can check their impacts***

**Boggs ’97**

(CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved -- perhaps even unrecognized -- only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases, technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications.  **Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics**, often inspired by localist sentiment, **comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence.** In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 **In the meantime, the** **fate of the world hangs in the balance.** The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites -- an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics *might* set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise -- or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec- tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75

***We subsume their framework – speech acts are only relevant when tied to action in the public sphere. Disengaging criticism from action reduces speech to consumption of products – turning their impacts***

**Norris ’06** (Trevor, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, “Studies In Philosophy and Education”, “HANNAH ARENDT & JEAN BAUDRILLARD: PEDAGOGY IN THE CONSUMER SOCIETY”)

**The polis and action are closely intertwined** and mutually interdependent: **while action is needed to preserve the polis, so too is the polis needed to preserve action**; while the polis is the location for action, so too is it the place where action is preserved and memorialized through speech. The polis is where we not only differentiate ourselves from others, but also differentiate between ‘‘activities related to a common world and those related to the maintenance of life’’ (Arendt, 1958, p. 28) such as production and consumption. **The polis provides the location for both self-disclosure and its preservation; it affords a remedy for the futility of action and speech by preventing it from fading into obscurity**. Through self-disclosure Arendt closely links action with speech, stating that ‘‘speechless action would no longer be action’’ (Arendt, 1958, p. 178). For along with deeds, speech is how actors both disclose themselves and preserve or memorialize action. Although labor and the oikos may include ‘‘speech’’ of a sort, she insists that ‘‘no other human performance requires speech to the same extent as action’’ (Arendt, 1958, p. 179). For Arendt**, the public and private realms and their corresponding activities are not historically static in their relation to each other; that is, they may change in relative importance throughout history.** Beginning with the rise of the labor theorists, from John Locke through Adam Smith to Karl Marx, action and the bios politikos (political life) have been marginalized while the private concerns of consumption and production have been elevated into a place of political dominance. This historical dynamic of the modern reversal of public and private spheres Arendt terms the rise of the social realm: ‘‘the emergence of the social realm... is a relatively new phenomenon whose origin coincided with the emergence of the modern age’’ (Arendt, 1958, p. 28**). With this loss of action and the public sphere, freedom becomes reduced to routinized behaviour, difference and plurality to conformism and uniformity, speech and self-disclosure to relentless production and consumption. Instead of experiencing the freedom associated with action and speech in the public realm, humans are reduced to mere adjuncts to the cycle of production and consumption. The polis in turn is required to enable this cycles smooth functioning and progressive acceleration. The social realm is a community centered around the cyclical process of production and consumption, in which human self-understanding becomes based on ‘‘possessive individualism’’** (MacPhearson, 1962) **and speech subjugated to commercial discourse. It is the end of action and speech.**

***We’ll indict “pre-fiat” and micro-politics. Those args mask that macro-politics shapes the local more than vice-versa.***

**Ebert ‘5**

Teresa L. Ebert is a professor of cultural theory at the University at Albany, State University of New YorkScience & Society, Vol. 69, No. 1, January 2005, 33–55, available at: http://people.missouristate.edu/WilliamBurling/Adobe%20files/Rematerializing%20Feminism.pdf

The emergence of micropolitics marks the impact of the globalization of capitalist production and the way that the dimensions of this objective reality have become less and less graspable by a subject who, through the working of ideology, has been remapped as the subject of desire. The subject of desire is, by its very formation, a local and localist subject. This desiring subject grasps the world through its identity and furthermore constructs this identity through the satisfactions that it acquires in its consuming relations to the world around it. Micropolitics is the politics of consumption, and consumption is always a matter of localities. **Micropolitics** does not have an inverse relation to universal objective reality, but rather is complementary to it: it **preoccupies the subject with the here and now and, in doing so, *distracts its attention from the all encompassing objective reality that in fact determines the here and now***. Advanced capitalism deploys micropolitics to restrict the access of the subject to the dynamics of traveling capital and its expanding range of exploitation. **It is** of course **ironic that micropolitics is seen as enabling politics** — **a politics that attends to the** connections and relations of the subject with its **immediate conditions** and serves as the basis for coalition and other local practices. In fact, micropolitics has become the logic of activism in the new social movements. To say what I have said in a different way: **micropolitics is** the politics of bypassing class and putting in its place lifestyle and consumption. It is **a politics that erases any examination of the structures of exploitation,** substituting instead ethnographical studies of the behavior of the subject in its multiple consuming relations.

**2nc/1nr – A2: “Politics Ceded Now”**

***They might say “politics is screwed-up now”. But, if the World’s too “conservative” now it’s because our form of political engagement is TOO THIN. It’s linear and voting neg solves***

**Katawala ‘9** (Sunder, Fabian Society, A Future For Politics, p. 31)

The answer to the political legitimacy crisis is politics. **There can be no magic bullet solution to what is primarily a question of** political cultural and **political education**. But **the overriding priority should be to pursue political reform in a way that is engaging and educative of the nature of politics itself and that brings about practical results.**

***Because politics is currently screwed-up, we need a POLITICAL realm to capitalize upon its failings. They give up on that, and we save it.***

**Boggs ’97**

(CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

So it follows that future attempts to revitalize the public sphere and reclaim politics for (and by) an empowered citizenry will face a Sisy- phean battle, especially since corporate colonization, the global capital- ist order, media myth-making, and ``post-modern'' social fragmentation are all so ¢rmly entrenched. And the main twentieth-century ideological discourses ^ nationalism, liberalism, socialism, Communism ^ can be expected to offer few guideposts in a rapidly-changing, unpredictable ¢eld of social forces, popular struggles, and subjective human responses. The truth may be that such ideologies have in themselves contributed to the decline of political life since the 1970s. Meanwhile, the depoliti- cized culture that I am exploring in these pages is neither monolithic nor immune to powerful social contradictions generated within any highly-strati¢ed order; the system is vulnerable to change, perhaps explosive change, as American society experiences further crisis and polarization. Popular movements and organizations have survived into the 1990s, even if many of them have been fully assimilated into normal politics or have become marginalized. Whether such movements can become repoliticized -- whether they can enter into and help transform the public sphere -- will be the urgent question facing the United States and the world in the early twenty-first century.

***And we control uniqueness – Debate is insulated from political elites and is an effective training ground for students - Forcing premature advocacy destroys effective politics by making debaters to outward too soon. Our framework solves, but sequences the process to first test and refine ideas to make them better***

**Coverstone 95** (Alan, Debate Coach – Montgomery Bell Academy, “An Inward Glance: A Response To Mitchell’s Outward Activist Turn ”, <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Coverstone1995China.htm>)

Debate teaches individual decision-making for the information age. No other academic activity available today teaches people more about information gathering, assessment, selection, and delivery. Most importantly, debate teaches individuals how to make and defend their own decisions. Debate is the only academic activity that moves at the speed of the information age. Time is required for individuals to achieve escape velocity. Academic debate holds tremendous value as a space for training. Mitchell's reflections are necessarily more accurate in his own situation. Over a decade of debate has well positioned him to participate actively and directly in the political process. Yet the skills he has did not develop overnight. Proper training requires time. While there is a tremendous variation in the amount of training required for effective navigation of the public sphere, the relative isolation of academic debate is one of its virtues. Instead of turning students of debate immediately outward, we should be encouraging more to enter the oasis. A thirsty public, drunk on the product of anyone who claims a decision, needs to drink from the pool of decision-making skills. Teaching these skills is our virtue. Second, Mitchell's argument underestimates the risks associated with an outward turn. Individuals trained in the art and practice of debate are, indeed, well suited to the task of entering the political world. At some unspecified point in one's training, the same motivation and focus that has consumed Mitchell will also consume most of us. At that point, political action becomes a proper endeavor. However, all of the members of the academic debate community will not reach that point together. A political outward turn threatens to corrupt the oasis in two ways. It makes our oasis a target, and it threatens to politicize the training process. As long as debate appears to be focused inwardly, political elites will not feel threatened. Yet one of Mitchell's primary concerns is recognition of our oasis in the political world. In this world we face well trained information managers.

Sensing a threat from "debate," they will begin to infiltrate our space. Ready made information will increase and debaters will eat it up. Not yet able to truly discern the relative values of information, young debaters will eventually be influenced dramatically by the infiltration of political elites. Retaining our present anonymity in political life offers a better hope for reinvigorating political discourse. As perhaps the only truly non-partisan space in American political society, academic debate holds the last real possibility for training active political participants. Nowhere else are people allowed, let alone encouraged, to test all manner of political ideas. This is the process through which debaters learn what they believe and why they believe it. In many ways this natural evolution is made possible by the isolation of the debate community. An example should help illustrate this idea. Like many young debaters, I learned a great deal about socialism early on. This was not crammed down my throat. Rather, I learned about the issue in the free flow of information that is debate. The intrigue of this, and other outmoded political arguments, was in its relative unfamiliarity. Reading socialist literature avidly, I was ready to take on the world. Yet I only had one side of the story. I was an easy mark for the present political powers. Nevertheless, I decided to fight City Hall. I had received a parking ticket which I felt was unfairly issued. Unable to convince the parking department to see it my way, I went straight to the top. I wrote the Mayor a letter. In this letter, I accused the city of exploitation of its citizens for the purpose of capital accumulation. I presented a strong Marxist critique of parking meters in my town. The mayor's reply was simple and straightforward. He called me a communist. He said I was being silly and should pay the ticket. I was completely embarrassed by the entire exchange. I thought I was ready to start the revolution. In reality, I wasn't even ready to speak to the Mayor. I did learn from the experience, but I did not learn what Gordon might have hoped. I learned to stop reading useless material and to keep my opinions to myself. Do we really want to force students into that type of situation? I wrote the mayor on my own. Debaters will experiment with political activism on their own. This is all part of the natural impulse for activism which debate inspires. Yet, in the absence of such individual motivation, an outward turn threatens to short circuit the learning process. Debate should capitalize on its isolation. We can teach our students to examine all sides of an issue and reach individual conclusions before we force them into political exchanges. To prematurely turn debaters out threatens to undo the positive potential of involvement in debate.

**A2: you cede politics/case o/w**

***Founding argument on emotion moots debate --- only our alternative preserves clash --- that’s key to testing the merits of their advocacy***

**Zompetti ‘4** Joseph P. Zompetti (Assistant Professor, School of Communication, Illinois State University) “PERSONALIZING DEBATING: DIVERSITY AND TOLERANCE IN THE DEBATE COMMUNITY” September 2004 Contemporary Argumentation and Debate volume 25

The first major problem with this new form of debating is its appeal to victimage. **Through victimage and scapegoating, a rhetor uses a purification ritual as a means of identifying and blaming the guilt onto an “appropriate” other**. This commonality helps form identification among people when such blaming is in common (Burke, 1962, p. 22). In other words, victimage necessarily implies the understanding that one is in a position of marginalization. In debate, marginalized groups gain credit for being victims by arguing their plight among the community. There is no shame in that. However, many so-called "victims" deploy these arguments in actual debate rounds. I have no problem with discussions of exclusivity and underrepresentation in our community, but let me be clear: **Such arguments should not be the focus of debate competition.**

**On one level, we clearly have a problem in our community, namely the marginalization of diverse groups**. On the other level, we have arguments about problem "x" occurring in debate rounds where debate teams may not have access to knowledge concerning the problem of the community-at-large or they may not be prepared to debate such issues (after all, one is reminded of the importance of clash in individual debates). **Clearly, we have a mismatch concerning a topic and its venue.** The concomitant positions advanced by a team in favor of changing the community are essentially "debate-proof." We may initially want to congratulate such debaters for their strategic prowess: For how can one debate against **the claim that one "feels" or "perceives" marginalization**? Such claims **are unverifiable and dependent on the person who is advancing the argument, not on the one answering it**. In essence, **then, victimage arguments "stack-the-deck" in favor of those advocating such positions.**

**One may also insert the role of the judge into this equation. Judging debates is hard enough, particularly when debaters already personalize judge's comments**. After all, when debaters make arguments, they put forward part of themselves and are vulnerable to criticism. But for many years debaters have claimed that judges are too subjective in their assessments, particularly when forms of racism and sexism emerge, subtly or not so subtly, in some judge's comments. **When debaters engage in a more explicit form of personalized debating, the role of the judge is even more difficult**. In addition, **any critical comment from a judge runs the risk of being misperceived. The result is a more frustrating and anxietyprone activity precisely because the arguments become personalized, as opposed to placing them within the larger community context.**1

**My position, then, is not that such arguments are untrue (yes, marginalization exists), but rather that such claims are not debatable**. Hence, **no clash can occur when such arguments are made**. **This destroys the nature of debate because it not only nullifies any ground the other team may have, but it also sets a very dangerous precedent where some team personally argues "x" where no alternate team may respond with "y."** **This is dangerous, of course, because debate as we know it ceases to exist – the fundamental element of clash** (i.e., the different affirmative and negative burdens) **becomes moot and irrelevant**. **Victimhood**, as is true with society as a whole, **becomes the ultimate trump card where someone's personal feelings, beliefs, or journeys supercede any attempts at verifying or locating expert testimonial evidence to the contrary**. What's more, an even more dangerous impulse occurs – that **people in positions of power may appropriate the arguments and rhetoric of the marginalized for their own ends**1 (Dubber, 2002). **The second major problem with this turn in contemporary policy debate is its deflection, if not downright rejection, of more fundamental or core problems which are the cause of marginalization.** Dana Cloud (1998) poignantly argues that when focusing on the personalizing of "debating," society stifles dissent, which is probably more important and powerful at ushering-in social change than particularized attention to therapeutic, albeit victimized, perspectives. The will to engage in discourse about transgression is one of individualized therapy, as if the individual's psychological condition is at stake (e.g., arguments about "discursive violence" are often deployed to this end). Her argument is primarily one about key progressive change – should we focus on individual notions of psychological distress or the larger group's problem of resource-based scarcity and exploitation? If one is compelled by the argument that we should look self-reflexively2 and comprehensively at the nature of excluding debaters of color and other marginalized groups, then we might be tempted to agree with the outcome of piecemeal solutions and incoherent policies. On the other hand, we may want to analyze how such relationships occurred and grew when other relationships and situations were not as obvious. In fact, we may want to even broaden our interpretation of such relationships – exactly how are students of color marginalized? Why do folks believe they have nothing to contribute? Why do students of

color feel excluded?

***Affect is not enough for decision-making – it leads to misguided decisions especially in the context of large magnitude and future-oriented impacts***

Paul **Slovic et al 2004** “Risk as Analysis and Risk as Feelings: Some Thoughts about Affect, Reason, Risk, and Rationality,” Risk Analysis, Vol. 24, No. 2

**There are two important ways that experiential thinking misguides us. One results from the deliberate manipulation of our affective reactions by those who wish to control our behaviors** (**advertising and marketing exemplify this manipulation**). **The other results from the natural limitations of the experiential system and the existence of stimuli in our environment that are simply not amenable to valid affective representation**. The latter problem is discussed below. **Judgments and decisions can be faulty not only because their affective components are manipulable, but also because they are subject to inherent biases of the experiential system.** For example, **the affective system seems designed to sensitize us to small changes in our environment** (e.g., the difference between 0 and 1 deaths) **at the cost of making us less able to appreciate and respond appropriately to larger changes further away from zero** (e.g., the difference between 500 deaths and 600 deaths). **Fetherstonhaugh** et al.(25) **referred to this insensitivity as “psychophysical numbing**.” Albert Szent-Gyorgi put it another way: **“I am deeply moved if I see one man suffering and would risk my life for him. Then I talk impersonally about the possible pulverization of our big cities, with a hundred million dead. I am unable to multiply one man’s suffering by a hundred million.”** **Similar problems arise when the outcomes that we must evaluate are visceral in nature. Visceral factors include drive states such as hunger, thirst, sexual desire, emotions, pain, and drug craving. They have direct, hedonic impacts that have a powerful effect on behavior.** Although they produce strong feelings in the present moment, **these feelings are difficult if not impossible to recall or anticipate in a veridical manner**, a factor that plays a key role in the phenomenon of addiction:(29) Unlike currently experienced visceral factors, which have a disproportionate impact on behavior, **delayed visceral factors tend to be ignored or severely underweighted in decision making**. **Today’s pain, hunger, anger, etc. are palpable, but the same sensations anticipated in the future receive little weight**. (p. 240)

**Threat**

***4 Our specific reps – even if doomsday – are good. Spur needed movements***

**Joppke '91**

(Christian - professor of political and social sciences at the European University Institute — The British Journal of Sociology - March - via J-Store)

**Since the ecology and anti-nuclear movements lack a well-defined group basis, they all the more depend on the public attention to the issues they address**. The new risks must be drawn as imminent and global, otherwise Olson's mobilization barrier could not be overcome. **No looming threat of disaster or prospect of immediate 'collective bads', no collective action**. **12 As a result, doomsday visions, Angst, and a sense of utmost urgency prosper in these movements'**. ' **After all, they emerge in reaction to policies on the brink of implementation, large-scale technologies in the process of realization or air and water already polluted. Considering their temporal position, there is no time to lose because too much time has already been lost.**

## 1nr

**O/V**

***b. Extinction inevitable - capitalism’s domination over nature and culture is the root cause of all violence***

**Shiva, ’02** (Vandana, Alternative Nobel Laureate, Director of The Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Natural Resource Policy, a network of researchers specializing in sustainable agriculture and development, and Philosophy Ph.D., “Terrorism as Cannibalism,” January 23, <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/2002-01/23shiva.cfm>, bgm)

Humans are experiencing their religious spaces enclosed when militaries occupy sacred lands as in the Mid East. Humans are experiencing enclosure through occupation as in Palestine. The children in affluent America are also experiencing a closing of their lives, and are turning to mindless violence as in the case of shooting at St. Columbines. And across the world, ecological, economic and political spaces are being enclosed through privatisation, liberalisation and globalisation. These multiple processes are breeding new insecurities, new anxieties, new stresses. Cultural security, economic security, ecological security, political security are all being rapidly eroded. Could the violence being unleashed by humans against humans be similar to the violence pigs, chicken and cattle express when denied their freedom to roll in the mud, peck for worms, and roam outside the confines of animal factories? Could the coercive imposition of a consumer culture worldwide, with its concomitant destruction of values, cultural diversity, livelihoods, and the environment be the invisible cages against which people are rebelling, some violently, most non-violently. Could the “war against terrorism” be equivalent to the detoothing, debeaking, dehorning of pigs chickens and cattle by agribusiness industry because they are turning violent when kept under violent conditions? Could the lasting solution to violence induced by the violence of captivity and enslavement for humans be the same as that for other animals – giving them back their space for spiritual freedom, ecological freedom, for psychological freedom and for economic freedom. The cages that humans are feeling tapped in are the new enclosures which are robbing communities of their cultural spaces and identities, and their ecological and economic spaces for survival. Globalisation is the overaching name for this enclosure. Greed and appropriation of other people’s share of the planet’s precious resources are at the root of conflicts, and the root of terrorism. When President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair announced that the goal of the global war on terrorism is for the defense of he American and European “way of life”, they are declaring a war against the planet-its oil, its water, its biodiversity. A way of life for the 20 percent of the earth’s people who use 80 percent of the planet’s resources will dispossess 80 percent of its people of their just share of resources and eventually destroy the planet. We cannot survive as a species if greed is privileged and protected and the economics of the greedy set the rules for how we live and die. If the past enclosures have already precipitated so much violence, what will be the human costs of new enclosures being carved out for privatisation of living resources and water resources, the very basis of our species survival. Intellectual property laws and water privatisation are new invisible cages trapping humanity.

**Link**

***It is not possible to solve any situation without solving them all – only a criticism which attacks the universal of capitalism can solve their impacts and the inevitable destruction of the earth and its people. This proves only the alt can solve the plan.***

**Zizek, ’89**

(Slavoj, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies, The Sublime Object of Ideology, page 3-4)

It is upon the unity of these two features that the Marxist notion of the revolution, of the revolutionary situation, is founded: a situation of metaphorical condensation in which it finally becomes clear to the everyday consciousness that it is not possible to solve any particular ques­tion without solving them all - that is, without solving the fundamental question which embodies the antagonistic character of the social totality. In a 'normal', pre-revolutionary state of things, everybody is fighting his own particular battles (workers are striking for better wages, feminists are fighting for the rights of women, democrats for political and social freedoms, ecologists against the exploitation of nature, participants in the peace movements against the danger of war, and so on). Marxists are using all their skill and adroimess of argument to convince the partici­pants in these particular struggles that the only real solution to their problem is to be found in the global revolution: as long as social relations are dominated by Capital, there will always be sexism in relations between the sexes, there will always be a threat of global war, there will always be a danger that political and social freedoms will be suspended, nature itself will always remain an object of ruthless exploitation. . . . The global revolution will then abolish the basic social antagonism, enabling the formation of a transparent, rationally governed society.

***The affirmatives call for environmental justice simply commodifies life into capital***

**Luke,** **’97** (Timothy W., Department of Political Science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, The (Un)Wise (Ab)Use of Nature: Environmentalism as Globalized Consumerism? http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim528.htm)

Newer ecological discourses about total cost accounting, lifecycle management, or environmental justice may simply articulate more refined efforts to sustainably develop these bigger global processes of universal capitalization by accepting small correctives against particular capitalist interests. Admitting that poor people have been treated unjustly in siting decisions for environmental bads lets rich people redistribute these ecological costs across more sites so that they might benefit from the material and symbolic goods created by being just so environmental. Environmental justice movements perhaps are not so much about attaining environmental justice as they are about moving injustices more freely around in the environment, assuring the birth of new consumerisms for increased efficiency at risk management and broader participation ecological degradation in our terraformed Nature.

**Perm**

***Their focus on specific identity categories makes the realization of a true universal impossible***

**Zizek, ’09** (Slavoj, senior researcher at the Institute of Sociology, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, professor at the European Graduate School, and total BAMF, First as Tragedy, Then as Farce, p. 102, bgm)

Liberals who acknowledge the problems of those excluded from the socio-political process formulate their goal as being the inclusion of those whose voices are not heard: all positions should be listened to, all interests taken into account, the human rights of everyone guaranteed, all ways of life, cultures, and practices respected, and so on. The obsession of this democratic discourse is the protection of all kinds of minorities: cultural, religious, sexual, *e tutti quanti*. The formula of democracy is patient negotiation and compromise. What gets lost here is the proletarian position, the position of universality embodied in the Excluded. This is why, upon a closer look, it becomes clear that what Hugo Chavez has begun doing in Venezuela differs markedly from the standard liberal form of inclusion: Chavez is not including the “excluded” dwellers of favelas as his *base* and then reorganizing political space and political forms so that the latter will “fit” the excluded. Pedantic and abstract as it may appear, this difference—between “bourgeois democracy” and “dictatorship of the proletariat” —is crucial.

***Particular struggles sap the energy from the criticism***

**Valentić 07** (Tonči, University of Zagreb, “Socialism reconsidered: Remarks on Žižek`s *Repeating Lenin”,* International Journal of Zizek Studies, <http://zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/view/47/92>)

Žižek`s assertion that the main failure of today's Left is the acceptance of the cultural wars (such as anti-racist or feminist) as the dominant terrain of the emancipatory politics is very easy to defend. There are basically two possible ways for the socio-political engagement: either to play the game of the system, i.e. to engage in the "long march through the institutions" or to get active in new social movements (such as feminism, ecology, antiracism, minority rights, etc.). Žižek rejects both of them, being mainly negative towards the second since they are not political in a strict sense of the word: they are not more that "single issue movements" with the lack of social totality, focused only on one group of people or one single social issue, thus rejecting the universalism as an important part of any struggle in the public sphere. Instead of a "right to narrate" one personal story or story from one particular point of view of the so-called socially deprived groups, he emphasizes the "right to truth" as embodied in historical figure of St. Paul, calling on the traces of Alain Badiou for humanity beyond particular disintegration or abstract humanism, beyond pathetic brotherhood, instead based on the "politics of truth". He puts into play the role of Saint Paul because in the realm of political theology he aimed to ground a new collective that abandons and leaves behind both the "Roman" and "Jewish" way, i.e. false universalism of liberal democracy's discourse and orthodox right-wing fundamentalism. With his assertion of today's world seen as period of post-modern relativism where we should articulate the universal truth as prerequisite for emancipatory politics, he overwrites the Leninist notion of "politics of truth" claiming it still has to be reinvented and implied. Since Badoiu`s notion of Event tends to "emerge out of nowhere", the same goes for Leninism as radical gesture: it is the only way to cope with contemporary totalitarian liberal democracy, so this reference to Lenin serves as an effort to break the vicious circle of these false options, i.e. either to play the game in hope you can one day beat the system or to fight the system emphasizing social particularities. The statement is very clear and convincing: partial emancipation is possible only through universal emancipation, which means particular experience cannot be universalized and therefore denotes a conservative political gesture, such as an emphasis on minority rights, gay and lesbian organizations, etc. Žižek`s critical remarks on the contemporary dominant fetish of repressed "otherness" as well as a concept of social intolerance towards the Other become the battlefield for analysis of Other's intolerance towards us, which is not politically correct but is politically true. Just as radicalism often represents an empty gesture, by the same token it is also the case with the political correctness as well as fascination with victimized Other, which leads us to the new type of exclusion, the exclusion of those who do not play by those imposed rules and are a priori considered terrorists or oppressors if they belong to the majority group (for example, single white Anglo-American male in today's United States in contrast to black lesbian woman). The important step, or to put it more clearly, the main theoretical act, is precisely to define hegemonic ideological coordinates because if you act you are already in the game, playing by the rules. Regarding political Denkverbot mentioned before, Žižek humorously but nonetheless punctually paraphrases Max Horkheimer`s sentence "those who do not want to talk about fascism, should keep silent about capitalism" into "those who do not want to talk about global capitalism, should keep silent about socialism". Political activity is here accurately seen as an example of *political* *interpassivity*, i.e. doing things not to achieve something, but to prevent something from really changing, as in an unmentioned reference to famous Visconti`s phrase in one of his movies that "everything has to be changed in order to remain the same". The Return to Lenin has a quite different aim. Instead of playing the role of leftist intellectual who pretends to be critical towards capitalism discussing the transition from commodity fetishism to fetishism which is today itself commodified or to support the naïve belief in cyber communism as the possible way of resistance, he calls for repetition of Lenin's historical gesture with the famous question, once more brought into the intellectual debate: "Čto djelat?" or "What Is To Be Done?" Here it is crucial to emphasize the relevance of so called "high theory" today for the most concrete political struggle – as we remember from socialism, theoretical knowledge is not unimportant; quite contrary, as Žižek argues, it is the main incentive for the revolutionary act which follows it. Another author who uses Lenin as a crucial figure is Toni Negri (article "What to do with "What to do?" Or rather: The body of General Intellect"), who grippingly emphasized the biopolitical aspect of Leninism, (Lenin beyond Lenin), i.e. interpreting communist struggle as inevitably biopolitical struggle. Since the present ideologico-political constellation is characterized by the tendency to introduce moralistic reasoning into the political struggle, we are only a few steps away from a teleological explanation of liberal-democratic capitalism as the ultimate and eternal social order. The true problem with the democracy as *liberal* democracy is in its inherent paradox, since it is possible only in the conditions of its impossibility, and the major problem with the state from the socialist point of view is that it has always been seen as an instrument of oppression which can never be fully democratized. For that reason, socialist interventions pinpoint the dominant role of the state as well as democracy's insufficiencies.