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## 1nc

### t

#### A) Interpretation – The Federal Government is the one in D.C.

**Dictionary of American politics**, 2nd edition, 19**68**.

Federal government: in the united states: the government which, from its capital in the district of Columbia, directly legislates, administers, and exercises jurisdiction over matters assigned to it in the constitution and exerts considerable influence, by means of grants-in-aid and otherwise, over matters reserved to the state governments.

#### B. Violation – The aff does not defend the federal government acting.

#### Voting issue ---

#### predictable limits – we are prepared to debate the USFG acting – allowing individual actions or independent criticisms of status quo policies justifies an infinite amount of aff cases.

#### Extra Topicality – Even if they claim to “defend” their plan – they skirt discussion of its merits by arguing in round poetry performance outweighs. This is a voting issue because we’re forced to win framework just to get back to equal footing – extra topicality also proves the resolution insufficient and explodes aff ground.

#### Even if they defend the plan coming out of cross-x be vigiliant --- protect the neg against any shadinesss or advocacy shifts

### Cp

***Text: The fifty state governments and the District of Columbia should substantially increase financial incentives for wind.***

***The fifty states should setup “Green Banks” as per our Center for American Progress evidence. Any energy project financing as a result of the counterplan should come from these “Green Banks”.***

***States can take the lead on clean energy***

SARAH **LASKOW**, Reporter, Good Environment, “As Washington Backs Off Clean Energy, States Are Filling the Void”, Jan 20th 20**12**, http://www.good.is/post/as-washington-backs-off-clean-energy-states-are-filling-the-void/

President Obama released his first campaign ad this week, which touts his credits on clean energy. But while the president has gone further toward supporting clean energy than any other environmental policy, the federal policies that were hustling wind and solar projects into existence have expired under his watch. **Renewable-energy advocacy groups are** pushing to reinstate those incentives, but they're also **shifting focus to the states**: **The Solar Energy Industries Association**, the industry’s lead trade group, **recently merged with the state-focused Solar Alliance to beef up its expertise** on the kaleidoscope of policies emerging from legislatures across the country. As a group, **states are already doing more to support clean energy development than the federal government ever dreamed of**. At the end of 2010, all but four states (Alabama, Missisippi, Tennessee, and Idaho) had approved a clean-energy policy of one kind or another. For states looking to increase their clean energy potential, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory advises using "suites of policies applied in succession” [PDF], with lower-cost strategies coming first. In other words, start small, with projects that will prove their worth quickly, then scale up as governments and citizens become more comfortable with green technology. **There are three major areas in which state governments have a chance to make a significant impact in the clean-energy sphere without needing help from Congress**. Standards. **State governments have the power to mandate certain outcomes. In clean energy, the two most important requirements for states to enforce are building codes and renewable-portfolio standards**. Building codes can require certain levels of energy efficiency in new construction, for instance, which can lock in energy savings over the decades-long lifespan of a building. Renewable portfolio standards require utilities to source a fixed percentage of their power from renewable sources by set deadlines. Connections. Renewable energy installations aren’t much use unless they connect back to the grid, so states need rules for distributed energy sources like rooftop solar to connect back to the grid. **Regulations** like these **also make it possible for the owners of distributed-energy sources to sell power back to the grid or receive credit on their energy bills for the power they contributed**. Money. **In the end, though, growing clean energy means building more renewable power projects, which requires financing. States have such a range of programs in place**—**including grants, rebates, loans, and loan guarantees**—**that researchers looking at state-level policies have had a difficult time deducing which ones are working best.** The Brookings Institution released a report this month advocating creation of **state clean energy funds** to support individual projects. Brookings sees these funds **as a potential engine of innovation, too, funding clean-energy startups and cutting-edge research and development.** **While the federal government backs off from its support of clean energy, state policies like these are increasingly essential for the industry’s continued growth. State-level regulations have a trickle-down effect,** too: **It’s easier for local governments to push for clean energy in states with strong frameworks**. Of course, that would be true for federal level policies, too—while it's heartening that states are taking initiative, they would be able to achieve more with some increased leadership from Washington.

***The Green bank solves all their financing and investment arguments***

**Center for American Progress** Action Fund, June 16, 20**09**,

http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2009/06/green\_bank\_primer.html

**The Green Bank**, or Clean Energy Deployment Administration, **is a key element of proposed clean-energy policies**. **The Green Bank would provide more favorable terms to companies** ”**including lower interest rates and a lower cost of debt**” **to offset the high cost of financing new renewable energy projects through the private sector**. **This new financing system will spark the clean-energy transformation and accelerate the cost-effective, large-scale deployment of renewable energies.** **It would help fund the transition to a clean-energy economy while making renewable energy production competitive with current electricity prices and keeping consumer prices low by facilitating the flow of private capital into renewable energy and efficiency projects. Most importantly, the Green Bank will use its partnerships with the private sector to provide the capital investment and financial security that is critical to the long-term viability of the clean-energy economy.**

**Why do we need a Green Bank?**

**The Green Bank would** **address the** following issues:

The **ongoing credit crunch.**

**Job losses in the manufacturing**, construction, and financial sectors of the economy.

**The need for large-scale, predictable financing** for clean energy.

**The lack of scalable and standardized finance models** for existing energy-efficient technologies.

The risk resulting from fluctuating fossil fuel prices.

**How would a Green Bank work?**

CAP Action proposes that **the Green Bank would**:

**Be structured as a public, non-profit entity wholly owned by the U.S. government** with independent funding and flexibility in financing decisions.

**Take a portfolio approach** to investing in projects, targeting projects across the spectrum of relative risk and limiting investment in any single technology.

**Select projects competitively based on greenhouse gas reductions** and avoidance, and prioritize projects that provide the fastest, cheapest, cleanest reduction in greenhouse gases and oil use””projects that today face market barriers in accessing debt financing or credit enhancement. A version of the Green Bank is included in the American Clean Energy and Security Act, H.R.2454, which the House is scheduled to vote on next week. It would establish a Clean Energy Deployment Administration within the Department of Energy. Representative John Dingell (D-MI) offered the amendment, which was crafted with the assistance of Representatives Jay Inslee (D-WA) and Bart Gordon (D-TN). It contains restrictions intended to limit funding of nuclear power plants. The energy bill pending in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee also includes a CEDA provision. And Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-MD) introduced a bill, H.R. 1698, to create an independent Green Bank separate from DOE. Its board would include the Secretaries of Energy, Interior, and Treasury, and Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Is the Green Bank economically feasible? **Questions of cost and financial viability are of the utmost importance in today’s economic climate. The Green Bank will ultimately prove to be a catalyst for economic recovery**; it **will leverage public and private capital, encourage businesses to invest again, and help to re-open credit markets by partnering with the private sector and facilitating responsible and diverse investment strategies.** **The Coalition for a Green Bank estimates that $50 billion of initial capital could enable the Green Bank to support up to $500 billion in loans over 20 years. This, matched with equity investments, could ultimately translate into $1 trillion worth of clean-energy investments.**

### 1nc

#### A) Romney will win --- best forecasts prove --- ignore polls

CU Boulder 10-4 (Updated election forecasting model still points to Romney win, University of Colorado study says <http://www.colorado.edu/news/releases/2012/10/04/updated-election-forecasting-model-still-points-romney-win-university>, jj)

An update to an election forecasting model announced by two University of Colorado professors in August continues to project that Mitt Romney will win the 2012 presidential election.

According to their updated analysis, Romney is projected to receive 330 of the total 538 Electoral College votes. President Barack Obama is expected to receive 208 votes -- down five votes from their initial prediction -- and short of the 270 needed to win.

The new forecast by political science professors Kenneth Bickers of CU-Boulder and Michael Berry of CU Denver is based on more recent economic data than their original Aug. 22 prediction. The model itself did not change.

“We continue to show that the economic conditions favor Romney even though many polls show the president in the lead,” Bickers said. “Other published models point to the same result, but they looked at the national popular vote, while we stress state-level economic data.”

While many election forecast models are based on the popular vote, the model developed by Bickers and Berry is based on the Electoral College and is the only one of its type to include more than one state-level measure of economic conditions. They included economic data from all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Their original prediction model was one of 13 published in August in PS: Political Science & Politics, a peer-reviewed journal of the American Political Science Association. The journal has published collections of presidential election models every four years since 1996, but this year the models showed the widest split in outcomes, Berry said. Five predicted an Obama win, five forecast a Romney win, and three rated the 2012 race as a toss-up.

The Bickers and Berry model includes both state and national unemployment figures as well as changes in real per capita income, among other factors. The new analysis includes unemployment rates from August rather than May, and changes in per capita income from the end of June rather than March. It is the last update they will release before the election.

Of the 13 battleground states identified in the model, the only one to change in the update was New Mexico -- now seen as a narrow victory for Romney. The model foresees Romney carrying New Mexico, North Carolina, Virginia, Iowa, New Hampshire, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Florida. Obama is predicted to win Michigan and Nevada.

In Colorado, which Obama won in 2008, the model predicts that Romney will receive 53.3 percent of the vote to Obama’s 46.7 percent, with only the two major parties considered.

While national polls continue to show the president in the lead, “the president seems to be reaching a ceiling at or below 50 percent in many of these states,” Bickers said. “Polls typically tighten up in October as people start paying attention and there are fewer undecided voters.”

The state-by-state economic data used in their model have been available since 1980. When these data were applied retroactively to each election year, the model correctly classifies all presidential election winners, including the two years when independent candidates ran strongly: 1980 and 1992. It also correctly estimates the outcome in 2000, when Al Gore won the popular vote but George W. Bush won the election through the Electoral College.

#### 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.

### 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’’).

### case

***Ontology not first --- must stop in the face of mass death***

**Davidson ’89**(Arnold I. coeditor of Critical Inquiry, Assoc Prof of Philosophy, U of Chicago, Critical Inquiry, Winter . p.426)

I understand Levinas’ work to suggest another path to the recovery of the human, one that leads through or toward other human beings: “The dimension of the divine opens forth from the human face… Hence metaphysics is enacted where the social relation is enacted- in our relations with men… The Other is not the incarnation of God, but precisely by his face, in which he is disincarnate, is the manifestation of the height in which God is revealed. It is our relations with men… that give to theological concepts the sole signification they admit of.” Levinas places ethics before ontology by beginning with our experience of the human face: and, in a clear reference to Heidegger’s idolatry of the village life of peasants, he associated himself with Socrates, who preferred the city where he encountered men to the country with its trees. In his discussion of skepticism and the problem of others, Cavell also aligns himself with this path of thought, with the recovery of the finite human self through the acknowledgement of others: “As long as God exists, I am not alone. And couldn’t the other suffer the fate of God?… I wish to understand how the other now bears the weight of God, shows me that I am not alone in the universe. This requires understanding the philosophical problem of the other as the trace or scar of the departure of God [CR, p.470].” The suppression of the other, the human, in Heidegger’s thought accounts, I believe, for the absence, in his writing after the war, of the experience of horror. Horror is always directed toward the human; every object of horror bears the imprint of the human will. So Levinas can see in Heidegger’s silence about the gas chambers and death camps “a kind of consent to the horror.” And Cavell can characterize Nazis as “those who have lost the capacity for being horrified by what they do.” Where was Heidegger’s horror? How could he have failed to know what he had consented to? Hannah Arendt associates Heidegger with Paul Valery’s aphorism, “Les evenements ne sont que l’ecume des choses’ (‘Events are but the foam of things’).” I think one understands the source of her intuition. The mass extermination of human beings, however, does not produce foam, but dust and ashes; and it is here that questioning must stop.

***The judge must evaluate the consequences of the plan – ignoring the implications allows infinite violence***

**Williams 2005** (Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales—Aberystwyth, The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations, p. 174-176)

A commitment to an ethic of consequences reflects a deeper ethic of criticism, of ‘self-clarification’, and thus of reflection upon the values adopted by an individual or a collectivity. It is part of an attempt to make critical evaluation an intrinsic element of responsibility. Responsibility to this more fundamental ethic gives the ethic of consequences meaning. Consequentialism and responsibility are here drawn into what Schluchter, in terms that will be familiar to anyone conversant with constructivism in International Relations, has called a ‘reflexive principle’. In the wilful Realist vision, scepticism and consequentialism are linked in an attempt to construct not just a more substantial vision of political responsibility, but also the kinds of actors who might adopt it, and the kinds of social structures that might support it. A consequentialist ethic is not simply a choice adopted by actors: it is a means of trying to foster particular kinds of self-critical individuals and societies, and in so doing to encourage a means by which one can justify and foster a politics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility in wilful Realism thus involves a commitment to both autonomy and limitation, to freedom and restraint, to an acceptance of limits and the criticism of limits. Responsibility clearly involves prudence and an accounting for current structures and their historical evolution; but it is not limited to this, for it seeks ultimately the creation of responsible subjects within a philosophy of limits. Seen in this light, the Realist commitment to objectivity appears quite differently. Objectivity in terms of consequentialist analysis does not simply take the actor or action as given, it is a political practice — an attempt to foster a responsible self, undertaken by an analyst with a commitment to objectivity which is itself based in a desire to foster a politics of responsibility. Objectivity in the sense of coming to terms with the ‘reality’ of contextual conditions and likely outcomes of action is not only necessary for success, it is vital for self-reflection, for sustained engagement with the practical and ethical adequacy of one’s views. The blithe, self-serving, and **uncritical stances of abstract moralism** or rationalist objectivism avoid self-criticism by refusing to engage with the intractability of the world ‘as it is’. Reducing the world to an expression of their theoretical models, political platforms, or ideological programmes, they fail to engage with this reality, and thus avoid the process of self-reflection at the heart of responsibility. By contrast, Realist objectivity takes an engagement with this intractable ‘object’ that is not reducible to one’s wishes or will as a necessary condition of ethical engagement, self-reflection, and self-creation.7 Objectivity is not a naïve naturalism in the sense of scientific laws or rationalist calculation; it is a necessary engagement with a world that eludes one’s will. A recognition of the limits imposed by ‘reality’ is a condition for a recognition of one’s own limits — that the world is not simply an extension of one’s own will**.** But it is also a challenge to use that intractability as a source of possibility, as providing a set of openings within which a suitably chastened and yet paradoxically energised will to action can responsibly be pursued. In the wilful Realist tradition, the essential opacity of both the self and the world are taken as limiting principles. Limits upon understanding provide chastening parameters for claims about the world and actions within it. But they also provide challenging and creative openings within which diverse forms of life can be developed: the limited unity of the self and the political order is the **precondition for freedom**. The ultimate opacity of the world is not to be despaired of: it is a condition of possibility for the wilful, creative construction of selves and social orders which embrace the diverse human potentialities which this lack of essential or intrinsic order makes possible.8 But it is also to be aware of the less salutary possibilities this involves. Indeterminacy is not synonymous with absolute freedom — it is both a condition of, and imperative toward, responsibility.

***Extinction first***

Robin **Attfield**, Professor of Philosophy at Cardiff University, “The Ethics of the Global Environment”, Perdue University Press, 19**99**, pg 68

Nevertheless, as John Leslie has remarked, many **philosophers write as if there were no reason for preserving the human species** beyond obligations either to the dead or to the living, and some as if there would be nothing wrong with allowing the species to extinguish itself, or even with actively extinguishing it ourselves, well before this would happen in the ordinary course of events. Now **the argument** concerning the value of ongoing current activities already shows that the verdicts that there would be nothing wrong with **allowing** (let alone causing) **premature extinction are unsupportable**; for the prospect of premature human extinction deprives many (but not all) widespread current activities of their meaning and value. But, as has just been argued, there must be something else to explain the strength of the imperative not to allow or to make premature extinction come about, and to explain what it is that makes most people who contemplate the possibility of premature human extinction regard it as appalling. Cicero makes a parallel point: 'As we feel it wicked and inhuman for men to declare that they care not if when they themselves are dead the universal conflagration ensues, it is undoubtedly true that we are bound to study the interest of posterity also for its own sake.'23  Likewise the consequentialist ethic introduced and defended in Chapter 2 maintains that future people have moral standing (and future living creatures of other species too). **Future generations have this standing even though their existence is contingent on current generations and the identity of future individuals is unknown at present; the good or ill of individuals who could be brought into existence count as reasons for or against actions or policies which would bring them into being**. This in turn implies that where the existence beyond a certain date of individuals likely to lead happy, worthwhile or flourishing lives can be facilitated or prevented, there is an obligation not to prevent it, other things being equal. **This does not mean that everyone should be continually having children**; other things are seldom equal, and problems of human numbers mean that acting on this basis could easily produce overextended families, countries or regions, or an overpopulated planet, where extra people would spell misery for themselves and for the others (see Chapter 7). But it does mean that each life likely to be of positive quality comprises a reason for its own existence, and that countervailing reasons of matching strength (concerning the disvalue of adding this life) are required to neutralise such a reason.  There are many other implications, including the importance of planning for the needs of future generations (considered in later chapters). **A further implication, more relevant here, is that humanity should not be allowed to become extinct, insofar as this is within human control, even if,** foreseeably, a small minority of any **given generation will lead lives of negative quality** (lives which are either not positively worth living or actually worth not living), **as long as**, **overall, the lives of that generation are of positive quality**, and the positive intrinsic value of worthwhile lives outweighs the intrinsic disvalue of the lives of misery. Since each generation is highly likely to include some lives which are not worth living, however hard its members and their predecessors may try to raise the quality of these lives, this implication makes all the difference to the issue of whether causing or even allowing the extinction of humanity is a moral crime.  **People who think that preventing misery is always of the greatest importance have to take the view that human extinction should be tolerated or even advocated; but the consequentialist ethic defended here says otherwise**. So, of course, say the widespread intuitions reviewed earlier. A modified version of one of John Leslie's thought-experiments could be used to test much the same issue. On each of numerous inhabitable planets, capable of supporting a large human population, whose members would predictably lead lives of positive quality, there will also be a person whose life will predictably and inevitably be of negative quality. For the purposes of the thought-experiment, these large human populations can be brought into existence by waving a magic wand. Should this be done? For consequentialists who believe in optimising the balance of intrinsic value over intrinsic disvalue, and in counting every actual and possible life as having moral standing, the answer is affirmative, even though the resulting population of each planet includes a life of negative quality.  But **theorists who prioritise the prevention of misery would have to hold that** the answer depends entirely on whether the **life of negative quality** on each planet **can be prevented**; **if it cannot, then none of these lives should be engendered**. (Others too, including consequentialists, might also take this view if the addition of human lives were liable to harm the living creatures of these same planets; to make this thought-experiment a test case, we need to adopt the further assumption that no such harm would be done.)   This thought-experiment also has a bearing on human extinction. For the future of the Earth beyond a certain date (just after the death of the youngest person now alive) is in some ways similar to the situation of the planets just mentioned. The current generation could produce a population living then, most of them people with lives worth living, but only at the risk of producing a minority whose lives will foreseeably be miserable. If the happiness or the worthwhile lives of the majority do not count as reasons for generating those same lives, and hence nothing counts but the misery of the minority, or if the prevention of misery  should be prioritised over all else, then allowing extinction is clearly mandatory, and so may be even genocide. **However**, as Leslie claims, **the coexistence of hundreds of thousands of lives of positive quality with one life of misery is not morally disastrous, if the misery of the miserable life really cannot be alleviated**. 25 (If of course this misery could be alleviated, whether by contemporaries or by the previous generation, then this might well be a morally disastrous situation, and alleviation would almost certainly be obligatory.) Consequentialism, then, does not mandate extinction, unlike several of the theories which stand opposed to it.

***There is no root cause to environmental destruction – assuming so prevents effective solutions to specific issues***

**Garrard 4** (Greg, PhD in Humanities and Cultural Industries @ Liverpool U, “Ecocriticism”, pp.

176-178, Questia) JPG

Much **ecocriticism has taken for granted that its task is to overcome anthropocentrism**, just as feminism seeks to overcome androcentrism. The metaphysical argument for biocentrism is meant to sustain moral claims about the intrinsic value of the natural world, which will in turn affect our attitudes and behaviour towards nature. **Wilderness experiences, or apocalyptic threats, or Native American ways of life, are supposed to provide the impetus** or the example by which individuals come **to an authentic selfhood orientated toward right environmental action. Whilst the importance of changing** the **minds** and lives of individuals **is undeniable, this book has aimed to show the political dimension that this moralistic emphasis may occlude.** However, the politicisation of ecocriticism does pose its own problems. Dwelling on the troubling example of Heidegger (Chapter 6), who espoused both Nazism and a kind of deep ecology, Jonathan Bate asserts in The Song of the Earth that 'The dilemma of Green reading is that it must, yet it cannot, separate ecopoetics from ecopolitics' (2000:266). Environmentalism is compatible with most political positions, and while we have seen possible dangers inherent in this, it might also give us a clear argument for better, not less, political attunement in ecocriticism. Bate rightly points out that poets are not the engineers of the world, and that literature cannot provide specific solutions, which means that ecocriticism must continue to adopt and adapt theories from feminist and Marxist traditions, enabling positive engagement in cultural politics. I would argue that the promise of ecofeminist literary and cultural theory has yet to be realised. With important exceptions such as Haraway, Armbruster, Westling and Murphy, such criticism has been held back by the overstated anti-rationalism and gynocentric dualism of radical ecofeminism. The work of Australian philosopher Val Plumwood offers ecofeminism a sound basis for a much-needed critique of the dynamics of domination as they operate in a range of cultural contexts. **A monolithically conceived root cause of environmental destruction**, be it labelled anthropocentrism or androcentrism **is bound to misrepresent the complexity of causation in the real world**. **Ecofeminism**, modified by dialogue with social ecological positions**, can provide insight into the cultural operations of environmental injustice**. In this way, the fusion of environmental and social development agendas that has occurred so strikingly within and between global NGOs might come to ecocriticism; Beyond Nature Writing (2001), edited by Karla Armbruster and Kathleen Wallace, includes several essays in this emergent field of enquiry. Ecocritics therefore continue to experiment with hybridised reading practices, drawing on various philosophical and literary theoretical sources. Bennett and Teague's The Nature of Cities (1999) reveals a new emphasis on bringing cultural theorists such as Cronon, Ross, Luke and Haraway into dialogue with literary ecocritics, thereby consolidating the field around a critical encounter between genres, perspectives and politics. The work of Richard Kerridge is exemplary in this respect: he writes with as much insight about postmodern risk as he does about Thomas Hardy. Harrison's eclectic Forests (1993), which ranges from Grimm fairy tales to the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, fosters the making of connections between disparate cultural phenomena without eliminating their peculiarities. Bate and Buell first published books that identified a single 'environmental tradition' in Britain and the USA, stemming from Wordsworth and Thoreau respectively. In later works, however, they favour an explicitly dialectical approach. In The Song of the Earth, Wordsworth's piety is leavened with Byron's wit, and Heidegger's portentousness gets a learned sneer from Theodor Adorno. For Buell, Writing for an Endangered World involves juxtaposing urbanites like Theodor Dreiser and Gwendolyn Brooks with the more obvious candidates for ecocritical treatment, Jeffers and Berry. Drawing upon such diverse resources of hope enables ecocriticism to connect with the urban and suburban places in which most of us will continue to live, and will add depth to the ecological critique of modernity; **material and economic progress is no more the root of all evils than it is an unalloyed benefit to people or the natural world**. By such means **the risk of fostering reactionary politics might be minimized.**

#### Environmentalism fails when focused on the individual level – debating policy proposals grounded in institutional awareness is key to change.

Maniates, Professor of Political Science and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, 1

(Michael, “Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?,” Global Environmental Politics 1:3, August 2001, http://merlin.allegheny.edu/employee/m/mmaniate/savetheworld.pdf, page 32-33)

Mark Dowie, a journalist and sometimes historian of the American environmental movement, writes about our “environmental imagination,” by which he means our collective ability to imagine and pursue a variety of productive responses (from individual action to community organization to whole-scale institutional change) to the environmental problems before us.7 My claim in this is that an accelerating individualization of responsibility in the United States is narrowing, in dangerous ways, our “environmental imagination” and undermining our capacity to react effectively to environmental threats to human well-being. Those troubled by overconsumption, consumerism and commodification should not and cannot ignore this narrowing. Confronting the consumption problem demands, after all, the sort of institutional thinking that the individualization of responsibility patently undermines. It calls too for individuals to understand themselves as citizens in a participatory democracy first, working together to change broader policy and larger social institutions, and as consumers second. By contrast, the individualization of responsibility, because it characterizes environmental problems as the consequence of destructive consumer choice, asks that individuals imagine themselves as consumers first and citizens second. Grappling with the consumption problem, moreover, means engaging in conversation both broad and deep about consumerism and frugality and ways of fostering the capacity for restraint. But when responsibility for environmental ills is individualized, space for such conversation disappears: the individually responsible consumer is encouraged to purchase a vast array of “green” or “eco-friendly” products on the promise that the more such products are purchased and consumed, the healthier the planet’s ecological processes will become. “Living lightly on the planet” and “reducing your environmental impact” becomes, paradoxically, a consumer-product growth industry. Skeptics may reasonably question if the individualization of responsibility is so omnipresent as to warrant such concern. As I argue in the next section of this article, it is: the depoliticization of environmental degradation is in full swing across a variety of fronts and shows little sign of abating. I continue with a review of the forces driving this individualization; it in particular implicates the rise of global environmental problems and the construction of an individualized politics around them. How might these forces be countered? How can the politics of individualization be transcended? How might our environmental imagination be expanded? I wrestle with these questions in the final section of this article by focusing on the IPAT formula—a dominant conceptual lens within the field of environmental policy and politics, which argues that “environmental impact” “population” x “affluence” x “technology.”

#### Any environmental strategy that fails to activate political forces will fail – only state action produces effective change.

Maniates, Professor of Political Science and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, 1

(Michael, “Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?,” Global Environmental Politics 1:3, August 2001, http://merlin.allegheny.edu/employee/m/mmaniate/savetheworld.pdf, page 32-33)

And yet mainstream environmentalism has not always advanced an individualized consumeristic strategy for redressing environmental ills. Even during the turn of the last century, a time of zealous rediscovery of the wonders of efficiency and scientific management, “the dynamics of conservation,” observes famed environmental historian Samuel P. Hays, “with its tension between the centralizing tendencies of system and expertise on the one hand and the decentralization of localism on the other . . .” fueled healthy debate over the causes of and cures for environmental ills.19 Throughout the 20th century, in fact, mainstream environmentalism has demonstrated an ability to foster multiple and simultaneous interpretations on where we are and where we are heading. But that ability has, today, clearly become impaired. Although public support for things environmental has never been greater, it is so because the public increasingly understands environmentalism as an individual, rational, cleanly apolitical process that can deliver a future that works without raising voices or mobilizing constituencies. As individual consumers and recyclers we are supplied with ample and easy means of “doing our bit.” The result, though, is often dissonant and sometimes bizarre: consumers wearing “save the earth” T-shirts, for example, speak passionately against recent rises in gasoline prices when approached by television news crews; shoppers drive all over town in their gasoline- guzzling SUVs in search of organic lettuce or shade-grown coffee; and diligent recyclers expend far more fossil-fuel energy on the hot water spent to meticulously clean a tin can than is saved by its recycling. Despite these jarring contradictions, the technocratic, sanitary and individualized framing of environmentalism prevails, largely because it is continually reinforced. Consider, for example, recent millennial issues of Time and Newsweek that look to life in the future.20 They paint a picture of smart appliances, computer-guided automobiles, clean neighborhoods, eco-friendly energy systems, and happy citizens. How do we get to this future? Not through bold political leadership or citizen-based debate within enabling democratic institutions— but rather via consumer choice: informed, decentralized, apolitical, individualized. Corporations will build a better mousetrap, consumers will buy it, and society will be transformed for the better. A struggle-free eco-revolution awaits, one made possible by the combination of technological innovation and consumer choice with a conscience. The “better mousetrap theory of social change” so prevalent in these popular news magazines was coined by Langdon Winner, a political-science professor and expert on technological politics, who first introduced the term in an essay on the demise of the appropriate technology movement of the 1970s.21 Like the militant recyclers and dead-serious green consumers of today, appropriate technologists of the 1970s were the standard bearers for the individualization of responsibility. The difference between then and now is that appropriate technology lurked at the fringes of a 1970s American environmental politics more worried about corporate accountability than consumer choice. Today, green consumption, recycling and Cuisinart-social-change occupy the heart of US ecopolitics. Both then and now, such individualization is alarming, for as Winner notes: The inadequacies of such ideas are obvious. Appropriate technologists were unwilling to face squarely the facts of organized social and political power. Fascinated by dreams of a spontaneous, grass-roots revolution, they avoided any deep-seeking analysis of the institutions that control the direction of technological and economic development. In this happy self-confidence they did not bother to devise strategies that might have helped them overcome obvious sources of resistance. The same judgment that Marx and Engels passed on the utopians of the nineteenth century apply just as well to the appropriate technologists of the 1970s: they were lovely visionaries, naive about the forces that confronted them.22

***The environment is resilient***

**Easterbrook 96** (Gregg, sr editor, The New Republic, former fellow at the Brookings Institute, A Movement on the Earth, p. 25, JM)

"Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But **the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible**. **The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation** more deadly than atomic fallout; **solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion**; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global **air pollution** far worse than that made by any factory**; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles**; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; **300-foot vacillations in sea levels;** shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; **collisions of asteroids and comets** bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. **Yet hearts beat on**, and petals unfold still. **Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape**. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

#### No extinction from eco collapse

**Easterbrook,** senior fellow at the New Republic, **03** [“We're All Gonna Die!”, <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=]

***If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up***. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, **it wouldn't be the final curtain**. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote *Remembrance of Things Past* while lying in bed.

#### 1. Even significantly increased, wind causes a dent in emissions

Bryce 11 (Robert, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, “THE HIGH COST OF WIND ENERGY AS A CARBON-DIOXIDE REDUCTION METHOD”, <http://www.robertbryce.com/articles/390-the-high-cost-of-wind-energy-as-a-carbon-dioxide-reduction-method.html>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

How does that 825 million tons of carbon dioxide compare with global emissions? In 2010, global carbon-dioxide emissions totaled 33.1 billion tons.[30] Thus, if the United States were somehow able to instantly increase its wind-generated electricity to 20 percent of total consumption, doing so might reduce global emissions by about 2.5 percent. But it is unlikely that global emissions will be the same in 2030 as they were in 2010. By 2030, the International Energy Agency (IEA) expects global emissions will total about 40.2 billion tons.[31] Thus, the 825 million tons that NREL claims might be reduced by achieving the “20 by ‘30” goal will result in a global reduction of just 2 percent.[32]

#### 1. Wind PTCs aren’t key to wind competitiveness – fossil fuel subsidies are 1000th the amount of PTC credits.

David Kreutzer, Ph.D. Feb 28, 2012 (David Kreutzer is the Senior Policy Analyst in Energy Economics and Climate Change at The Heritage Foundation's Center for Data Analysis, “Wind Subsidies vs. Oil Subsidies,” Heritage, ¶ <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/02/28/wind-subsidies-vs-oil-subsidies/>, KEL

In sharp contrast to wind turbines, the wind lobby is spinning at 100 percent capacity—in order to keep the industry in the taxpayers’ pockets. Their dizzying logic makes you wonder if they have been riding the blades instead of examining the facts.¶ First, they make two contradictory assertions: (1) Wind is the cheapest source of electricity (tied with natural gas); and (2) without substantial subsidies, the industry will suffer a severe recession. If it were the cheapest, it would not need subsidies to compete in the marketplace.¶ Second (perhaps in an attempt to square this inconsistency), they claim that their subsidies are equivalent to the subsidies received by the fossil fuel industry.¶ Perhaps because their recent profits have been so high, oil companies are frequently the example suggested by green energy subsidy seekers. So then, how do the subsidies compare?¶ The wind lobby is seeking an extension on the production tax credit that they and several other select renewable energy sources receive. Adjusted for inflation, the subsidy for wind energy is 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour. That may not seem like much, but for all of 2011 the wholesale price of electricity was about 5 cents per kilowatt-hour. So the subsidy amounts to 40 percent or more of the wholesale price. (It should be noted that wholesale prices so far this year are tracking below those of last year.)¶ If crude oil were subsidized at that same rate as wind energy, the oil companies would receive $50 for every barrel of oil produced (given Brent Crude’s current price of $125 per barrel). How does that compare to the actual subsidies received by the oil industry?¶ The most repeated number is $4 billion per year. But, Heritage’s Nick Loris and Curtis Dubay make clear that this number is way bigger than the actual subsidy. However, even that overstated number works out to only $0.60 per barrel, or barely 1 percent of what wind receives relative to market prices. A more honest estimate of the oil subsidies would be closer to a nickel per barrel, which is one-thousandth the subsidy given to wind.¶ If wind industry lobbyists want a subsidy comparable to oil’s nickel per barrel, they should get 0.0022 cents ($0.000022) per kilowatt-hour instead of the 1,000-times-larger subsidy they get now.¶ A much better idea is to get rid of all the subsidies. But what makes no sense is to say, “Since they get a nickel, we should get $50.”

#### 2. PTC extension alone can’t solve – need regional or national cap & trade to spur widespread development

Christopher Riti 2010 (COMMENT: Three Sheets to the Wind: The Renewable Energy Production Tax Credit, Congressional Political Posturing, and an Unsustainable Energy Policy, Pace Environ LR, Summer, pp. LN, KEL

The easiest and most obvious source of cost offsetting for the tax expenditure would be repealing the oil, coal, and natural gas subsidies mentioned above. n152 Besides that, there are a number of opportunities for defraying the costs of the program through other taxes and revenue-generating actions. The federal government might use a portion of the proceeds generated from carbon auctions under a greenhouse gas cap and trade program (e.g. one similar to the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, or [\*814] RGGI) to help defray the costs of a PTC program. n153 Putting a predictable, fixed price on carbon is a key part of stimulating significant renewable development, especially during a time of economic recession. n154 The PTC, by itself, is simply ineffective over the long term to spur true development of renewable capacity, given the ability of companies to largely externalize the true costs of burning fossil fuel sources. n155 Pricing carbon sends a signal to the marketplace that investment in clean renewable fuels is a wise business decision and highly cost-effective over the life of the development. Whether this cap and trade system is nationally-or regionally-based, the effect of the price signal should be recognizable.

#### Personal responsibility focus causes 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., 1997), 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., 1997), 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.

## 2nc

**2nc Impact Overview**

***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.**

***We control macro uniqueness. Statistics prove hegemony is decreasing violence***

**Owen 11** John M. Owen Professor of Politics at University of Virginia PhD from Harvard "DON’T DISCOUNT HEGEMONY" Feb 11 [www.cato-unbound.org/2011/02/11/john-owen/dont-discount-hegemony/](http://www.cato-unbound.org/2011/02/11/john-owen/dont-discount-hegemony/)

Andrew **Mack and** his **colleagues** at the Human Security Report Project are to be congratulated. Not only do they **present a study with a** striking **conclusion**, **driven by data**, **free of** theoretical or **ideological bias**, but they also do something quite unfashionable: they bear good news. Social scientists really are not supposed to do that. Our job is, if not to be Malthusians, then at least to point out disturbing trends, looming catastrophes, and the imbecility and men dacity of policy makers. And then it is to say why, if people listen to us, things will get better. We do this as if our careers depended upon it, and perhaps they do; for if all is going to be well, what need then for us? Our colleagues at Simon Fraser University are brave indeed. That may sound like a setup, but it is not. I shall challenge neither the data nor the general conclusion that violent **conflict** around the world **has been decreasing** in fits and starts **since the Second World War. When it comes to violent conflict among and within countries, things have been getting better**. (The trends have not been linear—Figure 1.1 actually shows that the frequency of interstate wars peaked in the 1980s—but the 65-year movement is clear.) Instead I shall accept that Mack et al. are correct on the macro-trends, and focus on their explanations they advance for these remarkable trends. With apologies to any readers of this forum who recoil from academic debates, this might get mildly theoretical and even more mildly methodological. Concerning international wars, one version of the “nuclear-peace” theory is not in fact laid to rest by the data. It is certainly true that nuclear-armed states have been involved in many wars. They have even been attacked (think of Israel), which falsifies the simple claim of “assured destruction”—that any nuclear country A will deter any kind of attack by any country B because B fears a retaliatory nuclear strike from A. But the most important “nuclear-peace” claim has been about mutually assured destruction, which obtains between two robustly nuclear-armed states. The claim is that (1) rational states having second-strike capabilities—enough deliverable nuclear weaponry to survive a nuclear first strike by an enemy—will have an overwhelming incentive not to attack one another; and (2) we can safely assume that nuclear-armed states are rational. It follows that states with a second-strike capability will not fight one another. Their colossal atomic arsenals neither kept the United States at peace with North Vietnam during the Cold War nor the Soviet Union at peace with Afghanistan. But the argument remains strong that those arsenals did help keep the United States and Soviet Union at peace with each other. Why non-nuclear states are not deterred from fighting nuclear states is an important and open question. But in a time when calls to ban the Bomb are being heard from more and more quarters, we must be clear about precisely what the broad trends toward peace can and cannot tell us. They may tell us nothing about why we have had no World War III, and little about the wisdom of banning the Bomb now. Regarding the downward trend in international war, Professor **Mack is friendlier to** more palatable theories such as the “**democratic peace**” (democracies do not fight one another, and the proportion of democracies has increased, hence less war); the interdependence or “**commercial peace**” (states with extensive economic ties find it irrational to fight one another, and interdependence has increased, hence less war); **and the notion that people** around the world **are** more **anti-war** than their forebears were. Concerning the downward trend in civil wars, he favors theories of economic growth (where commerce is enriching enough people, violence is less appealing—a logic similar to that of the “commercial peace” thesis that applies among nations) and the end of the Cold War (which end reduced superpower support for rival rebel factions in so many Third-World countries). These are all plausible mechanisms for peace. What is more, none of them excludes any other; all could be working toward the same end. That would be somewhat puzzling, however. Is the world just lucky these days? How is it that an array of **peace-inducing factors happens to be working coincidentally** in our time, when such a magical array was absent in the past? The answer may be that one or more of these mechanisms reinforces some of the others, or perhaps some of them are mutually reinforcing. Some scholars, for example, have been focusing on whether economic growth might support democracy and vice versa, and whether both might support international cooperation, including to end civil wars. **We** would still **need to explain how this** charmed **circle of causes got started**, however. And here **let me raise** another factor, perhaps even less appealing than the “nuclear peace” thesis, at least outside of the United States. That factor is what international relations scholars call hegemony—specifically **American hegemony**. A theory that many regard as discredited, but that refuses to go away, is called hegemonic stability theory. The theory emerged in the 1970s in the realm of international political economy. It asserts that **for the global economy to remain open**—for countries to keep barriers to trade and investment low—**one** powerful **country must take the lead**. Depending on the theorist we consult, “taking the lead” **entails** paying for global public goods (**keeping** the **sea** lanes **open**, **providing liquidity** to the international economy), **coercion (threatening** to raise **trade** **barriers or withdraw military protection** from countries that cheat on the rules), **or both**. The theory is skeptical that international cooperation in economic matters can emerge or endure absent a hegemon. The distastefulness of such claims is self-evident: they imply that it is good for everyone the world over if one country has more wealth and power than others. More precisely, they imply that it has been good for the world that the United States has been so predominant. There is no obvious reason why **hegemonic stability** theory **could** not **apply to other areas** of international cooperation, **including** in **security affairs,** **human rights**, **i**nternational **law**, **peacekeeping** (UN or otherwise), **and so on**. What I want to suggest here—suggest, not test—is that American hegemony might just be a deep cause of the steady decline of political deaths in the world. How could that be? After all, the report states that United States is the third most war-prone country since 1945. Many of the deaths depicted in Figure 10.4 were in wars that involved the United States (the Vietnam War being the leading one). Notwithstanding politicians’ claims to the contrary, a candid look at U.S. foreign policy reveals that the country is as ruthlessly self-interested as any other great power in history. The answer is that U.S. **hegemony might** just **be a deeper cause of the proximate causes** outlined by Professor Mack. Consider **economic growth and** openness to foreign **trade** and investment, which (so say some theories) **render violence irrational**. American power and policies may be responsible for these in two related ways. First, at least since the 1940s **Washington has prodded other countries to embrace** the market capitalism that entails **economic openness** and produces sustainable economic growth. The United States promotes capitalism for selfish reasons, of course: its own domestic system depends upon growth, which in turn depends upon the efficiency gains from economic interaction with foreign countries, and the more the better. During the Cold War most of its allies accepted some degree of market-driven growth. Second, the U.S.-led western victory in the Cold War damaged the credibility of alternative paths to development—communism and import-substituting industrialization being the two leading ones—and left market capitalism the best model. The end of the Cold War also involved an end to the billions of rubles in Soviet material support for regimes that tried to make these alternative models work. (It also, as Professor Mack notes, eliminated the superpowers’ incentives to feed civil violence in the Third World.) What we call **globalization is caused** in part **by the emergence of the U**nited **S**tates **as the** global **hegemon**.

***Empirical reality validates security problems***

**Liotta 5** (PH, Professor of Humanities and Executive Director of the Pell Center for International Relations and Public Policy at Salve Regina University, security dialogue 36:1 "through the looking glass: creeping vulnerabilities and the reordering of security")

**Although it seems attractive to focus on exclusionary concepts that insist on desecuritization, privileged referent objects, and the ‘belief’ that threats and vulnerabilities are little more than social constructions** (Grayson, 2003), **all these concepts work in theory but fail in practice**. While it may be true that national security paradigms can, and likely will, continue to dominate issues that involve human security vulnerabilities – and even in some instances mistakenly confuse ‘vulnerabilities’ as ‘threats’ – there are distinct linkages between these security concepts and applications. With regard to environmental security, for example, Myers (1986: 251) recognized these linkages nearly two decades ago: National security is not just about fighting forces and weaponry. It relates to watersheds, croplands, forests, genetic resources, climate and other factors that rarely figure in the minds of military experts and political leaders, but increasingly deserve, in their collectivity, to rank alongside military approaches as crucial in a nation’s security. Ultimately, we are far from what O’Hanlon & Singer (2004) term a global intervention capability on behalf of ‘humanitarian transformation’. Granted, **we now have the threat of mass casualty terrorism anytime, anywhere – and states and regions are responding differently to this challenge. Yet, the global community today also faces many of the same problems of the 1990s: civil wars, faltering states, humanitarian crises**. We are nowhere closer to addressing how best to solve these challenges, even as they affect issues of environmental, human, national (and even ‘embedded’) security. Recently, there have been a number of voices that have spoken out on what the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty has termed the ‘responsibility to protect’:10 the responsibility of some agency or state (whether it be a superpower such as the United States or an institution such as the United Nations) to enforce the principle of security that sovereign states owe to their citizens. Yet, the **creation of a sense of urgency to act – even on some issues that may not have some impact for years or even decades to come – is perhaps the only appropriate first response. The real cost of not investing in the right way and early enough in the places where trends and effects are accelerating in the wrong direction is likely to be decades and decades of economic and political frustration – and, potentially, military engagement. Rather than justifying intervention (especially military), we ought to be justifying investment.**

***Prefer this form of knowledge***

**Walt, ‘5** – Prof, Kennedy School of Government @ Harvard (Stephen M., Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. 2005. 8:23–48, pg. 25-26, “The Relationship Between Theory and Policy in International Relations,” <http://www.iheid.ch/webdav/site/political_science/shared/political_science/3452/walt.pdf>)

**Policy decisions can be influenced by several types of knowledge. First, policy makers invariably rely on purely factual knowledge** (e.g., how large are the opponent’s forces? What is the current balance of payments?). **Second, decision makers sometimes employ “rules of thumb”: simple decision rules acquired through experience rather than via systematic study** (Mearsheimer 1989).3 A third type of knowledge consists of typologies, which classify phenomena based on sets of specific traits. **Policy makers can also rely on empirical laws. An empirical law is an observed correspondence between two or more phenomena that systematic inquiry has shown to be reliable. Such laws (e.g., “democracies do not fight each oth**er**” or “human beings are more risk averse with respect to losses than to gains”) can be useful guides even if we do not know why they occur, or if our explanations for them are incorrect. Finally, policy makers can also use theories. A theory is a causal explanation— it identifies recurring relations between two or more phenomena and explains why that relationship obtains. By providing us with a picture of the central forces that determine real-world behavior, theories invariably simplify reality in order to render it comprehensible. At the most general level, theoretical IR work consists of “efforts by social scientists. . .to account for interstate and trans-state processes, issues, and outcomes in general causal terms”** (Lepgold & Nincic 2001, p. 5; Viotti & Kauppi 1993). **IR theories offer explanations for the level of security competition between states (including both the likelihood of war among particular states and the warproneness of specific countries); the level and forms of international cooperation (e.g., alliances, regimes, openness to trade and investment); the spread of ideas, norms, and institutions; and the transformation of particular international systems, among other topics. In constructing these theories, IR scholars employ an equally diverse set of explanatory variables**. Some of these theories operate at the level of the international system, using variables such as the distribution of power among states (Waltz 1979, Copeland 2000, Mearsheimer 2001), the volume of trade, financial flows, and interstate communications (Deutsch 1969, Ruggie 1983, Rosecrance 1986); or the degree of institutionalization among states (Keohane 1984, Keohane & Martin 2003). Other theories emphasize different national characteristics, such as regime type (Andreski 1980, Doyle 1986, Fearon 1994, Russett 1995), bureaucratic and organizational politics (Allison & Halperin 1972, Halperin 1972), or domestic cohesion (Levy 1989); or the content of particular ideas or doctrines (Van Evera 1984, Hall 1989, Goldstein & Keohane 1993, Snyder 1993). Yet another family of theories operates at the individual level, focusing on individual or group psychology, gender differences, and other human traits (De Rivera 1968, Jervis 1976, Mercer 1996, Byman&Pollock 2001, Goldgeier&Tetlock 2001, Tickner 2001, Goldstein 2003), while a fourth body of theory focuses on collective ideas, identities, and social discourse (e.g., Finnemore 1996, Ruggie 1998, Wendt 1999). **To develop these ideas, IR theorists employ the full range of social science methods: comparative case studies, formal theory, large-N statistical analysis, and hermeneutical or interpretivist approaches.**

***Hegemony turns environmental concerns outlined in the 1ac***

Ashok **Khosla 9**, IUCN President, International Union for Conservation of Nature, A new President for the United States: We have a dream, 1-29-09, http://cms.iucn.org/news\_events/?uNewsID=2595

**A rejuvenated America, with a renewed purpose, commitment and energy to make its contribution once again towards a better world could well be the turning point that can reverse the current decline in** the state of the global economy, **the health of its life support systems** and the morale of people everywhere. This extraordinary change in regime brings with it the promise of a deep change in attitudes and aspirations of Americans, a change that will lead, hopefully, to new directions in their nation’s policies and action. In particular, **we can hope that from being a very reluctant partner in global discussions**, especially **on issues relating to environment and sustainable development, the *U*nited *S*tates will become an active leader in international efforts to address the** Millennial **threats now confronting civilization and even the survival of the human species**. **For the conservation of biodiversity, so essential to maintaining life on Earth, this promise of change has come not a moment too soon**. It would be a mistake to put all of our hopes on the shoulder of one young man, however capable he might be. The environmental challenges the world is facing cannot be addressed by one country, let alone by one man. At the same time, **an inspired US President** guided by competent people, **who does not shy away from exercising the true responsibilities and leadership his country is capable of, could do a lot to spur the international community into action**. To paraphrase one of his illustrious predecessors, “the world asks for action and action now.” What was true in President Roosevelt’s America 77 years ago is even more appropriate today. From IUCN’s perspective, the first signals are encouraging. The US has seriously begun to discuss constructive engagement in climate change debates. With Copenhagen a mere 11 months away, this commitment is long overdue and certainly very welcome. Many governments still worry that if they set tough standards to control carbon emissions, their industry and agriculture will become uncompetitive, a fear that leads to a foot-dragging “you go first” attitude that is blocking progress**. A positive intervention by the *U*nited *S*tates could provide the vital catalyst that moves the basis of the present negotiations beyond the narrowly defined national interests that lie at the heart of the current impasse**. **The logjam in international negotiations on climate change should not be difficult to break if the US were to lead the industrialized countries to agree that much of their wealth has been acquired at the expense of the environment** (in this case greenhouse gases emitted over the past two hundred years) **and that with the some of the benefits that this wealth has brought, comes the obligation to deal with the problems that have resulted as side-effects**. With equitable entitlement to the common resources of the planet, an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all nations should be easy enough to achieve. Caps on emissions and sharing of energy efficient technologies are simply in the interest of everyone, rich or poor. And both rich and poor must now be ready to adopt less destructive technologies – based on renewables, efficiency and sustainability – both as a goal with intrinsic merit and also as an example to others. But climate is not the only critical global environmental issue that this new administration will have to deal with. **Conservation of biodiversity, a crucial prerequisite for the wellbeing of all humanity, no less America, needs as much attention, and just as urgently**. **The United States’ self-interest in conserving living natural resources strongly converges with the global common good in every sphere: in the oceans, by arresting the precipitate decline of fish stocks and the alarming rise of acidification; on land, by regenerating the health of our soils, forests and rivers; and in the atmosphere by reducing the massive emission of pollutants from our wasteful industries, construction, agriculture and transport systems.**

**2nc Impact Wall**

***Obama causes nuclear war with China***

**Ben Coes** 9-30-**11**, a former speechwriter in the George H.W. Bush administration, & author, “The disease of a weak president”, The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2011/09/30/the-disease-of-a-weak-president/

**The disease of a weak president** usually begins with the Achilles’ heel all politicians are born with — the desire to be popular. It **leads to pandering to different audiences, people and countries and creates a sloppy, incoherent set of policies. Ironically, it ultimately results in that very politician losing the trust and respect of friends and foes alike.** In the case of Israel, those of us who are strong supporters can at least take comfort in the knowledge that Tel Aviv will do whatever is necessary to protect itself from potential threats from its unfriendly neighbors. While it would be preferable for the Israelis to be able to count on the United States, in both word and deed, the fact is right now they stand alone. Obama and his foreign policy team have undercut the Israelis in a multitude of ways. Despite this, I wouldn’t bet against the soldiers of Shin Bet, Shayetet 13 and the Israeli Defense Forces. But **Obama’s weakness could** — in other places — **have implications** far, far worse than anything that might ultimately occur in Israel. **The triangular plot of land that connects Pakistan, India and China is held together with much more fragility and is built upon a truly foreboding foundation of religious hatreds, radicalism, resource envy and nuclear weapons.** If you can only worry about preventing one foreign policy disaster, worry about this one. Here are a few unsettling facts to think about: First, **Pakistan and India have fought three wars** since the British de-colonized and left the region in 1947. All three wars occurred before the two countries had nuclear weapons. **Both countries now possess hundreds of nuclear weapons, enough to wipe each other off the map many times over.** Second, Pakistan is 97% Muslim. It is a question of when — not if — Pakistan elects a radical Islamist in the mold of Ayatollah Khomeini as its president. Make no mistake, it will happen, and when it does the world will have a far greater concern than Ali Khamenei or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a single nuclear device. Third, China sits at the northern border of both India and Pakistan. China is strategically aligned with Pakistan. Most concerning, **China covets India’s natural resources. Over the years, it has slowly inched its way into the northern tier of India-controlled Kashmir Territory**, appropriating land and resources and drawing little notice from the outside world. In my book, Coup D’Etat, I consider this tinderbox of colliding forces in Pakistan, India and China as a thriller writer. But thriller writers have the luxury of solving problems by imagining solutions on the page. In my book, when Pakistan elects a radical Islamist who then starts a war with India and introduces nuclear weapons to the theater, America steps in and removes the Pakistani leader through a coup d’état. I wish it was that simple. The more complicated and difficult truth is that we, as Americans, must take sides. We must be willing to be unpopular in certain places. Most important, we must be ready and willing to threaten our military might on behalf of our allies. And our allies are Israel and India. **There are many threats out there — Islamic radicalism, Chinese technology espionage, global debt and half a dozen other things** that smarter people than me are no doubt worrying about. **But the single greatest threat to America is none of these. The single greatest threat facing America and our allies is a weak U.S. president. It doesn’t have to be this way**. President Obama could — if he chose — develop a backbone and lead. Alternatively, **America could elect a new president**. It has to be one or the other. The status quo is simply not an option.

**Sustainable**

***US can sustain heg for decades***

**Kaplan & Kaplan ’11** (Robert D, senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security, a national correspondent for The Atlantic and a member of the Defense Policy Board, Stephen S, former vice chairman of the National Intelligence Council as well as a longtime daily White House briefer and director of the president's daily briefing, March/April, The National Interest, Iss. 112; pg. 42, “America Primed” proquest, jj)

But in spite of the seemingly inevitable and rapid diminution of U.S. eminence, **to write America's great-power obituary is beyond premature.** **The United States remains a highly capable power**. **Iraq and Afghanistan**, as horrendous as they have proved to be - in a broad historical sense - **are** still relatively **minor events that America can easily overcome**. The eventual demise of empires like those of Ming China and latemedieval Venice was brought about by far more pivotal blunders. Think of the Indian Mutiny against the British in 1857 and 1858. Iraq in particular - ever so frequently touted as our turning point on the road to destruction - looks to some extent eerily similar. At the time, orientalists and other pragmatists in the British power structure (who wanted to leave traditional India as it was) lost some sway to evangelical and utilitarian reformers (who wanted to modernize and Christianize India - to make it more like England). But the attempt to bring the fruits of Western civilization to the Asian subcontinent was met with a violent revolt against imperial authority. Delhi, Lucknow and other Indian cities were besieged and captured before being retaken by colonial forces. Yet, the debacle did not signal the end of the British Empire at all, which continued on and even expanded for anorher century. Instead, it signaled the transition from more of an ad hoc imperium fired by a proselytizing lust to impose its values on others to a calmer and more pragmaric empire built on international trade and technology.1 **There is no reason to believe that the fate of America need follow a** more **doomed course**. Yes, the mistakes made in **Iraq and Afghanistan** have been the United States' own, but, though destructive, they **are not fatal**. If we withdraw sooner rather than later, the cost to American power can be stemmed. Leaving a stable Afghanistan behind of course requires a helpful Pakistan, but with more pressure Washington might increase Islamabad's cooperation in relatively short order. In terms of acute threats, Iran is the only state that has exported tetrorism and insurgency toward a strategic purpose, yet the country is economically fragile and politically unstable, with behind-the-scenes infighting that would make Washington partisans blanch. Even assuming Iran acquires a few nuclear devices -of uncertain quality with uncertain delivery systems -the long-term outlook for the clerical regime is itself unclear. The administration must only avoid a war with the Islamic Republic. To be sure, **America may be in decline in relative terms compared to some other powers, as well as to many countries of the former third world, but in absolute terms, particularly military ones, the United States can easily be the first among equals for decades hence.**

***US can maintain hegemony, multiple reasons***

**Walt ’09** (Stephen M, professor of international affairs at Harvard University, World Politics, “Alliances in a Unipolar World” Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009, muse, jj)

Despite these ambiguities, **Wohlforth is almost certainly correct in describing the current structure of world politics as unipolar. The United States has the world’s largest economy (roughly 60 percent larger than the number two power), and it possesses by far the most powerful military forces**. If one includes supplemental spending, U**.S. military expenditures now exceed those of the rest of the world combined**.[21](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.walt.html" \l "f21) Despite its current difficulties in Iraq and the recent downturn in the U.S. economy, **the United States retains a comfortable margin of superiority over the other major powers**. This capacity does not allow the United States to rule large foreign populations by force or to re-create the sort of formal empire once ruled by Great Britain, but **it does give the United States “command of the commons” (that is, the ability to operate with near impunity in the air, oceans, and space) and the ability to defeat** [End Page 92] **any other country (or current coalition) in a direct test of battlefield strength**.[22](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.walt.html" \l "f22) Put differently, **the United States is the only country that can deploy substantial amounts of military power virtually anywhere—even in the face of armed opposition—and keep it there for an indefinite period**. **Moreover, it is able to do this while spending a substantially smaller fraction of its national income on defense than previous great powers did, as well as a smaller fraction than it spent throughout the cold war**.[23](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.walt.html" \l "f23) **The United States also enjoys disproportionate influence in key international institutions**—largely as a consequence of its economic and military capacities—**and casts a large cultural shadow over much of the rest of the world as well**.[24](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.walt.html" \l "f24) In short, **America’s daunting capabilities are a defining feature of the contemporary international landscape**, the debacle in Iraq and its various fiscal deficits notwithstanding. U**.S. primacy shapes the perceptions, calculations, and possibilities available to all other states, as well as to other consequential international actors. Although other states also worry about local conditions and concerns, none can ignore the vast concentration of power in U.S. hands.**

***Even if heg is unsustainable—maintaining U.S. power key to smooth transition—solves great power world war 3.***

**Walton 2k7** [Dale C., Lecturer in IR and Strategic Studies, U of Reading, England (“Geopolitics and the Great Powers in the Twenty-First century,” Google Books]

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

**Turns**

***All their turns are inevitable - Zero Chances of willful US restraint – we’ll inevitably be engaged globally – the only question is effectiveness***

**Shalmon and Horowitz ’09** (Dan, Senior Analyst at Lincoln Group, LLC., and a graduate student at Georgetown University, total badass, Mike, assistant professor of Political Science at The University of Pennsylvania, as well as an FPRI scholar, less of a badass, Orbis, Volume 53, Issue 2, ‘The Future of War and American Military Strategy”, Spring)

**It is important to recognize at the outset** two **key points about United** **States strategy and the potential costs and benefits for the United States in a changing security environment. First, the United States is very likely to remain fully engaged in global affairs. Advocates of restraint or global withdrawal, while popular in some segments of academia, remain on the margins of policy debates in Washington D.C**. This could always change, of course. However, at present, **it is a given that the United States will define its interests globally and pursue a strategy that requires capable military forces able to project power around the world.** Because ‘‘indirect’’ counter-strategies are the rational choice for actors facing a strong state’s power projection, irregular/asymmetric threats are inevitable given America’s role in the global order.24

*Transition fails and causes global wars*

**Brzezinski ’12** (Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security advisor under U.S. President Jimmy Carter, is author of the forthcoming book Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power, Foreign Policy, After America

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/03/after_america?page=0,1>, jj)

For **if America falters, the world is unlikely to be dominated by a single preeminent successor** -- not even China. **International uncertainty, increased tension among global competitors, and** even **outright chaos would be far more likely outcomes**. **While a sudden, massive crisis of the American system** -- for instance, another financial crisis -- **would produce a fast-moving chain reaction leading to global political and economic disorder, a steady drift by America into increasingly pervasive decay or endlessly widening warfare with Islam would be unlikely to produce, even by 2025, an effective global successor**. **No single power will be ready by then to exercise the role that the world,** upon the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, **expected the United States to play: the leader of a new, globally cooperative world order**. **More probable would be** a protracted phase of rather inconclusive realignments of both global and regional power, with no grand winners and many more losers, in a setting of **international uncertainty and even of potentially fatal risks to global well-being. Rather than a world where dreams of democracy flourish, a Hobbesian world of enhanced national security based on varying fusions of authoritarianism, nationalism, and religion could ensue**. The leaders of the world's second-rank powers, among them India, Japan, Russia, and some European countries, are already assessing the potential impact of U.S. decline on their respective national interests. The Japanese, fearful of an assertive China dominating the Asian mainland, may be thinking of closer links with Europe. Leaders in India and Japan may be considering closer political and even military cooperation in case America falters and China rises. **Russia**, while perhaps engaging in wishful thinking (even schadenfreude) about America's uncertain prospects, **will almost certainly have its eye on the independent states of the former Soviet Union**. Europe, not yet cohesive, would likely be pulled in several directions: Germany and Italy toward Russia because of commercial interests, France and insecure Central Europe in favor of a politically tighter European Union, and Britain toward manipulating a balance within the EU while preserving its special relationship with a declining United States. **Others may move more rapidly to carve out their own regional spheres: Turkey in the area of the old Ottoman Empire, Brazil in the Southern Hemisphere, and so forth**. **None of these countries, however, will have the requisite combination of economic, financial, technological, and military power even to consider inheriting America's leading role**. China, invariably mentioned as America's prospective successor, has an impressive imperial lineage and a strategic tradition of carefully calibrated patience, both of which have been critical to its overwhelmingly successful, several-thousand-year-long history. China thus prudently accepts the existing international system, even if it does not view the prevailing hierarchy as permanent. It recognizes that success depends not on the system's dramatic collapse but on its evolution toward a gradual redistribution of power. Moreover, the basic reality is that **China is not yet ready to assume in full America's role in the world. Beijing's leaders themselves have repeatedly emphasized that on every important measure of development, wealth, and power, China will still be a modernizing and developing state several decades from now, significantly behind not only the United States but also Europe and Japan in the major per capita indices of modernity and national power**. Accordingly, **Chinese leaders have been restrained in laying any overt claims to global leadership.** At some stage, however, **a more assertive Chinese nationalism could arise** and damage China's international interests. **A swaggering, nationalistic Beijing would unintentionally mobilize a powerful regional coalition against itself**. None of China's key neighbors -- India, Japan, and Russia -- is ready to acknowledge China's entitlement to America's place on the global totem pole. They might even seek support from a waning America to offset an overly assertive China. **The resulting regional scramble could become intense, especially given the similar nationalistic tendencies among China's neighbors**. **A phase of acute international tension in Asia could ensue**. ***Asia of the 21st century could then begin to resemble Europe of the 20th century -- violent and bloodthirsty.*** At the same time, **the security of a number of weaker states located geographically next to major regional powers also depends on the international status quo reinforced by America's global preeminence -- and would be made significantly more vulnerable in proportion to America's decline. The states in that exposed position -- including Georgia, Taiwan, South Korea, Belarus, Ukraine, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Israel, and the greater Middle East -- are today's geopolitical equivalents of nature's most endangered species**. Their fates are closely tied to the nature of the international environment left behind by a waning America, be it ordered and restrained or, much more likely, self-serving and expansionist. A faltering United States could also find its strategic partnership with Mexico in jeopardy. America's economic resilience and political stability have so far mitigated many of the challenges posed by such sensitive neighborhood issues as economic dependence, immigration, and the narcotics trade. A decline in American power, however, would likely undermine the health and good judgment of the U.S. economic and political systems. ***A waning United States would likely be more nationalistic, more defensive about its national identity, more paranoid about its homeland security, and less willing to sacrifice resources* for the sake of others' development.** The worsening of relations between a declining America and an internally troubled Mexico could even give rise to a particularly ominous phenomenon: the emergence, as a major issue in nationalistically aroused Mexican politics, of territorial claims justified by history and ignited by cross-border incidents. **Another consequence of American decline could be a corrosion of the generally cooperative management of the global commons -- shared interests such as sea lanes, space, cyberspace, and the environment, whose protection is imperative to the long-term growth of the global economy and the continuation of basic geopolitical stability**. In almost every case, **the potential absence of a constructive and influential U.S. role would fatally undermine the essential communality of the global commons because the superiority and ubiquity of American power creates order where there would normally be conflict.** None of this will necessarily come to pass. Nor is the concern that America's decline would generate global insecurity, endanger some vulnerable states, and produce a more troubled North American neighborhood an argument for U.S. global supremacy. In fact, the strategic complexities of the world in the 21st century make such supremacy unattainable. But **those dreaming today of America's collapse would** probably **come to regret it. And as the world after America would be increasingly complicated and chaotic, it is imperative that the United States pursue a new, timely strategic vision for its foreign policy -- or start bracing itself for a dangerous slide into global turmoil.**

***Heg decline makes US-China war inevitable – US will lash-out to maintain power***Robert A. **Pape** (Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago) January/February 20**09** “The Empire Falls”, The National Interest, June 28,<http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=20484>, jj

Clearly, the United States is not the first great power to suffer long-term decline-we should learn from history. Great powers in decline seem to almost instinctively spend more on military forces in order to shore up their disintegrating strategic positions, and some like Germany go even further, shoring up their security by adopting preventive military strategies, beyond defensive alliances, to actively stop a rising competitor from becoming dominant. **For declining great powers, the allure of preventive war-**or lesser measures to "merely" firmly contain a rising power-**has a more compelling logic than many might assume**. Since Thucydides, scholars of international politics have famously argued that a **declining hegemon and rising challenger must necessarily face such intense security competition that hegemonic war to retain dominance over the international system is** almost **a foregone conclusion**. Robert Gilpin, one of the deans of realism who taught for decades at Princeton, believed that "**the first and most attractive response to a society's decline is to eliminate the source of the problem . . . [by] what we shall call a hegemonic war**." Yet, waging war just to keep another state down has turned out to be one of the great losing strategies in history. **The Napoleonic Wars, the Austro-Prussian War, the Franco-Prussian War, German aggression in World War I, and German and Japanese aggression in World War II were all driven by declining powers seeking to use war to improve their future security**. All lost control of events they thought they could control. All suffered ugly defeats. **All were worse-off than had they not attacked. As China rises, America must avoid this great-power trap**. It would be easy to think that greater American military efforts could offset the consequences of China's increasing power and possibly even lead to the formation of a multilateral strategy to contain China in the future. Indeed, when China's economic star began to rise in the 1990s, numerous voices called for precisely this, noting that on current trajectories China would overtake the United States as the world's leading economic power by 2050.8 Now, as that date draws nearer-indeed, current-dollar calculations put the crossover point closer to 2040-and with Beijing evermore dependent on imported oil for continued economic growth, one might think the case for actively containing China is all the stronger.

**K**

***Hierarchies and the us-them mentality are inevitable***

**Wilkinson 5** (Will Wilkingson, policy analyst for the Cato Institute, “Capitalism and Human Nature” http://www.cato.org/research/articles/wilkinson-050201.html

**Our disposition to think in terms of "us" versus "them" is irremediable and it has unavoidable political implications**. Populist and racialist political rhetoric encourages people to identify themselves as primarily rich or poor, black or white. It is important to avoid designing institutions, such as racial preference programs, that reinforce coalitional categories that have no basis in biology and may heighten some of the tensions they are meant to relax. A great deal of the animosity toward free trade, to take a different example, depends on economically and morally inappropriate coalitional distinctions between workers in Baltimore (us) and workers in Bangalore (them). Positively, free trade is laudable for the way it encourages us to see to members of unfamiliar groups as partners, not enemies.

We are Hierarchical

**Like many** animals and **all primates, humans form hierarchies of dominance. It is easy to recognize social hierarchies** in modern life. **Corporations, government**, **chess clubs, and churches all have formal hierarchical structures** of officers. **Informal structures of dominance and status may be the leading cause of tears in junior high students.**

The dynamics of dominance hierarchies in the EEA was complex. **Hierarchies play an important role in guiding collective efforts** and distributing scarce resources without having to resort to violence. Daily affairs run more smoothly if everyone knows what is expected of him. However, **space at the top of the hierarchy is scarce and a source of conflict and competition.** **Those who command higher status in social hierarchies have better access to material resources and mating opportunities. Thus, evolution favors the psychology** of males and females who are able successfully to compete for positions of dominance.

Living at the bottom of the dominance heap is a raw deal, and we are not built to take it lying down. There is evidence that lower status males naturally form coalitions to check the power of more dominant males and to achieve relatively egalitarian distribution of resources. In his book Hierarchy in the Forest, anthropologist Christopher Boehm calls these coalitions against the powerful "reverse dominance hierarchies."

Emory professor of economics and law Paul Rubin usefully **distinguishes between "productive" and "allocative" hierarchies. Productive hierarchies are those that organize cooperative efforts to achieve otherwise unattainable mutually advantageous gains. Business organizations are a prime example. Allocative hierarchies, on the other hand, exist mainly to transfer resources to the top. Aristocracies and** dictatorships are extreme examples. Although the nation-state can perform productive functions, there is the constant risk that it becomes dominated by allocative hierarchies. Rubin warns that our natural wariness of zero-sum allocative hierarchies, which helps us to guard against the concentration of power in too few hands, is often directed at modern positive-sum productive hierarchies, like corporations, thereby threatening the viability of enterprises that tend to make everyone better off.

**There is no way to stop dominance-seeking behavior. We may hope only to channel it to non-harmful uses. A free society therefore requires that positions of dominance and status be widely available** in a multitude of productive hierarchies, and that opportunities for greater status and dominance through predation are limited by the constant vigilance of "the people"—the ultimate reverse dominance hierarchy. A flourishing civil society permits almost everyone to be the leader of something, whether the local Star Trek fan club or the city council, thereby somewhat satisfying the human taste for hierarchical status, but to no one's serious detriment.

***5. Predictions are methodologically sound, reflexive, and increasingly accurate.***

Ruud **van der Helm** is a Dutch policy officer on instrument development in the Aid Effectiveness and Policy Department. Futures – Volume 41, Issue 2, Pages 67-116 (March **2009**) – obtained via Science Direct

Futurists build and discuss statements on future states of affairs. When their work is challenged, they cannot defend ‘‘what may come to be’’ with robust forms of proof. They have no direct observation, can design no experiments, and cannot accumulate data sets. All the work, all the discussions of validity, have to rely on indirect reasoning based on current and past observations, experiments and data. Such reasoning is fragile and subject to considerable uncertainty. Ever since the field emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, futurists have been acutely aware of the special challenge this implies, including two most obvious consequences. First, even the most serious work is vulnerable to potentially devastating criticism. This has triggered an on-going effort of theoretical justification that has accompanied the development of the Futures field. Second, in relation to this, sound methodology is crucially important to provide support when exploring such insecure ground as professional and academic speculation on possible futures. It is not surprising that methodology has constantly been one – and often the – central concern of the field, sometimes to a point of excess. As early as 1980, De´coufle´ could warn companion futurists against the urge ‘‘to jump steps in the long and difficult progression towards the still hypothetical scientificity of conjectural work by displaying inappropriate complacency for issues of method’’. Whether or not some futurists do ‘jump steps’, the Futures field has consistently shown much reflexivity on its theoretical foundations and its methodological procedures. However, the nature of the theoretical and methodological challenges to be addressed by such reflexivity changes over time. The doctrines, the methodological resources, the knowledge-base, the organisation of discussion in the field, that once provided the basis for successfully meeting the challenges of a given era may become inadequate or irrelevant if the context comes to change in a major way. Our argument in this special issue is that such a major change in the challenges that have to be met by our field is now well under way, calling for a major re-examination and renewal of the theoretical underpinnings of futures work.1 Deepening and refining the diagnosis of the changing context of FS is of course one part of the task ahead of us. But to launch the effort, and show its necessity, let us just sketch a rough picture of the situation, by reviewing three important aspects of the development of the Futures field: (1) practical necessity and finalisation, (2) peculiarity and separation, and (3) methodology-based development. Confronted with strident criticism on the possibility and legitimacy of any serious study of future situations, the strongest argument put forward by many pioneers of the Futures field was that studying possible futures was necessary for action and decision-making. As expressed by Bertrand de Jouvenel (1964): ‘‘One always foresees, without richness of data, without awareness of method, without critique nor cooperation. It is now urgent and important to give this individual and natural activity a cooperative, organised character, and submit it to growing demands of intellectual rigor’’. This has proved a decisive basis for the development of the field, fromthe1960s to thep resent day. It has led to a situation where most works on futures are legitimised through their connection to business management, to public decision-making, or both. The success of foresight in the recent years is an illustration of the strength of this covenant between futures methodology and the needs of long-term, strategic, management and policy. The downside of thus using the contribution to decision-making as the main theoretical justification and as the backbone of methodological design in futures work has been, and is now, a constant weakening of the effort to explore and develop other bases for theoretical foundation and methodological development. Although many such avenues have been opened, they have not been explored very far, because the evaluation of new methods has been based on their adequacy in serving studies designed for the preparation of decision-making, or of collective action.

***6. Act to save the most lives – imperfect knowledge doesn’t justify inaction***

**Cowen ‘04** (Tyler, Professor of Economics – George Mason University, “The Epistemic Problem Does Not Refute Consequentialism”, 11-2, <http://www.gmu.edu/jbc/Tyler/Epistemic2.pdf>, p. 14-15)

**The epistemic critique relies heavily on a complete lack of information about initial circumstances.** This is not a plausible general assumption, although it may sometimes be true. The critique may give the impression of relying more heavily on a more plausible assumption, namely a high variance for the probability distribution of our estimates concerning the future. **But simply increasing the level of variance or uncertainty does not add much force to the epistemic argument**. To see this more clearly, consider another case of a high upfront benefit. **Assume that the United States has been hit with a bioterror attack** and one million children have contracted smallpox. We also have two new experimental remedies, both of which offer some chance of curing smallpox and restoring the children to perfect health. **If we know for sure which remedy works, obviously we should apply that remedy. But imagine now that we are uncertain as to which remedy works**. The uncertainty is so extreme that each remedy may cure somewhere between three hundred thousand and six hundred thousand children. **Nonetheless we have a slight idea that one remedy is better than the other.** That is, one remedy is slightly more likely to cure more children, with no other apparent offsetting negative effects or considerations. **Despite the greater uncertainty, we still have the intuition that we should try to save as many children as possible**. We should apply the remedy that is more likely to cure more children. **We do not say: “We are now so uncertain about what will happen. We should pursue some goal other than trying to cure as many children as possible.”** Nor would we cite greater uncertainty about longer-run events as an argument against curing the children. We have a definite good in the present (more cured children), balanced against a radical remixing of the future on both sides of the equation. The definite upfront good still stands firm. Alternatively, let us assume that our broader future suddenly became less predictable (perhaps genetic engineering is invented, which creates new and difficult-to-forecast possibilities). That still would not diminish the force of our reason for saving more children. The variance of forecast becomes larger on both sides of the equation – whether we save the children or not – and the value of the upfront lives remains. A higher variance of forecast might increase the required size of the upfront benefit (to overcome the Principle of Roughness), but it would not refute the relevance of consequences more generally. **We could increase the uncertainty more, but consequentialism still will not appear counterintuitive**. The remedies, rather than curing somewhere in the range of three to six hundred thousand children, might cure in the broader range of zero to all one million of the children. By all classical statistical standards, this new cure scenario involves more uncertainty than the previous case, such as by having a higher variance of possible outcomes. Yet this higher uncertainty lends little support for the view that curing the children becomes less important. **We still have an imperative to apply the remedy that appears best, and is expected the cure the greater number of children.**  **This example** may appear excessively simple, but it **points our attention to the non-generality of the epistemic critique. The critique appears strongest only when we have absolutely no idea about the future; this is a special rather than a general case. Simply boosting the degree of background generic uncertainty should not stop us from pursuing large upfront benefits of obvious importance.**

***7. K doesn’t turn case – prefer our proximate internal links – they overdetermine war***

Scott D. **Sagan** – Department of Political Science, Stanford University – ACCIDENTAL WAR IN THEORY AND PRACTICE – **2000** – available via: www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/sagan.doc

To make reasonable judgements in such matters **it is essential**, in my view, **to avoid the common "fallacy of overdetermination."**  Looking backwards at historical events, it is always tempting to underestimate the importance of the immediate causes of a war **and argue that the** likelihood of conflict was so high that the **war would have broken out sooner or later even without the specific incident that set it off.**  If taken too far, however, this tendency eliminates the role of contingency in history and diminishes our ability to perceive the alternative pathways that were present to historical actors. The point is perhaps best made through a counterfactual about the Cold War. **During the** 1962 **Cuban Missile Crisis**, **a bizarre false warning** incident **in** the **U.S. radar systems** facing Cuba **led officers** at the North American Air Defense Command **to believe that** the U.S. was under attack and that **a nuclear weapon was about to go off in Florida.** Now **imagine** the counterfactual event that **this** false warning was reported and believed by U.S. leaders and **resulted in** a U.S. nuclear **"retaliation**" against the Russians. **How would future historians have seen the causes of World War III?** **One can easily imagine arguments stressing that the war between the U.S. and the USSR was inevitable. War was overdetermined: given** the **deep** political **hostility o**f the two superpowers, the ***conflicting ideology***, the escalating arms race, **nuclear war would have occurred eventually**. I**f not during that specific crisis over Cuba, then over the next one in Berlin,** or the Middle East, or Korea. **From that perspective, focusing on this particular accidental event as a cause of war would be seen as misleading. Yet, we all now know, of course that a nuclear war was neither inevitable nor overdetermined during the Cold War.**

**case**

***The advent of the nuclear age necessitates utilitarianism – absolutist ethics are self-contradictory***

**Nye 86** (Joseph S. 1986; Phd Political Science Harvard. University; Served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; “Nuclear Ethics” pg. 18-19) JFS

The significance and the limits of the two broad traditions can be captured by contemplating a hypothetical case.34 **Imagine** that you are visiting a Central American country and you happen upon a village square where **an army captain is about to order his men to shoot two peasants lined up against a wall.** When you ask the reason, you are told someone in this village shot at the captain's men last night. When you object to the killing of possibly innocent people, you are told that civil wars do not permit moral niceties. Just to prove the point that we all have dirty hands in such situations, the captain hands you a rifle **and tells you that if you will shoot one peasant, he will free the other.** Otherwise both die. He warns you not to try any tricks because his men have their guns trained on you. **Will you shoot one person with the consequences of saving one, or will you allow both to die but preserve your moral integrity by refusing to play his dirty game? The point** of the story **is to show the value and limits of both traditions. Integrity is clearly an important value, and many of us would refuse to shoot. But at what point does the principle of not taking an innocent life collapse before the consequentialist burden?** Would it matter if there were twenty or 1,000 peasants to be saved? **What if killing or torturing one innocent person could save a city of 10 million persons from a terrorists' nuclear device?** At some point does not integrity become the ultimate egoism of fastidious self-righteousness in which the purity of the self is more important than the lives of countless others? **Is it not better to follow a consequentialist approach, admit remorse or regret over the immoral means, but justify the action by the consequences?** Do absolutist approaches to integrity become self-contradictory in a world of nuclear weapons? "Do what is right though the world should perish" was a difficult principle even when Kant expounded it in the eighteenth century, and there is some evidence that he did not mean it to be taken literally even then. **Now that it may be literally possible in the nuclear age, it seems more than ever to be self-contradictory.**35 **Absolutist ethics bear a heavier burden of proof in the nuclear age than ever before.**

***The aff’s reliance on abstract theorization fails --- philosophical approaches to this year’s resolution are insufficient to produce a coherent reaction to global events***

**Whitington ‘12**

Jerome Whitington, Ph.D. in Anthropology, UC Berkeley, Visiting Scholar at Columbia University's Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy, and Adjunct Professor at The New School University, Graduate Program in International Affairs. His PhD dissertation in Anthropology, from UC Berkeley, deals with changing environmental norms surrounding hydropower development in Southeast Asia, with an emphasis on transnational regulatory techniques of activists and industry managers. He recently guest edited 'Science and the Political,' a special issue of parallax, including contributing an introduction and a research essay, 'Intervention, Management, Technological Error.' His current book project is titled Ecological Politics and the Intimacy of Expertise in Lao Hydropower Development. Writer of “Accounting for Atmosphere: The Anthropology of Climate Change”

Accounting for Atmosphere: The Anthropology of Climate Change is a project with the objective of building collaborative project appropriate to the challenge of understanding something as complex as climate change. Rather, the objective is to approach climate change with enough specificity that precise empirical statements can be linked with the broad significance of climate change’s global scope and geo-historical timescales.

5-27-12, Critical Theory Climate Blah Blah <http://accountingforatmosphere.wordpress.com/2012/03/27/critical-theory-climate-blah-blah/>, jj

Over the past several weeks I’ve become motivated to closely examine **critical theory approaches to climate change**. Most recently, I’ve been inspired by the limitations of object-oriented philosophy or what some are calling speculative realism, such as Levi Bryant’s recent lament that there is no hope for the climate and we might as well consign ourselves to a potlatch fossil energy conflagration. Bruno Latour’s now famous argument ‘From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern’ also hinges on climate change and, like Bryant’s, it **is** also **inadequate from any empirically-informed stand point**. But so what? Does it matter to critical theory? **Does critical theory matter to a social science of climate change? The real question**, it seems to me, **is** not to hammer the philosophy-types because they aren’t empirically grounded – nothing could be more pointless from my view – but rather **to ask whether work that’s a little less caught up in the intricacies of practice can help formulate relevant questions for an empirically-informed ‘fieldwork in philosophy**.’ In other words, **what is needed is neither a catalog of minutae nor theory from the troposphere, but a range of meso theorizations that provide a grasp on contemporary transformations. The loud sucking noise created from the collapse of Foucault-inspired critical social science in the US hasn’t really abated much over the past few years. My own dissatisfaction with the range of alternatives – Latour, Deleuze, whatever – has been heightened by the totally unsurprising realization in the course of my dissertation writing that those approaches has little to say about what was patently important in the field, and even less of a commitment to sussing out the demands empirical work should make on theory**. To top it off, I still find convincing Rabinow’s proposition that **we shouldn’t be doing theory.** Rather, **the challenge is to** identify what’s critical and then **create the necessary equipment**. Subsequently, the conceptual work I have found most useful has been far less over-arching, less tied to any God-figure, and a lot more mobile. But a specific disappointment remains – namely, whether there is capacity to think the broader significance of events or processes such as climate change, beyond the analytical demands. In other words, maybe even if we’re still within the space created when life enters history, ***the bottom up approach of analyzing ‘practices, instruments and techniques’*** (as a recent very awesome workshop hosted by Amy Levine and Andrea Ballestero pegged it) ***seems insufficient to the scale of the transformations we are witnessing.*** Granted, we are so close to so many potentially monumental historical moments. One doesn’t even know what questions to ask when scientists begin formulating concepts like Anthropocene, or for that matter when geothermal engineers trigger swarms of earthquakes by injecting pressurized water kilometers deep in seismically active fault zones. At the very least we are at an intensely generative moment. But the other side of the analytical coin is that our critical tools for understanding culture – power – history are really good now. I mean, they are fabulously good. The wealth of critical resources, far from having played themselves out, have instead obviated many of the questions that motivated them. When I started the Accounting for Atmosphere project, two overarching framings dominated: first, that the political project of dealing with climate change was to create a global regime to manage atmospheric chemistry; and second, that the primary technical mode for this dwelt on intensive quantification regimes at several scales (national carbon budgets, carbon finance (markets), and enterprise accounting (businesses, etc). All of this still holds, and many of the practices, instruments and techniques in play are excited loci of dynamic transformation. Indeed, there is a rapidly expanding literature on carbon markets, including luminaries such as Donald MacKenzie and Michel Callon. On the other hand, **there is Critical Theory Climate Blah Blah**, which is sort of like Video Killed the Radio Star, I mean, there are **a host of old and new hats weighing in on climate change who just don’t know much about it, or maybe they know something, a little bit, but are prone to speculation because they too easily recognize in climate change their own specific intellectual commitments.** Let me take an example I like: Peter Sloterdijk’s nifty Semiotext(e) volume Terror from the Air. To me, this is an exciting book – I very much sympathize with how he formulates a problematic around chemical warfare in terms of a trio of environment, design and atmosphere. But Sloterdijk’s short little passage on climate change just doesn’t cut it. **It’s banal. It’s generic. Climate is a stand in for what he already thinks**. At any rate, it’s just one example. Another example – one I really have not much sympathy for – is Brian Massumi’s ‘National Enterprise Emergency: Steps toward an ecology of powers’ (TCS, 2009).

***The aff’s focus on vague ontological concerns has zero practical value in terms of formulating policy responses to the energy crisis --- our “problem-solving” approach within the current ideological system is key to solve***

**Jenkins ‘11**

Willis Jenkins, Margaret A. Farley Assistant Professor of Social Ethics, Professor Jenkins teaches environmental ethics, global ethics, and Christian social thought. He is author of Ecologies of Grace: Environmental Ethics and Christian Theology, which won a 2009 Templeton Award for Theological Promise, and Sustainability, Social Justice, and Christian Ethics (Georgetown, in press). He is editor of The Spirit of Sustainability (2009) and coeditor of Bonhoeffer and King: Their Legacies and Import for Christian Social Thought (2010). He has written recent journal articles on ethics in the environmental sciences, on homelessness and urban theory, and on the field of religion and ecology.

Ethics & the Environment, ENVIRONMENTAL PRAGMATISM, ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT, AND CULTURAL REFORM, Volume 16, Number 1, Spring 2011, pp.
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Pragmatism: Making Ethics Practical

**Pragmatists** often **introduce their strategy of practical reason with an opening complaint that cosmological strategies of environmental ethics have not proven their practical worth**. **That complaint about effectiveness introduces a pragmatic proposal for less metaphysical debate and more attention to creating broad agreement on policy responses to practical problems**. The editors of the anthology Environmental Pragmatism thus set the scene: On the one hand, the discipline…has produced a wide variety of positions and theories in an attempt to derive morally justifiable and adequate environmental policies. On the other hand, **it is difficult to see what practical effect the field of environmental ethics has had on the formation of environmental policy**. (Light and Katz 1995, 1) Ben Minteer and Robert Manning blame the field’s ineffectiveness on its cosmological innovations: “**urgent calls for new environmental worldviews and radically revised ontological schemes, rather than leading to improved environmental solutions and conditions, only lead ethicists’ attention away from the resources already present within our shared moral and political traditions**.” In consequence, **the field exhibits a “conspicuous silence regarding concrete solutions to real world environmental dilemmas**” (2003, 319). Minteer and Manning follow the problem-solving approach opened by Bryan Norton, who contrasts his authentically “practical philosophy” with “**axiological” value theories** that, in his view, **have narrowed topics of discussion, reduced possibilities for interdisciplinary collaboration, and led to a communicative breakdown between science and society** (2003, 47–63). For Norton, **sustainability depends on an integrative, adaptive ethos developed from science-based responses to specific problems** (2005). **Pragmatists thus present their ethic of contextual problem-solving by pressing the dilemma between radical cosmological change and practical political engagement.** **Pragmatists expect environmental ethics to be practical in two ways: (1) by working with available moral resources, (2) for the sake of resolving specific policy problems.** **With both elements working together, they say, ethics can help achieve effective social response to environmental problems**. Andrew **Light thus asks ethicists to attend to cultural contexts by trying to “work within traditional moral psychologies and ethical theories that people already have” in order to create links between existing moral priorities in specific communities and the ends of environmental concern** (2003, 235). **Practical ethics requires, he says, a “practical anthropology,” attentive to the environmental interests and commitments that people hold, with a view toward “generating creative ways to persuade a variety of people” to adopt environmental solutions** (2003, 241).

***The impact is huge --- ceding the political makes collective action impossible --- moving away from anti-politics is vital to check 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.
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**2NC A2: Perm**

***1) Perm links to “need federal action” turns on case***

***2) Perm fails – Federal incentives crowd out states***

Kathleen **Sebelius** and the Securing a Clean Energy Future Task Force, Former Governor of Kansas, Securing a Clean Energy Future, A Report for the National Governors Association as part of the

Securing a Clean Energy Future Initiative, 20**08**, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0807ENERGYRD.PDF

**In deciding when and how to enact** tax **credits for** clean **energy, states should consider** existing **federal tax credits.** **If state incentives overlap too closely with federal ones, the state may become ineligible for federal assistance**. 61 The current federal production tax credit of 1.5¢ per kWh for renewable energy is set to expire on December 31, 2008; it may be renewed, but if not, **states may be in a position to bridge the gap**. One tax approach related to clean energy is a carbon tax, which is one of two primary regulatory mechanisms to reduce carbon emissions. The carbon tax penalizes high emitters and rewards low emitters. (The other approach is “cap and trade,” discussed on page 28). Both strategies attempt to make fossil fuels more expensive and reward clean energy investments. No state has yet enacted a carbon tax, but several municipalities are in the process of doing so, including Boulder, Colorado (Box 18), and the San Francisco Bay Area. 62

***3) Federal action crowds out state efforts, leading to inefficiency***

**Adler 7** – law prof, Case Western (Jonathan, 31 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 67)

At the same time, **federal regulation may discourage states from adopting or maintaining more protective environmental rules or even "crowd out" state-level regulatory action by reducing the net benefits of state-level initiatives**. Building on prior research and analysis of federalism in environmental law and policy, n10 this Article further seeks to reexamine some of [\*70] the conventional assumptions that underpin many discussions of the proper federal-state balance in environmental policy. Among other things, this Article suggests that **insufficient attention to the effects of federal action on state policy choices can reduce the scope and effectiveness of environmental protection efforts**. For example, **if federal regulatory action has the potential to discourage or crowd out state regulatory efforts, the adoption of a federal regulatory floor may actually lower instead of raise the aggregate level of environmental protection in a given jurisdiction**. n11

***4) No net benefit to the perm – Federal action creates a ceiling***

**Adler 7** – law prof, Case Western (Jonathan, 31 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 67)

In this way, **federal standards can discourage state policy-makers from adopting and maintaining more stringent measures of their own**, even where such measures could be justified. As a practical matter, **the federal "floor" may become a "ceiling" as well**. This effect is not merely hypothetical. **There are numerous examples of state legislation designed to prevent state environmental agencies from adopting regulatory standards that are more stringent than federal rules.** [n119](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.511255.98477628967&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1214593074266&returnToKey=20_T4054175409&parent=docview#n119) Between 1987 and 1995, nearly twenty states adopted at least one statute limiting the ability of state agencies to adopt regulatory controls more stringent than relevant federal standards. [n120](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.511255.98477628967&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1214593074266&returnToKey=20_T4054175409&parent=docview#n120) Some states focus on a given environmental concern, while others have general prohibitions against the adoption of any environmental rules more stringent than applicable federal standards. [n121](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.511255.98477628967&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1214593074266&returnToKey=20_T4054175409&parent=docview#n121) New Mexico and Colorado, for example, have statutes prohibiting the promulgation of air pollution controls more stringent than those required by federal law. [n122](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.511255.98477628967&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1214593074266&returnToKey=20_T4054175409&parent=docview#n122) **Virginia law bars state regulatory authorities from requiring greater amounts of water treatment than mandated under the federal Clean Water Act** ("CWA"). [n123](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.511255.98477628967&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1214593074266&returnToKey=20_T4054175409&parent=docview#n123) Other states have general prohibitions against agency promulgation of environmental rules more stringent than federal law. [n124](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.511255.98477628967&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1214593074266&returnToKey=20_T4054175409&parent=docview#n124)

**Forgiveness Perm**

***Embracing their worldview justifies Holocaust denial***

**Lipstadt** – Prof at Emory – **’93** (Denying the Holocaust http://www.thedivineconspiracy.org/Z5236V.pdf)

These **attacks on history and knowledge have the potential to alter dramatically the way established truth is transmitted from generation to generation**. Ultimately **the climate they create is of no less importance than the specific truth they attack** -- be it the Holocaust or the assassination of President Kennedy. **It is a climate that fosters deconstructionist history at its worst. No fact, no event, and no aspect of history has any fixed meaning or content. Any truth can be retold. Any fact can be recast. There is no ultimate historical reality. Holocaust denial is part of this phenomenon. It is not an assault on the history of one particular group. Though denial of the Holocaust may be an attack on the history of the annihilation of the Jews, at its core it poses a threat to all who believe that knowledge and memory [20] are among the keystones of our civilization. Just as the Holocaust was not a tragedy of the Jews but a tragedy of civilization in which the victims were Jew s, so too denial of t he Holocaust is not a threat just to Jewish history but a threat to all who believe in the ultimate power of reason**. It repudiates reasoned discussion the way the Holocaust repudiated civilized values. **It is undeniably a form of antisemitism**, and as such it constitutes an attack on the most basic values of a reasoned society. **Like any form of prejudice, it is an irrational animus that cannot be countered with the normal forces of investigation, argument, and debate. The deniers' arguments are at their roots not only antisemitic and anti- intellectual but, in the words of** historian Charles **Maier, "blatantly racist anthropology**. " (73**) Holocaust denial is the apotheosis of irrationalism.**

***It’s the ultimate cruelty – equivalent to the Nazi persecution***

**Lipstadt** – Prof at Emory – **’93** (Denying the Holocaust <http://www.thedivineconspiracy.org/Z5236V.pdf>)

Despite these dangers I have undertaken this work for a number of reasons. First, **denial of an individual's or a group's persecution, degradation, and suffering is the ultimate cruelty -- on some level worse than [28] the persecution itself. Those who have not experienced the Holocaust or the sting of antisemitism may find it difficult to understand the vulnerability it endangers in the victim. So, too, those who have never experienced racism cannot fully grasp the pain and anger it causes**. This book is, in part, an attempt to convey the pain the deniers inflict. In writing it I have often found myself angry with them despite the facts that they live in a strange mental wonderland and that neither they nor the nonsense they spread are worthy of my anger. Although we do not take their conclusions seriously, contradictory as it may sound, we must make their method the subject of stud y. We must do so not because of the inherent value of their ideas but because of the fragility of reason and society's susceptibility to such farfetched notions. Many powerful movements have been founded by people living in sim ilar irrational wonderlands, national socialism foremost among them.

***And distortions of history drive the future – its part of what spread the Holocaust – makes genocide more likely***

**Lipstadt** – Prof at Emory – **’93** (Denying the Holocaust <http://www.thedivineconspiracy.org/Z5236V.pdf>)

It is also crucial to understand that this is not an arcane controversy. The past and, more important, our perception of it have a powerful impact on the way we respond to contemporary problems. Deniers are well aware of history's significance. Not by chance did Harry Elmer Barnes believe that history could serve as a "means for a deliberate and conscious instrument of social transformation." (89) **History matters. Whether the focus be the Middle East, Vietnam, the Balkans, the Cold War, or slavery in this country, the public's perception of past events and their meaning has a tremendous influence on how it views and responds to the present. Adolf Hitler's rise to power was facilitated by the artful way in which he advanced views of recent German history that appealed to the masses. It did not matter if his was a distorted version, it appealed to the German people because it laid the blame for their current problems elsewhere**. Although history will always be at a [29] disadvantage when contending with the mythic power of irrational prejudices, it must contend nonetheless.

**2NC Solvency - Wind**

***States are already adopting successful wind policies now – disproves all your deficits***

**Wired Magazine**, “Texas Wind Blows With Green Power”, 8/17/**03**

**Texas,** a state famous for its love affair with fossil fuels, **has quietly begun a courtship with wind power that could push it to the nation's forefront in clean energy. Prodded by state laws that require utilities to purchase green credits, tax breaks and easy access to vast open plains with steady, strong winds, Texas has become the second-largest wind producer in the country, after California**. More than 900 megawatts of wind power generation have been built in Texas in the past three years, bringing the total to 1,094 megawatts, or enough to power about 500,000 homes in the energy-thirsty Lone Star state. "**At this point, we think 10,000-plus megawatts in the next five to eight years is doable**," said Russel E. Smith, executive director of the trade group Texas Renewable Industries Association. That would put the state well ahead of the 2,000 megawatts in new renewable energy capacity the legislature wants built before the end of the decade, but would remain only a small part of the state's total generating capacity of about 77,000 megawatts from oil, coal, natural gas and nuclear sources.

***States solve the aff: they are the leaders in production incentives for wind power***

**Shoock 2007** [Corey Stephen, JD Candidate, Fordham Journal of Corporate & Financial Law, 12 Fordham J. Corp.& Fin. L. 1011, WIND: HOW A TWO-TIERED NATIONAL RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD, ASYSTEM BENEFITS FUND, AND OTHER PROGRAMS WILL RESHAPE AMERICAN ENERGYINVESTMENT AND REDUCE FOSSIL FUEL EXTERNALITIES, lexis]

With rising externality costs and significant health and environmental consequences looming,¶ n102 **forty-nine**¶ **states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have implemented some form of** ¶ **incentive**¶ **for the production**¶ (supply-side¶ ) or consumption¶ (demand-side¶ ) **of electricity from renewable energy sources**¶ . n103¶ **Of those forty-nine**¶ **state**¶ **s, forty-six include**¶ **incentive**¶ **s for** ¶ **wind**¶ **energy** n104 the fastest growing renewable electricity generation source in the world. n105¶ State wind incentives, as for other renewables,¶ integrate supply-side and demand-side principles into a combination of both production and consumption tax credits, grants, loans, production¶ incentive¶ payments, and sale and use standards¶ .n106¶ State¶ action that comprehensively addresses energy¶ [\*1024] distribution and consumption¶ contributes to localized success in encouraging the construction of ¶ ¶ wind¶ power production facilities (usually called¶ "¶ wind¶ farms") in nearly every region of the country¶ . n107 In fact, because the¶ wind¶ -power industry has proven uniquely responsive to government action, n108 this Note will treat¶ wind¶ power as the bell-weather for assessing the relative effectiveness of renewable energy legislation. The commercial promise, potential proliferation, and likely contribution to national energy needs that¶ wind¶ power represents n109 requires that it be given special attention in the review of renewable energy policy in general. n110

**2NC A2: Green Energy Banks = $**

***1. Extend CAP – Green Banks are fiscally solvent***

***2. States can implement green energy banks –ratepayer charges can fund***

**Environmental Entrepreneurs**, June 29, **2012**, Mainstreaming Renewable Energy Finance <http://www.e2.org/jsp/controller?docId=29160&section=financing>, KEL

For the past four years, **there have been efforts to establish a ‘clean energy bank’, ‘green bank’ or ‘infrastructure bank’ at the federal level. With action in Washington blocked, those efforts have shifted to the states. Connecticut established the first in 2011**. The Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority (CEFIA) is a quasi-public entity funded by ratepayer electric charges and RGGI, and also has authority to issue bonds, seek Federal grants, accept philanthropy and raise capital. **California is now considering the application of AB32 auction proceeds to establish an infrastructure bank that would provide low cost debt for energy efficiency and renewable projects. The concept is also being explored in New York State and others.** ¶ The ‘green bank’ concept aims at accelerating deployment of renewable energy and energy efficiency by lowering the cost of financing. It takes advantage of the fact that **many states, like Connecticut, are already collecting ratepayer charges for renewable energy and efficiency programs, but redirects those funds away from direct investment and grants towards loans, in order to expand the pool of financial resources.** The intent is to create self-sustaining entities that operate on commercial credit principles. There are many questions around the green bank concept, which remain to be resolved on a state by state basis. Among these: Would the bank only finance mature technology, or would it reserve some capital for innovation? How would the bank use its credit capacity to stimulate lending by the private sector (eg. co-participation, loan guarantees, first loss provisions)? Would the bank be housed within an existing governmental agency, or would it be a newly created free-standing entity (possibly facilitating access to private capital)?

**2NC A2: Feds K2 Procurement**

***States solve – Residential tax incentives encourage procurement***

**IERN**, International Energy Regulation Network, “FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL AND REGULATORY INCENTIVES TO PROMOTE ADDITIONAL ENERGY SUPPLY AND TRANSMISSION INVESTMENT”, December **2011**, http://www.iern.net/portal/page/portal/IERN\_HOME/ICER\_HOME/ABOUT\_ICER/ICER\_Output/icer%20paper%20vwg3%20from%20USA%20final%20version.pdf

Upon examination of Table 1 above, it is noted that **twenty-five states offer a personal income tax credit or deduction relative to the installation or use of** non-traditional, **renewable energy sources**. **Twenty-five states also offer an income tax credit** or deduction **for corporate taxpayers**, **although these are not the same identical states as those who offer tax benefits to non-corporate taxpayers**. **The investments that form the basis for these tax benefits range from** wood stoves to **solar to wind** to geothermal. Some states focus on one particular technology while others provide similar benefits for any one of many defined renewable energy sources. **Massachusetts provides quite a straight-forward example of the type of benefit that an individual taxpayer could receive relative to the installation of solar or wind property**. As described in the Department of Revenue’s Income Tax regulations at 830 CMR 62.6.1, **An owner or tenant of a residential property located in the commonwealth** who is not a dependent of another taxpayer and who occupies the residential property as his or her principal residence **is allowed a solar and wind energy credit against personal income tax equal to fifteen percent of the net expenditure for renewable energy source property, or $1,000, whichever is less**. As further defined, **the renewable energy property is to be for the purposes of heating or cooling of the taxpayer’s dwelling or to provide hot water for use in such dwelling – or for producing electricity for the same purpose of providing heating, cooling, or hot water.** The property must also be expected to remain in operation for at least five years. Investment is incented through a more rapid payback of the taxpayer’s investment due to the reduced income tax payment. **The Alternative Energy System Credit in Montana is also quite straightforward**. As authorized in the Montana Code at 15-32-201 through15-32-203 and described by the Montana Department of Revenue, **non-fossil forms of energy generation, such as wind, solar**, solid waste, and decomposed organic waste **in your principal home qualify for the tax credit**, as do low-emission wood or a biomass combustions device and certain outdoor hydronic heaters or masonry heaters. **The credit for non-corporate taxpayers is the cost of the alternative energy system, including installations costs, less grants received, but not to exceed $500 per taxpayer.**

***Wind financial incentives***

**IERN**, International Energy Regulation Network, “FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL AND REGULATORY INCENTIVES TO PROMOTE ADDITIONAL ENERGY SUPPLY AND TRANSMISSION INVESTMENT”, December **2011**, http://www.iern.net/portal/page/portal/IERN\_HOME/ICER\_HOME/ABOUT\_ICER/ICER\_Output/icer%20paper%20vwg3%20from%20USA%20final%20version.pdf

As shown on Table 1 above, **twenty-three states offer some additional form of financial incentive relative to the renewable energy industry**. **These incentives are most often for the purpose of attracting new business to the state or to stimulate the creation of new jobs**. One example of this is found in Kansas. **Kansas has chosen to focus some of its financial incentives on the wind generation industry.** **It is understandable why it would do so, given that some have predicted that Kansas could provide 7,000 megawatts for export from wind energy each year**. 20 This appears to be supported by some of the maps that show wind potential around the continental United States. **As part of Kansas’ efforts to attract new business to the state, it enacted a new financial incentive for eligible wind and solar equipment. Specifically, financing up to $5 million is available to support a research, development, engineering or manufacturing project that results in at least $30 million in new investments in Kansas and the hiring of at least 200 new employees within 5 years, with the company paying at least $32,500 of average annual compensation per Kansas employee**. 21 Additionally, **as part of its financial incentive package directed to attracting wind and solar manufacturing, “all property actually and regularly used predominantly to produce and generate electricity utilizing renewable energy resources or technologies” are exempt from Kansas property taxes,** as set forth in Kansas Statutes § 79-201. Sales tax exemptions and income tax credits are also available. According to the Kansas Department of Commerce, Siemens Energy announced Kansas as the new site of a wind turbine production facility, citing in part the advantages associated with the above described financial incentives. **Furthermore, wind-powered generation capacity currently installed or under construction totals slightly over 1,000 MW throughout eight different Kansas counties.** 22 **This has allowed Kansas to become one of the nation’s top ten states for wind energy production, with wind generating capacity tripling since the beginning of 2008. This recent wind generation has also allowed Kansas to meet its goal of producing 10% of the state’s electricity from renewable sources by 2010.**

**2NC A2: Feds Key To Transition Without Economic Disruption**

***States can create identical incentives***

**CALPIRG** EDUCATION FUND, June 1st 20**06**, http://www.calpirg.org/reports/caf/challenging-nuclear-power-states

**State governments have the power to establish energy policies that serve their citizens’ needs**. **Renewable energy standards**, efficiency standards for appliances, **financial support for** energy efficiency and **renewables, and** other **clean energy policies** **can reduce the demand for power from new sources** and allow for the shutdown of existing nuclear power plants **without economic disruption.**
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**T**

***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 – Financial incentives include funding and loan guarantees; procurement is a non-financial incentive***

**Czinkota et al, 9** - Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books)

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. Fiscal incentives are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. **Financial incentives offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. Nonfinancial incentives include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements,** and investments in infrastructure facilities.

***C. This is a voting issue –***

***1. Limits – non financial incentives make the topic limitless crushing fairness***

***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***

**DA**

***Obama winning --- polls and electoral college --- but it’s close***

**Silver 10-4** (Nate Silver, 10-4-12, NYT, Oct. 3: Romney’s Electoral Challenge, and More on Debate Instant Polls <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/04/oct-3-romneys-electoral-challenge-and-more-on-debate-instant-polls/>, jj)

**The FiveThirtyEight forecast had** Mr. **Obama gaining slightly on Wednesday, estimating that he had a 86.1 percent chance of winning the Electoral College** on Nov. 6 — up from 84.7 percent in Tuesday’s forecast. This came despite the fact that it appeared there actually had been a modest shift back toward Mitt Romney in the polls even before the debate. In our “now-cast” — an estimate of what would happen if an election were held immediately — Mr. **Obama’s projected margin of victory in the national popular vote had fallen by about one percentage point** between Sunday and Wednesday. Our Nov. 6 forecast, however, had already anticipated some decline for Mr. Obama, and so has been less sensitive to the shift. In addition, **there is a particular Electoral College outlook that is becoming problematic for Mr. Romney.** As of Wednesday, our Nov. 6 forecast had Mr. Obama winning the popular vote by 4.1 percentage points. However, his advantage was larger than that — at least 4.9 percentage points, in 22 states (and the District of Columbia) — totaling 275 electoral votes: I highlight New Hampshire in yellow on this map because, although it is one of the states where Mr. Obama’s lead now exceeds 4.9 percentage points, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for him to win the Electoral College votes in this configuration. New Hampshire is not necessary because you could remove its 4 electoral votes from Mr. Obama’s column and he would still have 271, a winning total. It is not sufficient because if you removed any competitive state but New Hampshire from Mr. Obama’s column (for example, Nevada) he would at best achieve a 269-269 tie. Really, **a great deal of this comes down to Ohio**. Historically, **Ohio** is about two percentage points more Republican-leaning than the country as a whole. This year, however, it **has polled as being Democratic-leaning by one percentage point or so. I ran an alternate version of our simulation on Wednesday in which Ohio was in fact polling two points more Republican than the country as a whole, as it has, on average, in the past, while leaving all other states unchanged. That change alone boosted Mr. Romney’s Electoral College winning chances to 19 percent from 14 percent.**

***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.**

**1nc CP 1**

***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.***

***The United States will dedicate all necessary funding to the development of a smart grid for electrical production in the US.***

***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.**

***Upgrading the US to a smart grid ensures stable energy and prevents disruptions***

**Wittenberg 2011** (Scientific American, Sept. 11) <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=recent-blackout-highlights-nations>

Many experts say **smart-grid technology would** help. Such a system would **be able to intelligently respond to sudden peaks or drops in demand and energy supply**.¶ Last week, for example, **a mishap involving a single worker doing repairs on a power station near Yuma, Ariz., led to rolling blackouts over parts of Arizona, Southern California and Northern Mexico. The short circuit caused San Diego County's power-supply system to completely shut down** after it was required to take on the demand of those affected in Arizona and buckled under the extra load.¶ **Had a smart grid been in place, it** might have **helped isolate the outage and prevent it from spreading.** By monitoring activity on transmission lines in real time, **a smart grid also can help pinpoint a problem and redirect power accordingly**.¶ The Obama administration has allocated $11 billion in stimulus funding toward the electric grid. Of that, $4.4 billion was dedicated directly to building a smart grid.

**Cp 2**

***The United States federal government should issue licensing contracts for the procurement of small modular reactors on continental US military bases.***

***Plan deploys SMRs overseas --- “it’s military bases” includes overseas installations***

**CNA Analysis March 2011** (Feasibility of Nuclear Power on US military installations)

Appendix A: **DoD Installation energy use**

The tables in this appendix show the approximate size (MWe) of power plant needed to produce power equal to the average annual energy use during FY08–09 for each installation, while operating 7889.4 hours (0.9 capacity factor multiplied by 24 hours per day multiplied by 365.25 days per year). These tables only report average annual energy use and give no information about peak demands. Peak demands would also need to be considered when determining the appropriate power plant size.

Table 4. **Installations that require a plant size** of about 10 MWe or less

Installation name

Plant

size Installation name

Plant

size

NSWC Det Dania FL 0.1 Virgin Islands Army Nat'l Guard 0.2 ***Guam*** Army Nat'l Guard 0.4 NSU Saratoga Springs, NY 0.4 NSWC Det White Sands, NM 0.4 NAVSURFWARCEN Det Bayview, ID 0.5

NIOC Sugar Grove, WV 0.5 Izmir, AS 0.6 NAVMAG Indian Island,WA 0.6 MOT Sunny Point, NC 0.7 Kelly Support Facility, PA 0.7 Jim Creek (Naval Station Everett), WA 0.7 Singapore Area Coordinator 0.9 MCB Camp Elmore Norfolk, VA 0.9 NSA Orlando, FL 0.9 COMFLEACT Chinhae, KS 1.0 HQBN HQMC Arlington, VA 1.0 Hawaii Army Nat'l Guard, HI 1.1 Delaware Army Nat'l Guard 1.1 New Boston, TX 1.2 US Army Garrison Miami, FL 1.2 MARCORSUPACT Kansas City, MO 1.2 AFRADBIORSCHINST Bethesda, MD 1.2 NAVSUPPACT Souda Bay, Greece 1.3 New Hampshire Army Nat'l Guard 1.4 MCSF Blount Island, FL 1.4 Colorado Army Nat'l Guard 1.4 Army Nat'l Guard Readiness Ctr 1.4 NSA Athens, Greece 1.4 Moron AB 1.5 Puerto Rico Army Nat'l Guard 1.5 Rhode Island Army Nat'l Guard 1.5 New Mexico Army Nat'l Guard 1.6 Nevada Army Nat'l Guard 1.6 MARBKSD Washington DC 1.7 NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, CA 1.8 Connecticut Army Nat'l Guard 2.0 Wyoming Army Nat'l Guard 2.0 Parks USAR Training Center, CA 2.0 NAF El Centro, CA 2.0 NAVJNTSERVACT NS Tokyo, JP 2.1 Schinnen Garrison, Netherlands 2.1 58 NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, CA 2.1 Cape Cod, MA 2.1 Pittsburgh ARB, PA 2.1 Vermont Army Nat'l Guard 2.2 First MCD Garden City LI, NY 2.2 Maine Army Nat'l Guard 2.2 Creech AFB, NV 2.3 Arizona Army Nat'l Guard 2.4 ***Okinawa, Japan*** 2.5 Nebraska Army Nat'l Guard 2.5 MARFORRES New Orleans, LA 2.5 Maryland Army Nat'l Guard 2.6 NAVRESREDCOM MIDLANT Washington, DC 2.6 NAS Jrb Willow Grove, PA 2.7 Fort Hamilton, NY 2.7 Antigua 2.7 Washington Army Nat'l Guard 2.8 Minn St Paul ARB 2.9 RAF Fairford 2.9 NAVSTA Ingleside, TX 3.0 Fort Hunter Liggett, CA 3.0 Youngstown ARB, OH 3.0 Tooele Army Depot UT 3.0 Montana Army Nat'l Guard 3.0 North Carolina Army Nat'l Guard 3.1 Niagara ARB, NY 3.2 Massachusetts Army Nat'l Guard 3.2 Utah Army Nat'l Guard 3.2 Kentucky Army Nat'l Guard 3.2 Newport Chemical Depot, IN 3.3 Fort A.P. Hill, NJ 3.4 Oregon Army Nat'l Guard 3.6 LANTORDCOM Det Earle Colts Neck, NJ 3.6 NAS Kingsville, TX 3.6 Idaho Army Nat'l Guard 3.6 Los Angeles AFS 3.6 North Dakota Army Nat'l Guard 3.7 Ohio Army Nat'l Guard 3.7 Wisconsin Army Nat'l Guard 3.8 NAS Whiting Field Milton, FL 3.8 COMNAVFLTACT Okinawa 3.8 Georgia Army Nat'l Guard 3.9 Devens Training Area, MA 3.9 South Carolina Army Nat'l Guard 3.9 NAF Misawa, Japan 4.0 Fort Story, VA 4.0 Florida Army Nat'l Guard 4.1 Cheyenne Mtn AFB, CO 4.1 Fort Buchanan Puerto Rico 4.1 Lajes Field Azores 4.1 Dobbins ARB, GA 4.2 Grissom ARB, IN 4.4 Vance AFB, OK 4.5 Carlisle Barracks, PA 4.6 Tennessee Army Nat'l Guard 4.7 Oklahoma Army Nat'l Guard 4.7 NSD Monterey CA 4.8 Texas Army Nat'l Guard 4.9 West Virginia Army Nat'l Guard 5.0 Soldier Systems Ctr, Natick, MA 5.0 Missouri Army Nat'l Guard 5.1 Livorno Army Garrison 5.1 Naval Station Everett, WA 5.1 NSA Panama City, FL 5.1 NAS/JRB New Orleans, LA 5.2 South Dakota Army Nat'l Guard 5.3 Army Garrison Benelux 5.3 RAF Croughton, UK 5.4 Virginia Army Nat'l Guard 5.5 Fort McNair, DC 5.5 Alabama Army Nat'l Guard 5.6 Alaska Army Nat'l Guard 5.7 Fort Monroe, VA 5.7 UNNISERUOFHEASCN Bethesda, MD 5.7 Kansas Army Nat'l Guard, KA 5.9 Laughlin AFB, TX 6.0 Table 4. Installations that require a plant size of about 10 MWe or less (continued) Installation name Plant size Installation name Plant size 59 Blue Grass Army Depot, KY 6.1 NAVSURFWARCEN CARDEROCKDIV Bethesda MD 6.2 Yuma Proving Ground, AZ 6.2 Hawthorne Army Ammo Plant, NV 6.2 Sierra Army Depot, CA 6.3 MCAS Beaufort, SC 6.3 Navbase Point Loma, CA 6.4 NCBC Gulfport, MS 6.4 NUWC DET AUTEC Andros Island Bahamas 6.5 RAF Alconbury, UK 6.6 NAS Brunswick, ME 6.6 Westover ARB 6.7 Ascension Is. 6.7 SPAWARSYSCEN San Diego, CA 6.7 MCAS Yuma, AZ 6.8 March ARB, CA 6.9 Milan Army Ammo Plant, TN 6.9 Columbus AFB, MS 6.9 LANTORDCOM Yorktown, VA 7.0 Tonopah, NV 7.1 Illinois Army Nat'l Guard 7.1 Iowa Army Nat'l Guard 7.2 Louisiana Army Nat'l Guard 7.2 NUWC Keyport, WA 7.2 Minnesota Army Nat'l Guard 7.2 NAS Fallon, NV 7.3 NAS Meridian, MS 7.3 Cavalier AFS, ND 7.5 New Jersey Army Nat'l Guard 7.5 Naval Base Kitsap Bremerton, WA 7.5 Goodfellow AFB, TX 7.6 NAS Corpus Christi, TX 7.6 Presidio of Monterey, CA 7.7 Naval Support Activity Bahrain 8.1 Moody AFB, GA 8.1 81st Regional Spt Command, CA 8.1 New York Army Nat'l Guard 8.2 USNH Guam 8.2 California Army Nat'l Guard 8.6 NAVSTA Rota, Spain 8.9 NAS Key West, FL 9.2 MCAS Miramar, CA 9.2 MCLB Barstow, CA 9.3 Arkansas Army Nat'l Guard, AK 9.4 MARCORCUITDEP San Diego, CA 9.4 Michigan Army Nat'l Guard, MI 9.6 63rd Regional SPT Command, CA 9.6 NAS/JRB Fort Worth, TX 9.7 NAVSUPPACT Mid South Millington, TN 9.7 Altus AFB, OK 9.7 Fort Myer, VA 9.9 Fleet Readiness Center Southwest, CA 10.0 Table 5. Installations that require a plant size of about 10–20 MWe Installation name Plant size Installation name Plant size Mississippi Army Nat'l Guard 10.1 NAVBASE San Diego, CA 10.2 NSA New Orleans, LA 10.4 NAVAIRENGCEN Lakehurst, NJ 10.5 NAVSTA Pearl Harbor, HI 10.6 Army Research Lab Adelphi, MD 10.8 Luke AFB, AZ 10.8 Bamberg Army Garrison 10.9 NAS Sigonella, Italy 11.1 Patrick AFB, FLA 11.1 Table 4. Installations that require a plant size of about 10 MWe or less (continued) Installation name Plant size Installation name Plant size 60 Cannon AFB, NM 11.1 Hohenfels Army Garrison 11.2 Fort Greely, CO 11.2 Dugway Proving Ground, UT 11.3 MCB Hawaii Kaneohe Bay, HI 11.3 NAVSTA Mayport, Fl 11.5 NSA Mechanicsburg, PA 11.5 RAF Mildenhall, UK 11.6 Vicenza Garrison, Italy 11.7 Charleston, SC 11.8 Detroit Arsenal, MI 12.0 COMFLEACT Sasebo, Japan 12.2 Incirlik AB 12.2 Beale AFB, CA 12.3 Shaw AFB, SC 12.4 Dyess AFB, TX 12.8 Indiana Army Nat'l Guard 12.9 NSA Philadelphia, PA 13.0 Ansbach Army Garrison, Germany 13.1 Corpus Christi AD, TX 13.3 CG MCLB Albany, GA 13.3 Watervliet Arsenal, NY 13.3 Mcconnell AFB, KS 13.4 Tyndall AFB, FL 13.5 NAVBASE Guam 13.5 Kunsan AB, Korea 13.6 Randolph AFB, TX 13.8 NWS Charleston, SC 13.8 NSA Norfolk, VA 13.9 Seymour Johnson, NC 13.9 Davis Mothan AFB, AZ 14.0 Aviano AB, Italy 14.1 NAVSUPPACT Naples 14.2 Schweinfurt Army Garrison 14.3 Barksdale AFB, LA 14.5 Vilseck 14.8 Mcalester Army Ammo Plant, OK 14.8 99th Regional Spt Command, NJ 15.1 White Sands Missile Range, NM 15.6 Fort Monmouth, NJ 15.7 NAS Lemoore, CA 16.0 Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA 16.0 Schriever/Falcon, CO 16.2 Little Rock AFB, AK 16.2 NSWC Dahlgren Div Dahlgren, MD 16.7 Fort Irwin, CA 16.8 Holloman AFB, NM 17.3 Cape Canaveral AFB, FL 17.4 Nellis AFB, NV 17.5 Naval Base Ventura County, CA 17.5 NAVSUPPACT Portsmouth, NH 17.7 Letterkenny Army Depot 17.8 Fort Leavenworth, KS 17.8 NAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV China Lake, CA 17.9 Scranton Army Ammo Plant, PA 18.0 L G Hanscom AFB, MA 18.2 Hurlburt AFB, FL 18.4 Navbase Coronado San Diego, CA 18.5 F E Warren AFB 18.6 Dover AFB, DE 18.6 MCAS Iwakuni, Japan 18.7 NAVAVNDEPOT Cherry Pt, NC 18.7 ARWS (611th) 18.8 Naval Base Kitsap Bangor, WA 18.8 Daegu Garrison - Area IV 18.8 COMMAVDIST Washington,DC 19.2 NAF Atsugi, Japan 19.3 Mt Home AFB, ID 19.4 Andersen AFB, Guam (Joint Region Marianas) 19.5 Macdill AFB 19.5 Fort McCoy, WA 19.5 Lima Military Center 19.8 Fort Dix, NJ 19.8 Fort Meade, MD 19.9 Table 5. Installations that require a plant size of about 10–20 MWe (continued) Installation name Plant size Installation name Plant size 61 Table 6. Installations that require a plant size of about 20–30 MWe Installation name Plant size Installation name Plant size MARCORCRUITDEP Parris Island, SC 20.4 Baumholder Army Garrison, Germany 20.5 Pennsylvania Army Nat'l Guard 20.6 Spangdahlem AB, Germany 20.7 Stuttgart Army Garrison 20.7 Fort Mcpherson, GA 21.2 Andrews AFB, MD 21.4 Travis AFB, CA 21.5 Malmstrom AFB 21.7 Peterson AFB, CO 21.8 Deseret Chemical Depot, UT 21.9 Wiesbaden Army Garrison, Germany 21.9 Mannheim Army Garrison, Germany 22.0 Tobyhanna AD, PA 22.2 NAVSUPPFAC Diego Garcia 22.3 Fairchild AFB, WA 22.3 Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 22.4 Fort Rucker, AL 22.5 Heidelberg Army Garrison, Germany 22.6 NSY Norfolk, VA 23.2 Scott AFB 23.4 NSB Kings Bay, GA 23.6 MCAS Cherry Pt, NC 23.7 Fort Huachuca, AZ 23.7 Fort Lee, NJ 24.1 NAB Little Creek, VA 24.1 Langley AFB 24.1 Camp Zama Japan 24.6 Whiteman AFB, MS 24.9 USNA Annapolis, MD 24.9 Buckley AFB, CO 24.9 Fort Eustis, VA 25.6 Ellsworth AFB, SD 25.6 NAVSUPPACT Crane, IN 25.9 Kaiserslautern Army Garrison, Germany 26.2 Kirtland AFB, NM 26.6 Fort Polk, LA 26.7 NAVSTA Newport, RI 26.7 Sheppard AFB 26.9 RAF Lakenheath, UK 26.9 Osan AB, Korea 27.3 Camp Humphreys - Area III 27.3 Grand Forks, ND 27.7 Iowa Army Ammo Plant 27.9 CG MCCDC Quantico, VA 29.1 NAS Jacksonville, FL 29.2 Mcguire AFB, NJ 29.3 NAS Oceana, VA 29.4 Grafenwoehr Army Garrison, Germany 29.4 Edwards AFB, MD 29.7

***Japan alliance high and public wants US troops there now***

**Madsen and Samuels** 3/16/**11** (Robert, is a senior fellow at the Center for International Studies at MIT, a member of the executive council at Unison Capital, and an advisor to several international investment groups, and Richard, is Ford International professor of political science and director of the Center for International Studies at MIT,“Japan's Black Swan,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/03/15/japans\_black\_swan?page=0,2)

Geopolitically, **the recent events will enhance U.S.-Japan relations** in an international environment that is in some ways becoming more inclement. After decades of accepting U.S. supremacy in Asia as the foundation of its foreign and security policies, Japanese strategists had just begun open debate on the consequences of a changing regional power balance. In 2009 and 2010, the DPJ government accordingly considered a tilt toward China, but then the quarrel in the Sea of Japan and Beijing's use of an embargo on rare-earth exports as a diplomatic weapon persuaded Tokyo to pull back to the status quo ante. As one former defense minister subsequently noted: "we learned an important lesson, but the tuition was high." China likewise seems to have learned from the contretemps. Not only did Prime Minister Wen Jiabao express sympathy for the Japanese people following the earthquake, he also promised $4.5 million in aid and appears willing to dispatch personnel to assist in the relief and recovery efforts. Initial signs thus suggest that Beijing has moved beyond what one scholar calls "the harsher jingoistic anti-Japanese reflex in China that has poisoned relations with Japan in recent years."  Meanwhile, **the natural disasters have enhanced the legitimacy of both the Japan Self-Defense Forces (SDF) and the U.S. alliance**. In the largest deployment of Japanese military personnel since the Pacific War**, 100,000 soldiers have been mobilized to deal with the search, rescue, and eventual reconstruction campaign. All early evidence suggests they have been welcomed in this role, meaning that the nation is growing more comfortable with an army and navy about which it has long felt ambivalent. The same improvement may be seen in the Japanese attitude toward the American troops stationed on their soil.** Within hours of learning of the earthquake, President Barack **Obama expressed his sadness, promised extensive financial and humanitarian assistance, and declared the alliance "rock solid." At Japan's request, Washington immediately redirected the USS Ronald Reagan and its carrier task force from the waters around South Korea toward the affected Japanese coast**. Supported by American personnel and equipment from as far afield as Singapore, those forces are now engaged with the SDF in their first ever full-scale joint rescue and relief operations. **The deployment of helicopters from the controversial Futenma Marine air base in Okinawa has also been well received, perhaps marking significant progress towards the end of the bilateral disagreement over that facility.** **The alliance has never worked so smoothly nor been so widely accepted.**

***Plan alienates Japanese communities near bases --- massive opposition to nuclear post-Fukushima***

**Powell & Takayama 12** (Bill Powell and Hideko Takayama, April 20, 2012, CNN Money, Fukushima Daiichi: Inside the debacle <http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/04/20/fukushima-daiichi/>, jj)

That assent won't come easily. **Public opposition to nuclear power now runs hot in Japan. Far from fading over the last year, opposition seems to have expanded to a solid majority of citizens nationwide, putting both Noda's government and Japan's big business community** (which needs the electricity) **in a very difficult spot**. **The reason for that is the debacle of Fukushima** Daiichi—the six-reactor power station owned and operated by the Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO) —**and the many questions that still surround the terrifying events that began on March 11, 2011**.

***Crushes the alliance***

**Tanaka, ’10** – Senior Fellow at the Japan Center for International Exchange (2/10, Hitoshi, “The US-Japan Alliance: Beyond Futenma,” http://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:BrLWAbFxrrEJ:www.jcie.org/researchpdfs/EAI/5-1.pdf+japan+equal+negotiations+us&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESheENPuqbIG-8RbfWchijC7WxbtZKTDrU0wN8bzSwk\_YulPh9htyz3amNMQWtMuAlJAkehw8leYo2IQZf7qMesvk\_G-kemr\_jkwP3XutsFN6dpV8YCmiR2i4Ns6zfseGSYONfkC&sig=AHIEtbQHXZpJVcMaBydKC8HT0kgaT2qngA)

On the other hand, it is important to recognize that **the burden of maintaining the US-Japan security alliance has been disproportionately shouldered by local citizens in a few areas in Japan, especially in Okinawa**. In today’s world, **it is natural for people in a place like Okinawa**, which hosts 75 per cent of the US military facilities for the entire country of Japan, **to be bothered by the presence of foreign bases** and another country’s soldiers, **with all the disruption they inevitably bring**. ***If local relations cannot be managed skillfully, the entire US-Japan security alliance can be put at risk***. The Japanese and US governments established the SACO [Special Action Committee on Okinawa] process in 1995 to work to reduce the US military footprint, but unfortunately they have not yet put in place a precise implementation plan for the reversion of the Marine Corps base, Futenma Air Station, which is in a heavily populated area and has become a prominent issue in bilateral relations. The relocation of the base to new facilities in Okinawa simply cannot be implemented without eventually gaining the acquiescence of local communities. Given all of the time and energy that has gone into pushing forward the current agreement, it is entirely understandable for the US government to claim that there is no alternative to the existing relocation agreement. Nevertheless, we cannot deny the fact that there has been a sea change in Japan. The Democratic Party of Japan came to power on the strength of a campaign that, in part, opposed the current agreement, and the local community of Nago voted on January 24 to repudiate the base move to their city in a mayoral election that was widely perceived as a referendum on the relocation plan. Democratic governments have to find some way to respond to the voices of their people, and **the Japanese government cannot simply disregard these pressures.**

#### US/Japan alliance is key to prevent nuclear war

**INSS 00** Institute For National Strategic Studies [“The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership” (http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SR\_01/SR\_Japan.htm)]

Major war in Europe is inconceivable for at least a generation, but **the prospects for conflict in Asia are far from remote.** **The region features some of the world’s largest and most modern armies, nuclear-armed major powers, and several nuclear-capable states. Hostilities that could directly involve the U**nited **S**tates **in a major conflict could occur at a moment’s notice on the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait. The Indian subcontinent is a major flashpoint. In each area, war has the potential of nuclear escalation**. In addition, lingering turmoil in Indonesia, the world’s fourth-largest nation, threatens stability in Southeast Asia. **The U**nited **S**tates **is tied to the region by a series of bilateral security alliances** that remain the region’s de facto security architecture. **In this** promising but also **potentially dangerous setting, the U.S.-Japan bilateral relationship is more important than ever. With the world’s second-largest economy and a well-equipped and competent military, and as our democratic ally, Japan remains the keystone of the U.S. involvement in Asia. The U.S.-Japan alliance is central to America’s global security strategy.**

**Islanding/Heg**

***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.

***Solvency takes decades—SMRs require re-orienting the entire manufacturing industry***

Dylan **Ryan 11**, Masters in Mechanical Engineering, expertise in energy, sustainability, Computer Aided Engineering, renewables technology; Ph.D. in solar energy systems, 2011, "Part 10 – Small modular reactors and mass production options," <http://daryanenergyblog.wordpress.com/ca/part-10-smallreactors-mass-prod/-http://daryanenergyblog.wordpress.com/ca/part-10-smallreactors-mass-prod/>

So there are a host of practical factors in favour smaller reactors. But what’s the down side? Firstly, economies of scale. **With a small reactor, we have all the excess baggage that comes with each power station, all the fixed costs and a much smaller pay-off**. As I noted earlier, **even though many smaller reactors are a lot safer than large LWR’s** (even a small LWR is somewhat safer!) **you would still need to put them under a containment dome**. **It’s this process of concrete pouring that is often a bottle neck in nuclear reactor construction**. **We could get around the problem by clustering reactors together**, i.e putting 2 or 4 reactors not only on the same site but under the same containment dome. **The one downside here is that if one reactor has a problem, it will likely spread to its neighbours**. How much of a showstopper this fact is depends on which type of reactors we are discussing.

Also, in the shorter term **small reactors would be slower to build, especially many of those we’ve been discussing, given that they are often made out of non-standard materials**. **Only a few facilities in the world could build them as the entire nuclear manufacturing industry is currently geared towards large LWR’s**. ***Turning that juggernaut around would take decades***. So by opting for small reactors while we’d get safer more flexible reactors, we be paying for it, as **these reactors would be slower to build** (initially anyway) **and probably more expensive too.**

***DoD SMRs not viable till 2020 at the earliest --- too many hurdles***

**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>)

**Finding specific sites for nuclear power plants on or near military installations will be challenging.** **There are many considerations that affect whether a site is appropriate. Some of the considerations relate to safety and others to limiting risks of attack or sabotage, and still others to public opinion**. **Being located on a military installation** provides some advantages, but it also **imposes some constraints on how portions of the installation near the nuclear power plant can be used. Trade-offs will be required.**

**Designs for small reactors are at various levels of technological readiness and some are about to begin the NRC licensing process, but none have been licensed or constructed yet.** Consequently, **there are a number of unresolved certification, licensing, and regulatory issues**. **The size of the emergency planning zone that should surround the reactor is an example of such an issue. Resolving these issues will take time and resources**. NRC representatives have indicated that **they expect these issues could be resolved by the middle of the decade and that a plant could be built and operating by about 2020.**

***Multiple barriers to adoption***

**Parthemore and Rogers 10** (Christine Parthemore, Bacevich Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, Will Rogers, Research assistant at the Center for a New American Security, "Nuclear Reactors on Military Bases may be Risky", 5/20, <http://www.cnas.org/node/4502>)

On the other hand, opponents contend that **sufficient numbers of military base personnel may not have the requisite training in nuclear reactor management, oversight and regulatory credentials to attend to reactors in the round-the-clock manner necessary**. In most cases, **additional qualified personnel and improved physical security and safety requirements would be needed**. **As with all nuclear power generation, materials proliferation, water usage, radioactive waste management and public opinion will also be major concerns**. **Most military bases also strive to be integrated into their surrounding communities, and, by our experience, many base officials consider integrated electric infrastructure an important point of connection between local and military needs. Concepts for nuclear energy generation solely to supply military bases must be sensitive to what public perceptions could be in the event of extended blackouts for surrounding communities.**

***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.**

***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.**

***5) Heg collapse doesn’t cause global nuclear war – conflicts would be small and managable***

Richard **Haas** (president of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies) April **2008** “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask\_the\_expert.html

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.

***6) Transition is smooth – decline in power causes global cooperation***

Carla **Norrlof** (an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto) **2010** “America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” p. 50

Keohane and Snidal’s predictions – that the waning of American power did not have to jeopardize cooperation – were in this context reassuring. As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, Keohane explained the persistence of cooperation in terms of states’ continued demand for regimes.40 Snidal demonstrated that collective action depends as much on the hegemon’s size, as it does on the size of other actors in the international system. By paying attention to the size of all Great Powers, not just the hegemon, Snidal opened up the possibility that a more symmetrical distribution of power might enhance the prospects for the provision of public goods, thus offering a potential explanation for the otherwise puzzling persistence of cooperation in the 1980s despite America’s relative decline. The likelihood for cooperation increases with American decline because the hegemon can no longer singlehandedly provide the good as it declines, so smaller states have to chip in for the good to be provided. If one were to use Snidal’s production function in the revised model (i.e., by plugging the numbers from his production function into the revised model), the waning hegemon continues to be taken advantage of. While Snidal was modeling a theory he did not believe in, these distributional implications haunt the literature and cast decline as inescapable and continuous

**Nuclear Renaissance/Prolif**

***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.

***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.**

***SMRs are worse for prolif than large reactors***

Corey **Nealon 11**, "Could small nukes be the energy answer?," 12-4-11, <http://articles.dailypress.com/2011-12-04/news/dp-nws-nuclear-reactors-20111203_1_nuclear-power-reactors-energy-department>

Also, **small reactor technology is newer than conventional reactors**, many of which date to the 1970s. **Because they are smaller and more automated, they could potentially operate with fewer employees and less regulations**, Genoa said. Disadvantages That worries the Union of Concerned Scientists, a Massachusetts-based environmental watchdog group. **Companies developing small reactors are overstating their benefits and minimizing potential downsides**, Edwin Lyman, a scientist with the union's Global Security Program, told a Senate subcommittee in July. **Small reactors "could pose** comparable or even **greater safety, security and proliferation risks than large reactors,**" Lyman said. Any buy-in will likely require the cooperation of utility companies, which control electric transmission lines. A spokesman for Dominion, Virginia's dominant energy provider, said the Richmond-based utility has no plans for small reactors. "We're not pursuing them," Rick Zuercher said.

***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.**

***SMRs uniquely worse for prolif --- overstrain the IAEA --- only the aff links***

**Lyman 11** Dr. Edwin Lyman, SENIOR SCIENTIST, GLOBAL SECURITY, UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS, HEARING before a SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SPECIAL HEARING JULY 14, 2011--WASHINGTON DC <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112shrg72251/html/CHRG-112shrg72251.htm>, jj

**The distributed deployment of small reactors would** also **put great strains on existing licensing and inspection resources**. **Nuclear reactors are qualitatively different from other types of generating facilities, not least because they require a much more extensive safety and security inspection regime**. Similarly, **deployment of individual small reactors at widely distributed and remote sites around the world would strain the resources of the** International Atomic Energy Agency (**IAEA) and its ability to adequately safeguard reactors to guard against proliferation, since IAEA inspectors would need to visit many more locations per installed megawatt around the world.** **Maintaining robust oversight over vast networks of SMRs around the world would be difficult, if feasible at all.**

***Lack of effective inspections turns the whole case—makes SMRs worse for prolif, safety and security than large reactors***

Dr. Edwin **Lyman 11**, Senior Scientist, Global Security Program, Union of Concerned Scientists, July 14, 2011, Testimony Before the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, "An Examination of the Safety and Economics of Light Water Small Modular Reactors"

**Proponents of** small modular reactors (**SMRs) claim that their designs have inherent safety** features compared to large reactors, and some even argue that their reactors would have been able to withstand an event as severe as Fukushima. **We find these claims to be unpersuasive**. For any plant--large or small--the key factor is the most severe event that the plant is designed to withstand--the so-called maximum ``design-basis'' event. **Unless nuclear safety requirements for new reactors are significantly strengthened, one cannot expect that either small or large reactors will be able to survive a beyond-design- basis event like Fukushima**. Although some light-water SMR concepts may have desirable safety characteristics, **unless they are carefully designed, licensed, deployed and inspected, SMRs could pose comparable or even greater safety, security and proliferation risks than large reactors.**

***1) No impact - Deterrence solves***

**Waltz ’10** (Kenneth N, adjunct professor of political science @ Columbia, senior research scholar in the Institute of War and Peace , the National Interest, “Is Nuclear Zero the Best Option?” Sep/Oct, Iss. 109; pg. 88, proquest, jj)

War may not pay, as British economist Norman Angeli repeatedly claimed, but the lesson proved a hard one for states to learn. **Even with the horrors of World War I fresh in their minds, European countries went into World War II just twenty-one years later**. **Until August of 1945, violent conflict punctuated the history of states, especially of those major and great. When in short order the Soviet Union followed the United States into the nuclear business with "man of steel" Stalin and in due course "we will bury you" Khrushchev at the helm, many in the Western world thought that all hell would break loose.** Robert Maynard Hutchins, boy president of the University of Chicago (he was thirty when he took over), and Bertrand Russell, eminent in mathematics and rhetoric, proclaimed that in the nuclear age, world government was the only alternative to world war. **With nuclear weapons, war presumably meant that civilization would perish and we along with it. Instead, the alternative to world government proved to be nuclear deterrence, which banished war among the world's major nations through the long years of the Cold War and ever since**. Certainly, **violent conflict** still exists, but it **has been relegated to taking its course in the periphery of international politics. The United States, in particular, has been fond of beating up poor and weak states.** In the twenty years dating from 1983, we invaded six of them, beginning and ending with Iraq. **Yet since the end of World War II, states with nuclear weapons have never fought one another.** Testing propositions against historical events has become a favorite indoor sport of social scientists. **This is the only proposition that has passed every test. One might think that the best, in fact the only, peacekeeping weapon that the world has ever known would gain many fans. It does not seem to have done so.**

***2) Prolif is inevitable – Regional security concerns and prestige***

**Brown 2007** (The Washington Quarterly 31.1)

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/washington_quarterly/v031/31.1brown.html>

**Motivations for the acquisition of nuclear weapons vary** from one prospective nuclear entity to another. For terrorist groups, the wish to be able to inflict maximum damage is enough of a reason. For nations, the situation is more complex, **with a mixture of drivers** of different weights. As McGeorge Bundy points out, international prestige played a significant role in the British and French decisions. It provided what each wanted in the way of "a place at the table." **Internal prestige can** also **play a role**; elements of the Indian scientific community rather than the Indian military are believed to have led the push for India's nuclear weapons program to show that they could. **The overwhelming motive**, however, **is** usually **the belief that the possession of nuclear weapons will improve national security** or that not having them will damage it.

***3) Will be slow***

**Yusuf 2009** (Fellow, Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Longer-Range Future Boston University)

http://www.pugwash.org/01\_nuclear\_proliferation\_yusuf.pdf

First, it reveals consistent misjudgments regarding the extent of nuclear proliferation. **Overall, projections were far more pessimistic than actual developments**; those emanating from independent experts more so than intelligence estimates. In the early years of the Cold War, the overly pessimistic projections stemmed, in part, from an incorrect emphasis on technology as the driving factor in horizontal proliferation, rather than intent, a misjudgment, which came to light with the advent of a Chinese bomb in 1964. The parallel shift from developed-world proliferation to developing-world proliferation was accompanied by greater alarm regarding the impact of proliferation. It was felt that developing countries were more dangerous and irresponsible nuclear statesvthan developed countries. Second, while all the countries that did eventually develop nuclear weapons were on the lists of suspect states, **the estimations misjudged when these countries would go nuclear.** The Soviet Union went nuclear much earlier than had been initially predicted, intelligence estimates completely missed China’s nuclear progress, and India initially tested much later than U.S. intelligence projections had anticipated and subsequently declared nuclear weapon status in 1998 when virtually no one expected it to do so. Third, **the pace of proliferation has been consistently slower than has been** **anticipated by most experts due to a combination of overwhelming alarmism, the intent of threshold states, and many incentives to abstain from weapons development. In the post-Cold War period, the number of suspected threshold states has gradually decreased and the geographical focus has shifted solely to North-East Asia, South Asia, and the** **Middle East.**

## 2nc

#### Security alliance key to solving multiple crises, including terrorism, war and proliferation

**Leach**, representative in Congress, Apr. 20 **2005** p.l/n

(James, Congressional FDCH Testimony)

At the same time, **Japan is becoming ever more important to advancing a panoply of American foreign policy interests around the globe. From supporting counterterrorism operations in the Indian Ocean to contributions to humanitarian assistance in Iraq to preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to working with the U.S. and others in seeking a peaceful resolution to the North Korean nuclear challenge.** For many years**, Japan has also been deeply engaged with U.S. and other industrialized democracies as a leader at the United Nations and other multilateral institutions**. Indeed, the first article of the 1960 U.S. Japanese Security Treaty includes the stipulation that both partners will endeavor to strengthen the United Nations so that its mission of maintaining international peace and security may be discharged more effectively. In this regard it is in the world's interests and the United States' national interests to expand the United Nations Security Council. From a Congressional perspective, I find the claim of Japan, the world's second largest economy, the largest creditor country and the leader donor of foreign assistance, to be compelling. Japan's candidacy deserves America's unswerving support.

#### Backlash at US presence causes kickout

Doug Bandow 2010, is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and Vice President of Policy for Citizen Outreach, June 18th, 2010 [“Get Out of Japan”, National Interest Online, June 18th, 2010, available online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592, accessed June 28, 2010]

Moreover, there is talk of activists mounting a campaign of civil disobedience. Public frustration is high: in mid-May, a human chain of 17,000 surrounded Futenma. Local government officials oppose the relocation plan and would hesitate to use force against protestors. Naoto Kan could find himself following his predecessor into retirement if he forcibly intervened. Even a small number of demonstrators would embarrass U.S. and Japanese officials alike.

Moreover, Washington’s high-handedness may eventually convince the Japanese people that their nation must stop being an American protectorate. It may be convenient to be defended by the world’s superpower, but self-respect matters too. Tokyo has essentially given up control over its own territory to satisfy dictates from Washington. That is a high price to pay for U.S. protection. Kenneth B. Pyle, a professor at the University of Washington, writes: “the degree of U.S. domination in the relationship has been so extreme that a recalibration of the alliance was bound to happen, but also because autonomy and self-mastery have always been fundamental goals of modern Japan.”

#### Turns heg

Kapoor 10- Associate Fellow at the Centre for Land Warfare Studies

(6/10/10, “The Strategic Relevance of Okinawa” pg online @ [http://www.idsa.in/idsacomments/TheStrategicRelevanceofOkinawa\_rkapoor\_100610])

In the post-Occupation period, US troops and military bases in Japan have been instrumental in ensuring peace and stability within Japan as well as in East Asia. The geo-strategic location of Okinawa makes it the preferred site for hosting US military bases both in terms of securing Japan as well as for US force projection in the Far East. Okinawa’s distance from the rest of Japan and from other countries of East Asia makes it an ideal location to host military bases and thus extend US military outreach considerably. In the case of an eventuality, it is easier for the US marines, who act as first responders to exigencies, to take appropriate action well before the rest of Japan is affected. In addition, Japan cannot ignore the potential threat it faces from its nuclear neighbours including China, North Korea and Russia. The Russian and Chinese threats, as of now, can be ruled out. However, the North Korean threat is very much real and Japan has been building up its Ballistic Missile Defence system in collaboration with the US to cater for it. Okinawa Prefecture includes a chain of hundreds of small islands. The midpoint of this chain is almost equidistance from Taiwan and Japan’s Kyushu Island. During the Vietnam War, the USFJ military bases particularly in Okinawa were among the most important strategic and logistic bases. In addition, strategists in Japan note that despite the country’s three non-nuclear principles, some bases in Okinawa were used for stockpiling nuclear weapons during the Cold War. Even today, US nuclear-armed submarines and destroyers operate in the vicinity of Japan, facilitated by a secret deal between the governments of the US and Japan. Moreover, having military bases in Japan also helps the US to have easy access to the strategically important five seas –the Bering Sea, the Sea of Okhotsk, the Japan Sea, the East China Sea and the South China Sea.1

#### Uniqueness and issue specific spillover – military bases pursuing strong and collaborative local community relations now - key to solve land encroachment issues vital to military effectiveness - but energy citing decisions that cause local community backlash specifically spillover and undermine

Boccuti, Faul and Gray, 12

Amanda Boccuti, GIS Support Analyst, Marstel-Day, LLC, providing analysis and GIS support for U.S. Marine Corps projects. Lauren Faul, Specializing in Strategic Communications Analyst, Marstel-Day, LLC, Her primary responsibilities entail the development of engagement plans for the U.S. Marine Corps which will provide them a framework to sustain the missions through community outreach and engagement. She has previously worked as a Communications Director on Capitol Hill and Congressional Liaison for the Marine Corps. Lauren Gray, Environmental Issues Researcher, Marstel-Day, LLC, offering research and analysis of environmental issues for encroachment control plans and communications, outreach and engagement strategies for the U.S. Marine Corps. Her primary focus areas include climate change effects and energy development, 5/21/12, http://engagingcities.com/article/establishing-creative-strategies-effective-engagement-between-military-installations-communi

Throughout the Nation’s history, military installations and ranges were historically established in undeveloped areas, except for those forts located to defend cities. Local communities developed near the installations for safety and economic reasons resulting in the installation being the up-to-that-point rural community’s primary economic engine. Routine communication between the installations and local communities were minimal because the installation was self-supporting and not subject to local laws and regulations. Communications were primarily social. Starting in the post-World War II era and accelerating as the 20th Century came to a close, installation-adjacent communities increased in both density and size – becoming less rural, more suburban or urban, and more economically diverse.

Military missions continue to evolve, incorporating new weapon platforms and training over larger areas and at all hours of the day and night. These changes in both surrounding communities and the installation missions have often lead to competing interests with respect to the economy, natural resource management, and land use. Military installations and local communities must, therefore, focus communication efforts on building partnerships to find mutually acceptable paths forward for resolving their competing interests. Developing collaborative relationships is imperative to turning otherwise conflicting interests into opportunities for mutually beneficial solutions. The nature of those interactions is defined by issue type, installation and community rapport, and available communication channels.

The four military services (i.e., Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force) have service-specific community engagement programs to develop partnerships; all four, however, conduct information sharing through the Public Affairs Office (PAO), which handles media and public relations. Three of the services – the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force – have established encroachment management policies that outline service responsibilities to establish, maintain, and sustain community relationships in order to reduce encroachment effects. This responsibility is usually assigned to a Community Plans and Liaison Office (CPLO) or an equivalent community planner. The CPLO and PAO work with their installation Commander to act as the military’s voice and point of engagement in the community through consistent messaging, establishing an installation presence in community forums, and planning community-engagement events and processes.

Though Department of Defense (DoD) mechanisms exist to develop community partnerships, mediating the different interests and priorities among military installations and their surrounding communities is a complex, nuanced process usually exercised by the services, through their installation leadership. Siting of renewable energy projects, environmental stewardship responsibilities, noise from training events, and other policy- and planning-related matters invoke difficult questions, such as: how can an installation and its surrounding communities concurrently pursue goals and development in a way that lead to mutual gain, obtaining threshold requirements and fair compromise? Finding interest nexuses and fostering an open, strong relationship in which those nexuses can be explored is key.

#### We have 3 independent links

#### Local community backlash - Even aff advocates admit the link is true and highly likely

Andres and Breetz 11

Richard Andres, Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and a Senior Fellow and Energy and Environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic Research, Institute for National Strategic Studies, at the National Defense University, and Hanna Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Small Nuclear Reactorsfor Military Installations:Capabilities, Costs, andTechnological Implications, www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/StrForum/SF-262.pdf

Small reactors used on domestic military bases are likely to face a number of additional siting hurdles. As a distributed energy source, they are likely to face substantial “not-in-my-backyard” battles. Moreover, dispersing a large number of reactors leads to questions about longterm nuclear waste disposal.27 Arguably, reactors should be relatively safe on domestic military installations, certainly more secure than, for instance, the reactors situated in developing countries or intended for processing tar sands. Nevertheless, no issue involving nuclear energy is simple. Institutional and technical uncertainties—such as the security of sealed modules, the potential and unintended social and environmental consequences, or the design of reliable safeguards—make dispersing reactors across the country challenging. Some key issues that require consideration include securing sealed modules, determining how terrorists might use captured nuclear materials, carefully considering the social and environmental consequences of dispersing reactors, and determining whether Permissive Action Links technology could be used to safeguard them.

#### Plan sends critical signal of isolation to both local community and base officials - Military bases prioritizing community integration now

Parthemore and Rogers, 10

Christine Parthemore, Will Rogers, Center New American Security, 5/20, http://www.cnas.org/node/4502-http://www.cnas.org/node/4502

Are small nuclear reactors a smart choice for increasing energy security and reducing greenhouse gas emissions at federal government facilities? In recent months this has become a hot question in particular at domestic U.S. military installations, which must meet unique energy needs while reducing their carbon footprints. Now, it appears that this question is taking Capitol Hill by storm as well. The media have reported that Tennessee Sen. Lamar Alexander (R) is proposing a joint Department of Energy/Department of Defense demonstration project to examine the use of small reactors on federal sites. For some Department of Energy sites, such as Oak Ridge National Lab in Alexander’s home state — a site certainly accustomed to housing nuclear technology — demonstrating new nuclear reactor technology is largely a no-brainer. However, using nuclear reactors to power the nation’s defense installations warrants deeper consideration. Proponents of boosting this carbon-free energy source on military bases argue that these installations have unique capacities that would ease concerns over its use, namely more gates and more armed guards already on base 24/7. Likewise, the U.S. military services have unique energy security needs. Consistent energy supplies are a critical component of America’s ability to train at home and to operate globally. Energy is so important that some analysts are even exploring “islanding” the energy systems on some military installations to reduce vulnerabilities related to their reliance on often brittle domestic electric grids. Consideration of nuclear energy as part of these islanding concepts is on the rise. On the other hand, opponents contend that sufficient numbers of military base personnel may not have the requisite training in nuclear reactor management, oversight and regulatory credentials to attend to reactors in the round-the-clock manner necessary. In most cases, additional qualified personnel and improved physical security and safety requirements would be needed. As with all nuclear power generation, materials proliferation, water usage, radioactive waste management and public opinion will also be major concerns. Most military bases also strive to be integrated into their surrounding communities, and, by our experience, many base officials consider integrated electric infrastructure an important point of connection between local and military needs. Concepts for nuclear energy generation solely to supply military bases must be sensitive to what public perceptions could be in the event of extended blackouts for surrounding communities. Any legislation to consider the option of small nuclear reactors on military bases must include examination of these important concerns.

#### Impact - strong local community relations key to buffering agreements that solve land encroachment – vital to military effectiveness and biodiversity protection

Powledge, ’8

Fred Powledge, writer and editor, Fred Powledge is the author of seventeen books and scores of magazine articles and reports. Powledge’s articles have appeared in dozens of publications, including The New Yorker, Audubon, BioScience, and many others. They draw on his extensive experience as a journalist, which includes reporting as a staff member of The New York Times, the Atlanta Journal, and the Associated Press. He has served as a consultant to agricultural research institutions in Colombia, Peru, Sri Lanka, and Italy. He has contributed to biennial editions of World Resources, which is an authority on global environmental and development issues, and to several encyclopedias. Most recently, Fred Powledge has been the author of articles in the journal BioScience on a variety of important environmental subjects, .http://www.dodbiodiversity.org/ch10/Chapter.10.Partnerships.pp144-153.pdf

Buffering has become an important buzzword in military-community relations. At most installations, civilian development and population growth make it highly unlikely that the base itself can be enlarged, even though modern weaponry and training techniques need expanded space. Thus was born the buffering idea.4 The Army led this movement in the nineteen-nineties by acquiring conservation easements on lands around Fort Bragg, North Carolina, that were suitable habitat for the red-cockaded woodpecker.5 The Army eventually expanded and formalized this strategy into the Army Compatible Use Buffer Program (acub). The Marine Corps followed soon after by acquiring easements on land adjacent to its Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, also in North Carolina. In 2003, the Department of Defense broadened the buffering idea to allow military departments (in the words of a dod document) to: enter into an agreement with a state or private entity to limit development or property use that is incompatible with the mission, to preserve habitat, or to relieve anticipated environmental restrictions that would restrict, impede, or interfere with military training, testing, or operations on the installation.6

### 2NC local coop k2 heg – non-land encroachment warrants

#### Independent of land use – 4 additional reasons strong ties with local community key to military base effectiveness – intellectual capital, key trade skills, synergy with local industrial clusters and academic institutions, recruitment and retention

DOD, ’4 (Federal Register, 2/12, [http://www.leg.wa.gov/JointCommittees/JCVMA/Documents/JCVMArpt.pdf)\*\*](http://www.leg.wa.gov/JointCommittees/JCVMA/Documents/JCVMArpt.pdf)**)

(a) Numerous commentors expressed support for the draft criteria without suggesting changes and used the opportunity to provide information on their particular installations. DoD understands and greatly appreciates the high value that communities place on the installations in their area and the relationships that have emerged between the Department and local communities. Both the BRAC legislation and DoD’s implementation of it ensure that all installations will be treated equally in the base realignment and closure process. (b) Several commentors gave various reasons why a particular installation, type of installation, or installations designated by Congress as unique assets or strategic ports, should be eliminated from any closure or realignment evaluation. Public Law 101–510 directs DoD to evaluate all installations equally. The Department has issued guidance to all DoD Components instructing them to treat all installations equally. (c) Some commentors indicated the selection criteria should reflect the statutory requirement of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, to maintain a core logistics capability, and the statutory limitation of Section 2466 that the Department spend no more than 50% of its depot-level maintenance and repair funds to contract for the performance of such workload. Consistent with the development and application of the criteria used in all previous rounds, it is inappropriate to include any statutory constraints in the selection criteria because they are too varied and numerous and could preclude evaluation of all installations equally. The absence of these requirements in the text of the criteria, however, should not be construed as an indication that the Department will ignore these or any other statutory requirements or limitations in making its final recommendations. (d) The Department did not receive any requests from local governments that a particular installation be closed or realigned pursuant to section 2914(b)(2) of Public Law 101–510, which states that the Secretary shall consider any notice received from a local government in the vicinity of a military installation that the local government would approve of the closure or realignment of the installation. A few private citizens, however, asked that a particular installation be closed or that operations be restricted to limit noise or other community impacts. (e) A few commentors expressed concern over the broad nature of the criteria and requested greater detail, including in some cases requests for definitions, specificity regarding select functions, and explanations of when a closure as opposed to a realignment was appropriate. While the Department appreciates a desire for detail, the inherent mission diversity of the Military Departments and Defense Agencies makes it impossible for DoD to specify detailed criteria that could be applied to all installations and functions within the Department. Broad criteria allow flexibility of application across a wide range of functions within the Department. (f) A few commentors recommended assigning specific weights to individual criteria and applying those criteria uniformly across the Department. It would be impossible for DoD to specify weights for each criterion that could be applied uniformly to all installations and functions because of the inherent mission diversity within the Department. Other than the requirement to give the military value criteria priority consideration, the numbering reflected in the listing of the criteria are not intended to assign an order of precedence to an individual criterion. (g) One commentor suggested that section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department to exclude military installations with less than 300 authorized civilian positions from consideration for closure or realignment under BRAC. While section 2687 allows the Department to close or realign such installations outside the BRAC process, it does not preclude their consideration within BRAC. In order for the Department to reconfigure its current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both warfighting capability and efficiency, it must undertake an analysis of the totality of its infrastructure, not just those with 300 or more authorized civilian positions. (h) Some commentors were concerned that BRAC would be used as a ‘‘back door’’ method of privatizing civilian positions. DoD’s civil service employees are an integral part of successful accomplishment of defense missions. Section 2904 specifically limits the ability of the Secretary of Defense to carry out a privatization in place of a military installation recommended for closure or realignment to situations where that option is specified in the recommendations of the Commission and determined by the Commission to be the most cost-effective method of implementation of the recommendation. Therefore, if any closure or realignment recommendation includes privatization, it will be clearly stated in the recommendation. (i) One commentor suggested that the Department needed to conduct a comprehensive study of U.S. military installations abroad and assess whether the existing U.S. base infrastructure meets the needs of current and future missions. The BRAC statute applies to military installations inside the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States. As a parallel action, the Secretary of Defense has already undertaken a comprehensive study of global basing and presence—the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS). BRAC will accommodate any decisions from that study that relocate forces to the U.S. DoD will incorporate our global basing strategy into a comprehensive BRAC analysis, thereby ensuring that any overseas redeployment decisions inform our recommendations to the BRAC Commission. (j) A few commentors cautioned the Department against using the authority provided by section 2914(c) to close and retain installations in inactive status because of the negative effect such action might have on the relevant local community. The Department recognizes that job creation gained through the economic reuse of facilities is critically important to mitigate the negative impact of BRAC recommendations. As such, the Department will exercise the utmost caution and consideration when exercising its authority to retain installations in an inactive status. It should be noted that the Department has always had this authority, even though its appearance in the authorizing legislation for the 2005 round would indicate it is a new authority. As such, the Department’s actions in the four previous base closure rounds demonstrate that it will be exercised judiciously (k) A few commentors asked the Department to give priority to relocating activities within the same state or local community. The Department recognizes that the economic impact of BRAC reductions can be lessened by moving functions to geographically proximate locations. As specified in the BRAC legislation, however, military value must be the primary consideration when making these decisions. Specifically, those factors that are set out in criteria one through four are the most important considerations when selecting receiving locations. (2) Military Value Comments (a) A majority of comments received dealt with the military value criteria. In the aggregate, military value refers to the collection of attributes that determine how well an installation supports force structure, functions, and or missions. (b) One commentor was concerned that the Department would lose sight of the value of service-unique functions when applying criteria that include reference to jointness. The Department recognizes the distinct military value provided by both service-unique functions and those functions that are performed by more than one service. Accordingly, the Secretary established a process wherein the Military Departments are responsible for analyzing their service-unique functions, while Joint Cross-Service Groups, which include representatives from each of the military services, analyze the common business-oriented support functions. (c) A few commentors were concerned that criterion two, which captures the legislative requirements set out in Section 2913(b)(1)–(3), did not recite verbatim the language in the BRAC statute. They urged incorporation of ‘‘Preservation of’’ into the final criteria to ensure that the 2005 BRAC round preserve the infrastructure necessary to support future military requirements. Selection criteria must facilitate discriminating among various military installations, assessing the value of each and comparing them against each other to see which installations offer the greatest value to the Department. Criteria one through three compare the respective assets of different military installations against each other, valuing those with more of those assets more highly than those without those assets. By valuing the installations with more of these assets higher, the Department ‘‘preserves’’ these valuable assets set out in the criteria. If the Department were to modify the criteria to include ‘‘preservation,’’ as suggested in the comment, we would be forced to assess how an installation ‘‘preserves’’ something rather than whether an installation possesses the assets worthy of preservation, potentially undercutting the statutory factors rather than furthering those factors. While the criteria proposed by the Secretary do not recite the statutory language verbatim, they do fully reflect the nine factors set out in the statute, and as such are legally sufficient. Additionally, the Department does not agree with the assertion that the criteria must contain the word ‘‘preservation’’ in order to comply with congressional intent. The report of the Committee of Conference to accompany S. 1438, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, refers to the preceding list of requirements as ‘‘factors that must be evaluated and incorporated in the Secretary’s final list of criteria.’’ The BRAC statute does not require, as a matter of law, a verbatim recitation of the factors set out in Section 2913. On the contrary, a requirement for a verbatim recitation is inconsistent with the requirements for publication of draft criteria, an extensive public comment period, and finalization of criteria only after reviewing public comments. If the Secretary were bound to adopt the statutory language as his criteria, the detailed publication process required by Congress would be meaningless. (d) A few commentors stressed the importance of maintaining a surge capacity. Surge requirements can arise for any number of reasons, including contingencies, mobilizations, or extended changes in force levels. Criteria one and three capture the concept of surge capacity as they are currently drafted. As was the case with the criteria used in the past three rounds of BRAC, criterion one requires the Department to consider ‘‘current and future’’ mission capabilities and criterion three assesses the ‘‘ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization and future total force requirements’’. In 1999, after three rounds of BRAC using these criteria (and similar criteria used in the first round of BRAC), the Department looked closely at its ability to accommodate increased requirements and found that even after four rounds of base realignments and closures it could accommodate the reconstitution of 1987 force structure—a significantly more robust force than exists today—which is a more demanding scenario than a short term mobilization. Further, as required by Section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Pub. L. 108–136), the Secretary, as part of his assessment of probable threats to national security, will determine the ‘‘potential, prudent, surge requirements to meet those threats.’’ (e) Numerous commentors stated that previous BRAC rounds failed to evaluate research, development, test and evaluation, engineering, procurement, and technical facilities accurately, because of the lack of effective criteria to consider the features essential to their performance. They noted that the criteria applied to such facilities in previous rounds were largely the same criteria that were applied to operations, training and maintenance facilities serving very different functions. DoD highly values its research, development, test and evaluation, engineering, procurement, and technical facilities. Research, development, engineering, procurement and other technical capabilities are elements of military value captured within criteria one through four. The Department will consider military value in a way that incorporates these elements. (f) Several commentors also raised concerns that the criteria did not take into account the availability of intellectual capital, critical trade skills, a highly trained work force, allied presence, and the synergy among nearby installations and between DoD facilities and nearby industrial clusters and academic institutions. DoD appreciates the importance of having an available pool of intellectual capital and critical trade skills that make up, and allow us to recruit and retain, a highly trained and experienced work force, as well as the synergy provided by nearby facilities. To the extent that the availability of highly skilled civilian or contractor work forces and relationships with local institutions and other installations influence our ability to accomplish the mission, they are captured in criteria one, three and seven.

### 2NC General Backlash Links/A2: Plan Popular

#### SMRs uniquely unpopular because deployed closer to population centers

ITA, 11

Department Commerce, International Trade Administration, Feb, http://trade.gov/mas/ian/build/groups/public/@tg\_ian/@nuclear/documents/webcontent/tg\_ian\_003185.pdf-

One additional obstacle is beyond the scope of this report but could play a significant role in whether SMRs are commercially deployed: public opinion. To the extent that the smaller profile of SMRs results in their deployment closer to population centers, public opposition to their deployment might rise. Deployment at existing sites, or in industrial applications away from residential areas, however, might minimize the impact of public opinion. Education about the safety features of SMRs and nuclear reactors in general could also ameliorate this concern.

#### Wide variation in local opinion guarantee the link and spillover EVEN IF PUBLIC SUPPORT IS GENERALLY INCREASING – dod feasibility assessment concedes the disad comes first

King 11

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

DoD will have to take the views of stakeholders such as state and local governments into account when deciding whether to undertake, or participate in a nuclear power project. Governmental views at these levels vary considerably and may be shaped by public opinion. Public opinion is solicited and taken into consideration at several stages of the NRC licensing process. Although public views toward nuclear power are increasingly favorable, there is significant opposition within some segments of the population. Before undertaking a specific nuclear power project, it would be important for DoD to take public opinion into account and consider it in the context of broader military installation/community relations.

#### Prefer our ev – their polls are flawed, support for new reactors collapsed post fukushima, and opposition is more intense – specifically indicts the gallup polling their ev cites

Mariotte, 12

Michael Mariotte, executive director of Nuclear Information and Resource Service, 6/5/12, http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say-http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say

Nonetheless, despite asking the same question, Gallup and NEI can’t agree on the answer. NEI, for example, in November 2011 asserted that 28% of the public strongly favors nuclear power with an additional 35% somewhat in favor. NEI found only 13% strongly opposed and another 21% somewhat opposed. A May 2012 NEI poll did not publicly break down the numbers into strongly vs somewhat, but claimed a similar 64-33% split between support for nuclear power and opposition. Gallup, asking the same question in March 2012, found a narrower split. A smaller number was strongly in favor (23%, a drop of 5%) and a larger number strongly opposed (24%, increase of 3%)—overall an 8-point anti-nuclear swing among those with strong opinions. Those in the middle were 34% somewhat favor vs 16% somewhat opposed. The 2012 numbers were slightly worse for nuclear power than the identical question asked in March 2011, just before Fukushima. But other polls suggest that Gallup and NEI may be asking the wrong question. For example, the LA Times reported on a Yale-George Mason University poll in April 2012 that found that support for new nuclear power had dropped significantly, from 61% in 2008 to 42% today. Even Rasmussen in its May 2012 poll found that only 44% support building new reactors. That was good news for Rasmussen since it found that only 38% oppose them, with a surprising 18% undecided (surprising because no other poll we saw had such a high undecided contingent for any nuclear-related question). Meanwhile the March 2012 ORC International poll found that: “Nearly six in 10 Americans (57 percent) are less supportive of expanding nuclear power in the United States than they were before the Japanese reactor crisis, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. Those who say they are more supportive of nuclear power a year after Fukushima account for well under a third (28 percent) of all Americans, little changed from the 24 percent who shared that view in 2011.” But perhaps the most telling, and easily the most interesting, poll comes from a March 2012 poll from the Yale Project on Climate Change Communications. Participants were asked, “When you think of nuclear power, what is the first word or phrase that comes to your mind?” 29% of those polled said “disaster.” Another 24% said “bad.” Only about 15% said “good” and that was the only measurable group that had anything positive to say. That poll also found that, “…only 47 percent of Americans in May 2011 supported building more nuclear power plants, down 6 points from the prior year (June 2010), while only 33 percent supported building a nuclear power plant in their own local area.”

#### NIMBY is key - increases strength and intensity of opposition locally

Ansolabehere, 7

Stephen Ansolabehere Elting R. Morison Professor, Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, March 26, 2007

The 2007 survey focused on additional attributes of power sources, including siting, waste management, and technology transfer. These problems have long discouraged support for nuclear power, but they present obstacles to the development of other fuels as well. How would you feel if a [type of facility] were built within 25 miles of our house? Strongly Oppose Oppose somewhat Support somewhat Strongly Support The survey presented respondents with several different sorts of facilities – a natural gas-fired power plant, a coal-fired power plant, a nuclear power plant, and a wind power facility (with 100 250-foot towers). We also described carbon capture and sequestration and asked If carbon dioxide were pumped deep under ground within 25 miles of your home, would you support such a facility? Table 5 summarizes the responses to these questions in 2007. The same questions were asked for coal, natural gas, and nuclear power plants in 2002 and virtually the same pattern emerged. Public support for and opposition to such facilities varies greatly. Wind power generating facilities enjoy support of a strong majority of fully 75 percent of the sample. However, only wind seems to receive majority support. A bare majority opposes construction of a natural gas-powered electric power plan within 25 miles of their homes (53% against versus 46% for). Almost two-thirds oppose pumping carbon underground within 25 miles of their home (carbon capture and sequestration). Fully three fourths oppose construction of either a coal power plant or a nuclear power plant nearby, with the strongest opposition to a nuclear facility. Local opposition to coal and nuclear facilities is not just a problem of “not in my back yard.” These are among the least popular form of electricity generation period, and most people want to reduce their use. Opposition is especially intense, however, the closer facilities get to home. Wind power is relatively popular as a general matter and as a local development.

#### Opposition is more vocal, organized and aggressive in siting fights

Angwin, 12

Meredith Angwin,

former project manager at EPRI, Electric Power Research Institute, 7/18/12, http://yesvy.blogspot.com/2012/07/american-nuclear-society-awards-to.html

The importance of community

Some people advocate raising school taxes and others disagree. Both sides feel fine about expressing their views in public forums. Both sides know that plenty of people disagree with them, but they also know that most people are going to keep it civil, and those who don't keep it civil will not be supported in their rudeness. In contrast, people supporting nuclear power in Vermont are likely to feel intimidated by the opposition. Opponents shout at meetings. They drive NRC officials out of the room or throw manure in their water glasses. There was arson at Vermont Yankee's office building. (The office building is not on the plant site.) The people who do these things are applauded by the other opponents. In my opinion, one of the reasons that the opponents can get away with this type of action is that so few supporters bother to show up at hearings and so forth. If there were more of us at the meetings, less intimidation would be possible

### Cyber

#### State actors won’t engage in cyberwarfare---Russia and China have too much to lose

**Knake ’10** (Robert K, international affairs fellow in residence at the Council on Foreign Relations studying cyber war, 2-16, CFR, “Cyberterrorism Hype v. Fact” <http://www.cfr.org/terrorism-and-technology/cyberterrorism-hype-v-fact/p21434>, jj)

For now, the United States has little to fear from al-Qaeda on the cyberfront. **Only a handful of sophisticated nation states currently have the ability to carry out a devastating cyberstrike.** In his assessment of the People's Liberation Army Modernization program, Blair briefly noted that "China's aggressive cyberactivities" pose challenges, and **it's true that China, Russia, and other countries' capabilities do pose a real threat. Luckily, these countries also have vulnerable systems, as well as a lot to lose, in any conflict, cyber or otherwise.**

#### No impact---we could recover from a cyberattack

**Lewis ’03** (James, senior fellow and director of the Technology and Public Policy Program at CSIS, Summer, Knowledge, Technology & Policy, “Cyber terror: Missing in Action” springer link, jj)

In general, **analyses of cyber terrorism or cyber warfare greatly exaggerate the vulnerability of infrastructure and nations to the effects of computer network attacks. The hypothetical vulnerability of various infrastructures--water systems, air traffic control, electrical grids--is routinely overstated in cyber attack scenarios. Very few, if any, of these infrastructures are dependent on computer networks (and the Internet) for their operation**. Cyber attack scenarios also seem to assume a high degree of passivity or incompetence in their victims. The history of both terror and conventional military attacks shows that **people in the United States and elsewhere are resilient and inventive in response to attacks and show a surprising, even heroic, capability to resist and restore.**

#### Terrorists don’t have the technical capacity to utilize cyberwarfare

**Knake ’10** (Robert K, international affairs fellow in residence at the Council on Foreign Relations studying cyber war, 2-16, CFR, “Cyberterrorism Hype v. Fact” <http://www.cfr.org/terrorism-and-technology/cyberterrorism-hype-v-fact/p21434>, jj)

While the United States' critical infrastructure, from the electric grid to the financial sector, is vulnerable to attack through cyberspace, **al-Qaeda lacks the capability and motivation to exploit these vulnerabilities**. **To penetrate, map, and damage the networks that control the industrial base requires a large team of experienced hackers, a lot of time, and advanced infrastructure. Only a handful of groups, mostly nation state actors, possess this level of capability, and al-Qaeda is not one of them**. **In the last ten years**, according to the National Counterterrorism Center's Worldwide Incidents Tracking Database, **there have been 63,192 incidents of terrorism. Not one was an incident of cyberterrorism.** As [Irving Lachow](http://www.ndu.edu/IRMC/ia/lachow.html) at NDU has pointed out, **the jihadist community heavily relied on one London-based hacker known by the moniker Irhabi 007, who at best had moderate ability. Since his arrest in 2005, indications are that al-Qaeda's cybercapabilities have only eroded**. While continuing to rely on petty crime to fund many plots, **al-Qaeda has been unable to capitalize on the explosion of cybercrime, lacking the technical capability to do so.** For al-Qaeda to do any real damage with cyberattacks, it would need to make a multi-year investment in developing offensive cybercapabilities and would need a secure facility and advance test bed from which to do it**. Understanding the control software for an electric grid is not a widely available skill. It is one thing to find a way to hack into a network and quite another to know what to do once you're inside.**

**Ext – SQUO Solves – Base Backup**

***Microgrids solve DOD vulnerability***

**Pike Research 11**, market research and consulting firm that provides in-depth analysis of global clean technology markets, 9/16/’11

(<http://www.pikeresearch.com/newsroom/military-microgrid-capacity-to-experience-more-than-700-growth-by-2017>)

***Military Microgrid Capacity to Experience More than 700% Growth*** by 2017

September 16, 2011

The United States Department of Defense (DOD) is the single largest consumer of petroleum in the world. U.S. military operations are also the largest consumer of all forms of energy globally. **Microgrids, which enable distributed energy generation at a localized scale including the ability to “island” themselves from larger utility grids, can shrink the amount of fossil fuels consumed** to create electricity **by networking generators** as a system **to maximize efficiency. Microgrids enable military bases** – both **stationary and tactical – to *sustain operations no matter what is happening on the larger utility grid*** or in the theater of war.

According to a new report from Pike Research, the **capacity of military microgrids will grow at a rate of 739%** between 2011 and 2017, increasing from 38 megawatts (MW) to 316 MW during that period, under a baseline forecast scenario. The cleantech market intelligence firm expects that, under a more aggressive adoption scenario, stationary and mobile military microgrid capacity could reach as high as 817 MW during the same timeframe.

“**The military’s primary concern is disruption of service from utility transmission and distribution lines,” says** senior analyst Peter **Asmus. “The lack of control and ownership of these lines** – and the uneven quality of power service regionally throughout the United States – **has prompted the DOD to reexamine the existing electricity service delivery model.** This analysis has led the DOD to the inevitable conclusion that **the best way to bolster its ability to secure power may well be through microgrid technology it can own and control.”**

Asmus adds that, as awareness about the electrical grid’s vulnerability to terrorist attacks has increased in recent times, ***the U.S. military has become one of the strongest proponents of microgrids***, which offer the ultimate secure power supply for fixed base mobile operations. **Many** **army, navy, air force, and other related bases and offices already have** vintage **microgrids** in place. What is new, says Asmus, is that **these facilities are looking to envelop entire bases with microgrids and integrate distributed energy generation on-site. These resources**, when capable of safe islanding from the surrounding grid, **offer the ultimate security since fuel never runs out with renewable energy resources** such as solar or wind. **The opportunity to help develop these microgrids has attracted a number of powerful technology companies** including Lockheed Martin, GE, Honeywell, Boeing, and Eaton.

***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.

***Status quo solves islanding---the military figured out their advantage and fixed it***

Michael **Aimone 9-12**, Director, Business Enterprise Integration, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), 9/12/12, Statement Before the House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies, http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony%20-%20Aimone.pdf

**DoD’s facility energy strategy is also focused heavily on grid security in the name of mission assurance.** Although the Department’s fixed installations traditionally served largely as a platform for training and deployment of forces, in recent years they have begun to provide direct support for combat operations, such as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) flown in Afghanistan from fixed installations here in the United States. Our fixed installations also serve as staging platforms for humanitarian and homeland defense missions. These installations are largely dependent on a commercial power grid that is vulnerable to disruption due to aging infrastructure, weather-related events, and potential kinetic, cyber attack. **In 2008, the Defense Science Board warned that DoD’s reliance on a fragile power grid to deliver electricity to its bases places critical missions at risk**. 1 Standby Power Generation Currently, **DoD ensures that it can continue mission critical activities on base largely through its fleet of on-site power generation equipment**. **This equipment is connected to essential mission systems and automatically operates in the event of a commercial grid outage**. In addition, **each installation has standby generators in storage for repositioning as required**. **Facility power production specialists ensure that the generators are primed and ready to work, and that they are maintained and fueled during an emergency**. With careful maintenance **these generators can bridge the gap for even a lengthy outage**. **As further back up to this installed equipment, DoD maintains a strategic stockpile of electrical power generators and support equipment that is kept in operational readiness**. For example, **during Hurricane Katrina, the Air Force transported more than 2 megawatts of specialized diesel generators from Florida, where they were stored, to Keesler Air Force Base in Mississippi, to support base recovery.**

#### SMRS don’t solve readiness

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>)

There are liabilities to having a nuclear power plant located on a military installation. First, the military installation must find and give up all other use of a small area where the site is to be built. The site would need to be “not too near” to certain types of facilities. For example, not too near a hospital and not too near a facility that stores and handles explosives. Finding a specific site on an installation that is appropriate and suitable may be difficult. In addition, having a nuclear power plant on a military installation would almost certainly impose some restrictions on how land and airspace in the immediate vicinity of the nuclear plant could be used thereafter.

A small nuclear plant providing power to a DoD installation could be located on non-military government controlled land or on private land near the military installation. This may make site security more complicated and would probably make the approval process more challenging. This doesn't mean that siting on non-military government controlled land or private land shouldn't be considered; it means that such siting would need to be supported by clear and persuasive reasons.

#### Still vulnerable to attacks

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

Firstly like large reactors, one of the biggest qualms that the public has to nuclear is problems associated with nuclear waste. A more decentralized production of nuclear waste inevitably resulting from an increase in SMRs production was not even discussed. The danger of transporting gas into some military bases in the Middle East is already extremely volatile; dangers of an attack on the transit of nuclear waste would be devastating.

## 1nr

**Nuke power down now**

***Nuclear power low globally***

**FP ‘11**

APRIL 13, 2011, Foreign Policy, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/04/13/fukushimas_hidden_fallout?page=full>, jj

Nuclear Power

**The disaster at Fukushima has put a premature end to the Europe-based "nuclear renaissance**," a post-post-Chernobyl movement toward expanding nuclear energy that had the International Energy Agency predicting nuclear would grow from 6 percent of total global energy supply to more than 11 percent by 2035. **Now those growth rates are being called into question. The European Union** (whose energy commissioner, Günther Oettinger, has declared the situation at Fukushima a nuclear "apocalypse") **has called for "stress tests" for its 143 reactors. Meanwhile, Germany -- the EU's biggest economy -- has suspended plans to prolong the life of its nuclear plants. Elsewhere in the world**, U.S. President Barack **Obama, while expressing support for nuclear power, has requested a comprehensive review of the safety of domestic plants. And China, which has plans for a massive expansion of nuclear energy, has said it will hold off on approving new nuclear plants to allow for a revision in safety standards.**

***Fukushima fears and nobody can pay for it***

**Jayaraman ‘12**

Nityanand Jayaraman, 6-15-12, The Hindu, This renaissance is just a fairy tale <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/article3528968.ece>, jj

For a professed proponent of liberalisation and free trade, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's penchant for a technology that cannot float without subsidies is telling. Nuclear power's unfavourable economics are not lost on Dr. Singh. Recently, Westinghouse Electric and Nuclear Power Corporation of India Limited (NPCIL) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to negotiate the setting up of AP1000 reactors in Gujarat, ending a slump in interest from the Toshiba subsidiary in India's nuclear market. For Toshiba's Westinghouse and other nuclear equipment suppliers, the Civil Nuclear Liability Act's clause on supplier liability was the key hurdle to investing in India. The companies wanted the Indian government to insulate them from the financial fallouts of any potential disaster caused by their technology by spreading that liability among taxpayers. The recent MoU suggests some progress in moving towards this goal. More **obstacles remain**, though. **Nuclear projects are un-bankable.** The government may deploy mental health specialists to deal with the fears of Kudankulam protestors. But those **shrinks are unlikely to be able to allay the fears of financiers or nuclear equipment suppliers.** According to nuclear energy expert Peter Bradford, “**The most implacable enemy of nuclear power in the past 30 years has been the risk not to public health but to investors' wallets**. **No nuclear power project has ever bid successfully in a competitive energy market anywhere in the world**.” Mr. Bradford was member of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and chair of the New York and Maine electricity regulatory commissions. He teaches a course on nuclear power at the Vermont Law School. Second thoughts **Unpredictable financial implications associated with constructing, running, decommissioning plants and handling nuclear risks are causing a rethink on nuclear energy worldwide**. But these developments seem to slip by India without so much as causing a ripple. **Germany and Switzerland have decided to phase out nuclear power**, despite their substantial dependence on it. **Israel abandoned its year-old civilian nuclear programme after Fukushima**. **Belgium revived a pre-Fukushima decision to phase out nuclear power, using the Japanese disaster as a reminder.** **Italy and Kuwait gave up their nuclear debut by abandoning plans for 10 and four plants respectively. Mexico dropped plans for constructing 10 plants. All of Japan's 54 reactors are now closed, and plans for 14 new reactors killed.** The story of nuclear energy's unviability is told not just by the actions of naysayers, but also by the experiences of those — like **Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iran, Turkey, Vietnam and South Africa** — pursuing nuclear programmes. **All of them want the nuclear option, but have no idea how they will finance it. If the U.S. is Dr. Singh's inspiration, then the so-called nuclear renaissance's trajectory in that country gives even more cause for despair**. In 2009, the U.S. declared a nuclear revival with promises of more than 30 new reactors. Today, **most** of these **projects are doomed**. **Even candidates for federal loan guarantees** such as the South Texas project, and the Calvert Cliffs-3 project in Maryland, **have been mothballed**. **State governments** in the U.S. **do not seem to share the Federal Government's enthusiasm for nukes.** **Bills to reverse moratoria on nuclear plants in Minnesota, Kentucky and Wisconsin failed last year. In Missouri, North Carolina and Iowa, legislators defeated bills to charge electricity consumers in advance to finance reactors.** “At the time of Fukushima, only four countries — China, Russia, India and South Korea — were building more than two reactors. In these four nations, citizens pay for the new reactors the government chooses to build through direct subsidies or energy price hikes,” Bradford notes. **Finland was among the few that reiterated its commitment to nuclear power after the Fukushima disaster**. The 1,600 MW Olkiluoto nuclear plant uses French company Areva's technology. Areva's modular design was expected to make it faster and cheaper to build. **But 11 years later, the project is behind schedule and its $4.2 billion budget is up now by 50 per cent**. After Fukushima, Areva admits that the same plant would cost $8 billion. Even Areva's home project, in Flamanville, France, has suffered a $4 billion cost overrun and a four year delay. Indeed, **31 out of 45 reactors that were being constructed globally around 2009 were either delayed or did not have official dates for commissioning**, says a report for the German Government by consultant Mycle Schneider.

**Ext – Causes Prolif**

***Expanding nuclear leadership increases tech transfer and causes prolif -- the US won’t be able to control the process.***

**Keeny, ‘7**

[Spurgeon, former deputy director of the U.S Arms Control and Disarmament agency, 6-18, “PANEL II OF A COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS SYMPOSIUM; SUBJECT: CAN NUCLEAR ENERGY GO BEYOND THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005?” Lexis]  
MR. KEENY: I'd just like to add one point. Going back half a century, President **Eisenhower had a well-intentioned unfortunate initiative and that his "Atoms for Peace" proposal and it** was well- intentioned and **was based on a thesis that nuclear power would be so commonplace that it had to be accepted as a worldwide phenomenon, and by encouraging it on our terms we would have a better role**. **And I think that with based on a misunderstanding status for nuclear power at that time that led to** a different -- **a very foolish program of spreading nuclear reactors all over the world** to people who hadn't the remotest idea what to do with them -- how to use them. And -- (inaudible) -- last couple of decades trying to retrieve the remnants of that program, I think we should -- not totally analogous but should carefully examine what we do in introducing -- (off mike) -- because we're going to have to subsidize it. **These really poor undeveloping countries can't afford the capital costs of any kind of nuclear program. We should be very careful in thinking it through as to whether we can control the inevitable by doing things at our initiative that will** soon get out of -- (inaudible) -- **not necessarily stay under our control** because I think -- I sort of see that theme emerging again and themes that are strangely reminiscent of that -- (off mike) -- fast -- (inaudible).

**Ext – Inspection Turn**

***Preserving sufficient IAEA resources solves their internal link—means inspections prevent inevitable global nuclear energy expansion from causing prolif***

Adam M. **Scheinman 8**, Assistant deputy administrator, Nonproliferation and international security, DOE/NNSA, March 31, 2008, "A TIME FOR ACTION: THE U.S. NEXT GENERATION SAFEGUARDS INITIATIVE"

And so we know **the international community is capable of responding to proliferation challenges**. A question for international safeguards is whether we not only can respond, but, in the words of the IAEA, whether we can “stay ahead of the game.” That is, **can we take steps today, even with major nonproliferation problems in Iran and North Korea unresolved, to ensure that expanded nuclear energy use does not contribute to the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.**

**I believe the answer to that question is ‘yes.**’ But more than agreement to the principle, **we need the commitment to act on it**. **This means** political acceptance, but **also readiness to commit the necessary resources and attention that will** – in the words of President Bush – **“ensure that the IAEA has all the tools it needs to fulfill its essential mandate.” And that mandate, of course, is verification that nuclear material is not diverted from peaceful uses.**

As everyone here knows, nuclear power is poised for a major take-off. Some 34 new power reactors are under construction in 11 countries, with up to 60 additional reactors to be built in the next 15 years according to IAEA estimates. Some projections envision the global share of electricity from nuclear power plants increasing between 25 to 95 percent by 2030. And if nuclear power is to play a major role in sustainable development, growth will have to accelerate after that.

**Some may ask whether we’re opening Pandora’s box by promoting nuclear uses worldwide**. There is, for example, already a perception that, in certain regions of the world, **nations seek to acquire nuclear power more for strategic and political reasons than for economic or environmental ones. Others point to increasing risks of nuclear terrorism,** **to the damage done by the Khan network and what it may mean for future nuclear black marketeering, and to growing accumulations of plutonium-bearing spent fuel as additional concerns.**

**These are serious concerns that must be met with equally serious and comprehensive responses. Primary among them is an international safeguards system that is effective and strictly applied; that employs technologies and enjoys access sufficient to deter nuclear cheating; and that above all provides assurances that nations respect their international obligations.**

***Declining confidence in IAEA inspections causes breakout prolif***

Adam M. **Scheinman 8**, Assistant deputy administrator, Nonproliferation and international security, DOE/NNSA, March 31, 2008, "A TIME FOR ACTION: THE U.S. NEXT GENERATION SAFEGUARDS INITIATIVE"

**If states lacked confidence in the IAEA to verify peaceful activities, then they may seek to create options to break-out of the nonproliferation regime and pursue weapons themselves**. In this sense, **international safeguards help maintain a healthy distance between nuclear order and anarchy, and it is for this reason that the United States and the world community have such a major stake in the success of international safeguards.**

**A2: Space Exploration – Nuclear Bad**

***Nuclear fails***

**Burgess ‘11**

James Burgess studied Business Management at the University of Nottingham. He has worked in property development, chartered surveying, marketing, law, and accounts. He has also studied journalism and has written many articles over the years for a wide variety of sources.

James is the Deputy Editor of Oilprice.com

24 November 2011, Oil Price, Nuclear or Solar, Where Does the Future of Space Exploration Lie? <http://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/Nuclear-Or-Solar-Where-Does-The-Future-Of-Space-Exploration-Lie.html>, jj

**The major problem that NASA faces when pursuing this form of technology is that**, **as Dr**. John M. **Logsdon, a space expert at George Washington University, said** “**It’s really only possible with plutonium-238 to do what it’s intending to do,”** **and the United States stopped making Plutonium-238 in the 1980’s. Since then they have bought it from Russia, but now they no longer make it either.** A 2009 report by the National Academy of Sciences called for **restarting production**, but this **has not been done, mostly for cost reasons.** **A proposed alternative** to the Plutonium reliant nuclear power pack **is a Stirling Engine system which could produce five times as much electricity from each unit of heat** (NASA’s current method is only 6% efficient). Although the obstacle still to overcome in the development of this technology is that it has many moving parts and has not yet been adapted to space use. **Therefore, solar cells have always been used where possible**. Steven W. Squyres, a professor of astronomy at Cornell who is the chief scientist behind the Opportunity and Spirit rovers, said: **“You always use solar when you can; it’s simpler, cheaper, just easier to do.** You only use nuclear when you have to.’’ This thought was obviously prevalent when NASA launched their Jupiter-bound, Juno space shuttle, as that too relies upon solar cells; even though Jupiter is five times as far from the sun as Earth, and therefore the sun’s intensity is 96% lower.

***SPS fills in and is less dangerous --- a nuclear accident in space would shut down NASA forever and cause extinction***

**Grossman ‘11**

Karl Grossman, professor of journalism at the State University of New York/College of New York, is the author of the book, The Wrong Stuff: The Space’s Program’s Nuclear Threat to Our Planet(Common Courage Press) and wrote and presented the TV program Nukes In Space: The Nuclearization and Weaponization of the Heavens

July 2011, Counterpunch, What Could Truly End the Space Program <http://www.counterpunch.org/2011/07/22/what-could-truly-end-the-space-program/>, jj

What is NASA’s future now that Atlantis has landed and the shuttle program is over? **If NASA persists in using nuclear power in space, the agency’s future is threatened.** Between November 25 and December 15 NASA plans to launch for use on Mars a rover fueled with 10.6 pounds of plutonium, more plutonium than ever used on a rover. The mission has a huge cost: $2.5 billion. But **if there is an accident** before the rover is well on its way to Mars, **and plutonium is released on Earth, its cost stands to be yet more gargantuan.** NASA’s Final Environmental Impact Statement for what it calls its Mars Science Laboratory Mission says that if plutonium is released on Earth, **the cost could be as high as $1.5 billion to decontaminate each square mile of “mixed-use urban areas” impacted.** What‘s the probability of an accident releasing plutonium? The NASA document says “the probability of an accident with a release of plutonium” is 1-in-220 “overall.” If you knew your chance of not surviving an airplane flight?or just a drive in a car?was 1 in 220, would you take that trip? And **is this enormous risk necessary? In two weeks, there’ll be a NASA mission demonstrating a clear alternative to atomic energy in space: solar power.** On August 5, **NASA plans to launch a solar-powered space probe it’s named Juno to Jupiter. There’s no atomic energy involved**, although NASA for decades has insisted that nuclear power is necessary for space devices beyond the orbit of Mars. With Juno, NASA will be showing it had that wrong. “Juno will provide answers to critical science questions about Jupiter, as well as key information that will dramatically enhance present theories about the early formation of our own solar system,” says NASA on its website. “**In 2016, the spinning, solar-powered Juno spacecraft will reach Jupiter**.” It will be equipped with “instruments that can sense the hidden world beneath Jupiter’s colorful clouds” and make 33 passes of Jupiter. As notes Aviation Week and Space Technology: “**The unique spacecraft will set a record by running on solar power rather than nuclear radioisotope thermoelectric generators previously used to operate spacecraft that far from the Sun.”** The Mars rover to be launched, named Curiosity by NASA, will be equipped with these radioisotope thermoelectric generators using plutonium, the deadliest radioactive substance. Juno, a large craft?66-feet wide?will be powered by solar panels built by a Boeing subsidiary, Spectrolab. The panels can convert 28 percent of the sunlight that them to electricity. They’ll also produce heat to keep Juno’s instruments warm. This mission’s cost is $1.1 billion. In fact, Juno is not a wholly unique spacecraft. **In 2004, the *E*uropean *S*pace *A*gency launched a space probe called Rosetta that is also solar-powered**. Its mission is to orbit and land on a comet?beyond the orbit of Jupiter. **Moreover, there have been major developments in “solar sails” to propel spacecraft**. Last year, the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency launched its Ikaros spacecraft with solar sails taking it to Venus. In January, NASA itself launched its NanoSail-D spacecraft. The Planetary Society has been developing several spacecraft that will take advantage of photons emitted by the Sun to travel through the vacuum of space. ***At no point will Juno (or the other solar spacecrafts) be a threat to life on Earth***. This includes Juno posing no danger when in 2013 it makes a flyby of Earth. Such flybys making use of Earth’s gravity to increase a spacecraft’s velocity have constituted dangerous maneuvers when in recent years they’ve involved plutonium-powered space probes such as NASA’s Galileo and Cassini probes. Curiosity is a return to nuclear danger. NASA’s Final Environmental Impact statement admits that **a large swath of Earth could be impacted by plutonium in an accident involving it**. The document’s section on “Impacts of Radiological Releases” says “**the affected environment” could include** “the regional area near the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station and **the global area**.” “Launch area accidents would initially release material into the regional area, defined?to be within ?62 miles of the launch pad,” says the document. This is an area from Cape Canaveral west to Orlando. But “since some of the accidents result in the release of very fine particles less than a micron in diameter, a portion of such releases could be transported beyond?62 miles,” it goes on. These **particles could become “well-mixed in the troposphere**”?**the atmosphere five to nine miles high?“and have been assumed to potentially affect persons living within a latitude band from approximately 23-degrees north to 30-degrees north.” That’s a swath through the Caribbean, across North Africa and the Mideast, then India and China Hawaii and other Pacific islands, and Mexico and southern Texas. Then, as the rocket carrying Curiosity up gains altitude, the impacts of an accident in which plutonium is released would be even broader. The plutonium could affect people “anywhere between 28-degrees north and 28-degrees south latitude**,” says the NASA document**. That’s a band around the mid-section of the Earth including much of South America, Africa and Australia.** Dr. Helen Caldicott, president emeritus of Physicians for Social Responsibility, has long emphasized that **a pound of plutonium if uniformly distributed could hypothetically give a fatal dose of lung cancer to every person on Earth.** A pound, even 10.6 pounds, could never be that uniformly distributed, of course. But **an accident in which plutonium is released by a space device as tiny particles falling to Earth maximizes its lethality**. A millionth of a gram of plutonium can be a fatal dose. The pathway of greatest concern is the breathing in plutonium particle.. As the NASA Environmental Impact Statement puts it: “**Particles smaller than about 5 microns would be transported to and remain in the trachea, bronchi, or deep lung regions.” The plutonium particles “would continuously irradiate lung tissue.”** “A small fraction would be transported over time directly to the blood or to lymph nodes and then to the blood,” it continues. Once plutonium “has entered the blood via ingestion or inhalation, it would circulate and be deposited primarily in the liver and skeletal system.” Also, says the document, some of the plutonium would migrate to the testes or ovaries. The cost of decontamination of areas affected by the plutonium could be, according to the NASA statement, $267 million for each square mile of farmland, $478 million for each square mile of forests and $1.5 billion for each square mile of “mixed-use urban areas.” The NASA document lists “secondary social costs associated with the decontamination and mitigation activities” as: “Temporary or longer term relocation of residents; temporary or longer term loss of employment; destruction or quarantine of agricultural products including citrus crops; land use restrictions which could affect real estate values, tourism and recreational activities; restriction or bands on commercial fishing; and public health effects and medical care.” As to why the use of a plutonium-powered rover on Mars?considering that NASA has successfully used solar-powered rovers on Mars?the NASA Environmental Impact Statement says that a “solar-powered rover?would not be capable of operating over the full range of scientifically desirable landing site latitudes” on this mission. There’s more to it. For many decades there has been a marriage of nuclear power and space at NASA. The use of nuclear power on space missions has been heavily promoted by the U.S. Department of Energy and its predecessor agency, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and the many DOE (previously AEC) national laboratories including Los Alamos and Oak Ridge. This provides work for these government entities. Also, the manufacturers of nuclear-powered space devices?General Electric was a pioneers in this?have pushed their products. Further, NAS has sought to coordinate its activities with the U.S. military. The military for decades has planned for the deployment of nuclear-powered weapons in space. Personifying the NASA-military connection now is NASA Administrator Charles Bolden, a former NASA astronaut and Marine Corps major general. Appointed by President Barack Obama, he is a booster of radioisotope thermoelectric generators as well as rockets using nuclear power for propulsion. The U.S. has spent billions of dollars through the years on such rockets but none have ever taken off and the programs have all ended up cancelled largely out of concern about a nuclear-powered rocket blowing up on launch or falling back to Earth. **Accidents have happened in the U.S. space nuclear program. Of the 26 space missions that have used plutonium** which are listed in the NASA Environmental Impact Statement for the Mars Science Laboratory Mission, **three underwent accident causing**, admits the document. **The worst occurred in 1964** and involved, it notes, the SNAP-9A plutonium system aboard a satellite that failed to achieve orbit and dropped to Earth, disintegrating as it fell. **The 2.1 pounds of plutonium fuel dispersed widely over the Earth and Dr. John Gofman, professor of medical physics at the University of California at Berkeley, long linked this accident to an increase in global lung cancer**. **With the SNAP-9A accident, NASA switched to solar energy on satellites**. Now all satellites?and the International Space Station?are solar-powered. **There was a near-miss involving a nuclear disaster and a space shuttle.** The ill-fated Challenger’s next mission in 1986 was to loft a plutonium-powered space probe. The NASA Environmental Impact Statement includes comments from people and organizations some highly critical of a plutonium-powered Mars Science Laboratory Mission. Leah Karpen of Asheville, North Carolina says: “**Every expansion of plutonium research, development and transportation of this deadly material increases the risk of nuclear accident or theft.** In addition, plutonium production is expensive and diverts resources from the more important social needs of our society today, and in the future.” She urges NASA “to reconsider the use of nuclear” and go with solar instead. Jeremy Maxand, executive director of the Idaho-based Snake River Alliance, calls on NASA and the Department of Energy to “take this opportunity to move space exploration in a sustainable direction with regard to power. **Using solar rather than nuclear to power the Mars Science Laboratory Mission would keep the U.S. safe, advance energy technologies that are cleaner and more secure, be more fiscally responsible, and set a responsible example to other countries as they make decisions about their energy future.”** Ace Hoffman of Carlsbad, California speaks of “**today’s nuclear NASA**” and a “closed society of dangerous, closed-minded ‘scientists’ who **are hoodwinking the American public and who are guilty of premeditated random murder**.” He adds: “The media has a duty to learn the truth rather than parrot NASA’s blanketly-false assertions.” NASA, in response to the criticisms, repeatedly states in the document: “NASA and the DOE take very seriously the possibility that an action they take could potentially result in harm to humans or the environment. Therefore, both agencies maintain vigorous processes to reduce the potential for such events.” Involved in challenging the mission is the Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space (www.space4peace.org). Bruce Gagnon, coordinator of the Maine-based organization, says that “NASA sadly appears committed to maintaining their dangerous alliance with the nuclear industry. Both entities view space as a new market for the deadly plutonium fuel.” Says Gagnon: “The taxpayers are being asked once again to pay for nuclear missions that could endanger the life of all the people on the planet?Have we not learned anything from Chernobyl and Fukushima? We don’t need to be launching nukes into space. It’s not a gamble we can afford to take.” With the return of Atlantis and end of the shuttle program, there are concerns about this being the “end” of the U.S. space program. **An accident if NASA continues to insist on mixing nuclear power and atomic energy**?**a nuclear disaster overhead**?that, indeed, **could *end the space program***..
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***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.

***Restrictions must directly limited production***

**Ludwig von Mises Institute**, no date (XXIX. RESTRICTION OF PRODUCTION

The Nature of Restriction, accessed 8/16/12, http://mises.org/humanaction/chap29sec1.asp)

We shall deal in this chapter with those **measures** which **are directly and primarily intended to divert production** (in the broadest meaning of the word, including commerce and transportation) from the ways it would take in the unhampered market economy. Each authoritarian interference with business diverts production, of course, from the lines it would take if it were only directed by the demand of the consumers as manifested on the market. ***The characteristic mark of restrictive interference with production is that the diversion of production is*** not merely an unavoidable and unintentional secondary effect, but ***precisely what the authority wants to bring about***. Like any other act of intervention, such **restrictive measures** affect consumption also. But this again, in the case of the restrictive measures we are dealing with in this chapter, is not the primary end the authority aims at. The government wants to **interfere with production**. The fact that its measure influences the ways of consumption also is, from its point of view, either altogether contrary to its intentions or at least an unwelcome consequence with which it puts up because it is unavoidable and is considered as a minor evil when compared with the consequences of nonintervention.

***B. Violation – MLPs are different than incentives – lit makes a clear distinction***

Denise **Bode**, CEO, American Wind Energy Association, November 29, **2010**

Building a Domestic Wind Energy Industry, National Journal,

<http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/11/can-tax-incentives-save-renewa.php>, KEL

**With respect to *tax incentives*,** **wind energy needs a level playing field**. **Our competitors in the fossil fuels industries have tax incentives that are permanent**, some of them dating back nearly a century, ***as well as*** **access to Master Limited Partnerships** (MLP’s) ***that make it easy to use those incentives***. **By contrast, the wind incentive has been allowed to expire three times in the past 11 years**—each time bringing wind development to a standstill—and has been extended only for one- or two-year periods. In addition, wind projects are not eligible for MLP’s.

***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***

**Da**

***A) Romney will win --- best forecasts prove --- ignore polls***

**CU Boulder 10-4** (Updated election forecasting model still points to Romney win, University of Colorado study says <http://www.colorado.edu/news/releases/2012/10/04/updated-election-forecasting-model-still-points-romney-win-university>, jj)

**An update to an election forecasting model announced by two University of Colorado professors in August continues to project** that Mitt **Romney will win** the 2012 presidential election.

According to their updated analysis, **Romney is projected to receive 330 of the total 538 Electoral College votes**. President Barack **Obama is expected to receive 208 votes -- down five votes from their initial prediction -- and short of the 270 needed to win.**

**The new forecast by poli**tical **sci**ence **professors Kenneth Bickers of CU-Boulder and Michael Berry of CU Denver is based on more recent economic data** than their original Aug. 22 prediction. The model itself did not change.

“We continue to show that the **economic conditions favor Romney even though many polls show the president in the lead**,” Bickers said. “**Other published models point to the same result**, but they looked at the national popular vote, while we stress state-level economic data.”

While many election forecast models are based on the popular vote, **the model developed by Bickers and Berry is based on the Electoral College and is the only one of its type to include more than one state-level measure of economic conditions. They included economic data from all 50 states and the District of Columbia.**

Their original prediction model was one of 13 published in August in PS: Political Science & Politics, a peer-reviewed journal of the American Political Science Association. The journal has published collections of presidential election models every four years since 1996, but this year the models showed the widest split in outcomes, Berry said. Five predicted an Obama win, five forecast a Romney win, and three rated the 2012 race as a toss-up.

**The Bickers and Berry model includes both state and national unemployment figures as well as changes in real per capita income, among other factors.** **The new analysis includes unemployment rates from August rather than May, and changes in per capita income from the end of June rather than March**. It is the last update they will release before the election.

Of the 13 battleground states identified in the model, the only one to change in the update was New Mexico -- now seen as a narrow victory for Romney. **The model foresees Romney carrying New Mexico, North Carolina, Virginia, Iowa, New Hampshire, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Florida**. Obama is predicted to win Michigan and Nevada.

In Colorado, which Obama won in 2008, the model predicts that Romney will receive 53.3 percent of the vote to Obama’s 46.7 percent, with only the two major parties considered.

**While national polls continue to show the president in the lead, “the president seems to be reaching a ceiling at or below 50 percent in many of these states**,” Bickers said. “**Polls typically tighten up in October as people start paying attention and there are fewer undecided voters.”**

The state-by-state economic data used in their model have been available since 1980. When these data were applied retroactively to each election year, **the model correctly classifies all presidential election winners, including the two years when independent candidates ran strongly: 1980 and 1992.** **It also correctly estimates the outcome in 2000, when Al Gore won the popular vote but George W. Bush won the election through the Electoral College.**

***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.

**Da 2**

***Oil prices will stabilize at high levels now***

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.**

***Link timeframe is quick---the plan lowers the expected future demand for oil—causes oil prices to plummet***

**Feldstein, ‘8** - Martin Feldstein, 7/1/2008. Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan, is a professor at Harvard and a member of The Wall Street Journal's board of contributors. “We Can Lower Oil Prices Now,” The Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121486800837317581.html?mod=opinion\_main\_commentaries.

Unlike perishable agricultural products, oil can be stored in the ground. So **when will an owner of oil reduce production or increase inventories instead of selling his oil and converting the proceeds into investible cash?** **A simplified answer is that he will keep the oil in the ground if its price is expected to rise faster than the interest rate that could be earned on the money obtained from selling the oil.** The actual price of oil may rise faster or slower than is expected, but **the decision to sell (or hold) the oil depends on the expected price rise**. There are of course considerations of risk, and of the impact of price changes on long-term consumer behavior, that complicate the oil owner's decision – and therefore the behavior of prices. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (the OPEC cartel), with its strong pricing power, still plays a role. But **the fundamental insight is that owners of oil will adjust their production and inventories until the price of oil is expected to rise at the rate of interest, appropriately adjusted for risk.** **If the price of oil is expected to rise faster, they'll keep the oil in the ground. In contrast, if the price of oil is not expected to rise as fast as the rate of interest, the owners will extract more and invest the proceeds.** The relationship between future and current oil prices implies that **an expected change in the future price of oil will have an immediate impact on the current price of oil.** Thus, when oil producers concluded that the demand for oil in China and some other countries will grow more rapidly in future years than they had previously expected, they inferred that **the future price of oil would be higher than they had previously believed.** They responded by reducing supply and raising the spot price enough to bring the expected price rise back to its initial rate. Hence, **with no change in the current demand for oil, the expectation of a greater future demand and a higher future price caused the current price to rise.** Similarly, credible reports about the future decline of oil production in Russia and in Mexico implied a higher future global price of oil – and that also required an increase in the current oil price to maintain the initial expected rate of increase in the price of oil. Once this relation is understood, **it is easy to see how news stories, rumors and industry reports can cause substantial fluctuations in current prices – all without anything happening to current demand or supply.** Of course, **a rise in the spot price of oil triggered by a change in expectations about future prices will cause a decline in the current quantity of oil that consumers demand.** If current supply and demand were initially in balance, the OPEC countries and other oil producers would respond by reducing sales to bring supply into line with the temporary reduction in demand. **A rise in the expected future demand for oil thus causes a current decline in the amount of oil being supplied.** This is what happened as the Saudis and others cut supply in 2007. Now here is the good news. **Any policy that causes the expected future oil price to fall can cause the current price to fall**, or to rise less than it would otherwise do. In other words, **it is possible to bring down today's price of oil with policies that will have their physical impact on oil demand or supply only in the future.** For example, **increases in government subsidies to develop technology that will make future cars more efficient, or tighter standards that gradually improve the gas mileage** of the stock of cars, **would lower the future demand for oil and therefore the price of oil today**. Similarly, **increasing the expected future supply of oil would also reduce today's price. That fall in the current price would induce an immediate rise in oil consumption that would be matched by an increase in supply from the OPEC producers and others with some current excess capacity or available inventories**. **Any steps that can be taken now to increase the future supply of oil, or reduce the future demand for oil in the U.S. or elsewhere, can therefore lead both to lower prices and increased consumption today.**

***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.

**CP**

***The United States federal judiciary, using the next available test case, should issue a narrow ruling that: restrictions on master limited partnerships for the production of wind power are unconstitutional and cannot be enforced on the grounds that they infringe on state sovereignty.***

***The Supreme Court can remove restrictions --- solves the aff***

**Percival ‘97**

Robert V. Percival ++ Professor of Law, Robert Stanton Scholar & Director, Environmental Law Program, University of Maryland School of Law.

The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1997, 1997 U Chi Legal F 159

ARTICLE: Regulatory Evolution and the Future of Environmental Policy, Lexis, jj

These efforts are being undertaken at a time when **the federal judiciary has become less sympathetic toward environmental concerns**. Despite doctrines of deference to administrative agencies, **a judiciary more skeptical of regulation has struck down major environmental regulations by insisting that agencies provide greater and more specific evidentiary support for them**. **Important regulatory initiatives**, such as the EPA's effort to phase out all remaining uses of asbestos, **have been struck down on grounds that harken back to the common law's demand for detailed proof of particularized injury**. n59 Despite broad citizen suit provisions in the environmental laws, the courts are showing signs of reviving common-law doctrines of legal injury as a predicate for recognition of standing to sue. n60 **Judicial resuscitation of constitutional principles of state sovereignty now threatens to undermine national regulatory programs**. For the first time in more than 60 years, **the Supreme Court has struck down a federal regulatory program on the grounds that it exceeded the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce**. n61 While this decision did not occur in an environmental case, lower courts may now insist on more particularized showings of interstate impact to uphold federal environmental regulationsn62 and [\*171] **some courts have struck down such regulations for infringing on state sovereignty**. n63 By **requiring more detailed demonstrations of causal injury or effects on interstate commerce, these decisions make it more difficult to achieve the law's promise of preventative regulation**, resurrecting the very deficiencies of the commonlaw that public law sought to overcome.

**1NC Frontline to Wind Climate Advantages**

***And, GHG emissions key to preventing another Ice Age - replaces natural loss of CO2***

**RIDLEY 1-14-2012** – Matt BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, Are We Holding a New Ice Age at Bay?, Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204257504577150812451167538.html>

**The entire 10,000-year history of civilization has happened in an unusually warm interlude in the Earth's recent history. Over the past million years, it has been as warm as this or warmer for less than 10% of the time, during 11 brief** episodes known as **interglacial periods**. One theory holds that **agriculture and dense settlement were impossible in the volatile, generally dry and carbon-dioxide-starved climates of the ice age,** **when crop plants would have grown more slowly and unpredictably even in warmer regions**.¶ **This warm spell is already 11,600 years old,** and it must surely, in the normal course of things, come to an end. **In the early 1970s, after two decades of slight cooling, many scientists were convinced that the moment was at hand**. They were "increasingly apprehensive, for the weather aberrations they are studying may be the harbinger of another ice age," said Time in 1974. The "almost unanimous" view of meteorologists was that the cooling trend would "reduce agricultural productivity for the rest of the century," and "the resulting famines could be catastrophic," said Newsweek in 1975.¶ **Since then**, of course, **warmth has returned, probably driven at least partly by man-made carbon-dioxide emissions. A new paper, from universities in Cambridge, London and Florida, drew headlines last week for arguing that these emissions may avert the return of the ice age.** Less noticed was the fact that the authors, by analogy with a previous warm spell 780,000 years ago that's a "dead ringer" for our own, expect the next ice age to start "within about 1,500 years." Hardly the day after tomorrow.¶ Still, it's striking **that most interglacials begin with an abrupt warming, peak sharply, then begin a gradual descent into cooler conditions before plunging rather more rapidly toward the freezer**. The last interglacial—which occurred 135,000 to 115,000 years ago (named the Eemian period after a Dutch river near which the fossils of warmth-loving shell creatures of that age were found)—saw temperatures slide erratically downward by about two degrees Celsius between 127,000 and 120,000 years ago, before a sharper fall began.

***And, Impact is extinction—history proves.***

**Marsh 12** (Gerald Marsh is a retired physicist from the Argonne National Laboratory and a former consultant to the Department of Defense on strategic nuclear technology and policy in the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton Administration, 2012, The Coming of a New Ice Age, Winningreen, <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>)

Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the day, **the real danger facing humanity is not global warming, but more likely the coming of a new Ice Age.** ¶ **What we live in now is known as an interglacial, a relatively brief period between long ice ages.** Unfortunately for us, **most interglacial periods last only about ten thousand years, and that is how long it has been since the last Ice Age ended.** ¶ How much longer do we have before the ice begins to spread across the Earth’s surface? Less than a hundred years or several hundred? We simply don’t know.¶ **Even if all the temperature increase over the last century is attributable to human activities, the rise has been relatively modest one of a little over one degree Fahrenheit — an increase well within natural variations over the last few thousand years.** ¶ **While an enduring temperature rise of the same size over the next century would cause humanity to make some changes, it would undoubtedly be within our ability to adapt.** ¶ **Entering a new ice age, however, would be catastrophic for the continuation of modern civilization.** ¶ One has only to look at maps showing the extent of the great ice sheets during the last Ice Age to understand what a return to ice age conditions would mean. **Much of Europe and North-America were covered by thick ice, thousands of feet thick in many areas and the world as a whole was much colder.** ¶ **The last “little” Ice Age started as early as the 14th century when the Baltic Sea froze over followed by unseasonable cold, storms, and a rise in the level of the Caspian Sea. That was followed by the extinction of the Norse settlements in Greenland and the loss of grain cultivation in Iceland.** Harvests were even severely reduced in Scandinavia And this was a mere foreshadowing of the miseries to come.¶ **By the mid-17th century, glaciers in the Swiss Alps advanced, wiping out farms and entire villages. In England, the River Thames froze during the winter, and in 1780, New York Harbor froze.** Had this continued, history would have been very different. Luckily, the decrease in solar activity that caused the Little Ice Age ended and the result was the continued flowering of modern civilization.¶ **There were very few Ice Ages until about 2.75 million years ago when Earth’s climate entered an unusual period of instability.** Starting about a million years ago cycles of ice ages lasting about 100,000 years, separated by relatively short interglacial periods, like the one we are now living in became the rule. **Before the onset of the Ice Ages, and for most of the Earth’s history, it was far warmer than it is today.** ¶ Indeed, the Sun has been getting brighter over the whole history of the Earth and large land plants have flourished. Both of these had the effect of dropping carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere to the lowest level in Earth’s long history. ¶ Five hundred million years ago, carbon dioxide concentrations were over 13 times current levels; and not until about 20 million years ago did carbon dioxide levels dropped to a little less than twice what they are today. ¶ It is possible that moderately increased carbon dioxide concentrations could extend the current interglacial period. But we have not reached the level required yet, nor do we know the optimum level to reach. ¶ So, **rather than call for arbitrary limits on carbon dioxide emissions, perhaps the best thing the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the climatology community in general could do is spend their efforts on determining the optimal range of carbon dioxide needed to extend the current interglacial period indefinitely.** ¶ **NASA has predicted that the solar cycle peaking in 2022 could be one of the weakest in centuries and should cause a very significant cooling of Earth’s climate.** Will this be the trigger that initiates a new Ice Age?¶ We ought to carefully consider this possibility before we wipe out our current prosperity by spending trillions of dollars to combat a perceived global warming threat that may well prove to be only a will-o-the-wisp.

***3. China, India and Germany will fill in to lead global transition***

Stephen **Dolezalek &** Joshua **Freed** April **2012**, Dolezalek has been a leading global CleanTech investor for the last decade, in the two decades prior he was a leading Silicon Valley corporate attorney. Josh Freed is Vice President for the Third Way Clean Energy Program “American Kodak Moment”, Third Way: First Thinking, <http://www.thirdway.org/publications/514>, KEL

Meanwhile, **our economic rivals, like China, India, Brazil, and Germany, are investing in rapidly developing domestic clean tech sectors**.15 **American companies invented the modern wind turbine and solar panel**.16 **Today, wind and solar companies from other countries are beginning to build manufacturing plants here in the U.S., much as Japanese and Korean car firms like Toyota**, Honda, and Hyundai **did with auto assembly plants in the 1980s**. This marked a shift in the auto industry that helped accelerate the decline of American car companies.17 **What if the stakes are far higher with clean tech than they were with the auto sector?**

***4. Global transition to renewables now – massive tech and investment increases***

[**United Nations Environment Programme**](http://www.unep.org/) **(UNEP), 12**

(June 13, “UNEP says global transition to renewable energy accelerating,” <http://www.evwind.es/2012/06/13/unep-says-global-transition-to-renewable-energy-accelerating/>, d/a 7-31-12, ads)

**Record investments, technological advancement, supportive policies and increased political goodwill have powered a dramatic transition to cleaner sources of fuel in many countries globally**.¶ According to UNEP’s Global Renewables Status Report 2012 released on Monday, **investments in clean energy hit 257 billion U. S. dollars by** December 20**11**.¶ "***Renewable energy markets and policy frameworks have evolved rapidly in recent years.*** **Renewable energy sources have grown to supply an estimated 16-17 percent of global final energy consumption in** **2010**," said the report.¶ It was compiled by the UNEP and Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21st Century (REN21).¶ **The flagship report shed light on renewable energy market trends, investments and policy development globally by relying on updated data provided by a network of 400 researchers**.¶ Experts stressed that ***this report dovetails with global aspirations to accelerate the transition to cleaner and greener energy sources.****¶* "**There may be multiple reasons driving investments in renewables, from climate, energy security and the urgency to electrify rural and urban areas in the developing world as one pathway towards eradicating poverty**-**whatever the drivers the strong and sustained growth in renewable energy sector is a major factor that is assisting many economies towards a transition to a low carbon, resource efficient green economy**," UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner said.¶

***3. No Impact to warming***

**Goklany 2012** [Indur, Indur M. Goklany is a science and technology policy analyst for the United States Department of the Interior, where he holds the position of Assistant Director of Programs, Science and Technology Policy. He has represented the United States at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and during the negotiations that led to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. He was a rapporteur for the Resource Use and Management Subgroup of Working Group III of the IPCC First Assessment Report in 1990, Economic Development in Developing Countries: Advancing Human Well‐Being and the Capacity to Adapt to Global Warming, <http://books.google.com/books?id=vO2ppGUrkEgC&pg=PA1&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=4#v=onepage&q=157&f=false>] Awirth

Although the IPCC notes that **sustainable development “can reduce vulnerability to climate change**, and climate change could impede nations’ abilities to achieve sustainable development pathways” (IPCC 2007: 20), **many proponents of greenhouse gas controls** on the other hand, **dwell on the** latter (**downside**) aspect **of** economic **development while** generally **ignoring the upside** (e.g., Freeman and Guzman 2009). Here I will examine whether global warming hinders sustainable development or whether sustainable development makes it easier to cope with warming, and which effect, if any, is predominant? It is possible to answer these questions using results from the previously‐discussed Britishgovernment sponsored “Fast Track Assessments” (FTAs) of the global impacts of global warming (Parry et al. 2004; Arnell et al. 2002, 2004). The FTAs provide estimates of the contribution of global warming to the total populations‐at‐risk of malaria, hunger, and coastal flooding due to sea level rise for 2085. Goklany (2009a, 2009d), while recognizing that, realistically, 2085 is beyond the period that is reasonably foreseeable, converted these estimates of populations‐at‐ risk into mortality by comparing historical mortality estimates from the World Health Organization (for 1990, the base year) against FTA estimates of populations at‐ risk for that year. **The results indicate that under the IPCC’s warmest** (A1FI) **scenario**, which gives an increase in average global temperatures of 4°C between 1990 and 2085, **global warming would contribute no more than 13% of the total mortality from malaria,2 hunger and coastal flooding in 2085** (Goklany 2009a: 71). **The remaining 87% or more is due to non‐global warming related factors**. However, **had improvements in adaptive capacity been appropriately accounted for, the 87% contribution from the latter would have been much smaller, but then so would have the 13% share attributed to global warming** (probably by a like amount). **FTA results also indicate that:  By 2085, global warming *would reduce* the global population at risk of water shortages**, although some areas would see increases (Arnell 2004; see Goklany 2009a: 72–74).3 This finding is contrary to the erroneous impression conveyed by the IPCC’s AR4’s Work Group II Summary for Policy Makers (IPCC 2007) because that summary emphasizes the number of people that may experience an increase in water shortage but neglects to provide corresponding estimates for the number that would see a reduction in water shortage (Goklany 2007, 2009). However, the finding that the net population experiencing water shortage would be reduced is consistent with other studies of the global impact of global warming on water resources (Oki and Kanae 2006). Remarkably, this result is obtained despite the fact that Arnell (2004) does not allow for any adaptation and, consequently, advances in adaptive capacity that should logically occur under the IPCC scenarios!  **Partly due to increases in net primary productivity because of CO2 fertilization, the amount of habitat devoted to cropland would be halved by global warming under** the A1FI scenario, at least through 2100 (Goklany 2007b). Since diversion of habitat to cropland is perhaps the single largest threat to species and ecosystems (Goklany 1998; MEA 2005), **this means that global warming could actually reduce pressures on biodiversity** (Goklany 1998; 2005). Thus, at least through 2085–2100, GW may relieve some of the problems that some developing countries face currently (e.g., water shortage and habitat loss), while in other instances, **the contribution of GW to the overall problem** (e.g., cumulative mortality from malaria, hunger and coastal flooding) **would be substantially smaller than that of non‐GW related factors.** Notably, economic **development**, one of the fundamental drivers of GW, **would reduce mortality problems regardless of whether they are due to GW or non‐GW related factors**. Hence, ***lack of economic development would be a greater* problem than global warming**, at least through 2085–2100. This is consistent with Figure 7, which shows that notwithstanding global warming and despite egregiously overestimating the negative consequences of global warming, future net GDP per capita will be much higher than it is today under each scenario through at least 2200. Note that Figure 7 also shows that through 2200, notwithstanding global warming, net GDP per capita will be highest under the warmest scenario, and lowest under the poorest scenario (A2). **This suggests that if humanity has a choice of which development path it takes, it ought to strive to take the scenario that has the highest economic growth, whether or not that exacerbates global warming** (Goklany 2007c). The **additional** economic **development would** more than **offset the cost of *any warming***. No less important, it is far cheaper for the world to advance economic development than mitigate climate change by a meaningful amount (Goklany 2003, 2005, 2009d). **This is consistent with** the Tol et al. (2007) **analysis of various climate‐sensitive infectious diseases**. That analysis suggests that “[D]eaths will first increase, because of population growth and climate change, but then fall, because of development … As climate can only be changed with a substantial delay, development is the preferred strategy to reduce infectious diseases even if they are exacerbated by climate change. Development can … increase the capacity to cope with projected increases in infectious diseases over the medium to long term.” Thus, **it is most unlikely that under the IPCC’s warmest scenario, global warming will overwhelm economic development in developing countries**, notwithstanding the Stern Review’s upper bound damage estimates. Second, **economic development should be given priority over reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It would enable developing countries to cope not only with any negative impacts of climate change**, but more importantly, other larger problems that they will face (Goklany 2005, 2007b).

***1. Even significantly increased, wind causes a dent in emissions***

**Bryce 11** (Robert, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, “THE HIGH COST OF WIND ENERGY AS A CARBON-DIOXIDE REDUCTION METHOD”, <http://www.robertbryce.com/articles/390-the-high-cost-of-wind-energy-as-a-carbon-dioxide-reduction-method.html>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

How does that 825 million tons of carbon dioxide compare with global emissions? In 2010, global carbon-dioxide emissions totaled 33.1 billion tons.[30] Thus, **if the United States were somehow able to instantly increase its wind-generated electricity to 20 percent of total consumption, doing so might reduce global emissions by about 2.5 percent.** But **it is unlikely that global emissions will be the same in 2030 as they were in 2010.** **By 2030, the International Energy Agency (IEA) expects global emissions will total about 40.2 billion tons.[**31] Thus, **the 825 million tons that NREL claims might be reduced by achieving the “20 by ‘30” goal will result in a global reduction of just 2 percent**.[32]

***2. Warming Is Not Anthropogenic – Multiple Natural Processes Subsume Human Impacts***

**Bast and Taylor 11** – \*CEO of the Heartland Institute, author of Rebuilding America’s Schools (1990), Why We Spend Too Much on Health Care (1992) Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism (1994) Education & Capitalism (2003), Climate Change Reconsidered (2009), and The Patriot’s Toolbox (2010, rev. ed. 2011), \*\* managing editor of Environment & Climate News, Senior Fellow for The Heartland Institute, bachelors degree from Dartmouth College and law degree from the Syracuse University College of Law, (Joseph and James, “Global Warming: Not a Crisis,” The Heartland Institute, 8/2/11, http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis) //PC

Natural or Man-Made? **The** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change **(IPCC),** an agency of the United Nations, **claims the warming that has occurred since the mid-twentieth century “is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations**” (IPCC, 2007). Many climate scientists disagree with the IPCC on this key issue. As Idso and Singer wrote in 2009, **The IPCC does not apply generally accepted methodologies to determine what fraction of current warming is natural, or how much is caused by the rise in** greenhouse gases (**GHG**). **A comparison of “fingerprints” from best available observations with the results of state-of-the-art GHG models leads to the conclusion that the (human-caused) GHG contribution is minor. This fingerprint evidence, though available, was ignored by the IPCC. The IPCC continues to undervalue the overwhelming evidence that**, on decadal and century-long time scales, **the Sun and associated atmospheric cloud effects are responsible for much of past climate change. It is** therefore **highly likely that the Sun is also a major cause of twentieth-century warming, with anthropogenic GHG making only a minor contribution**. In addition, the IPCC ignores, or addresses imperfectly, other science issues that call for discussion and explanation (Idso and Singer, 2009). Scientists who study the issue say it is impossible to tell if the recent small warming trend is natural, a continuation of the planet’s recovery from the more recent “Little Ice Age,” or unnatural, the result of human greenhouse gas emissions. **Thousands of peer-reviewed articles point to natural sources of climate variability that could explain some or even all of the warming in the second half of the twentieth century** (Idso and Singer, 2009). S. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery **documented natural climate cycles of approximately 1,500 years going back hundreds of thousands of years** (Singer and Avery, second edition 2008). It is clear from climate records that **the Earth was warmer than it is now in recorded human history, before man-made greenhouse gas emissions could have been the cause.** We know enough about how the Earth’s climate works to know that biological and physical processes remove CO2 from the atmosphere at a faster rate when concentration levels are higher and release more heat into space when temperatures rise. These feedback factors and radiative forcings are poorly modeled or missing from the computer models that alarmists use to make their forecasts. The arguments are complex, but the debate over natural versus man-made climate change is unquestionably still ongoing. The more we learn, the less likely it becomes that human greenhouse gas emissions can explain more than a small amount of the climate change we witness.

***) No impact -Non-unique---we’re in a period of global cooling***

**Star Tribune, March 19th, 2011** (“Jason Lewis: Climate change is natural, and we don’t have the data to predict it” <http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentary/118270544.html>, jj)

All in the name of a [**global warming theory**](http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2007/gore-lecture_en.html) whose fundamental premise **looks weaker every day**. Not long ago, the [Heartland Institute asserted](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/blogs/gleick/detail?entry_id=82761) that **NASA had "been artificially inflating U.S. temperatures by 0.15 degrees Celsius since the year 2000" and as a result erroneously reported that readings over the last decade "were warmer than the 1930s, when in fact the opposite was true**." Eventually, agency officials did recant 1998 as the hottest on U.S. record when the data were reanalyzed showing the pre-greenhouse-gas era year of 1934 to be slightly warmer. **Across the globe, the last few winters have been exceedingly harsh. China has endured its most severe winter in 100 years, snow has fallen in Baghdad, and the United Kingdom just suffered through its coldest December since 1683,** according to figures from the Met Office. **British astrophysicist** David **Whitehouse says that not only have temperatures leveled off since 1998, they may actually be cooling once again**. Of course, that doesn't mean it's so. In 1975, Newsweek cited the scientific consensus (heard that one before?) about the coming danger of global cooling. Temperatures had been declining since 1940 even as carbon dioxide levels rose. Regardless of who is correct, we would do well to remember that cold is far more calamitous for mankind than the purported 0.6 degrees Celsius rise in the last century. Besides, as a growing number of "[climate skeptics](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8694544.stm)" point out, **atmospheric variables tend to mitigate or reverse the effects of greenhouse gases**. By not accurately accounting for the "negative feedback" of water vapor, ocean currents, ozone, aerosols, volcanoes and, most important, solar output (as well as the diminishing effects of accumulated greenhouse gases) global-warming proponents allow themselves to sanctimoniously pronounce that, all things being equal, a rise in CO2 will elicit a rise in temperature. Of course, all things are never equal. And therein lies the problem. **The global-warming hysteria is based on computer models, not empirical data, because the records simply don't go back far enough**. If Climategate taught us anything, it's that **these models are subject to human manipulation.** The famous "hockey stick" graph showing rapid warming in the 20th century was thoroughly debunked by Canadian researchers even before the purloined e-mails showed how global warming researchers were desperately trying to "hide the decline" in temperatures. Which is not to say that the Earth doesn't warm at times and ice doesn't melt in the Arctic. **The Earth warms** (see the Medieval Warm Period), **then it cools** (see the Little Ice Age), **and then it warms and** ... well, **you get the picture**.

**1NC Frontline to Employment Advantage**

***Manufacturing is strengthening- industry reports***

**Schmidt 10-4** [Mike Schmidt, Associate Editor, Manufacturing Business Technology 10-4-2012 Manufacturing Business Technology Magazine http://www.mbtmag.com/articles/2012/10/ism-manufacturing-back-track]

**The manufacturing sector is back on track** – at least for now.¶ **Economic activity in the manufacturing sector expanded in September** following three straight months of slight contraction, **according to the latest Manufacturing ISM Report on Business**.¶ The September PMI registered 51.5 percent, an increase of 1.9 percentage points when compared to the August reading of 49.6 percent. A reading above 50 percent indicates the manufacturing economy is expanding, while a reading below 50 percent means it is contracting. **To add to the good news, the overall economy grew for the 40th consecutive month**. A reading above 42.6 percent generally indicates expansion in this area.¶ It’s a welcome sight, but there are no assurances the recent turnaround will last.¶ “I’m not ready to get really excited about a new direction or significant change, but certainly we can hope it hangs in there” says Brad Holcomb, CPSM, CPSD, chair of the Institute for Supply Management Manufacturing Business Survey Committee.¶ “We’re making a good showing,” he adds, noting that **an uptick in new orders is driving growth in the manufacturing sector.¶** New Orders¶ ISM’s New Orders Index registered 52.3 percent in September, an increase of 5.2 percentage points when compared to the August reading of 47.1 percent. Prior to September, new orders had contracted for three consecutive months.¶ “**It’s a reflection of consumer activity and consumer confidence**, so I’m pleasantly surprised to see that 5.2 percentage-point bump” says Holcomb.¶ Employment¶ **There was also good news to be found in the most recent performance of the ISM Employment Index.** After registering 56.6 percent in June, the Index dropped to just 51.6 percent in August. However, it rebounded to 54.7 in September – the 36th straight month of growth in this area.¶ “When I see employment going up like that **it represents some additional optimism on the part of manufacturing to make sure there is** good, solid and **growing employment in advance of those new orders,**” says Holcomb.

***Most reliable surveys say job growth now***

**Lee 10-5** [Don Lee 10-5-2012 LA Times “Unemployment falls sharply to 7.8%, a 3 1/2-year low” http://www.latimes.com/business/money/la-fi-mo-economy-jobs-20121005,0,3919543.story]

**The nation's unemployment rate fell sharply** to 7.8% **in September**, the lowest level since January 2009 when President Obama took office. And **the government reported Friday that job growth this summer was stronger than previously estimated**.¶ Overall, **the economy added 114,000 jobs in September**, in line with analysts' expectations. **Job growth for August was revised up to 142,000** from 96,000; **and the new-jobs figure for July was bumped up to 181,000,** from 141,000 previously estimated.¶ Far more surprising was the dramatic 0.3 percentage point decline in the jobless rate, which all year long had been hovering between 8.1% and 8.3%. The big drop would seem out of sync with the modest job gains last month.¶ But the explanation is that the unemployment figure is based on a different survey than the one that produces the monthly payroll job tally. **The job growth numbers come from a survey of employers and is considered more reliable month to month**.

***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.**

***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.**

***3. Green jobs simply tradeoff with current jobs – no net gain***

**Wald, New York Times Staff Writer, 11**

(Matthew, October 25, “Solar Power Industry Falls Short of Hopes in Job Creation,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/26/business/energy-environment/in-terms-of-jobs-solar-energy-lacks-power.html?pagewanted=all>, d/a 7-31-12, ads)

But **the effect on jobs is murkier**. “**Net jobs” is seldom mentioned**. The object now is to put more man-hours into each megawatt-hour, after years of trying to slim down the system and minimize labor input.¶ And, economists point out, some of the ***work that renewable energy creates goes to people who already have jobs*** — **roofers who install the panels or truck drivers who move them around, or steel workers who make towers for new wind machines**.¶ **Some of the jobs could eventually go elsewhere.** Two years ago, Evergreen Solar, which got $58 million in aid from Massachusetts for a factory in Devens, said it would shift production to China instead. **Such a move would offer only a small advantage in labor costs — because those are small to begin with** — but American experts say the Chinese offer more lavish subsidies.¶ **The debate is part of a larger discussion of what constitutes a “green” job**. In October 2009, Congress gave the Bureau of Labor Statistics a special appropriation to count them.¶ The first problem was to define the term. The bureau, an independent statistical agency within the Labor Department, established two definitions: jobs in business that “produce goods or provide services that benefit the environment or conserve natural resources,” and “jobs in which the work performed makes the production processes of business establishments more environmentally friendly or use fewer natural resources.”¶ The bureau’s first report is due early next year. The problem is that **lots of jobs are partly green and partly not.** At a House Energy and Commerce subcommittee hearing on Sept. 22, members got into an extended argument with an Obama administration witness about whether the driver of a hybrid bus, with its lower pollution and lower fuel consumption, had a green job.¶ “Driving a bus is driving a bus, right?” said Connie Mack, Republican of Florida. Hilda Solis, the secretary of labor, said they were “green buses.” But aides later clarified that the bureau counted any bus driving job as green because it preserved natural resources.¶ None of this suggests that ***green is*** bad, just that it is ***not particularly job-heavy***. In December 2010, Susan Combs, the comptroller of Texas, reported that **school districts** in her state **were giving tax abatements to lure new jobs, but had to give $1.6 million for every** [**wind energy**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/w/wind_power/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) **job. Manufacturing jobs could be created for $166,000 each.**¶

***4. Green jobs are a farce – federal efforts and PTCs do nothing to solve***

**Glantz, New York Times Staff Writer, 11**

(Aaron, August 18, “Number of Green Jobs Fails to Live Up to Promises,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/19/us/19bcgreen.html?pagewanted=all>, d/a 7-31-12, ads)

In the Bay Area as in much of the country, **the green economy is not proving to be the job-creation engine that** many **politicians envisioned**. President **Obama** once **pledged to create five million green jobs over 10 years**. Gov. Jerry Brown promised 500,000 clean-technology jobs statewide by the end of the decade. But the **results** so far **suggest such numbers are a pipe dream**.¶ “I won’t say I’m not frustrated,” said Van Jones, an Oakland activist who served briefly as Mr. Obama’s green-jobs czar before resigning under fire after conservative critics said he had signed a petition accusing the Bush administration of deliberately allowing the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, a claim Mr. Jones denies.¶ A [study released in July by the non-partisan Brookings Institution](http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2011/0713_clean_economy.aspx) found ***clean-tech***nology ***jobs accounted for just 2 percent of employment nationwide*** and only slightly more — 2.2 percent — in Silicon Valley. **Rather than adding jobs**, the study found, **the sector** actually **lost 492 positions from 2003 to 2010 in** the South Bay, where the unemployment rate in June was 10.5 percent.¶ ***Federal and state efforts to stimulate creation of green jobs have*** largely ***failed***, **government records show**. **Two years after it was awarded $186 million in federal stimulus money to weatherize drafty homes, California has spent only a little over half that sum and has so far created the equivalent of just 538 full-time jobs in the last quarter**, according to the State Department of Community Services and Development.¶ The weatherization program was initially delayed for seven months while the federal Department of Labor determined prevailing wage standards for the industry. Even after that issue was resolved, the program never really caught on.¶ “Companies and public policy **officials** really **overestimated how much consumers care about energy efficiency**,” said Sheeraz Haji, chief executive of the Cleantech Group, a market research firm. “People care about their wallet and the comfort of their home, but it’s not a sexy thing.”¶ **Job training programs** intended for the clean economy have **also failed to generate big numbers**. **The Economic Development Department in California reports that $59 million in state, federal and private money dedicated to green jobs training and apprenticeship has led to only 719 job placements** — the equivalent of an $82,000 subsidy for each one.¶ “The demand’s just not there to take this to scale,” said Fred Lucero, project manager at [Richmond BUILD](http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=1243), which teaches students the basics of carpentry and electrical work in addition to specifically “green” trades like solar installation.¶ **Richmond BUILD has found jobs for 159 of the 221 students who have entered its clean-energy program — but only 35 graduates are employed with solar and energy efficiency companies**, with the balance doing more traditional building trades work. Mr. Lucero said he considered each placement a success because his primary mission was to steer residents of the city’s most violent neighborhoods away from a life of crime.

***5. Can’t create enough jobs – other sectors are more vital***

**Sullivan, Reuters Staff Writer, 12**

(Andy, April 13, “Analysis: Obama's "green jobs" have been slow to sprout,” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/13/us-usa-campaign-green-idUSBRE83C08D20120413>, d/a 7-31-12, ads)

**The effort has been complicated by confusion over what** exactly **constitutes a green job**.¶ In March, the Labor Department estimated there were 3.1 million green jobs in the United States as of 2010, using a broad definition that included everything from nuclear power-plant workers to regulators, lobbyists and park rangers.¶ The Recovery Act used a narrower definition, focusing on wind, solar and other renewable-energy industries and energy-efficiency efforts aimed at reducing consumption.¶ Using a definition similar to the Labor Department's, **the Brookings Institution estimated that the Las Vegas region that includes the vast solar fields** sprouting around Boulder City **supported 9,797 "clean jobs**" in 2010, accounting for 1.2 percent of the region's employment.¶ Local **officials don't expect that figure to grow much.**¶ **"Will it add a significant number of jobs**, enough **to make a** real **dent in** our **unemployment? No, I don't see that happening,"** **said** Darren **Divine, vice president for academics at the College of Southern Nevada**.¶ **The fields of healthcare, education and technology are likely to provide the best employment prospects in the years to come,** he said.

## 2nc

### 2nc Impact Overview

***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.**

**2nc Impact Wall**

***Romney solves wind MLPs***

**Lane 12** (Jim Lane, By Biofuels Digest | Thu, 16 August 2012, Oil Price, Determining Mitt Romney's Position on Biofuels, <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Biofuels/Determining-Mitt-Romneys-Position-on-Biofuels.html>, jj)

Our surmise? **The Romney view is that states should take up the leading role in fostering commercialization** through public/private partnerships, to the extent that government should take a role – based on supporting those technologies that best match up with their resources. The bottom line? For advanced biofuels, we would expect far more emphasis on role of the states in fostering technology commercialization, continued commitment on basic research; and, continued support of international efforts like the Global Bioenergy Partnership and bilateral MOUs on energy cooperation (such as the US-Australia agreement). Mandates? That will entirely depend on the composition of the next Congress, but **we would expect to see an Administration that supported** a reforecast of RFS2, **a wind-down of tax credits at the federal level, but support for private sector instruments such as expanding Master Limited Partnerships to advanced energy technologies.**

***Romney averts economic collapse***

**Weisenthal ‘12**

Joe Weisenthal, Prior to joining Business Insider in October 2008, Joe was a correspondent for paidContent.org, as well as the Opening Bell editor at Dealbreaker.com. He previously was a writer and analyst for Techdirt.com, and before that worked as an analyst for money management firm Prentiss Smith & Co. He got started writing with his own infrequently updated blog TheStalwart.com. A graduate of The University of Texas at Austin, Joe's interests include Chinese food, chess and poker. He currently has the title of Deputy Editor.

May 12, 2012, Business Insider, It's More Clear Than Ever That If Romney Loses, The Economy Is Going To Implode <http://www.businessinsider.com/only-mitt-romney-can-stave-off-a-new-debt-ceiling-fiasco-2012-5>, jj

It's More Clear Than Ever That ***If Romney Loses, The Economy Is Going To Implode*** Back in April we made the argument that **a** Mitt **Romney win would be better for the economy**, based on fairly simple logic: **A** Mitt **Romney victory would see higher government deficits, which is just what this struggling economy needs right now to regain full health. If Obama wins, there's a good chance that we'll fly off the fiscal cliff, as the *political gridlock* will see spending cuts kick in, and perhaps even higher taxes. If Romney wins, not only will taxes stay low, Republicans will drop their opposition to government spending and deficits. That's because parties in power always support higher deficits and spending. It's just what they do. We'd love to hear someone say with a straight face that Republicans, if given full power, would seriously stick to their principles of limiting government. Opposing deficits is strictly the purview of the opposition party. So the Keynesian choice is Romney.** And as Matt Yglesias makes clear in his latest column for Slate, **this choice is actually even more urgent.** That's because **House Republicans voted this week to renege on the debt ceiling deal** made last summer. Remember as part of the deal that was made, starting in 2012 there are going to be cuts to domestic spending and military spending. But **Republicans have voted to remove the military cuts, and put the entire burden on domestic spending.** Those changes won't actually happen, but it's a show of extraordinarily bad faith that after that long fight that brought the country close to the brink of disaster last summer that Republicans are already trying to unwind the deal. **What this means is that good faith fights over the next debt ceiling question** (**which will come up** late this year or **early next year) will be *100%* impossible**. As Yglesias says in the subtitle of his column: **House Republicans just reneged on the debt-ceiling deal, making a default in 2013 almost inevitable.** Says Yglesias: **If** Mitt **Romney wins that may not be a problem, as he and congressional Republicans could just quickly lift the ceiling.** ***But if Obama’s still in office, we’re looking at a potential disaster.*** **Having won concessions by using the debt ceiling as leverage in the past, the GOP isn’t going to quietly go back to the old complain-and-agree approach**. But **there’s no way Democrats can bargain with a party that’s so eager to wriggle out of the terms of deals.** So again, ***it's clear that if you want higher spending and a prevention of cataclysmic self-inflicted wounds out of Washington, Romney is the choice.***

***Obama’s weakness causes global nuclear war***

**Ben Coes** 9-30-**11**, a former speechwriter in the George H.W. Bush administration, & author, “The disease of a weak president”, The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2011/09/30/the-disease-of-a-weak-president/

**The disease of a weak president** usually begins with the Achilles’ heel all politicians are born with — the desire to be popular. It **leads to pandering to different audiences, people and countries and creates a sloppy, incoherent set of policies. Ironically, it ultimately results in that very politician losing the trust and respect of friends and foes alike.** In the case of Israel, those of us who are strong supporters can at least take comfort in the knowledge that Tel Aviv will do whatever is necessary to protect itself from potential threats from its unfriendly neighbors. While it would be preferable for the Israelis to be able to count on the United States, in both word and deed, the fact is right now they stand alone. Obama and his foreign policy team have undercut the Israelis in a multitude of ways. Despite this, I wouldn’t bet against the soldiers of Shin Bet, Shayetet 13 and the Israeli Defense Forces. But **Obama’s weakness could** — in other places — **have implications** far, far worse than anything that might ultimately occur in Israel. **The triangular plot of land that connects Pakistan, India and China is held together with much more fragility and is built upon a truly foreboding foundation of religious hatreds, radicalism, resource envy and nuclear weapons.** If you can only worry about preventing one foreign policy disaster, worry about this one. Here are a few unsettling facts to think about: First, **Pakistan and India have fought three wars** since the British de-colonized and left the region in 1947. All three wars occurred before the two countries had nuclear weapons. **Both countries now possess hundreds of nuclear weapons, enough to wipe each other off the map many times over.** Second, Pakistan is 97% Muslim. It is a question of when — not if — Pakistan elects a radical Islamist in the mold of Ayatollah Khomeini as its president. Make no mistake, it will happen, and when it does the world will have a far greater concern than Ali Khamenei or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a single nuclear device. Third, China sits at the northern border of both India and Pakistan. China is strategically aligned with Pakistan. Most concerning, **China covets India’s natural resources. Over the years, it has slowly inched its way into the northern tier of India-controlled Kashmir Territory**, appropriating land and resources and drawing little notice from the outside world. In my book, Coup D’Etat, I consider this tinderbox of colliding forces in Pakistan, India and China as a thriller writer. But thriller writers have the luxury of solving problems by imagining solutions on the page. In my book, when Pakistan elects a radical Islamist who then starts a war with India and introduces nuclear weapons to the theater, America steps in and removes the Pakistani leader through a coup d’état. I wish it was that simple. The more complicated and difficult truth is that we, as Americans, must take sides. We must be willing to be unpopular in certain places. Most important, we must be ready and willing to threaten our military might on behalf of our allies. And our allies are Israel and India. **There are many threats out there — Islamic radicalism, Chinese technology espionage, global debt and half a dozen other things** that smarter people than me are no doubt worrying about. **But the single greatest threat to America is none of these. The single greatest threat facing America and our allies is a weak U.S. president. It doesn’t have to be this way**. President Obama could — if he chose — develop a backbone and lead. Alternatively, **America could elect a new president**. It has to be one or the other. The status quo is simply not an option.

**2nc uq**

***The debate reset the election --- Romney has new life***

**Miller 10-4** (Zeke Miller, BuzzFeed Staff, 10-4, 5 Things Mitt Romney's Debate Win Means <http://www.buzzfeed.com/zekejmiller/5-things-mitt-romneys-debate-win-means>, jj)

**After three weeks of the worst press of his presidential bid**, Mitt **Romney finally has a clean win, a kind of *reset* he is immediately using** — **and from which to launch a new campaign offensive**. **Romney** has taped a series of direct-to-camera ads, and **is restarting his campaign** schedule on Thursday after spending the better part of the last week in debate prep and fundraising.

***Romney will decisively win --- key indicators go neg***

Only 42% are certain to vote for Obama

Wisconsin recall election and 2010 midterms prove conservative momentum against Obama

Job approval ratings too low

Undecideds will break for Romney

Most objective polls show Romney winning battleground states

Economic fundamentals indicate Romney win

**Hart 10-1** (Ben Hart | 10/1/12, Conservative HQ, Nine Reasons Why Romney Will Win the Election by At Least Four Percent — Despite His Inept Campaign <http://www.conservativehq.com/article/10065-nine-reasons-why-romney-will-win-election-least-four-percent-%E2%80%94-despite-his-inept-campa>, jj)

**Mitt Romney is running an utterly inept campaign**. His ads are just dreadful. And he really has no message the voters can discern. The Romney campaign so far has been pathetic — worse than McCain’s in 2008. In the Real Clear Politics list of polls, every poll now has Mitt Romney running behind. **Ignore all this. Mitt Romney will win this election**. And it won’t be that close. Here are nine reasons reasons why.

***REASON #1*: Just 42 percent say they are “certain” to vote for Obama**. This is in the most recent tracking poll by Scott Rasmussen, which shows Obama leading Romney by 2 points among “likely voters.” **The lack of enthusiasm among Obama’s supporters will get swamped by the rabid enthusiasm of the anti-Obama vote.**

***REASON #2*: Scott Walker’s 7 point margin of victory** in June in heavily Blue Wisconsin. The polls in the Real Clear Politics average of polls understated Scott Walker’s strength in the Wisconsin recall election in June by a bit more than four percent. If there is a similar four-point polling error now (which is likely), **Romney is now running tied with or slightly ahead of Obama.** But the GOP voter base is far more energized to defeat Obama than it was to defeat Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett in the Wisconsin recall election in June. The energy in Wisconsin was on the Democrat side — aimed at defeating Walker. **The Dems and the Big Labor Unions spent about $40 MILLION to defeat Walker in a heavily blue state, but lost.** We’re likely to see that the polls now are greatly underestimating the seething anger out there bubbling under the surface over what Obama is doing to America.

***REASON # 3*: Obama’s job approval numbers are exactly what they were in early October of 2010 – just prior to the sweeping GOP election victories in the 2010 mid-term elections. On October 4, 2010, Obama’s job approval rating stood at 48 percent**, with 51 percent disapproving of his job performance — **identical to Obama’s job approval numbers now. The 2010 mid-term elections four weeks later produced the biggest landslide in favor of the GOP in a century.** We’re likely to see something very similar in November 6th. **The polls were overstating Obama’s strength then, and are now.** Furthermore, Team Romney, if they have any competence at all, should be able to bring Obama’s job approval rating down to 45 or 43 percent with some decent ads cataloguing Obama’s disastrous record and pathological lying. But even if Team Romney is incapable of creating any decent ads, there will come a point when even low-information undecided voters will begin to take stock of their own personal situation. **Look for Obama’s job approval numbers to start dropping precipitously over the next few weeks as the electorate** (especially those less-engaged undecided voters) **start to focus on what Obama has done to America.**

***REASON #4*: The undecided vote tends to break 80 percent against the incumbent in the final week before Election Day.** If Scott Rasmussen’s poll is correct that just 42 percent of likely voters are “certain” to vote for Obama (while 43 percent of likely voters are “certain” to vote for Romney) this leaves 15 percent of likely voters who are persuadable — in other words, not sold on Obama. Many of these **soft Obama “leaners” won’t vote.** Obama’s given his soft “leaners” no reason to make the effort to vote.

***REASON #5*: Throw out the media polls. The Gallup poll that shows Obama up by six is of registered voters, not likely voters. So this poll is useless** as any kind of gauge on what’s likely to happen in the election. For the media polls to be right (that purport to be of “likely voters”), we would need to see Democrats turn out equal of greater than what we saw in the 2008 election. **In 2008, the Democrats had a +7 percent turnout advantage over the GOP. If that happens, Obama will win. But that won’t happen.** In 2004, the two parties were dead even on turnout. That’s where it’s likely to be this year — at best for Democrats. But the media polls are assuming an 8-9 percent turnout advantage for Democrats. **The actual turnout on Election Day will be about equal between Republicans and Democrats.** Every survey (including the skewed media surveys) shows Romney leading Obama among Independents. Here’s what the media polls look like if you unskew the results by assuming an even turnout among Republicans and Democrats. **Rasmussen currently has the electorate favoring the GOP by about 2 percent. The Real Clear Politics average of polls also shows a slight edge for the GOP on the generic ballot.** So with a deflated Democrat voter base and a super-charged GOP voter base, projecting and even turnout between Democrats and Republicans is being generous to the Democrats. But the media projects an +8 to +9 turnout advantage in favor of the Dems — greater than the +7 percent Dem turnout advantage in 2008. You decide if that sounds plausible. It’s virtually impossible for either candidate to win without carrying the Independent vote. So, to know where the election really stands, track what all these polls are saying about what the Independents are thinking. Romney’s holding an average 10 percent advantage among Independents even in the skewed media-sponsored polls. There are other indicators that the media-sponsored polls are wrong. Both Romney and Obama are spending a lot of time and money campaigning hard in Pennsylvania. But this should be a blowout state for Obama if the media polling is right. **Polls show Romney up by 11 percent in Indiana — a state Obama won. Other polls show it much tighter than expected in states like New Mexico and Nevada**, which have heavy Hispanic populations (who presumably heavily favor Obama). **Arizona, once thought to be a tight battleground state** (also with a heavy Hispanic population), **is looking like a blowout for Romney**, with Romney now at +10 over Obama. **All these are indicators that the national media-sponsored polls are way off — vastly overestimating Obama’s strength.** By the way, I’m not as convinced that Hispanics will vote as overwhelmingly for Obama as the polls now suggest. The Hispanic cable channel Univision has produced an explosive documentary on the real story behind Obama’s “Fast & Furious” gun-running scandal that has resulted in the deaths of hundreds of innocent Mexicans that isn’t sitting well with Mexico or with many Hispanic Americans. And most Hispanics are not in sync with Obama’s extremely liberal social issue positions – i.e. gay marriage, gays in the military, taxpayer-funded-abortion-on-demand, Obama’s assault on the Catholic Church, etc.

***REASON #6*: Obama’s dismal economic record.** Barack Obama has added $6 TRILLION to the national debt. What has all this deficit spending bought us? Zero net-new jobs. **The economy is now growing at an anemic 1.3% annual rate**. The economic growth rate has dropped each of the last three quarters. The economy is now teetering on the brink of another recession. **The real unemployment rate is 11.2 percent** if you use the size of the labor force as it stood on Obama’s first day as President. If the labor participation rate was sitting at the 30 year average of 65.8 percent, the unemployment rate now would actually be 11.7 percent. Since the Obama Administration declared the end of the recession in June of 2009, 58 percent of the jobs created have been low income jobs. (Source: National Employment Law Center) The percentage of working age Americans with a job has been below 59 percent for 35 months in a row. Since Obama became president, the number of Americans living in poverty has risen by 6.4 million. The cost of a gallon of regular gasoline cost $1.86 on average in America on Obama’s first day as President. Right now, that same gallon of gas costs $3.75 on average. The number of Americans on food stamps has grown from 31.9 million when Barack Obama entered the White House to 46.7 million today. Since January of 2009, the median household has lost $4,019 in income per year. Median household income has fallen every year of the Obama Administration. America now ranks #18 in the world on the World Index of Economic Freedom. Countries that are the most free economically are the world’s most prosperous countries. The U.S. now ranks behind most of the industrialized world in terms of economic freedom. We have thus relinquished the big advantage America had over the rest of the world that made the United States the most prosperous nation in human history. Under Obama, America has fallen from the #1 ranked country for economic competitiveness to #7, according to the World Economic Forum. This is why our standard of living is falling like a lead balloon. All Team Romney has to do is catalogue these facts. The fact that Romney has not done so yet is mystifying. James Carville helped focus Bill Clinton’s winning 1992 campaign against George H. W. Bush by telling Clinton: “It’s the economy, stupid!” Carville was trying to get an undisciplined candidate to focus on the most important issue to voters. It’s still “The economy, stupid” — only more so. The economy is a whole lot worse today than it was in 1992. Actually, the economy then was wonderful compared to now.

***REASON #7*: Obamacare is as unpopular is ever. Polls tracking support vs opposition to Obamacare have remained consistent** over the last two-and-a-half years — 53 percent favoring repeal, 42 percent opposing repeal. If anything, opposition to Obamacare has hardened since the law’s passage. Though it sure would help if Romney would sometimes talk about the coming catatsrophe that is Obamacare. For some reason, Romney inexplicably is ignoring the topic. We now learn that Obamacare . . . contains 21 new taxes and tax increases that will cost the average American family $4,791 in additional taxes and penalties per year. requires the hiring of 16,000 new IRS agents to enforce Obamacare. is now in the process of building 159 brand new government agencies to administer Obamacare. REASON #8: Obama’s foreign policy record is starting to look even worse than Jimmy Carter’s. The Middle East is now on fire. The U.S. Ambassador to Libya, Chris Stevens, and three others were brutally murdered by al Qaeda. Ambassador Stevens was sodomized repeatedly and brutally tortured before he was savagely executed and dragged through the streets. For some reason, the U.S. Embassy in Libya had absolutely no security — zero. Now even the mainstream media is having a tough time completely ignoring Obama’s lies about the al Qaeda attack on the U.S. Embassy. We now learn that the Obama White House knew from the beginning that the attack on the U.S. Embassy on September 11th was executed by al Qaeda, had been planned long in advance, and had nothing to do with that silly anti-Islam YouTube video. But the Obama Administration continued to insist that the attack was provoked by the video anyway — and continues to blame the video, even now. Why? Because the Obama White House wants to divert attention from the complete failure that is Obama’s Middle East policy. Total incompetence plus pathological lying exposed for all to see is a toxic political mix for any President. Obama calls the attack on the U.S. Embassy in Libya and execution of Ambassador Chris Stevens as a ”bump in the road.” Bump in the road to what? You can just imagine what Chris Stevens’ family thinks of that assessment. As if that’s not enough . . . Egypt, once a strong U.S. ally, is now under the control of the rabidly anti-American Muslim Brotherhood — thanks to Obama’s decision to back the overthrow of Hosni Mubarak. Obama is doing absolutely nothing about Iran’s march toward getting a nuclear bomb. Meanwhile, Obama has gone out of his way to alienate America’s two closest allies — Great Britain and Israel. REASON #9: Romney will perform well enough in the debates. Romney showed himself to be an able debater during the primaries. He destroyed Newt in the debate just before the Florida GOP primary. He also destroyed Rick Perry, ending Perry’s hapless campaign. So look for Romney to show well in the debates. He doesn’t even have to win the debate. Obama, no doubt, will perform well also. Romney just needs to show he’s capable. Ronald Reagan in 1980 pulled away from Jimmy Carter after the debate because Reagan showed he wasn’t the Mad Bomber Carter was trying to portray Reagan as. Reagan showed in his debate with Carter he was capable of leading the country. He did not have to win the debate. Carter’s record was so bad, all Reagan had to do was show he wasn’t some kind of extremist and that he belonged on the stage with Carter. And that’s about all Romney has to do . . . because Obama’s record is such an obvious disaster on every front. Once Romney succeeds at that (not throwing up on himself, and looking presentable) all of Obama’s attack ads will fall flat because Obama’s ads will not resemble the Romney voters saw in the debates. Remember, only 42 percent say they are “certain” to vote for Obama. So that’s 58 percent who, frankly, would prefer someone else, if that someone else looks plausible. Romney’s mission for the debates: Look plausible. He will. Presidential races rarely turn on debate performance anyway. **This race will be won by Romney and lost by Obama based on the underlying fundamentals.**

***Debate was a game changer --- Romney’s within striking distance and bad jobs numbers will give him momentum***

**Sink 10-4** (Justin Sink - 10/04/12, The Hill, Romney campaign exudes confidence, 'believes he can win', <http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/260357-romney-campaign-exudes-confidence-following-debate-deemed-success>, jj)

The Romney campaign sought to capitalize on what **it** hopes **will be a game-changing event**, announcing a major foreign policy address next week and signaling it would hit Obama hard if a Friday jobs report is disappointing. GOP strategists said **September’s jobs report as another opportunity for Romney to drive home his message that Obama’s policies have been bad for the economy**. **The report is expected to show the economy added 115,000 jobs, not enough to alter the 8.1 percent unemployment rate**. Assuming that’s the case, **Romney is ready to pounce, arguing as he did Wednesday night that “trickle-down government” was responsible for the stagnation.** In anticipation of the report, Romney’s campaign released a new swing-state ad Thursday that shows the candidate speaking directly to the camera about his plan to create 12 million new jobs. Elsewhere, Republicans crowed that **their candidate** had **shifted the race’s momentum and had a chance to defeat Obama on Election Day.** “**Romney really breathed new life into his campaign**, that’s for sure — it's too bad we didn't see this Romney sooner because he could have been leading in the polls,” said Republican strategist Ford O'Connell. “**This was the Massachusetts moderate that Democrats feared, and he showed that he was a principled but practical conservative willing to reach across party lines.”** Republicans hope that **the candidate's new mojo will help rally support among their conservative base**. Romney spokeswoman Andrea Saul said Thursday **there was already evidence that supporters were excited**. She said in a message on Twitter that **he had received more than two online donations every second in the hours after the debate.** Strategists noted that ***polls show Romney in striking distance, and they expect the margin to close because of the debate.*** In an NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll release Wednesday, **Romney trailed the president by just three percentage points among likely voters, and was within the margin of error in Florida and Virginia. Romney is looking to aggressively target those two states in the coming days**, with rallies in Florida over the weekend bookended by his post-debate rally in Virginia on Friday night and the foreign policy address Monday at the Virginia Military Institute. Romney’s campaign promises that speech will challenge Obama aggressively. The GOP nominee will attack the president for “equivocation” and “weakness,” and will criticize White House handling of the terrorist attack on the U.S. consulate in Libya. “He will offer a stark contrast between his vision for a strong foreign policy and the failed record of President Obama,” said campaign spokeswoman Amanda Henneberg. Romney still faces a struggle to defeat Obama, according to polls. The president held an eight-point lead headed into debate night in the pivotal state of Ohio, which every Republican president has needed to secure the White House. And in all but three of the elections since the first televised presidential debate in 1960, the man entering the first debate with a lead held on for victory. Nate Silver, the polling analyst for the New York Times, also found that challengers typically earn a bounce from the first debate — but averaged just a net one and a half point bounce. But Republicans say they are hopeful **the success at the debate can turn the race the way Ronald Reagan used a debate victory over President Jimmy Carter in 1980. That debate was seen as helping to lift Reagan to a huge win on Election Day.**

***Polls prove Romney win --- he’s overcome the likeability gap and seen as better on the core issues***

**Sullivan 10-4** (Andy Sullivan, Oct 4, 2012, Reuters, Romney gains ground on Obama after strong debate

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/04/us-usa-campaign-poll-idUSBRE8931E420121004>, jj)

(Reuters) - Republican presidential challenger Mitt **Romney gained ground on** Democratic President Barack **Obama after a strong performance** in their first debate heading into the November 6 election, according to a Reuters/Ipsos poll taken after their prime-time face-off. **Romney is now viewed positively by 51 percent of voters, the first time he has enjoyed a net positive in the U.S. presidential race**, the poll found. Obama's favorability rating remained unchanged at 56 percent, according to the poll. **Romney moved ahead of the president on several core issues** after Wednesday's debate, **which was widely seen as a victory for the Republican candidate. Voters now see Romney as a better bet to boost the economy, spur job creation and manage the budget deficit, the poll found. He narrowed Obama's advantage on taxes, the Social Security retirement program and the Medicare health insurance program for the elderly and disabled. Romney's strong performance could make the race more competitive**, Ipsos pollster Cliff Young said. "If he has more debates like this, is able to push through his message and target undecideds, we might see movement in voting intention, but he needs a lot more of this," Young said. Obama and Romney have two more debates before the election. The poll found that **Obama's** 7 percentage point **advantage over Romney had narrowed** to a lead of 5 percentage points, 48 percent to 43 percent. The online poll surveyed 536 registered voters on Wednesday and Thursday after the debate. It has a credibility interval of 4.8 percentage points. A truly accurate reading on the debate's impact on the race will not be possible for several days, Young said. That is because the poll drew on a smaller pool of voters, taken over a shorter period of time, than the Reuters/Ipsos daily tracking poll that measures the prospects of each candidate. Romney has trailed Obama in opinion polls since early September and had faced rising criticism from within his own party after a series of campaign missteps. A secretly recorded video released last month showed Romney at a private fundraiser denigrating 47 percent of Americans as government-dependent victims who pay no taxes and would back Obama "no matter what." That followed Romney's widely criticized response to attacks on U.S. compounds in Libya and Egypt. **Romney needed a strong debate performance to change the dynamics of the race. The poll suggested he may have done so. Twenty-seven percent of those surveyed said the debate had prompted them to see Romney in a more positive light**, while 19 percent said it caused them to view him more negatively and 40 percent said it did not change their opinion. Obama did not appear to suffer any damage. Fifty-four percent said the debate did not change their opinion of the president, while 16 percent said their opinion had improved and 18 percent said they viewed him more negatively. Obama's favorability ratings remained unchanged, as 56 percent said they viewed him favorably and 44 percent said they viewed him unfavorably. His standing improved among independents by 8 percentage points. **Romney appears to have made his greatest strides among his fellow Republicans - a development that could help his fundraising and get-out-the vote efforts in the final weeks of the campaign. Forty-six percent of Republicans said their opinion of Romney was "very favorable" after the debate, a gain of 10 percentage points.**

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

**Meyers & Walter 10-1** (Jim Meyers and Kathleen Walter, 10-1-12, Newsmax, Rasmussen: Race Still Close, 'Could Go Either Way' <http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/rasmussen-2012-presidential-debates/2012/10/01/id/458240>, jj)

Pollster and political analyst Scott Rasmussen tells Newsmax that **despite new polls showing President Obama pulling ahead of Mitt Romney, the race is still close and “could go either way.”** He also says **poll numbers have historically shifted against the incumbent in the weeks leading up to Election Day** — and predicts that this week’s debate could have a “big impact” on the election. Rasmussen is founder and president of Rasmussen Reports and co-founder of the sports network ESPN. He has been an independent public opinion pollster for more than a decade, and most major news organizations cite his reports. **The Rasmussen Daily Presidential Tracking poll for Sunday has Mitt Romney leading Barack Obama 50 percent to 47 percent**. But a new Washington Times/Zogby survey has Obama ahead by 8 points, and a Washington Post/ABC News poll shows the president pulling ahead in swing states. In an exclusive interview with Newsmax.TV, Rasmussen observes: “**What we do know is in the last couple of elections, between the first of October and Election Day, the numbers have shifted about three points. And they generally tend to shift against the party that currently has the White House.**

**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.”**

***Dem enthusiasm low --- dooms Obama***

**Bischoff & Pant 9-29** (Laura A. Bischoff and Meagan Pant, Staff Writer, 9-29-12, Enthusiasm wanes among crucial young voters, Springfield News Sun, <http://www.springfieldnewssun.com/news/news/enthusiasm-wanes-among-crucial-young-voters/nSPGh/>, jj)

**Young voters gave Barack Obama a big boost in the 2008 presidential election, when a highly energized group of twenty-somethings accounted for 18 percent of all ballots cast.**

**No one expects** Republican nominee Mitt **Romney to win the youth vote** this November, **but** analysts say $4 dollar a gallon gas, crushing student debt and an uncertain job market could cut into the lead Democrats have with some **young voters** while causing others to **sit the election out**.

“**Obama is going to win the 18-29 vote**; no Democrat has lost it since Michael Dukakis in 1988,” said Geoffrey Skelley, political analyst for the University of Virginia Center for Politics. “**The question is by how much.”**

About 1.57 million Ohioans under 30 are registered to vote as of September — and candidates have been wooing the age group with visits to college campuses across the state. President Obama, who announced his re-election campaign at Ohio State University, held rallies this week at Bowling Green State and Kent State universities, where he urged students to register to vote. Meanwhile, Wisconsin Congressman Paul Ryan held one of his first events at Miami University after being named the Republican vice presidential candidate.

The two campaigns are using different messages in their appeals to young people, Skelley said. Obama is touting the part of his health care law that allows children to stay on their parents’ insurance until age 26, his efforts to limit student loan debt and his stance of social issues such as gay marriage.

Romney’s message is much simpler: He’s telling young voters, “I can fix the economy,” Skelley said.

Fading enthusiasm?

While young people turned out in record numbers in 2008, **there is some evidence of a drop in enthusiasm this year**. **Overall, 58 percent of likely Ohio voters say they are highly enthusiastic about the race, but the percentage goes lower with the younger demographic**, according to the most recent Marist Poll. **Of those 18-29, 51 percent said they were very enthusiastic, the lowest percentage among the various age groups.**

Romney can’t take much encouragement from the numbers, though, because the enthusiasm levels were about the same for Romney supporters as they were for Obama backers.

“The youth vote undoubtedly will dip in 2012, but how far down it goes it going to be the question,” said Tyler Harber, a Washington-based Republican strategist and a former pollster.

**Young voters** who supported the president in 2008, then graduated college to find lackluster job prospects **may be less inclined to support Obama again,** Harber said. But that doesn’t necessarily turn them onto Romney, he said.

“The job issue affects them, but they can’t pull the lever for Mitt Romney,” Harber said. “**So what do they do? They don’t vote.”**

Central State University graduate student Cara Lindo, 29, is not one of those who won’t vote. She says she’ll vote for Obama. But she acknowledges that some of **the enthusiasm young people felt for Obama in 2008 is no longer present.**

“What really kind of contributed to the excitement the first time around was that he was so brand new and he was proposing this change,” she said. “There was a lot of hope there because we didn’t know what he could do. A lot of the problems he inherited couldn’t really be fixed in four years, so I think a little bit of that excitement is gone, but **(we’re) still hopeful that things can change and things can get better.”**

**A2: Link Turns – Top Level**

***Our wedge issue link co-opts all link turns --- its 100% upside for Obama --- people who oppose the plan won’t vote for him anyway***

**Lacey ‘12**

Stephen Lacey, reporter/blogger for Climate Progress, where he writes on clean energy policy, technologies, and finance. Before joining CP, he was an editor/producer with RenewableEnergyWorld.com. He received his B.A. in journalism from Franklin Pierce University.

Think Progress, Apr 9, 2012, Pew Poll: Clean Energy Is A Political Wedge Among Republicans <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/04/09/460485/pew-poll-clean-energy-is-a-political-wedge-among-republicans/>, jj

**Energy has turned into a contentious campaign issue in 2012, pitting “drill-baby-drill” against “clean energy now**.” **But multiple polls now make clear that the clean energy issue is a winning one for progressives.** The way the media and cable TV frame the national debate may make it seem like there’s an even split between supporters of fossil fuels and supporters of renewable alternatives. However, **a new poll from the Pew Research Center finds that clean energy has far more support than fossil fuels support across the political spectrum** — except among conservative Republican males. **The poll illustrates how clean energy has become a wedge issue among Republicans moving into the presidential election**. This is precisely what has happened on climate (see “Independents, Other Republicans Split With Tea-Party Extremists on Global Warming“). **Pew found that 52% of Americans believe “alternative” resources are the most important energy priority for the country. That’s still a substantial increase over oil, coal and gas, which received preferential support from 39% of respondents.** This poll shows that **clean energy still has very strong bipartisan support**. But that support has shifted in the last year, with an increase in Americans saying domestic production of fossil fuels should be a top priority. With previous polls showing support for offshore drilling increasing as gas prices climb, that shift isn’t much of a surprise. (It should be noted that multiple analyses, including one from the Associated Press, have shown no correlation between lower gas prices and more drilling.) The poll showed a shift in favor of domestic fossil fuel production among a variety of voters. But the most striking change was among older, conservative Republican males: Over the past year, there has been an increase in the percentage of Republicans, particularly conservative Republicans, who view the expansion of exploration and production of oil, coal and natural gas as a more important priority for addressing the nation’s energy supply than the development of alternative energy sources. Conservative Republicans now prioritize traditional energy sources over alternative sources by a 65% to 26% margin; a year ago they were divided (47% oil, coal, natural gas vs. 43% alternative energy). In the current survey, men 50 and older say it is more important to expand exploration from traditional energy sources, by 51% to 37%. A year ago, older men prioritized the development of alternative energy sources by a comparable margin (54% to 35%). Here’s the chart: While there’s clearly a partisan gap between Republicans and Democrats over fossil fuel production, this poll shows that it’s really the Tea Party crowd that is the primary factor widening that gap. **Support for fossil fuels hasn’t grown nearly as much among moderate Republicans and Independents. These findings back up what we already know: The only voters who may get turned off by clean energy — conservative Republican males — would likely never support a progressive candidate anyway. So talking about clean energy and pushing federal clean energy policies, which still has solid support among the rest of the electorate, *can only be a political positive*, making it a classic wedge issue.**

**A2: Plan Unpopular – Fossil Fuel States**

***1) Green youth vote key --- 2008 proves --- our links outweigh***

***2) Turn --- fossil fuel voters support the plan***

**Crooks ‘12**

Ed, Financial Times, 6-5, Shale gas fuels change in US swing states, PROQUEST, jj

"**We haven't seen the Republicans using it as a wedge issue, but I can see it becoming one**," Mr Sracic said. "**Ohio is going to be very, very close and little things can mean a lot**." **The energy industry, however, may be swimming against the tide. Opinion polls have generally supported a policy similar to Mr Obama's, backing increased oil and gas drilling and more investment in renewables such as wind and solar power.**

***4) Link outweighs --- these voters not key***

**Wilson ‘12**

Eric Wilson /// August 15, 2012, Red Alert Politics, New Polls Spell Bad News for Obama as Republican Voting Enthusiasm Soars <http://redalertpolitics.com/2012/08/15/new-polls-spell-bad-news-for-obama-as-republican-voting-enthusiasm-soars/>, jj

With so many Democrats disappointed in President Obama’s record to date, **his re-election campaign faces an uphill battle in matching his performance in 2008**. **With only 5 percent of national voters undecided, Resurgent Republic’s polling analysis warns that “it will be difficult for President Obama to close these gaps by winning the undecided voters outright.”** While Democrats are less excited about voting for President Obama in 2012, Republicans are more excited about sending him packing. **Key Republican demographics, like Evangelicals, white males, and married voters, are more enthusiastic about voting. With fewer than 90 days to go until the election, President Obama’s greatest challenge is not winning over independents, but rather energizing his own base so they will turn out in November.**

***6) GOP can’t paint Obama as anti-fossil fuels***

**Montopoli ‘12**

Brian Montopoli is the senior political reporter at CBSNews.com. CBS News, 7-24-12, Fracking boon could boost Obama in Ohio, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57478320/fracking-boon-could-boost-obama-in-ohio/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+BuzzGames_Gamecore+(TheShowbuzz%3A+Games+GameCore)>, jj

**Despite the concerns of environmentalists**, who generally support the Democratic Party, President **Obama has been largely supportive of fracking**. In May, his administration issued a rule requiring that companies disclose the chemicals used in drilling on public land - but, in a concession to the industry, they must only do so after the drilling is completed. **The president has taken steps to streamline regulation of fracking**, and the Environmental Protection Agency has altered rules to make it easier for the industry to comply, in part by giving drillers more time to invest in equipment to reduce pollution from fracking wells. (Most fracking is regulated not by the federal government but on a state basis, because most drilling takes place on private land.) **During his State of the Union** Address in January, Mr. **Obama noted that there is enough natural gas in the ground to power America for a century.** "And my administration will take every possible action to safely develop this energy," he said. "Experts believe this will support more than 600,000 jobs by the end of the decade." Those words did not stop his presumptive general election opponent from casting the president as hostile to the industry. "This president has eight different agencies trying to fight their way to become regulators of the gas-extraction technology known as fracking," Mitt Romney said in Pennsylvania in April. "And the intent, of course, is to slow down the development of our own resources." In March, Romney wrote in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch that he "will respect states' proven ability to regulate fracking, rather than sending federal bureaucrats to take control." **But with the industry thriving, Republicans appear to realize they will have a hard time gaining traction by casting the president as anti-fracking.** In Ohio, the GOP message on energy has largely been that Mr. Obama has been hostile to coal - a far easier case to make in light of that industry's struggles.

**2nc General Wedge Issue Link Modular**

***Dems avoiding the renewables debate now --- plan puts Romney between a rock and a hard place --- he either supports the plan and loses his base or he attacks the plan and loses independents and moderates***

**Roberts ‘12**

David Roberts is a staff writer for Grist. 1-26-12, Grist, Clean energy is a wedge issue that favors Democrats <http://grist.org/politics/clean-energy-is-a-wedge-issue-that-favors-democrats/>, jj

**During Obama’s State of the Union speech**, Democracy Corps ran a dial-test focus group. **Fifty swing voters were given devices that let them register approval or disapproval continuously throughout the speech. Two results in particular are worth highlighting.** Overall, **there was a striking degree of unanimity**, quite in contrast to the polarization in Washington. Reactions to the speech split along party lines on only a few issues. **The most interesting split came during the section of the speech on energy: This section received the highest sustained ratings of the speech from Democrats and independents**, but it was also one of the few polarizing sections as Republicans reacted negatively to the President’s call for more support of clean energy (independents, like Democrats, responded very favorably). Overall, **Obama gained 22 points on the issue, one of his biggest gains on the evening, as these voters endorsed his appeal to end subsidies for oil companies and instead focus those resources on expanding clean energy in America**. [my emphasis] It seems **the Republican attempt to drag clean energy into the culture war has reached only the conservative base. Independents outside the Fox-Limbaugh loop still favor it.** In other words, ***this is a powerful wedge issue that favors Democrats***. **With the Wall Street Journal editorial page beating its chest, Politico making sweet, sweet love to the Solyndra non-scandal**, and the Chamber of Commerce dumping money into attack ads, **Democrats have gotten unduly spooked. They’ve started believing John Boehner’s trash talk, that energy is a wedge to divide unions from greens. It’s an empty threat. The fact is, overwhelming majorities of Americans — across party, age, and regional lines — support clean, modern energy**. A poll conducted by ORC International in November found that **77 percent of Americans, including 65 percent of Republicans, believe that “the U.S. needs to be a clean energy technology leader and it should invest in the research and domestic manufacturing of wind, solar, and energy efficiency technologies**.” Last February, **a Gallup poll offered a list of actions Congress might take. The most popular option, with an incredible 83 percent support, was “an energy bill that provides incentives for using solar and other alternative energy resources.” Americans love clean energy.** When they hear about green energy infrastructure, according to the focus-group results … … **participants immediately make the connection between new energy and new jobs**. They say, “Alternative energy — good jobs, local jobs — I think we have a tremendous opportunity here — it’s about creating goods and services — invest in infrastructure.” **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. On to the second significant finding: Americans want to tax the rich. These swing voters, even the Republicans, responded enthusiastically to [Obama's] call for a “Buffett Rule” that would require the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share. As one participant put it, “I agree with his tax reform — the 1 percent should shoulder more of the burden than the other 99 percent. He [Obama] talked about being all for one, one for all — that really resonated for me.” These dial focus groups make it very clear that defending further tax cuts for those at the top of the economic spectrum puts Republicans in Congress and on the Presidential campaign trail well outside of the American mainstream. (See also this Sept. 2011 Gallup poll or this Oct. 2011 Bloomberg poll or this Oct. 2011 CBS News poll or many others). What this shows is that the Occupy movement has won. Americans across party lines increasingly see things in terms of the 1 percent and the 99 percent. A Pew survey earlier this month found that “conflict between rich and poor now eclipses racial strain and friction between immigrants and the native-born as the greatest source of tension in American society.” Two-thirds of Americans now see “strong conflicts” between the rich and poor. Even Mitt Romney is using Occupy’s language. These issues — clean energy and taxing the rich — are not unconnected. **Properly done, clean energy is a populist issue**. **Big Oil perfectly symbolizes the 1 percent, and Americans are ready to redirect public resources away from oil and toward a wide network of home-grown cleantech innovators. Clean energy isolates the Republican base from the broad mass of American opinion and, in particular, from swing-state independents**. **It’s a wedge issue and an electoral winner for Democrats if they can quit playing defense and go on the attack. The appropriate response to threats from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is a well-administered ass kicking.**

**A2: link defense**

***Clean energy support is unanimously popular and will mobilize the base --- but voters want action not talk --- polls prove***

**Taylor-Miesle ‘12**

Heather Taylor-Miesle, NRDC Action Fund, Fire Dog Lake, Voters Want Obama’s Clean Energy Plan, 2-10-12, <http://my.firedoglake.com/htmnrdcactionfund/2012/02/10/voters-want-obamas-clean-energy-plan/>, jj

**Another major poll has confirmed that American voters across the political spectrum welcome clean energy development**. It also found that when given the facts, the majority of Democrats and Independents oppose the Keystone XL pipeline for dirty tar sands oil. The support for clean energy isn’t news—**many pollsters have determined that Democrats, Republicans, and Independents embrace clean energy and want to develop more of it.** But the timing of this latest poll is instructive. It should remind candidates that ***clean energy is a mobilizing issue***. **It offers a positive way to address voters’ biggest concerns right now: jobs, economic growth, and the health of our families.** But as NRDC’s Action Fund mapped out in the report “Running Clean**,” in order to win on clean energy, candidates can’t just name check the issue. They have to lead on it. They have to offer a vision for America’s clean energy future, and they have to do it before their opponents frame the issue for them.** This latest poll, conducted by Geoff Garin and Allan Rivlin of Hart Research, focused on **four swing states: Colorado, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio**. Those same four states **have been bombarded with ads funded by oil companies attacking** President **Obama**. And yet the poll found that 45 percent of voters trust the president more than the Republican Congress when it comes to energy issues. The GOP-led House only got 38 percent on energy. The poll also asked voters if they supported the president’s decision to reject the Keystone XL pipeline. At first, voters opposed his decision by 43 to 32 percent. But when pollsters offered more detailed arguments for and against the pipeline, things changed. More voters started to back the president and resist the pipeline. Of those, 79 percent of Democrats thought the president was right to deny the pipeline, while 9 percent did not. Forty-eight percent of Independents agreed with the president’s decision to reject it, compared to 33 percent who want it go forward. For Republicans, the split was 69 percent to 13 percent. GOP supporters of the Keystone XL pipeline have been out front with their message over the past few weeks. They have been using wildly inflated jobs numbers and downplaying the fact that much of the tar sands oil would be imported out of the U.S. to other markets. But their story seemed to break through. Media Matters released a survey analyzing coverage of the Keystone XL pipeline from August 1 to December 31, 2011. A full 79 percent of the time, broadcast news reporting on Keystone XL interviewed a pipeline proponent. They interviewed a critic of the tar sands pipeline only 7 percent of the time. With coverage like that, it’s no wonder voters aren’t getting the whole story. But when they learn more—like that the pipeline will create as few as 2,500 jobs according to a Cornell University study, will increase gas prices in the Midwest, and send its dirty oil to the “Foreign Trade Zone” in Port Arthur, Texas, where companies get incentives to export around the world, then their opposition grows. The Hart Research poll confirms it. But **leaders have to get their message out about why the dirty stuff hurts America and why clean energy helps it grow**. **Voters respond to the clean-versus-dirty message, but candidates have to deliver that message clearly and quickly**. This isn’t just about the race in November; this is the race every day to frame the debate first.

**A2: clean tech**

***US clean tech leadership high now***

**Frankfurt School ‘12**

Frankfurt School, UNEP Collaborating Center, GLOBAL TRENDS IN RENEWABLE ENERGY INVESTMENT 2012

<http://fs-unep-centre.org/sites/default/files/publications/globaltrendsreport2012final.pdf>, jj

**The** second **highlight was a resurgence** – at least temporarily – **in the United States’ importance in the renewable energy sector**. Beaten into a distant second place by China in both 2009 and 2010, **the US rallied to neck-and-neck with China in 2011, on the back of a 57% surge in US investment in renewables to $51 billion**. Investment in renewable power and fuels in China gained a more modest 17% to $52 billion, still just a fraction ahead of the US (but actually behind the US if investment in energy-smart technologies such as efficiency and smart grids is also included). Investment in Germany – which pushed the US hard for second position in 2010 – dipped 12% to $31 billion1.

***Status quo solves military green tech***

**Guterl 1-24-12** (Fred, Scientific American, How Obama Plans to “Double Down” on Clean Energy

<http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/2012/01/24/how-obama-plans-to-double-down-on-clean-energy/>, jj)

In truth, **a shift within the U.S. military to green fuels has been under way for more than a year. The U.S. Navy has been purchasing jet fuel derived from camelina**—a derivative of canola—**and a diesel** like **fuel derived from algae** for its ships. **The U.S. Air Force in 2010 began testing camelina oil in place of petroleum** in its fuels **as part of a program to derive as much as half of its fuel from alternative sources by 2016.**

***Hard power outweighs their internal***

**Layne 2** (Christopher, visiting fellow in foreign policy studies at Cato, Los Angeles Times, October 6, 2002)

U.S. **strategists believe that** "it can't happen to us," because **the United States is** a different kind of hegemon, **a benign hegemon that others will follow willingly due to the attractiveness of its** political **values** and culture. While flattering, **this** self-serving argument **misses the** basic **point: Hegemons are threatening because they have too much power**. And **it is America's power--not** the self-proclaimed benevolence of **its intentions--that will shape others' response** to it. **A state's power is a** hard, **measurable reality, but its intentions**, which can be peaceful one day but malevolent the next, **are ephemeral**. Hegemony's **proponents claim that the United States can inoculate itself** against a backlash **by acting multilaterally. But other states are not going to be deceived by** Washington's **use of international institutions as a fig leaf to cloak** its **ambitions of dominance**. And in any event, there are good reasons why the U.S. should not reflexively embrace multilateralism. When it comes to deciding when and how to defend American interests, Washington should want a free hand, not to have its hands tied by others.

### Econ

***Manufacturing strong now***

**Perry ‘12**

Dr. Mark J. Perry is a professor of economics and finance in the School of Management (http://www.umflint.edu/departments/som/) at the Flint campus of the University of Michigan (http://www.umflint.edu/). Perry holds two graduate degrees in economics (M.A. and Ph.D.) from George Mason University (http://www.gmu.edu/) in Washington, D.C. In addition, he holds an MBA degree in finance from the Curtis L. Carlson School of Management (http://www.csom.umn.edu/) at the University of Minnesota (http://www.umn.edu/). Visit Dr. Perry's Carpe Diem Blog (http://mjperry.blogspot.com/) for economics and finance.

1-2-12, Seeking Alpha, Decline Of Manufacturing Is Global Phenomenon: The World Is Better Off Because Of It

<http://seekingalpha.com/article/317013-decline-of-manufacturing-is-global-phenomenon-the-world-is-better-off-because-of-it>, jj

The chart above shows manufacturing output as a share of GDP, for both the "world less the U.S." and the U.S. alone, using United Nations data for GDP and its components at current prices in U.S. dollars from 1970 to 2010. **We hear all the time** from Donald Trump and others **about the "decline of U.S. manufacturing,"** about how nothing is made here any more, and how everything that used to be made here is now made in China and other low wage countries. **An underlying assumption of most of those claims is that if the manufacturing base is shrinking in the U.S.** (the "hollowing out of U.S. manufacturing"), **that there is an offsetting manufacturing gain that is captured elsewhere in the world, as manufacturing output supposedly shifts from the U.S. to other countries, with world manufacturing remaining constant. In reality, the chart** above **shows that the decline in U.S. manufacturing** as share of GDP between 1970 and 2010 **is a really a global phenomenon as the entire world becomes increasingly a services-intensive economy**. The manufacturing/GDP ratio in the U.S. fell from 24% to 13% between 1970 and 2010, while the world ratio fell at almost the same rate, from 27% to 16%. **As a share of GDP, manufacturing has declined in most countries since the 1970s.** **A few examples: Australia**'s manufacturing/GDP ratio went from 22% in 1970 to 9.3% in 2010, **Brazil**'s ratio went from 24.5% to 13.5%, **Canada**'s from 19% to 10.5%, **Germany**'s from 31.5% to 18.7%, **and Japan**'s from 35% to 20%. Bottom Line: When we hear claims that "nothing is made here anymore," **it's not really the case that somebody else is making the stuff Americans used to make as it is the case that we** (and others around the world) **just don't manufacture as much "stuff" any more in relation to the growing levels of national income**, which the graph above clearly shows. The main reason that the manufacturing/GDP ratio has declined in the U.S. and around the world is that **productivity gains for durable goods have significantly lowered the price of those goods relative to: a) the prices of services, and b) household incomes**, as I pointed out in this CD post on the "miracle of manufacturing." In other words, **the declining manufacturing/GDP ratio reflects declining prices for manufacturing goods, *which is a sign of economic progress*, not regress**. **The standard of living around the world today, along with global wealth and prosperity, are all much, much higher today with manufacturing representing 16% of total world output** (including the U.S.) compared to 1970, when it was almost twice as high at almost 27%. And for that progress, **we should celebrate, not complain about the "decline of manufacturing**."

***Manufacturing high now***

**Schroeder ‘11**

Joshua Schroeder graduated cum laude from Carleton College with a BA in Economics in 2001 and received his MBA from ESADE Business School in Barcelona in 2007. He is fluent in Spanish and English and has lived and worked in five countries throughout Europe and the Americas. Joshua is an entrepreneur and real estate development professional with extensive experience planning and developing large-scale resort communities for Azul de Cortez (currently Director of Strategy and Business) and Grupo Abrisa (previously as Senior Associate of Corporate Strategy). Azul de Cortez is a planned coastal community with over 4,800 approved units and amenities including marina, golf, beach clubs, and hotels on the Sea of Cortez in Baja California Sur. Joshua has an excellent track record of working with talented entrepreneurs and senior executives to create valuable business opportunities in both real estate and non real estate sectors. Joshua has been investing for the past 10 years

11-17-11, See It Market, U.S. Still in the Business of Making Things <http://www.seeitmarket.com/u-s-still-in-the-business-of-making-things/>, jj

**It is a common refrain** amongst my friends and family, specifically my grandfather, **that the U.S. just doesn´t make anything anymore**. Additionally, most political pundits and so called experts on the economy would have you believe that the United States´ golden years as a manufacturing country were lost forever with the emergence of globalization and low-cost producing countries such as China. It is understandable that the general economic malaise and difficult job market facing many Americans has brought about a large amount of pessimism regarding the future, but **that should not be reason for us to ignore the facts and forget that we live in a manufacturing powerhouse.** In fact, according to the latest United Nations statistics **the United States is still the world´s largest manufacturer, with output** ($1.83 Trillion) **representing approximately 20 percent of the world´s share, greater than that of Germany, Brazil, France and India combined.** Furthermore, **the sector has continued to expand, benefitting from the**, albeit less than stellar, **cyclical rebound fueled by growing consumer demand, strong capital spending and increasing exports to the developing world. Yes it is true; the China manufacturing sector** ($1.79 T) **continues to grow rapidly and will no doubt take over the top spot in the near future. Their ability to leverage low cost labor, attract foreign direct investment and create first class infrastructure over the past two decades has been impressive.** However, their manufacturing future depends on how well they can manage the transition to a consumer led economy and the stronger currency and higher manufacturing wages that will certainly accompany it. Below is a table of the world’s manufacturing leaders and their respective percentage share of the world total: **Note that the United States is the world leader in six of the categories and in the top three in 16 out of the 22 sectors**. **It should also be highlighted that the United States dominates in higher value more sophisticated manufacturing sectors such as Office, Accounting and Computing Machinery, Medical, Precision and Optical Instruments as well as Radio, Television and Radio Equipment.** So while it is true that **manufacturing** represents a smaller piece of the overall U.S. economy than it used to, and a much smaller percentage share compared to many emerging economies, it **is still an engine of output that is the world´s largest and one that has been doing its part in contributing to recent U.S. GDP growth.**
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**2nc**

***Biggest impact in the round***

**Bostrum**, 20**02** (Nick, PhD and Professor at Oxford, March, [www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html](http://www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html))

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. **An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal**. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time **that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization. Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation,** either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that **a smaller nuclear exchange**, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it **would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.**

***Oil prices high – supply and refinery issues***

**Shore 10/3/2012** (Sandy, Huffington Post Analyst, “Gas prices still high on coasts due to low supplies”. Huffington Post. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/04/gas-prices-still-high-on-coasts-low-supplies_n_1938753.html>) [nagel]

**Drivers on either coast may be questioning the conventional wisdom that gas prices fall after Labor Day. Motorists in California paid** an average of $4.232 per gallon Wednesday. That's 45 cents **higher than the national average and exceeded only by Hawaii** among the 50 states. **Prices in New York, Connecticut and New Hampshire are at or near highs for the year. They're also about 40 cents higher than a year ago. Refinery and pipeline problems have shrunk supplies of gasoline on the coasts and driven up prices in states that typically have some of the highest gas prices in the U.S. anyway.** In other regions, gas prices have trickled lower after a late-summer surge. California's gasoline inventories have shrunk to the lowest levels in more than a decade. That has been exacerbated by the state's strict anti-pollution laws which require motorists to use costlier blends of gasoline. Drivers in the Pacific Northwest also are feeling the pinch. The average price in Oregon and Washington is above $4. Tom Kloza, chief oil analyst at Oil Price Information Service, expects another dramatic surge in West Coast prices over the next five days before they eventually head lower. Kloza says conditions are improving on the East Coast, where **refinery issues created tight supplies in the past several weeks, mainly in the Northeast.** The situation is gradually easing as more imported oil arrives, he said.

***Oil prices high now – Mid East conflict***

**AFP 10/5/2012** (Associated Foreign Press, “Oil prices rebound amid Turkey-Syria tensions”. Channel News Asia. <http://www.channelnewsasia.com/stories/afp_world_business/view/1229650/1/.html>) [nagel]

**Oil prices rose Thursday** after four days of losses, **aided by worries over clashes on the Syria-Turkey border and a weaker dollar** on the eve of keenly-awaited US jobs data, analysts said. New York's main contract, WTI light sweet crude oil for November, advanced $3.57 to $91.71 a barrel. Brent North Sea crude for delivery in November rallied $4.41 to stand at $112.58 a barrel in late London trade. "**The bounce was in part technically driven, while raised supply-side concerns stemming from the escalation of conflicts between Turkey and Syria also lent support,**" said Fawad Razaqzada, analyst at trading group GFT Markets. "But I think the bounce will be short-lived as traders are likely to wait until Friday is over before taking on any bold positions... Tomorrow's nonfarm payroll number is eagerly anticipated and could provide near-term direction." On Friday, the US Labour Department releases figures for September job creation and unemployment, with analysts expecting little change from August's unimpressive numbers. Saudi Oil Minister Ali Naimi reiterated the commitment of the world's leading crude exporter to keep prices from rising. **"Despite the mixed global economic backdrop, oil prices have remained high**," he said.

***Incentives not working now and are going to expire anyway. Even if they aren’t renewed, market uncertainty will block adoption***

**O’Neil ‘12**

Lauren O'Neil, Washington, July 2nd, 2012, Natural Gas Week, GOP Skepticism Grows Over Renewable Incentives, Lexis, jj

**The ailing financial health seen at several alternative energy firms over the last year has emboldened a number of the most "anti-spending" Republican lawmakers to back down from their previous support of renewable energy incentives as a bargaining chip with their Democratic colleagues.**

**Now, much of the GOP's congressional leadership is going out of its way to argue that past spending on alternatives has been mismanaged, either because it supported foreign jobs or funded firms that were unsuccessful.**

**At stake in this political maneuvering is the fate of federal grants and various tax credits for renewable electricity -- along with biofuels and alternative vehicles** -- which generally garner broad support from the White House and the Senate's Democratic leaders.

**If there is enough pushback from Republicans to block or significantly delay the renewal of such credits, it could create uncertainty for alternative energy investors**. **Measures such as renewable energy investment and production tax credits are not permanently melded into the US tax code and must be renewed to continue**. For example, the 2.2¢/kWh production tax credit (PTC) for wind is due to expire at year's end (see table).

Illustrating the GOP's heightened criticisms of clean energy "subsidies," Senate Republican Policy Committee Chairman John Barrasso (R-Wyoming) circulated a memo to his committee arguing that President Obama's contention that wind, solar and geothermal energy generation has doubled since 2008 is misleading.

"**These sources still amount to a negligible portion of the total power consumed by the US last year**," Barrasso charged. "**Their products continue to lag in the marketplace, yielding taxpayers no decipherable return and costing billions."**

**A2: Resilient**

***Their evidence is inconclusive- Russia’s economy is only resilient in a world with stable oil prices.***

**Bergval 6/12/12** (Daniel, Economist at SEB (a Swedish Bank Investor), Senior administrative officer at Ministry of Finance, Sweden, Project manager at OECD “Russia: Resilient So Far”, 6/12/12, SEB Economics Insight: Macro Update, 96797299-SEB-report-Russia-resilient-so-far.pdf) ALT

Even **though Russia is not immune to the crises in the euro zone, the economy has been resilient so far**. GDP growth during Q1 2012 came in at a strong 4.9% compared to a year earlier (Chart 1) and indicators do not point to an imminent weakening (Chart 2). The consensus estimate has become more positive in the past quarter. **We are sticking to our relatively positive view, as long as oil prices stay at roughly the levels of today** (Chart 3). We expect GDP to grow by 3.8 and 4.1% in 2012 and 2013, respectively, unchanged since our previous forecast and slightly above consensus for 2013. **High oil prices will fuel government revenue – creating room for fiscal policy, exports and other parts of the economy such as capital spending and consumption**. Our forecast is that oil prices will average USD 113 per barrel in 2012 and USD 120 in 2013. **There are downside risks**, however. **A more severe than expected downturn in the euro zone could push oil prices further down, hurting exports, the current account and government finances and increasing pressures on the banking system.** Oil prices are currently below our average forecast for 2012 but are expected to rise later this year.

***1998 and 2008 crises proves that the economy is only resilient due to high oil prices***

**THE ECONOMIC TIMES 2008** (“Russia seen shrugging off market collapse,” Sep 21, Lexis)

**Buoyed by vast oil wealth, Russia is shrugging off its worst market meltdown in a decade, emerging with its booming economy almost intact**, analysts say.

The Russian stock market last week saw its sharpest falls since the catastrophic economic collapse of 1998 after suffering the toxic combination of global financial turmoil, falling commodity prices and a local credit crunch.

But **with oil prices still almost ten times higher than a decade ago, economists see Russia emerging with a relatively mild hangover**.

**The collapse was a "reality check, not a derailment, because the government had the money to fix it**," said Chris Weafer, chief strategist at Moscow investment bank Uralsib. "The Kremlin's confidence has not been shaken."

The government suspended trading on Wednesday after sharp drops of over 10 percent that left the benchmark RTS down 57 percent from an all-time high achieved in May.

After a series of ineffectual appeals for calm, the Kremlin put its money on the table, pledging over 60 billion dollars (over 40 billion euros) to prop up prices.

When the RTS reopened Friday, shares surged over 22 percent, recovering the week's losses.

**The crash has exposed flaws in the financial system**, analysts said, **but oil wealth has allowed the Kremlin to smooth over the cracks and avoid a repeat of the 1998 financial crisis**, when a sovereign debt default caused a collapse of the ruble, all but wiping out the country's middle class.

**This time around, with oil prices around 100 dollars a barrel** -- around 10 times higher than in 1998 -- **Russia's prospects could not look more different**, said Ronald Smith, chief strategist at Moscow's Alfa-Bank.

"**If you compare it to 1998, the outlook for the economy is fundamentally good**," he said. "**We will come out of this with growth that is maybe slower than we had... but relatively high**."

**A2: Russia oil stabilization fund**

***Russia can’t handle low prices—any studies to the contrary use flawed data.***

Clifford **Gaddy** and Barry Ickes, December 20**05**. Fellow at Brookings at Associate Professor of Economics at Penn State. Eurasian Geography and Economics, 46.8, pp. 559-583(25).

**What is distinctive for Russia**, we would argue, **is the scale of the informal rent redistribution**. Like the part of the iceberg that lies beneath the surface, **the informal rent categories may turn out to be most important in assessing current and future economic and political developments**. To take one example, **one frequently hears statements to the effect that a decline in oil prices would have little impact on the Russian economy. The government’s oil stabilization fund, it is said, absorbs the windfall**. The core budget is sustainable at much lower oil prices. **But this line of thinking is based on looking at formal taxes alone**. In fact, we see that the formal taxes and the formal budget are only a part of the picture. **Informal rent-sharing sustains a much broader part of the economy and society. Lower oil prices mean smaller overall rents, and thus less to be shared among all the categories – not just the part represented by formal taxes**.

# Rd 8 vs Michigan state HR
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**T – Production Not R & D**

***Energy production refers to the extraction, conversion, and distribution of energy – excludes R&D***

**Koplow 4** Doug Koplow is the founder of Earth Track in Cambridge, MA. He has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for 20 years, primarily in the energy sector "Subsidies to Energy Industries" Encyclopedia of Energy Vol 5 2004www.earthtrack.net/files/Energy%20Encyclopedia,%20wv.pdf

3. SUBSIDIES THROUGH THE FUEL CYCLE Because no two fuel cycles are exactly the same, **examining subsidies through the context of a generic fuel cycle is instructive in providing an overall framework from which to understand how common subsidization policies work**. **Subsidies are grouped into preproduction** **(e.g., R&D,** resource location), **production** (**e.g., extraction, conversion/generation, distribution**, accident risks), consumption, postproduction (e.g., decommissioning, reclamation), and externalities (e.g., energy security, environmental, health and safety). 3.1 Preproduction **Preproduction activities include research into new technologies, improving existing technologies**, and market assessments to identify the location and quality of energy resources. 3.1.1 Research and Development R&D subsidies to energy are common worldwide, generally through government-funded AND %26D of 50% versus private returns of only 20 to 30%. However, the general concept masks several potential concerns regarding energy R%26D. First, ideas near commercialization have much lower spillover than does basic research, making subsidies harder to justify. Second, politics is often an important factor in R%26D choices, especially regarding how the research plans are structured and the support for follow-on funding for existing projects. Allocation bias is also a concern. Historical data on energy R%26D ( AND one-twentieth, albeit during the more limited 1995-1998 period. 3.1.2 Resource Location Governments frequently conduct surveys to identify the location and composition of energy resources. Although AND , the costs of siting studies should be recovered from the beneficiary industries. 3.2 Production **Energy production includes all stages from the point of resource location through distribution to the final consumers.** **Specific items examined here include resource extraction, resource conversion (including electricity), the various distribution links to bring the energy resource to the point of final use, and accident risks.**

***Vote negative:***

***Limits---there are endless obscure energy technologies the aff could develop---overstretches our research burden and undermines preparedness for all debates---err neg because the terms incentives and restrictions serve no limiting function***

***Ground --- allowing R & D means they don’t have to defend in actual energy production, just that we research the tech --- moots links to core neg args like oil prices and tradeoff***

**1nc**

***Obama winning --- polls and electoral college --- but it’s close***

**Silver 10-4** (Nate Silver, 10-4-12, NYT, Oct. 3: Romney’s Electoral Challenge, and More on Debate Instant Polls <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/04/oct-3-romneys-electoral-challenge-and-more-on-debate-instant-polls/>, jj)

**The FiveThirtyEight forecast had** Mr. **Obama gaining slightly on Wednesday, estimating that he had a 86.1 percent chance of winning the Electoral College** on Nov. 6 — up from 84.7 percent in Tuesday’s forecast. This came despite the fact that it appeared there actually had been a modest shift back toward Mitt Romney in the polls even before the debate. In our “now-cast” — an estimate of what would happen if an election were held immediately — Mr. **Obama’s projected margin of victory in the national popular vote had fallen by about one percentage point** between Sunday and Wednesday. Our Nov. 6 forecast, however, had already anticipated some decline for Mr. Obama, and so has been less sensitive to the shift. In addition, **there is a particular Electoral College outlook that is becoming problematic for Mr. Romney.** As of Wednesday, our Nov. 6 forecast had Mr. Obama winning the popular vote by 4.1 percentage points. However, his advantage was larger than that — at least 4.9 percentage points, in 22 states (and the District of Columbia) — totaling 275 electoral votes: I highlight New Hampshire in yellow on this map because, although it is one of the states where Mr. Obama’s lead now exceeds 4.9 percentage points, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for him to win the Electoral College votes in this configuration. New Hampshire is not necessary because you could remove its 4 electoral votes from Mr. Obama’s column and he would still have 271, a winning total. It is not sufficient because if you removed any competitive state but New Hampshire from Mr. Obama’s column (for example, Nevada) he would at best achieve a 269-269 tie. Really, **a great deal of this comes down to Ohio**. Historically, **Ohio** is about two percentage points more Republican-leaning than the country as a whole. This year, however, it **has polled as being Democratic-leaning by one percentage point or so. I ran an alternate version of our simulation on Wednesday in which Ohio was in fact polling two points more Republican than the country as a whole, as it has, on average, in the past, while leaving all other states unchanged. That change alone boosted Mr. Romney’s Electoral College winning chances to 19 percent from 14 percent.**

***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.**

**CP**

***Text: The fifty state governments and the District of Colombia should substantially increase funding for fusion energy generation in the United States.***

***And allow for capital costs and construction work in progress reimbursement for nuclear power utilities***

***And states with renewable portfolio standards should include nuclear power into their RPS***

***State incentives key to nuclear power development***

Lisa **Janairo** is a senior policy analyst at The council of State Governments, Jan **2009**, http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/TIA\_nuclear\_final\_3.pdf

**States may play a significant role in bringing about the nuclear renaissance**. While regulating nuclear reactor safety is a federal function, **states make the final decision on whether new plants can be built** **and**, if so, **how the costs will be passed to consumers. Anticipating the coming nuclear renaissance**, **states** such as Florida and South Carolina **have positioned themselves to tap the development of new plants by making it easier for utilities to finance new projects.**

**Cp 2**

***Through all necessary means the Chinese government will provide all necessary resources to the Institute of Plasma Physics for the research and development of fusion power. China should offer to share this technology with the United States.***

***China can effectively develop fusion --- sharing it with the US solves case***

**Dillow 2010** (Clay, Popular Science, Dec 6)

<http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2010-12/wikileaked-cables-beijing-reveal-chinas-pursuit-fusion-power-teleportation>

One confidential diplomatic cable sent from the Beijing Embassy to Washington in February suggests **China is doing big things** at the small scale. For one, **China is aggressively expanding its nuclear energy resources**, with plans to open at least 70 nuclear plants in the next decade. More interestingly, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (**CAS) is pouring research funding into** its Institute of Plasma Physics (IPP) to conduct ongoing research into **nuclear fusion**. Apparently China has been hard at work on its Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak (EAST) reactor, which is designed to sustain a controlled fusion reaction that can go on indefinitely at high temperatures. In 2009, **researchers a**pparently **sustained** a 18-million-degree **reaction** for 400 seconds, and a 180-million-degree reaction for 60 seconds. Their goal for 2010 was to sustain a 180-million-degree reaction for more than 400 seconds, though it’s unclear if they achieved that. Moreover, **IPP is** apparently **conducting research on hybrid fission-fusion reactors**, though details are slim.

**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’’).

**Development**

***No impact to accidents***

**Wheeler 12** (John Wheeler, Producer of "This Week in Nuclear"; Manager in the Nuclear Industry; Former Senior Reactor Operator; Nuclear Workforce Planning and Workforce Development Expert, “Whos' Really to Blame for Fukushima Health Impacts?” 3/12/12) http://theenergycollective.com/johnwheeler/79128/anti-nuclear-hysterics-not-melted-reactors-blame-fukushima-health-impacts

As is often the case, the passage of time yields clarity about events, and the nuclear power plant accident at Fukushima is no different. **It has become clear that the misinformation and hysterics by anti-nuclear groups and individuals were mostly wrong**. Their doomsday prophesizing actually worsened human suffering and environmental impacts by contributing to unwise decisions by political leaders in Japan and elsewhere to shut down nuclear plants. In contrast, **bloggers and experts from within the nuclear community accurately predicted outcomes and human health impacts.**

**As was predicted on this blog and elsewhere, the multi-barrier reactor containment design protected the public**. Contrary to claims by anti-nuclear groups, the melted cores did NOT burn through the reactor vessels. **The containment structures remained virtually intact**. **The damaged reactor fuel remained inside the reactor vessels and containment systems.**

**Despite preposterous claims** by Greenpeace and others, **there were no chunks of plutonium scattered across the countryside. Only radioactive gasses escaped over the land, and most of that gas was short lived Iodine that has long since decayed away.**

As reported on Bloomberg and other news sources, **no one in the public was harmed by radiation from the damaged reactors.** A small number of plant workers received higher than normal radiation exposures, without lasting effects. **Any hypothetical future health effects will be immeasurably low and will be indistinguishable from normal disease rates within the general population.**

**No one**, not even the “Fukushima 50″, **was exposed to life threatening amounts of radiation**. **Journalists who flew across the Pacific to cover the story received more radiation exposure from cosmic rays in flight than they received from the reactors once on the ground.**

The visually spectacular hydrogen explosions of the plant buildings, while providing great fodder for anti-nuclear rhetoric had little impact on the safety of the reactors, and harmed no one.

**The unit 4 fuel storage pools did not empty of water and did not catch on fire. The fuel there remained safely submerged and suffered no damage of any consequence.**

Finally, **there was no need for the 50-mile evacuation zone ordered** by NRC Chairman Greg Jaczko. His decision still has nuclear experts scratching their heads and wondering why. Jaczko’s actions demonstrated he lacks the experience and knowledge to ask the right questions at crucial moments. In addition, he lacked the wisdom to recognize other more credible information was available that contradicted his view. He needlessly rushed forward with an ill-advised decision that was horribly wrong.

This is not to imply there were no environmental or economic impacts from the reactor accident – of course there were! The expensive cleanup in surrounding areas will take years and will cost billions. This is but a small fraction of the total cost of recovery from the horrific earthquake and tsunami.

The earthquake and tsunami were responsible for untold human suffering and devastation. That is where the focus of the world should have been and should continue to be. The problems at the Fukushima nuclear plant accident have contributed needlessly to Japan’s economic burden by prompting the irrational shutdown of nuclear plants across the country. This has caused energy shortages and billions of dollars of additional costs from skyrocketing imports of fossil fuels. Of course, the fossil fuels providers are scrambling to rake in tens of billions of dollars in profits.

**The health effects to Japan’s population were NOT from radiation**, but from stress caused by the unfounded fear of future health effects. **The responsibility for this lies squarely on anti-nuclear activists who relished in spouting fatalistic, exaggerated claims, and on an uninformed media who presented those claims as virtual facts while downplaying opposing views from true experts in the field.**

***Solvency takes centuries***

**Brumfiel 12** (Geoff Brumfiel is a staff reporter for Nature in London, where, for more than a decade, he has covered the ITER project

Scientific American; Jun2012, Vol. 306 Issue 6, p56-61, 6p, 3 Color Photographs, 1 Diagram, EBSCO Host, jj)

Yet like the summit that birthed it, **ITER** (pronounced "eater") **has not lived up to expectations.** **Cost estimates have doubled and doubled again as engineering problems find bureaucratically expedient solutions**. For instance, **rather than pooling resources,** **the seven partners are producing bits and pieces in their home countries**, then assembling them at ITER's building site in the south of France. **The process is akin to ordering nuts, bolts and brackets from a catalogue, then trying to build a 747 in your backyard**. ***Progress is glacial***. Less than a year ago ITER was a 56-foot-deep hole in the ground, which has only recently been filled with nearly four million cubic feet of concrete. **The start date has slipped from 2016 to 2018 to late 2020**. **The first real energy-producing experiments will not come before 2026 -- two decades after the start of construction. And ITER is just the beginning** of this putative new source of energy. **Even if it is successful, another generation of test reactors will have to follow it, and only after these have run their course will local municipalities begin to build fusion plants to supply the grid. ITER is but one step in a project that will continue for decades, if not *centuries*. Supporters** argue that ITER is the only hope, in the long term, of meeting the world's unquenchable demand for power. But even they **have been forced to recalibrate their Utopian expectations**. **The project now seems to be propelled by institutional inertia -- it is easier for individual governments to stay the course rather than be the lone pariah who pulls out early**. Critics, meanwhile, have more ammunition with each delay and cost overrun. **ITER**, they say, **is a colossal waste of money at a time when funding is desperately needed in other areas of energy research.** Both sides agree: when the project is finally completed, it had better work.

***( ) No fusion before 2100***

William **Reville** is an emeritus professor of biochemistry and public awareness of science officer at UCC. The Irish Times - Thursday, June 7, 20**12** Fusion energy still a pipe dream <http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/sciencetoday/2012/0607/1224317432816.html>

NUCLEAR FUSION is the holy grail of power generation, promising the safe, clean generation of boundless energy from essentially limitless, cheap fuel – if we can ever get it to work. **The timeline for the development of nuclear fusion has been lengthened several times, costs have ballooned and it seems unlikely that nuclear-fusion power will be available before the end of this century**. The current situation is summarised by Geoff Brumfiel in the June edition of Scientific American. Massive energy is released in nuclear fusion because some of the matter in the atomic nucleus is converted into energy, as in Einstein’s famous equation E=mc2, where E is energy, M is mass and C is the speed of light. Even the tiniest amount of matter is equivalent to an enormous amount of energy, because C2 is such a huge number. The nuclear fusion of 1g of fuel releases the same energy as burning 11 tonnes of coal. The sun’s enormous energy is generated by nuclear fusion when hydrogen atoms fuse together to form helium. The plan for earthly nuclear fusion requires us to simulate the sun on Earth – an enormously difficult task. Fusion on Earth requires a temperature of 100,000,000 degrees Kelvin, 10 times hotter than the sun, whose huge gravitational field allows fusion to occur more easily. Two forms of hydrogen, deuterium and tritium, will fuel nuclear-fusion power plants. Deuterium is easily extracted from sea water and tritium, a mildly radioactive form of hydrogen, can be made from lithium, a fairly common metal. Hydrogen atoms exist as a “plasma” of positively charged atomic nuclei at fusion temperatures. Fusion temperature is reached by heating the hydrogen with a mixture of microwaves, electricity and bombardment with particles. A viable fusion plant must generate much more energy from fusion than the input energy necessary to heat the fuel to fusion temperature. The energy released will heat water, raising high-pressure steam to turn a turbogenerator that generates electricity. The principle of deriving fusion energy in this way was first demonstrated in the Joint European Torus (Jet) device at Culham, UK, which has been in operation since 1983. In 1997, a fusion power of 10 megawatts was sustained for 0.5 seconds and 65 per cent of the power expended to ignite the plasma was recovered through fusion. The 80 cubic metre Jet plasma is too small to produce a net energy gain. This will be the role of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (Iter) under construction in Cadarache, France, with a plasma volume of about 830 cubic metres. The Iter is designed to generate fusion power of 500 megawatts, 10 times the power needed to ignite the plasma. Iter is a collaboration of seven partners – EU, US, Japan, Russia, China, India and South Korea. The EU provides 45.5 per cent of the funding and each other partner provides 9.1 per cent. Each partner constructs different components for Iter in its own country and ships them to France for incorporation into **Iter. This arrangement is intrinsically awkward and dogs the project with delays and budgetary over-runs. Original construction costs were estimated at $5 billion (€3.9bn). This doubled in the mid-1990s and costs have now doubled again to $20 billion (€15.6bn). Iter fusion will operate intermittently, up to 30 minutes at a time, because materials that can withstand continuous fusion conditions are not yet available. A programme to develop these materials, essential for commercial reactors, is also under way, but it will have to overcome formidable technical difficulties**. Iter will test the feasibility of a sustained fusion reaction and will then become a test nuclear fusion power plant. Following several delays it is hoped to build Iter by 2020, after which about 1,000 scientists and engineers will work on the device for 20 years. If Iter works, a demonstration reactor with all the functions of a power plant will be built by 2050 and tested for 10 to 20 years. Finally, ***it may be possible to start up full-scale nuclear fusion worldwide by 2100, but many things could lengthen this timeline***. Fusion technology emits no warming CO2 gas but nuclear fusion will not be available to mitigate the effects of global warming this century. Bringing the sun to Earth was never going to be easy, but work will continue because the dream of cheap, clean and virtually unlimited power is irresistible.

***( ) Throwing money at fusion does nothing***

**Economist 02**

The Economist 364. 8282 (Jul 20, 2002): 69-70. Science and Technology: It's impossible. And what's more, it's improbable; Nuclear fusion, PROQUEST, jj

SOME say that **a dollar spent on nuclear fusion is a dollar wasted**. **And many, many dollars have been spent on it, as physicists try to duplicate, in a controlled setting, the process by which the sun shines**. **Since 1951, America alone has devoted more than $17 billion** (see chart on next page) **to working out how to fuse atomic nuclei so as to generate an inexhaustible supply of clean, safe power. The claim that this money is wholly wasted may not be entirely fair, though. Fusion science has made a big return on this investment in the form of a new universal constant. This constant is the number 30, a figure that has for the past half-century or so been cited almost religiously by researchers as the number of years that it will take before fusion power becomes a commercial reality.**

***( ) Key fusion methods haven’t even been invented yet***

**Power & Energy 10**

ITER and nuclear fusion: Pro or con-fusion? <http://www.ngpowereu.com/article/ITER-and-nuclear-fusion-Pro-or-con-fusion/>, jj

Perhaps one of the more prominent within this camp, Sébastien Balibar, Director of Research for the French National Centre for Scientific Research, certainly has the expertise to back up his sentiment. Speaking to Project Syndicate, he said: "**We say that we will put the sun into a box. The idea is pretty. The problem is, we don't know how to make the box. Confining a little sun inside a box is an extremely difficult task for three main reasons.**

"**First, the nuclear fuel is** not seawater, but **a mixture of the two heavy isotopes of hydrogen, deuterium and tritium, a radioactive element that has been produced in small quantities for hydrogen bombs. *Any development of fusion reactors would require producing tritium with industrial methods that have yet to be invented*.**

"**Second, the deuterium-tritium fusion reaction starts at around 100 million degrees. To achieve this requires using a magnet to accelerate a plasma that is a big flame of deuterium and tritium nuclei. This must be done in an ultra-high vacuum in a large chamber**. ITER is not designed to produce electricity, but to study the stability of the flame in the magnet. **Since the fusion reactions produce alpha particles, which pollute the plasma, one has to insert a 'diverter' inside the flame at 100 million degrees in order to clean it. *Nobody has ever accomplished this***, but ITER may be able to try in around 2030 - that is, if it solves the previous problem.

"**Third, fusion** also **emits neutrons that will produce helium gas bubbles inside the wall material, which tends to explode**. The supporters of ITER explain that if the walls are porous, the bubbles can escape. But **nothing can be both leak-proof and porous** - and ITER is not designed to study this contradiction. In the future, a 'blanket' should be inserted between the plasma and the walls, with two objectives: to protect the outer walls and to produce tritium from nuclear reactions within a circulating fluid containing lithium. This might work, but the first wall of the blanket will need to not only be leak-proof and porous, but also sufficiently permeable to neutrons, which have to hit the lithium atoms beyond it.

"**ITER will not solve our energy problem**," concludes Balibar. "Although it has some scientific interest in plasma physics, the participating countries should clearly state that funding it won't affect the rest of their research efforts. At the same time, the international community should support research on energy saving and storage and accelerate the development of fourth-generation nuclear reactors, which will use fission and be both clean and durable."

In line with Balibar's perspective is the French association, Sortir du nucleaire (Get out of nuclear energy), who claim that **ITER is hazardous because scientists don't yet know how to manipulate the high-energy deuterium and tritium hydrogen isotopes used in the fusion process**. **Even peers within the fusion sector have become critical** of ITER in recent years, **claiming that ITER researchers have failed to face up to potential technical and economic problems due to the dependence of their jobs on the continuation of tokamak research.**

***No terror***

**STRATFOR 1-16-12** (Jihadism in 2012: A Persistent, Low-Level Threat, <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/jihadism-2012-persistent-low-level-threat>, jj)

Conclusion

While **the al Qaeda core has been marginalized and heavily damaged**, the ideology of **jihadism** continues to survive and **win new converts**, albeit **at progressively lower numbers**. As long as this ideology is able to spread, the war its adherents are waging will continue. While **jihadists do not pose a strategic geopolitical threat on a global, regional or national scale**, they nonetheless are capable of killing scores of people. For that reason alone, the jihadist threat remains in 2012.

***No retaliation***

- Delay in identification – bad forensics – too many countries – lack of data – turf battles   
**Erwin and Manguson ‘9** (Sandra and Stew, National Defense “7 Deadly myths about weapons of terror” 6-1, 94:667 lexis)

Myth #4: If the U.S. Were the Victim of a Nuclear Attack, It Would Immediately Retaliate Under the nightmare scenario of a nuclear bomb exploding in a U.S. city, the implied assumption is that the nation’s leaders would immediately be able to fire back. That would be the case under the Cold War rules of nuclear retaliation, but **the situation is far more complicated when nuclear attacks are perpetrated by non-state actors such as terrorist organizations. Unless the weapon is delivered by a missile, immediate retaliation is not realistic**, experts said. **It could take weeks or months to figure out where the nuclear materials came from or how the explosive device was built. No state or terrorist group would choose to launch a nuclear weapon by missile because we would know the origin**, said Evan Montgomery, of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. The more likely means to execute a nuclear attack would be to smuggle the materials and build the bomb on U.S. soil, or steal a bomb and somehow manage to bring it into the United States. Either way**, U.S. nuclear experts may not be able to quickly determine the origin of the weapon once it’s detonated. Forensics can take weeks or months,** said Charles Blair, director of the Center for Terrorism and Intelligence Studies and co-author of a recently published book titled, “Jihadists and Weapons of Mass Destruction.” “**None of the systems we have now are very quick**,” he said. “Government officials and the public would have to be willing to wait a while before we retaliate.” Nuclear forensics usually is based on fallout and debris. Within hours, U.S. authorities could determine that it was a nuclear explosion. It would take up to a couple of days to determine if there was uranium, plutonium or a mix of the two in the weapon. It’s known that eight nations have plutonium bombs, and six others have enough plutonium to build a bomb. **If there were a nuclear explosion of a plutonium based weapon, it could be traced to one of 14 countries. With uranium-based weapons, it’s more complicated. There are 40 countries that have enough uranium to build at least one bomb. That would take longer to track**, said Blair. “You can take debris samples and compare them against known tests. You can within several weeks trace the design to known designs.” Nuclear forensics would be far easier if there were a single global database that listed all known methods of creating uranium or plutonium, and catalogued the weapon designs, Blair said. But such a database is unlikely to ever materialize. **States prefer to not reveal information about the fissile materials they use** or their methods for constructing a weapon. The world’s largest nuclear powers, the United States and Russia, both go to great lengths to protect their top secret data on the isotopic composition of their weapons grade plutonium. Even for the United States it’s been a challenge to keep track of its own plutonium. Ola Dahlman, a nuclear physicist and advisor to the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said there is one cubic meter of plutonium that the United States cannot account for. “Nobody is really concerned,” he told National Defense. “But it shows how hard it is to keep track of things.” Because plutonium is not a naturally occurring substance, it can only be made in reactors. Identifying the origin in this case would be somewhat easier because reactors have identifiable signatures. **With uranium weapons the situation gets more complex because experts would have to figure out how it was enriched. “It doesn’t leave many traces**,” said Blair.  Considering how many nuclear weapons still exist on the planet, it may be shocking to many that nuclear forensics is a vanishing science in the United States. **The nation currently has only 40 to 45 scientists who are nuclear forensics experts working at national laboratories**, said Blair. “**Most are pretty old and will be dying soon**.” Only seven universities in the United States offer graduate degrees in radiochemistry, which is one of the primary drivers of nuclear forensics, says Blair. Of those seven programs, four are staffed by just one faculty member. “The U.S. doesn’t really have the brainpower right now to really attack this,” said Blair. It’s also worth noting that **no single U.S. government agency is entirely responsible for nuclear attribution**. The Department of Homeland Security’s Domestic Nuclear Detection Office comes the closest. It operates a nuclear forensic center that coordinates the work of seven agencies. But the lines of responsibility are blurred, Blair said. **If an attack occurred, the FBI would probably step in right away to investigate but the national labs would want to preserve the evidence untouched so they could collect debris**, Blair said. **There would be turf battles within the government, which would complicate the forensics work.**

***The environment is resilient***

**Easterbrook 96** (Gregg, sr editor, The New Republic, former fellow at the Brookings Institute, A Movement on the Earth, p. 25, JM)

"Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But **the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible**. **The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation** more deadly than atomic fallout; **solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion**; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global **air pollution** far worse than that made by any factory**; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles**; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; **300-foot vacillations in sea levels;** shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; **collisions of asteroids and comets** bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. **Yet hearts beat on**, and petals unfold still. **Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape**. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

***1. Alternate causalities – A. human population growth.***

**THE ADVERTISER, March 23, 1999**, p. lexis-nexis

By far the greatest pressure on biodiversity is the demand the growing human population places on the oceans. Marine

ecosystems have been modified and biodiversity lost through the clearing of native vegetation, the introduction of exotic species, pollution and climate change. For example, 5000 million litres of Sydney sewage which has only received primary treatment is discharged into the ocean each day. This is the equivalent of 2000 Olympic swimming pools full of sewage being pumped into the ocean 365 days of the year.

***B. Overfishing***

**The Ocean Conservancy, 2002**, HEALTH OF THE OCEANS REPORT: 2002, http://www.oceanconservancy.org/dynamic/downloads/healthOceans.pdf

Changes in marine food webs as a result of overfishing have far-reaching impacts. As we demonstrate in the chapter on wildlife, the precipitous decline in the number of Steller sea lions in Alaska-from 140,000 in 1972 to 40,000 today-has been linked in part to humans' overfishing of the Stellers' main food sources: pollock, cod, and mackerel. In the chapter on ecosystems, we provide a portrait of the Gulf of Maine, which has lost many of its top predatory species to overfishing. As a result, crustaceans such as lobsters and crabs now dominate, but don't exert a controlling influence on the populations of other species of fish. The serial depletion of fish-fishing one stock to depletion, and then gearing up to fish another one to depletion-simplifies marine ecosystems and contributes to their collapse. Overfishing not only threatens the world's food supply, but can also bring about irreversible changes in marine biodiversity.

***C. Waste***

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration** Year of the OceanReport, **1998**, PERSPECTIVES ON MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TODAY, http://www.yoto98.noaa.gov/yoto/meeting/mar\_env\_316.html

Direct discharges are defined here to include releases from vessels, discharges of municipal and industrial wastewater via pipelines, and dumping of waste materials, such as dredged material, into ocean waters. In the United States, there are more than 2,000 sewage treatment plants, municipalities, and industrial facilities discharging effluents into estuarine and coastal waters. Approximately 2.3 trillion gallons of effluent are discharged into marine waters from sewage treatment facilities annually. While most of this sewage meets secondary treatment standards prior to disposal, nutrients and pathogens from such discharges can contribute to the degradation of local marine ecosystems creating "dead zones"6 and forcing the closure of shellfish beds and swimming areas. Nutrient loading can be significant causes of degradation to coral reefs and other coastal ecosystems.

**Stem**

***STEM workers high now***

**Economics and Statistics Administration (ESA) 7/14/2011** “New Commerce Department Report Shows Fast-Growing STEM Jobs Offer Higher Pay, Lower Unemployment,” <http://www.esa.doc.gov/news/2011/07/14/new-commerce-department-report-shows-fast-growing-stem-jobs-offer-higher-pay-lower-u>, ts)

WASHINGTON – The U.S. Department of Commerce’s Economics and Statistics Administration (ESA) today released a new report that profiles U.S. employment in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields. STEM: Good Jobs Now and for the Future offers an inside look at workers who are driving our nation’s innovation and competitiveness and helping America win the future with new ideas, new companies and new industries. In 2010, 7.6 million people or 5.5 percent of the labor force worked in STEM occupations. Key findings from the new report show that over the past 10 years, growth in STEM jobs was three times greater than that of non-STEM jobs, and STEM jobs are expected to continue to grow at a faster rate than other jobs in the coming decade. Meanwhile, STEM workers are also less likely to experience joblessness. “This report profiles the fast-growing, productive STEM workforce and illustrates how we can win the future by encouraging the pursuit of 21st century jobs in science, technology, engineering and mathematics,” U.S. Commerce Secretary Gary Locke said. “STEM jobs are essential to a competitive, innovative and technologically advanced U.S. economy.”

***1) STEM workers at sufficient levels***

B. Lindsay **Lowell**, Institute for the Study of International Migration, American Behavioral Scientist “A Long View of America’s Immigration Policy and the Supply of Foreign-Born STEM Workers in the United States”, 53(7) 1029–1044, March 20**10**

We hear frequently from prestigious panels or futurists, of one stripe or another, expressions of deep concern over the putative U.S. “restriction” of the highly skilled immigrant, in particular of scientists and engineers (Lowell & Salzman, 2007). It is hard not to come away from these pronouncements with a misleading perception that our system has failed in the past and will continue to fail to supply an adequate number of immigrants to the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). But this is far from the facts of the matter as immigration has continued to supply a substantial number of workers to STEM jobs and, unless STEM employment begins to grow at rates greater than those of the past 7 years, immigrants will continue to be a major supplier of STEM jobs. Contrary to casual perceptions, it can be readily demonstrated that the United States has admitted substantial numbers of immigrants over the past several decades and that there has been significant growth in the numbers of scientists and engineers since the 1990s. The growth during the 1990s was clearly related to the booming economy led by information technology (Dumagan & Gill, 2002; Lowell, 2001). However, it was abetted by an immigration system that is significantly more open than sometimes presumed. For one, family-based visas are issued to many skilled migrants who are sponsored by their often equally skilled spouses (Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, & Smith, 2000; Kaushal & Fix, 2006). Also, the Immigration Act of 1990 increased the number of visas available for foreign-born employment-based visas and diversified and eased admission for temporary skilled workers. In fact, the number of both permanent and temporary workers has continued to grow since the 1990 act went into play. Analyses of the Immigration Act of 1990 find clear evidence that the expanded cap on the employment-based visas increased the permanent admission of skilled workers, as well as their contribution to the flow (Greenwood & Ziel, 1997; Polgreen & Simpson, 2006). In addition, and with little need to resort to sophisticated analysis, temporary work visas can be seen to have admitted a significantly increased number of highly skilled workers. So the 1990 act, arguably, had its intended effect even if that has fallen short of admitting the number of immigrants that some of today’s stakeholders would prefer.

***2) More people than jobs***

B. Lindsay **Lowell**, Director of Research, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University **and** Hal **Salzman**, Professor of Public Policy at the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and. Public Policy and Senior Faculty Fellow at Rutgers, “Into the Eye of the Storm: Assessing the Evidence on Science and Engineering Education, Quality, and Workforce Demand”, October 20**07**, <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411562_Salzman_Science.pdf>

In short, the U.S has been graduating more S&E students than there have been S&E jobs; hence, there are 15.7 million workers who report at least one degree in an S&E field but 4.8 million workers in an S&E occupation. There is, rather obviously, high attrition from school to work, and it simply cannot be explained by underachieving S&E graduates failing to qualify for jobs. At the same time, many of the S&E graduates outside of a formal S&E job may benefit from their training, but the simple indicators used here suggest that such training is not central to their current employment. This evidence suggests that the school-to-work attrition is neither due to poor educational preparation or, more optimistically, to the failure of formal occupational classifications to capture the extent to which S&E training is used in the labor market. Something else appears to be going on.

***3) No future shortage either – US primary education strong***

B. Lindsay **Lowell**, Director of Research, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University **and** Hal **Salzman**, Professor of Public Policy at the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and. Public Policy and Senior Faculty Fellow at Rutgers, “Into the Eye of the Storm: Assessing the Evidence on Science and Engineering Education, Quality, and Workforce Demand”, October 20**07**, <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411562_Salzman_Science.pdf>

The proportion of students who at least finish a high school degree has increased notably over the past 30 years. There is some debate over the precise rate of completion and the appropriate measure to use, but the most widely accepted “status completion” rate for 18- to 24-year-olds compiled by the National Center for Educational Statistics was 83 percent in 1972 and increased to 87 percent by 2004. The different methods result in completion rates that vary, but the trends are similar, showing significant increase in completion rates over the past 20 to 30 years, with slow to marginal increases more recently.2 Although the high school completion rate is lower for certain groups, there has been steady improvement in high school completion for every demographic group. At the same time, more students are staying in school and more of the student population is “on track,” defined as enrolled at the modal grade level for their age. Between 1994 and 2003, there was a 6 percentage point increase to 75 percent of 12- to 17-yearolds who were academically “on track” (Dye and Johnson 2006). High school students’ exposure to science and math has increased over time. In 1982, high school graduates earned 2.6 math credits and 2.2 science credits on average. By 1998, the average number of credits increased to 3.5 math and 3.2 science credits. Further, the share of students who take algebra early increased from 1986 to 1999. The percentage of 13-year-olds enrolled in algebra and in prealgebra rose 38 and 78 percent, to 22 and 34 percent from 16 and 19 percent, respectively (NCES 2001a). Students from all racial/ethnic groups, and both male and female students, significantly increased science and math course-taking, albeit differential achievement rates between groups remain. Table 1 shows the trends from 1990 to 2000. Further, the Council of Chief State School Officers report that the majority of states now require three or four years of high school mathematics and two or three years of high school science (Blank and Langesen 2005). There have been significant gains in course-taking at the national level, increasing from only 45 percent of students taking chemistry in 1990, to 55 percent in 1996, and 60 percent in 2004. The proportion taking three years of math increased from 49 percent in 1990 to 72 percent in 2004, and the proportion of students completing four years of math increased from just 29 percent in 1990 to 37 percent in 1994, and to 50 percent in 2004. Similarly, the number of math and science qualified instructors has increased notably. Of course, the distribution of improvement matters, and there are substantial differences between states and regions and between different demographic groups. Similar trends in math and science are evident among college-bound seniors taking the SAT, though a drop in English composition also occurred (see table 2).

***1) 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.**

***Air power fails---history and Libya proves***

**Ramberg, June 6th, 2011** (Bennett, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins; J.D. UCLA, foreign policy analyst in the [Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Bureau+of+Politico-Military+Affairs%22) at the [Department of State](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Department+of+State%22) during the [George H.W. Bush](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22George+H.W.+Bush%22) administration, academic appointments have included positions at Princeton, Stanford and UCLA, Seattle Post Intelligencer, “Why NATO’s air might lacks power” <http://www.seattlepi.com/default/article/Why-NATO-s-air-might-lacks-power-1411125.php>, jj)

NATO is chagrined. Yes, the bombing campaign stopped [Muammar Qadhafi](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Muammar+Qadhafi%22)'s march on Benghazi. And, yes, it staved off rebel defeats elsewhere, breaking the government's siege on Misurata. But **the alliance's hopes for a quick victory through a mini "shock and awe" failed after months of trying.** Catch me if you can, the dictator taunted NATO in his May 13 radio comment: "I am in a place you cannot reach." **Given NATO's resources, why the failure?** One answer: The colonel is not the blowhard some depicted. That should come as no surprise. Over the decades, Qadhafi proved to be a brutal but deft dictator. He beat back multiple attempts to unseat him. He survived years of isolation following the 1988 Lockerbie bombing. And in 2003, he proved nimble enough to surrender his nascent nuclear program as the quid pro quo for resumption of diplomatic relations with the United States and others. But there remains another reason: **NATO's belief in air power**. **In 1999, the alliance learned** **a** lesson - or, better put, **mislesson - that air power could win wars**. **In** the 11-week **Kosovo** campaign, **air power did** indeed **prevail. NATO hoped the strategy would repeat in North Africa. But the presumption lay on a historic anomaly - with unique caveats - rather than the broader tapestry of air power in history. The result: the Libya stalemate today**. A deeper look at history adds perspective. Air power classically seeks to bend the curve of war toward success. Tactically, it attempts to block adversary gains and provide an additive to ground forces. Strategically, it strives to incite domestic political instability within the adversary's ranks, intimidating the enemy to concede. The Kosovo war included intense NATO bombing subject to a limited objective: the expulsion of Serbian forces from the province. The three-month war included about 10,500 strike missions dropping 12,000 tons of bombs largely flown by the United States under the NATO banner. In addition to military targets, the war destroyed about 50 percent of Serbia's productive capacity. The blow squeezed a nation already reeling in the aftermath of the nearly decadelong Balkan wars. **In the aftermath, some reviewers remained mystified over NATO's air power success.** **After all, no other air campaign** - the dropping of the atomic bomb in World War II excluded - **successfully delivered a knockout blow without an effective ground war**. **The Blitz over Britain in World War II failed. Likewise, the extended bombing of Germany. The fire bombings of Tokyo also stumbled**. **After World War II, other conflicts repeatedly demonstrated the limits of air power**. **In the Cold War's hot wars, air campaigns could only help prevent defeat in Korea. It did not even achieve that in Vietnam. The Soviets found the same in Afghanistan. Israel's 1967 successful air assault on Egypt's air force still required ground forces to win the war. Air power supplemented the 1991 and 2003 wars in Iraq, the Bosnia war and the ongoing war in Afghanistan**. So why did Kosovo prove different? The answer lies less in unconvincing threats of ground intervention or Russia's displeasure with Serbia that some suggest than in the Milosevic regime's conclusion that it could afford to lose the province as long as regime change in Belgrade did not follow. That is not the case in Libya. Despite the [Security Council](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Security+Council%22)'s humanitarian resolution, the leaders of Britain, France and the United States call for Qadhafi's removal. The repeated bombardment of the Libyan leader's residential compound brings the point home. And the colonel has gotten the message and drawn the logical conclusion: Surrender is not an option. **This places NATO in a quandary. Absent a coup or lucky air strike** that takes out Qadhafi, **success requires what all other wars demanded: a competent, reasonably armed and well-led ground capacity. In the Libya case, this will require time, money, equipment and leadership with far more on-the-ground NATO assistance.** For those who think otherwise, they would do well to recall the conclusion [Johns Hopkins](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Johns+Hopkins%22) University strategist [Eliot Cohen](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Eliot+Cohen%22) - the director of the U.S. government's Persian Gulf War evaluation - made in Foreign Affairs in 1994: "**Air power is an unusually seductive form of military strength, in part because, like modern courtship, it appears to offer gratification without commitment." In Libya, gratification will not suffice**.

***Nuclear dries up renewable investment***

**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**. "§ Marked 18:54 § 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."

***Green energy key to prevent extinction***

**Jagger ‘08** (Bianca, Chair, World Future Council, CQ Congressional Testimony, "RENEWABLE ENERGY," 3/6, lexis)

**“If we go beyond the point where human intervention can no longer stabilise the system, then we precipitate unstoppable runaway climate change. That will set in motion a major extinction event** comparable to the five other extinction crises that the earth has previously experienced.” As climate change kicks in, the tropical and subtropical countries of Africa, South Asia and Latin America will heat up more and more, with temperatures becoming increasingly intolerable. **Droughts will affect large parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Melting glaciers will flood river valleys and then, when they have disappeared, unprecedented droughts will occur. § Marked 18:54 § Poor, low-lying countries** such as Bangladesh **will find it** much **harder to cope with sea level rise** than Holland or Florida. If current trends are allowed to continue, **hundreds of millions of people in the poorer countries will lose their homes, as well as the land on which they grow their crops. And then there is the threat of diseases**: By the end of the century **182 million people in sub-Saharan Africa alone could die of diseases directly attributable to climate change**, according to Christian Aid. **Given the scale of this impending disaster, we have no choice but to embark upon a global renewable energy revolution, by replacing our carbon-driven economy with a renewable energy economy**. **The challenge we are facing now is how to switch to a more secure, lower-carbon energy system that** does not undermine economic and social development, and **addresses the threats of climate change** and global inequality.

## 2nc

**Iran 2nc Overview**

***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.**

**2nc impacts**

***Obama won’t open Yucca***

**Vaughan ‘12**

Johnny entered the renewable energy business in 2008 with the belief this is an industry that offers everyone a chance to make money and make a difference no matter if you work in the industry or buy the products. While working as a solar hot water representative he furthered his education and working relationships with business leaders for geothermal and became a supporter Liquid Fuel Thorium Reactors.

8-26-12, Examiner, $15 Billion hole in the ground, <http://www.examiner.com/article/15-billion-hole-the-ground>, jj

As of this month, **plans to store nuclear waste at** Nevada's **Yucca** Mountain **have been defunded** **and abandoned because of two decades of legal challenges and political opposition from the state**. The federal government already has spent about $15 billion, including $9.5 billion collected from industry; on the Yucca facility located about 100 miles from Las Vegas. **At least nine states have banned the construction of new reactors until a permanent storage site is found for thousands of years**. At what point will the public (we the people) demand congress to do something to solve the problem of approximately 2000 tons generated each year or 57,000 tons of nuclear material stored around the country? Is this the work of the Science and Technology Committee? Do we the people want to re-elect the people that approved this $15 Billion hole in the ground or support 200 more nuclear plants without waste storage? Are they qualified to solve our energy problems?

***Obama’s reelection is key to CTBT ratification***

**Schneidmiller**, 7/18/**2011** (Chris – editor of Global Security Newswire, Senate Decision Key to Future of Test Ban Treaty, Nuclear Threat Initiative, p. http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/senate-decision-key-to-future-of-test-ban-treaty/)

The **Obama** administration **is preparing for a lobbying campaign that could *determine the future* of the *C***omprehensive ***T***est ***B***an ***T***reaty (see GSN, July 15). Administration officials have declared in recent months that they intend to follow through on their long-stated pledge to seek the U.S. Senate’s advice and consent on the accord. Still to be determined are when that will occur and whether the White House can overcome entrenched divisions on Capitol Hill to secure necessary Republican support for ratification. The stakes are significant: U.S. approval could draw other holdout nations into the treaty regime, bringing it that much closer to becoming international law, proponents say. Failure would provide those states with continued reason to dismiss the pact -- though critics say they might do that anyway. **Before seeking a vote, the administration intends to carry out a program to educate lawmakers and the public on the value of the treaty**, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen **Tauscher has said** on multiple occasions this year (see GSN, May 11). The effort would address issues likely to be debated in the Senate -- the viability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal without testing, whether all CTBT member states have accepted an absolute ban on any trial blasts, and the ability to catch any state that attempts to cheat. “We continue a long, methodical process to lay the groundwork for Senate consideration of the CTBT,” the State Department said last month in a statement to Global Security Newswire. “Currently, we are in the process of engaging with members of the Senate and their staff on the importance of the CTBT.” It added: “We are not moving for a Senate vote, don’t expect one anytime soon, and will not push for one until we have done the engagement work needed to secure approval.” Several analysts agreed that the White House would not begin the fight until it felt secure the result would be an improvement on the last time a Democratic president tried to persuade the Senate to approve the treaty. The United States signed the pact in 1996, but three years later the Clinton administration ratification effort ran into a brick wall of skeptical lawmakers. The Senate voted 51-48 against approval. A two-thirds affirmative vote would be required for the United States to become a full participant in the accord. Washington is among 44 capitals that must ratify the test ban before it can enter into force. Thirty-five nations have taken that step, leaving only China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan and the United States. President Obama might wait to make his push until after publication of a new National Academy of Sciences report on the treaty, said arms control specialist Jeffrey Lewis. The follow-up to a 2002 academy study is expected to assess the effect that ratification would have on the U.S. capability to keep its nuclear weapons in working order without testing and on the capacity to identify atomic detonations in other nations. The new report is undergoing classification review, which could take weeks or years, according to Lewis. A classified National Intelligence Estimate on the matter was sent to Capitol Hill last August, but has not been seen by most lawmakers, said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. The document is said to offer an updated, thorough assessment of the ability to detect secret nuclear tests, according to Kimball. Senator Robert Casey (D-Pa.) suggested at the Arms Control Association’s annual meeting in May that the Senate might not take up the treaty until after the 2012 election. "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don't have a high degree of confidence that we will," the lawmaker said, echoing time line estimates from other observers. “I don’t think [the Obama administration is], at least in the near term, serious about putting this to a vote,” said Lewis, director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. “I don’t think there’s a desire to have a vote if they think they’re going to lose, and I don’t think the votes are there yet.” Only 41 lawmakers who considered the treaty in 1999 remain in the Senate, Kimball said in a recent issue brief. Newer senators must be briefed on the matter, while the chamber as a whole must be informed of technical developments since 1999 that would promote entry into force. **Politics plays a role in congressional policy debates** and nuclear security will be a topic of discussion during the 2012 presidential election campaign, **Kimball said**. The White House is already taking heat over what Republicans say are inadequate attempts to rein in suspected proliferation activities in nations such as Iran and Syria (see GSN, March 30). Still, **the Senate’s ratification** last year **of** the U.S.-Russian **New START** nuclear arms control pact **is *cause for optimism* about the test ban’s chances on Capitol Hill, Kimball said. Thirteen GOP senators voted in favor** of the bilateral agreement. The two years it took Moscow and Washington to negotiate and approve New START “was relatively fast for a treaty,” according to Kimball. He said the administration should take whatever time is needed to see the test ban passed. “I would hope that the issue of the test ban treaty does not become a partisan political football because there is strong Republican support for the test ban treaty out there,” Kimball said. “If the treaty is not seriously considered by the Senate until after 2012, that will be because it took that much time to sort through the issues and to develop enough support to go ahead with the final stages of the ratification effort.” **That plan**, though, **would *hinge on Obama’s re-election*. Should he be defeated** next year, **the pact would** almost certainly **remain frozen in place in Washington**.

***Ratification of the CTBT prevents multiple scenarios for nuclear war***

**Davis**, 4/11/**2007** (Ian – co-executive director of the American Security Information Council, Getting the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Back on Track, Huffington Post, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dame-anita-roddick-and-dr-ian-davis/getting-the-nuclear-test-\_b\_45625.html+CTBT+obama+priority&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=10&gl=us)

The United States is key to progress. But the US Senate's highly partisan 1999 rejection of the CTBT, the opposition of the Bush administration, and the reluctance of the nine other CTBT hold-outs have left the treaty to languish. It never enjoyed formal entry into force and this inaction has left the door open to renewed nuclear testing. The new Senate leadership should make **reinvigoration of the global nonproliferation regime** a high priority. Ratifying the CTBT could provide a **centerpiece** to demonstrating a change in leadership: the US rejoining the rest of the world to promote international cooperative agreements, from reducing global warming to keeping lethal WMD material out of the hands of criminals and terrorists. This can't happen too soon. North Korea has marched through the open door with its first underground test of an atomic device. There is widespread agreement that the test has escalated tension in the region and raised the stakes in the stand-off with the United States. It could also destroy the prospects for the CTBT and open the floodgates to more nuclear-armed states. While we welcome the current agreement with Pyonyang which may ultimately eliminate the North Korean nuclear program, and lead to a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, the details of implementation have yet to be worked out, and already, strong conservative opposition to the agreement is beginning to appear. The door to an alternative way forward is also still open, and the ***U***nited ***S***tates could seize the **moral high ground** by leading the world through it. If President Bush were to press the Senate to reconsider and support ratification of the treaty, it could be part of a far-reaching strategy for **shoring up the North Korean agreement**, peacefully **tackling the Iranian nuclear program** and for preventing a world with ***40 or more nuclear powers***. The North Korean and Iranian nuclear crises exemplify an increasing number of damaging developments that make it clear that the non-proliferation system needs to be **strengthened** and updated, not neglected or discarded. The international community must not only work together to develop more effective diplomatic approaches towards North Korea and Iran, but it must also apply stricter international safeguards on all nuclear programs, prevent the spread of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, secure a global halt to the production of fissile material for weapons purposes, take new steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons and achieve the entry into force of the CTBT. If, in 1963, at the height of the Cold War, the US, UK, and USSR could negotiate a limited test ban treaty. Why can't we ratify a comprehensive treaty now? Were we less threatened then? Are Iran and North Korea greater threats to the United States than was the USSR? The CTBT is ***vital*** to a system of security that **does not rely on nuclear weapons**. Its entry into force would put a ***cap on the nuclear age***. Posturing for domestic politics and insisting on a macho attitude in international relations has dangerous long-term implications, both for America and the rest of the world. Since the Bush administration has come to power, global non-proliferation has gone into a holding pattern at best, a **tailspin at worst**. That can only lead to a world overpopulated with nuclear weapons and a ***nuclear war sooner or later***. The consequences do not bear thinking about. So it is vital that CTBT supporters put the treaty back on the American and European political agenda and move to secure ratification by other key states.

***Romney cuts pell grants – that’s key to STEM workers***

[LEVY](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/pema_levy.php), 9/5/2012 (PEMA, is a News Writer at TPM covering the 2012 election. Before coming to TPM, Pema was an assistant editor at The American Prospect where she wrote about politics and the economy, [TPM2012](http://2012.talkingpointsmemo.com/), “Duncan: ‘Romney Will Cut Education’ To Give Millionaires A Tax Break,” <http://2012.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/09/dncc-convention-education-duncan-pell-grants.php>, ts)

Speakers stressed Obama’s work on education, particularly his expansion of the Pell grant program, and compared the president’s priorities to the cuts they argued Mitt Romney’s policies would impose. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan described the steps Obama has taken to improve education. “Our president knows education is about jobs. It’s about giving every child a shot at a secure middle-class life,” Duncan said. “Right now, we’re in a race for jobs and industries of the future. If countries like China out-educate us today, they’ll out-compete us tomorrow.” Duncan spoke to the strides Obama has made toward student loan reform and making college more accessible to young people — another crucial constituency in November. He fought to keep student loan interest rates from going up. He fought for Pell grants. He took the big banks out of the federal student loan program and passed billions of dollars in savings on to young people. This year alone, he helped nearly 10 million students afford college. Duncan also lit into Romney and Paul Ryan, arguing they would cut American investment in education. “Under the Romney-Ryan budget, education would be cut by as much as 20 percent,” Duncan said. “In order to cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires, Gov. Romney will cut education for our children.” To bring the point home, a Florida college student, Johanny Adames, described her support for Obama on stage. A student at Miami Dade College who became a U.S. citizen this year, Adames said that the Pell Grant program made it possible for her to attend college. “But Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan want to cut the Pell grants that make my future possible,” Adames said. “If they won’t invest in my future, do they really believe in America’s?”

***Romney cuts Pell Grants***

**ThinkProgress, 10/3/2012** (ThinkProgress’ live coverage of the first presidential debate, hosted by the University of Denver, in Colorado. Our teams in Washington D.C. and on the ground in Denver will fact-check both candidates’ claims in real time and offer a wide range of multimedia content. Ryan would cut Pell Grants, http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2012/10/03/953591/thinkprogress-liveblog-of-the-first-presidential-debate/)

On the topic of education, it’s important to keep Romney’s running mate in mind. VP pick Paul Ryan’s budget limits nondefense discretionary appropriations (which includes funding for Pell Grants) to $474 billion next year, $38 billion below the CBO’s baseline. If Ryan’s cuts are apportioned equally and across the board, it would cut discretionary funding for the Pell Grant program [by more than $15 billion total](http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2012/10/03/953591/thinkprogress-liveblog-of-the-first-presidential-debate/%E2%80%9Dhttp:/www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/higher-education/report/2012/08/28/34421/the-ryan-budgets-pell-grant-cuts-put-college-out-of-reach-for-low-income-students/%E2%80%9D), or 42 percent, next year alone. This would eliminate Pell Grants for 1 million students and reduce remaining grants by more than $1,500, on average, for each Pell Grant recipient:

***Republicans 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.**

***The impact is great power wars***

**Mead, ’09** [Walter Russell, Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, New Republic, February 4, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2]

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. **Crisis** can also **strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists** who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well**. If financial crises have been a normal part of life** during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, **so has war.** **The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war:** The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises**. Bad economic times can breed wars**. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but **the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States** may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we **may still have to fight.**

***And, turns aff’s investment***

**Richard 10/10/08** (Michael Graham, L.L.P, Law “4 Reasons Why Recession is BAD for the Environment”

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-graham-richard/4-reasons-why-recession-i_b_133564.html>)

1) **When squeezed, companies** will **reduce** their **investments into** research & development and **green** **programs**. These are usually not short-term profit centers, so **that is what's axed first.** Some progress has been made in the past few years, it would be sad to lose ground now. 2) **Average people**, when money is tight, will **look for less expensive products** (duh). Right now, **that** usually **means** that **greener products won't make it.** Maybe someday if we start taxing "bads" instead of "goods" (pollution, carbon, toxins instead of labor, income, capital gains) the least expensive products will also be the greenest, but right now that's not the case. 3) **There's less money going into the stock markets and bank loans are harder to get, which means that many small firms and startups working on** the breakthrough **green technologies** of tomorrow **can have trouble getting funds or can** even **go bankrupt**, especially if their clients or backers decide to make cuts. 4) **During economic crises, voters want the government to appear to be doing something about the economy** (even if it's government that screwed things up in the first place). **They'll accept all kinds of measures and laws, including those that aren't good for the environment. Massive corn subsidies anyone? *Don't even think about progress on global warming...***

Uq

***Jobs report gives Obama momentum***

**Wolf 10-5** (Richard Wolf, USA TODAY, 10-5-12, Analysis: Jobs report provides political boost for Obama <http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2012/10/05/jobs-election-obama-romney-analysis/1613551/>, jj)

**The Labor Department's report that unemployment has fallen below 8% for the first time since January 2009 is sure to provide a needed political boost for** President **Obama.** 9:46AM EST October 5. 2012 - For President Obama, **the first national unemployment rate to fall below 8% during his presidency couldn't come at a better time. The Labor Department's announcement** this morning that the economy gained 114,000 jobs in September and the jobless rate fell from 8.1% to 7.8% **represents a big**, if temporary, **political boost for a president suddenly struggling to overcome a poor performance in the first nationally televised debate.** What's more, **Obama can even boast that jobs numbers for July and August were better than previously announced**. **In August, for instance, 142,000 jobs were created, not the 96,000 announced last month.**

***Wallstreet predicts Obama win***

**Okpalaoka 10-3** (Ugonna Okpalaoka | October 3, 2012, the Grio, Wall Street predicts an Obama victory <http://thegrio.com/2012/10/03/wall-street-predicts-an-obama-victory/>, jj)

**Wall Street analysts have publicly declared their prediction for the 2012 presidential election, and it looks like** President Barack **Obama is set to win**, Talking Points Memo reported. **This prediction is worth its weight because firms hire analysts to pay close attention to the race and monitor the economic implications of the election outcome.** As TPM explains: Party strategists and reporters aren’t the only ones who get paid to evaluate the presidential landscape — **firms routinely hire analysts or “political intelligence” firms to predict election outcomes or, more importantly, game out legislative scenarios on Capitol Hill**. While partisans may have the luxury of optimism as to whether their candidate might **prevail, investors need to keep a clear head if they want to predict whether the health care companies will be transformed by Romney repealing Obamacare or the defense industry pinched by the upcoming sequester. The finance world has been foreseeing an Obama victory for some time now.** “**Obama has led in the polls all year**,” Tina Fordham, Citi’s senior political analyst, told Politico. “**And history suggests that incumbent presidents who maintain their lead go on to be re-elected**.” She also said **there is a reduced risk for an ‘October Surprise’ that would change the election’s outcome because “the two main external threats to the U.S. economy — and thereby Obama’s re-election — have receded.” An informal Business Insider poll of over 200 financial traders showed that 65 percent of them believe Obama will win the election. And the Moody’s Analytics presidential election model is also expecting the President to win in November. Based on the economic data, the model predicts that Obama will win 303 electoral votes, more than the 270 needed to win the race.**

***Obama’s winning but Romney’s pulling close and it could swing***

**Salant 10-3** (Jonathan D. Salant on October 03, 2012, Bloomberg Businessweek, Obama Lead Over Romney Similar to 2008 Margin Over McCain <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-10-03/romney-narrows-gap-in-florida-and-virginia-swing-states-poll>, jj)

**A poll of three swing states** released today **shows Republican challenger Mitt Romney pulling closer to** President Barack **Obama in Florida and Virginia while continuing to trail in Ohio**. **The NBC News/Wall Street Journal/Marist College survey of likely voters taken Sept. 30-Oct. 1 put Obama ahead in Florida, 47 percent to 46 percent, and in Virginia, 48 percent to 46 percent**. Obama led by five points in both states in the Sept. 9-11 NBC/Journal/Marist poll. **In Ohio**, without which a Republican candidate has never won the White House, **Obama led, 51 percent to 43 percent**. He was ahead, 50 percent to 43 percent, in last month’s poll. **The results in Florida and Virginia show Romney closing the gap in two states crucial to his White House hopes** as the two presidential candidates prepare for their first of three debates tonight. The debate, to be held at the University of Denver in Colorado, starts at 9 p.m. Washington time. **Romney** also **reduced Obama’s lead in a national** NBC/Journal **poll** released yesterday. **The president led Romney, 49 percent to 46 percent**, among likely voters, down from 50 percent to 45 percent in a comparable survey two weeks earlier. Obama’s margin increased to five points over Romney -- 48 percent to 43 percent -- when third-party candidates were included. **A NPR poll released today gave Obama a seven-point lead, 51 percent to 44 percent, among likely voters nationally**. That survey of 800 likely voters was conducted Sept. 26-30 and has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. Gender Gap In the NBC/Journal poll of swing states -- those with a history of voting for either major party candidate -- Romney gained in Florida and Virginia among likely female voters. In Florida, Obama led among women, 48 percent to 45 percent, down from a 12-point advantage last month. Men backed Romney by one point, 47 percent to 46 percent, after supporting him 49 percent to 45 percent in September. Women in Virginia backed Obama, 52 percent to 44 percent, down from 54 percent to 40 percent in September. Romney led among men, 48 percent to 45 percent, compared with a 49 percent to 44 percent advantage the previous month. In Ohio, where Obama retained his lead, he polled 56 percent of female voters compared with 39 percent for Romney. In September, Obama’s advantage was 54 percent to 38 percent. Romney led among men, 48 percent to 46 percent, unchanged from a month ago. Favorable View **At least 50 percent of voters in all three states viewed Obama favorably**. In Florida, Romney was viewed favorably by 46 percent and unfavorably by 43 percent. His unfavorable rating was higher than his favorable one in Ohio, 51 percent to 42 percent, and in Virginia, 47 percent to 45 percent. **Obama was preferred on handling the economy, 48 percent to 44 percent**, in Ohio. Romney had the advantage in Virginia, 46 percent to 45 percent, and the two candidates were tied in Florida at 45 percent. Pollsters surveyed by telephone 890 likely voters in Florida with a margin of error of plus or minus 3.3 percentage points, 931 likely voters in Ohio with a margin of error of 3.2 percentage points, and 969 likely voters in Virginia with a margin of error of 3.1 percentage points. In the national NBC/Journal poll, 43 percent of registered voters said Romney, a former Massachusetts governor and private- equity executive, would do better at creating jobs and improving the economy; 42 percent picked Obama. Among these voters, Obama was viewed favorably by 52 percent and unfavorably by 42 percent; Romney was rated favorably by 41 percent and unfavorably by 44 percent. Economic Recovery **Registered voters, by 57 percent to 39 percent, said the economy was recovering**; by 44 percent to 13 percent, they said it would improve in the next 12 months; 35 percent said it wouldn’t change. **Obama’s job performance rating was 49 percent positive and 48 percent negative.**

***Multiple election forecast models indicate Obama win***

**Balz 9-30** (Dan Balz, The Washington Post staff, 9-30-12, Standard Examiner, Political scientists predict Obama victory, but it's not unanimous <http://www.standard.net/stories/2012/09/30/political-scientists-predict-obama-victory-its-not-unanimous>, jj)

Polls give Obama the advantage, nationally and in most of the battleground states, but they are, as is often said, snapshots in time, not predictions of the future. **The election forecasts are in fact predictions, based on various and varied statistical models. Most give the advantage to the president**, but the verdict is not unanimous. The 13 projections are contained in the new issue of PS: Political Science and Politics, which is published by the American Political Science Association. **Eight of them project that Obama will win the popular vote**; five say the popular vote will go to Romney. But the degree of certainty in those forecasts differs. **One projection favoring the president says there is an 88 percent certainty that he’ll win, while two others forecasting Obama say there is only a 57 percent certainty.** James E. Campbell, the department chairman at the University at Buffalo in New York, who wrote the introduction to the package, rates them this way: **Five predict that Obama will win a plurality of the two-party vote, although three are on "the cusp of a toss-up**." Five predict that Romney will win the plurality of the two-party vote. Three are in what he calls the toss-up range. One of the most bullish of the Obama-will-win projections comes from Helmut Norpoth, a professor at Stony Brook University, and Michael Bednarczuk, a grad student at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. They wrote that **Obama will defeat Romney "by a comfortable margin." Their projection, made 299 days before the election, is based on a model that takes into account the performance of the candidates in the primaries and presidential election cycles**. "In plain English," they wrote, "Obama has history on his side as well as the fact that he was unchallenged in the primaries." One of the most bearish about the president’s prospects is Alfred G. Cuzan, the department chairman at the University of West Florida. He notes that since 1880, a sitting president has lost his reelection bid only six times, and only twice when the incumbent had succeeded a president of a different party. But Cuzan, whose model is called the "Fiscal Model," looks at changes in government spending relative to the size of the economy as his guide. He argues that the expansionary spending policies of the president dim his chances of winning. "Even if he does squeeze by the Republican candidate," Cuzan wrote, "it is highly likely that President Obama would do so with a smaller share of the vote than in 2008, the first president in well over a century to be reelected to a second term by a thinner margin of victory than he received the first time around." Alan Abramowitz, a professor at Emory University, looks at the advantages of incumbency, presidential approval as of the end of June in an election year and change in real gross domestic product in the second quarter of the year. He calls his method the "Time for a Change" model. He also has made adjustments to factor in the increased polarization in the electorate, which he says has affected the impact of certain fundamentals that generally determine the outcome. **He projected a one-point margin for Obama in the popular vote, but added: "Barring any changes in the second quarter GDP estimate, this is the closest popular vote margin predicted by the model in the entire postwar era** although it is only slightly smaller than the 1.2 point margin predicted for Jimmy Carter in 1976." That was before the government revised its second-quarter real GDP growth estimate down from 1.7 percent to 1.3 percent. I e-mailed Abramowitz to ask whether he would change his forecast. He said the idea is to forecast the result before the conventions. He said the new GDP number would reduce Obama’s predicted margin but said the president’s better approval ratings would somewhat offset that. He also said he believes **the race will tighten before November. Campbell also foresees a close outcome, but he still tipped in Obama’s direction. He uses two different models, although both include real GDP as one of the factors. Incumbency, he notes, is one big advantage for the president, while the economy is obviously Obama’s problem**. In terms of economic growth, he noted, Obama ranks eighth out of the past 10 presidents who sought reelection. Veteran modeler Michael Lewis-Beck of the University of Iowa and Charles Tien, the department chairman at Hunter College in New York, offer contrasting forecasts based on competing models. A traditional "Jobs Model" shows Obama in deep trouble. But using a different model, they see Obama winning. Forced to choose between the two, they stick to the jobs model, which shows Obama capturing about 48 percent of the vote. Conceding that any inherent margin for error could result in an Obama victory, they nonetheless concluded, "It still suggests an Obama victory is unlikely." Robert Erikson, a Columbia University professor, and Christopher Wlezien of Temple University use a wide variety of economic measures in their "Leading Economic Indicators and the Polls" model. They noted the disparity between perceptions of business conditions and leading economic indicators on the one hand and income growth on the other. Four years ago, the first two were at historic lows while income growth was "middling." This year it is the reverse. They ask: "What does this suggest about President Obama’s electoral fate? Is it a dismal election-year economy that dooms the president to certain defeat? Or are economic circumstances brighter than the income numbers would indicate, offering promise of reelection?" **Their answer, made a month before the party conventions, was for a very close election with Obama slightly favored**, despite the fact that economic conditions alone would seem to make Romney the heavy favorite.

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

**Meyers & Walter 10-1** (Jim Meyers and Kathleen Walter, 10-1-12, Newsmax, Rasmussen: Race Still Close, 'Could Go Either Way' <http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/rasmussen-2012-presidential-debates/2012/10/01/id/458240>, jj)

Pollster and political analyst Scott Rasmussen tells Newsmax that **despite new polls showing President Obama pulling ahead of Mitt Romney, the race is still close and “could go either way.”** He also says **poll numbers have historically shifted against the incumbent in the weeks leading up to Election Day** — and predicts that this week’s debate could have a “big impact” on the election. Rasmussen is founder and president of Rasmussen Reports and co-founder of the sports network ESPN. He has been an independent public opinion pollster for more than a decade, and most major news organizations cite his reports. **The Rasmussen Daily Presidential Tracking poll for Sunday has Mitt Romney leading Barack Obama 50 percent to 47 percent**. But a new Washington Times/Zogby survey has Obama ahead by 8 points, and a Washington Post/ABC News poll shows the president pulling ahead in swing states. In an exclusive interview with Newsmax.TV, Rasmussen observes: “**What we do know is in the last couple of elections, between the first of October and Election Day, the numbers have shifted about three points. And they generally tend to shift against the party that currently has the White House.**

**A2: “October Surprise” Thumpers – General**

***No October suprises***

**Okpalaoka 10-3** (Ugonna Okpalaoka | October 3, 2012, the Grio, Wall Street predicts an Obama victory <http://thegrio.com/2012/10/03/wall-street-predicts-an-obama-victory/>, jj)

She also said **there is a reduced risk for an ‘October Surprise’ that would change the election’s outcome because “the two main external threats to the U.S. economy** — and thereby Obama’s re-election — **have receded.”**

***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 Mid East Thumpers**

***Middle east issues don’t swing the election.***

**Herb 9-15**. [Jeremy, Defense reporter, "President Obama’s ‘proud’ statements on improving US image might boomerang" The Hill -- thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/249651-obamas-proud-statements-on-improving-us-image-might-backfire]

Larry **Korb, a defense analyst** at the liberal-leaning Center for American Progress, **said this week’s incidents in the Middle East would not harm Obama’s reelection chances** — **and that more of a focus on foreign policy actually would help the president,** **despite the violence**.¶ “**What Americans are much more concerned about is getting out of the wars, getting bin Laden**,” Korb said. “**If Romney is going to win, it’s going to be on the economy. It’s not going to be foreign policy. People are happy we’re out of Iraq and on our way out of Afghanistan.”**

**A2: Israel Strikes Iran Thumper**

***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.**

**A2: Eurozone thumper**

***Merkel’s defusing the Euro crisis --- protects Obama from fallout***

**Weinthal 9-19** (Benjamin Weinthal is a Berlin-based fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies and a European affairs correspondent for the Jerusalem Post. 9-19-12, Herald Online, Did Germany’s Angela Merkel Save Obama? <http://www.heraldonline.com/2012/09/19/4276095/did-germanys-angela-merkel-save.html>, jj)

BERLIN — Barack **Obama** had a lot on his hands last week with attacks on U.S. embassies across the Middle East, but in Europe, a big story buried by the drama of firefights in Libya, Cairo riots, and tumult in Tunisia should have him sleeping a bit easier. In fact, he **might want to send a thank-you note to** Germany's top court, which last Wednesday upheld Chancellor Angela **Merkel**'s plan to rescue the euro. “**Germany today is sending again a strong signal to Europe and beyond**,” declared Merkel, who Forbes magazine last month called the most powerful woman in the world. The Federal Constitutional Court — Germany's functional equivalent to the U.S. Supreme Court — ruled that Merkel's administration can allocate funds to the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) to help bail out fledgling eurozone countries, as well purchase bonds from Italy and Spain's struggling economies. **Had the German federal court** in the southwestern city of Karlsruhe **declared the ESM to be unconstitutional, the ruling would have** severely **jolted** the European (and very likely the **American) markets**. Holger **Schmieding**, chief economist at Berenberg Bank, **termed the decision “another big step towards defusing the euro crisis.” Merkel's tireless push for the European Stability Mechanism** Treaty, under which Germany will contribute 190 billion euros to a 500 billion euro fund to prop up the faltering Italian, Spanish, and Greek economies, **should come as welcome news to** President **Obama, helping to shore up his chances of winning reelection later this fall**. At the very least, **it won't hurt**. **U.S. stock markets were upbeat on the news of the German ruling**, with the Dow Jones Industrial Average rising 44 points shortly before the market opened for the day. Major U.S. stock indexes — Dow Jones, S&P 500, and Nasdaq — closed the week with notable gains. Yet the market indexes should be taken with a heavy dose of salt; the Federal Reserve's announcement last Thursday to inject $40 billion in mortgage-backed securities each month over an indefinite period of time surely helped as well. But at least Obama, Federal Chairman Ben Bernanke, and Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner are putting their (well, your) money where their mouths are. The administration has long warned Germany of the costs of imposing austerity on the rest of Europe. In late July, Geithner cracked the whip like a 19th-century German schoolmaster, warning Merkel to fall in line behind stimulus packages. “If you leave Europe on the edge of the abyss as your source of leverage, your strategy's unlikely to work,” said Geithner, “because you're going to raise the ultimate cost of the crisis . . . and you're going to . . . do a lot of damage to the politics of those countries, because the human costs of what's happening not just in Greece but across Europe now are enormously high, and you're seeing that reflected in much more political extremism.” Geithner could have added that austerity-driven policies would have affected the U.S. economy, and thus, his boss's chances of reelection. Earlier this week, one observer quipped that European Central Bank (ECB) president Mario Draghi had done more than perhaps the president himself to secure Obama's second term in the White House. Draghi navigated the ECB to green-light purchases of short-term government bonds from indebted countries to rescue their wobbly economies. The Italian banker's move prompted the Deutsche Bundesbank and its powerful head Jens Weidmann to issue an unusually sharp dissent, noting that the ECB's decision was “tantamount to financing governments by printing banknotes.” For Germans with a salient historical memory of the hyperinflation and largely worthless currency of the Weimar Republic crisis period, Draghi seemed to be laying a foundation for a wave of dangerous inflation. Merkel had spent weeks pushing for Draghi's economic prescriptions (“whatever it takes”) to save the euro, by recapitalizing struggling Spanish banks and putting the Greek economy on life support. And, though the German public may be a bit confused over all this, **Merkel — and Obama — got what they wanted.** But **Merkel's favor to Obama comes at a strange moment** in U.S.-German relations, a moment in which tensions have run higher than usual. The relationship between these two leaders has had its ups and downs. And it didn't start out all that well: In 2008, Merkel remarked through a spokesman that she found it “odd” that then-candidate Obama planned to visit Berlin, and that she had “little sympathy for the Brandenburg Gate being used for electioneering and has expressed her doubts about the idea.” In the years since that inauspicious beginning, relations between Angie and Barack warmed. But they cooled dramatically in March 2011, when Merkel joined Russia and China at the U.N. Security Council in abstaining from a vote on the U.S.-led resolution to impose a no-fly zone intended to stop Moammar Gadhafi's forces from attacking civilians in Libya. The incident marked a low point in relations between the two leaders: Obama shot back at Merkel, declaring that “some nations may be able to turn a blind eye to atrocities in other countries” — but the United States could not. A little less than two weeks later, Merkel's Foreign Ministry — led by the pro-business Free Democratic Party politician Guido Westerwelle — frustrated Obama administration officials when it midwifed a deal under which India bought 1.5 billion euros ($2.1 billion) of Iranian crude oil through the Bundesbank. “Treasury is concerned about recent reports that the German government authorized the use of EIH 1 / 8the European-Iranian trade bank in Hamburg 3 / 8, as a conduit for India's oil payments to Iran,” noted a U.S. Treasury official. The Bundesbank cooperated with EIH, which the European Union has since included in its sanctions list for facilitating payments to Iran's nuclear program in contravention of Washington's wishes. It may have annoyed the United States, but for Merkel, it was just another domestic political masterstroke: German's foreign and economic ministries — both of which are run by her government's coalition partner, the Free Democrats (whose voting constituencies center around small and mid-size company owners) twisted the arm of the ostensibly independent Bundesbank to transfer the payments to the EIH. Germany remains Iran's largest EU trade partner, with an annual bi-lateral trade volume hovering around 4 billion euros, and this robust trade relationship has been a source of great irritation for the Bush and Obama administrations. According to WikiLeaks, U.S. diplomatic cable dispatches noted before the Treasury rebuke that “Germany won't sanction German Bank EIH” because “the German business community is very powerful.” Anyway, it wasn't long before the diplomatic fissures between Washington and Berlin were repaired. A mere two months after the EIH scandal surfaced, Obama awarded Merkel the Presidential Medal of Freedom in a June ceremony at the White House. In his tribute to the physicist turned politician, Obama said that “Chancellor Merkel has promoted liberty and prosperity in her own country, in Europe, and throughout the world.” So far, Merkel has had little problem pursuing her interests, with or without Washington's approval. She enjoys high popularity among her citizens, and looks likely to win a third term in the national elections in 2013. An Emnid poll on Sunday showed that Merkel secured a 2 point increase and has climbed 12 points ahead of her nearest rival, the Social Democratic Party (SPD). According to the weekly Die Zeit, Merkel's successful crisis management has helped boost her lead in front of the SPD to the largest since the 2009 federal election. But the German electorate is deeply divided over the wisdom and equity of bailing out feeble southern European economies at its expense. In challenging the ESM bailout based on unconstitutionality, Germans mounted their largest-ever grassroots petition, collecting 37,000 signatures and bringing the measure all the way to the high court. A poll commissioned by the German press agency DPA and conducted by YouGov days before the court ruling showed 53 percent of Germans oppose the shift of more power to the EU, and 54 percent of those questioned sought a legal review of the ESM and further contributions to the eurozone. Germany's largest daily, the mass-circulation Bild, which has frequently editorialized in favor of expelling Greece from the currency union, headlined the court's decision “Merkel's expensive victory.” Despite the deep-seated euro skepticism among large swaths of the German electorate, Merkel remains wedded to the common European currency project. The Berlin daily Der Tagesspiegel and the top German business daily Handelsblatt both said the judges had saved Merkel from an ugly domestic defeat. It shows political toughness on the part of Merkel, but it still bears costs that the chancellor will be forced to assuage the public on. Think of it like this: The court's ruling is like the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in June to uphold Obama's signature piece of domestic health care legislation — the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as Obamacare. Had Obama lost that decision it would have hurt him politically; but even in winning he still needs to convince the public that it's the right policy. Germany's federal constitutional court did place some restrictions on Merkel's mobility, however, barring her from reaching further into taxpayer coffers on behalf of weaker EU economies. Chief Justice Andreas Vosskuhle said that “No rule of the treaty must be interpreted in a way which would result in higher payment obligations by Germany, without the consent of the German representative.” In other words, if Merkel wants to contribute any more than the 190 billion euros that Germany has already budgeted for the latest bailout, she'll need the approval of parliament. But with most parties in the Bundestag lined up behind her, Merkel has political capital to spare, and she has just scored an impressive domestic victory. The same Merkel who snubbed Obama's campaign efforts four years ago in the German capital may now make a decisive difference in his reelection four years later. **If Europe's markets do not go into upheaval over the next several months**, sparking a trans-Atlantic economic spillover effect in the United States, **Obama might just ride Merkel's coattails to election victory**.

**A2: Job Numbers Report Thumper**

***Job reports don’t swing the election***

**Raum 9-16** (Tom Raum, Associated Press / September 16, 2012, Christian Science Monitor, Do the jobs numbers matter to voters? http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Latest-News-Wires/2012/0916/Do-the-jobs-numbers-matter-to-voters, jj)

**The government's monthly jobs report has become Washington's most anticipated and studied economic indicator, pounced upon by politicians, economists and journalists for snap judgments as the presidential election nears**. **But in the real world, most everybody else just looks around and figures things out for themselves.**

**Is that steel plant closing? Are Ford or General Motors rehiring?** How much are those groceries? What's a full tank of gas going to run me? How much is our house worth? How's that 401(k) doing? When will I find another job? Will our college-educated daughter ever find work and move out.

**These are the kinds of questions economists and pollsters say are on people's minds more than government statistics.**

**"People are not looking at these government reports to decide how the economy is doing**, or how well they or their neighbors are doing. They know from their own daily experience," Democratic pollster Mark Mellman said.

**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.”**

***The base is excited now***

**Blake ‘12**

Aaron Blake, 07/25/2012, the Washington Post, Enthusiasm: The Holy Grail of the 2012 race <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/post/enthusiasm-the-elusive-holy-grail-of-the-2012-race/2012/07/25/gJQAxMHCAX_blog.html>, jj

The 39 percent of Democrats who told Gallup they were more enthusiastic than before other recent elections is the lowest that number has been measured in a presidential election cycle since March 2000. And **the 59 percent who told CNN they were “extremely” or “very” enthusiastic is much higher than it has been in recent months** — a suggestion that it might have been a momentary bump. (**The CNN poll may have been a reflection of Obama’s recent base-rallying announcements, including coming out in support of gay marriage, stopping the deportation of young illegal immigrants, and pushing for tax cuts for the wealthy to expire**.) Overall, **both sides right now have something to be excited about** and something to keep them from showing up to vote. That’s why enthusiasm overall is lower at this point than it was in either 2004 or 2008, and it’s also why we’ve seen some muddled polling on the enthusiasm gap.

**A2: winners win**

***Obama can’t parlay wins***

Peggy **Noonan**, “The Town Hall Revolt, One Year Later”, July 10th 20**10**, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704111704575355403205238916.html?KEYWORDS=Peggy+Noonan

The president, of course, got his victory on health care. But a funny thing is, normally the press and the public judge a president's effectiveness in large part by legislative victories—whether he has "the ability to get his program through Congress." Winning brings winning, which increases popularity. Mr. Obama won on more than health care; he won on the stimulus package and the Detroit bailout. And yet his poll numbers continue to float downward. He is not more loved with victory. To an unusual and maybe unprecedented degree his victories seem like victories for him, and for his party, and for his agenda, but they haven't settled in as broad triumphs that illustrate power and competence.

**A2: Venezuela Thumper**

***No Venezuela civil war***

**Mander 10-2** (Benedict Mander in Caracas, 10-2-12, Financial Times, Chávez turns to spin to avoid turbulence <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/5269807c-0c7a-11e2-a776-00144feabdc0.html#axzz28Gik9be6>, jj)

Nevertheless, **fears that the military would back Mr Chávez if he failed to admit defeat were** partially **assuaged when General** Wilmer **Barrientos, the army’s senior operational commander for the elections, assured last month that his “highly professional institution” would “remain loyal to the constitution and respect the decision of the people”.**

“**The army** has been subjected to strong pressure [from Chávez], and the high command is clearly politicised…But the majority **are committed to democracy**,” said Rocío San Miguel, an anti-Chávez activist who heads the watchdog Citizen Control, which focuses on national security issues.

Ms San Miguel is more concerned about the 125,000-strong Bolivarian National Militia, which will assist the army in ensuring stability during the elections and which is seen as an “armed wing of the revolution” and a kind of presidential Praetorian guard.

Meanwhile, unofficial armed urban militias that profess loyalty to Mr Chávez are a more unpredictable and combustible force, especially in a highly polarised country where some 12m illegal arms circulate, impunity reigns and the homicide rate is one of the highest in the world.

The International Crisis Group think-tank warned earlier this year that politicians could take advantage of the bandana-clad vigilantes to stoke unrest, while they might even “take to the streets on their own”.

The government argues that the danger comes from the other side. “Everything indicates that the opposition has a violent plan,” says Miguel Angel Pérez Pirela, a prominent commentator on state television, who argues Mr Capriles has failed to say that he would unconditionally accept the election results.

“The problem is that there is a very small part of the opposition backed by the US that has a lot of money and a lot of interests, and that in the past has resorted to violence and coups. It’s the same group that is trying to take power now.”

Nevertheless, Ms San **Miguel rules out civil war in Venezuela**. “**For that you need two forces capable of dominating territory, but the only force capable of doing that is the army**,” she said, arguing that **it is unlikely that the army would split as it never has in previous coups. “I doubt that there will be serious public unrest.”**

**A2: not perceived**

***Fusion is perceived as nuclear power***

**Economist, 10** (“Expensive Iteration: A huge international fusion-reactor project faces funding difficulties” 6/22, <http://www.economist.com/node/16635938>)

VIABLE **nuclear fusion has been only 30 years away** since the idea was first mooted in the 1950s. Its latest three-decade incarnation is ITER, a joint effort by the European Union (EU), America, China, India, Japan, Russia and South Korea to construct a prototype reactor on a site in Cadarache, France, by 2018. If all goes to plan, in about 30 years it will be reliably producing more energy than is put in.

**The International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor became plain ITER following public anxiety about anything that has “thermonuclear” next to “experimental” in its name**. ITER aims to produce energy by fusing together the nuclei of hydrogen atoms, confined in a magnetic field at high temperatures—a process akin to that which powers the sun.

For all its cosmic ambition**, ITER has run into the earthiest of difficulties: spiralling costs**. The project was never going to be cheap. Initial projections in 2006 put its price at €10 billion ($13 billion): €5 billion to build and another €5 billion to run and decommission the thing. Since then construction costs alone have tripled.

***Lack of public awareness means plan gets conflated with fission --- studies prove***

**Jones et al 10**

Tom Horlick-Jones, Cardiff University School of Social Sciences, UK

Ana Prades, CIEMAT, Spain

Josep Espluga, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain

Investigating the degree of “stigma” associated with nuclear energy technologies: A cross-cultural examination of the case of fusion power

Public Understanding of Science 2012 21: 514 originally published online 22 July 2010

DOI: 10.1177/0963662510371630, jj

Despite its fifty-year period of research and development, **fusion power is not a widely familiar technology, and certainly not well understood, among** European lay **publics**. **It is therefore perhaps unsurprising that perception studies suggest that historical associations with the military use of nuclear technologies and with the fission power programme have a dominant role in shaping views about fusion, where they do exist**.1

***The whole “nuclear brand” terrifies the public --- including fusion***

**Jones et al 10**

Tom Horlick-Jones, Cardiff University School of Social Sciences, UK

Ana Prades, CIEMAT, Spain

Josep Espluga, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain

Investigating the degree of “stigma” associated with nuclear energy technologies: A cross-cultural examination of the case of fusion power

Public Understanding of Science 2012 21: 514 originally published online 22 July 2010

DOI: 10.1177/0963662510371630, jj

**Drawing a comparison with the notion of a “brand” in marketing** (Myers, 1999), **it is as though a nuclear label serves to very powerfully communicate a rich and detailed collection of ideas and images.** This is not a calculated response to information; indeed, **it is evident that these participants know very little about fusion**. Rather, **the response seems to be an instantaneous emotional sense of fear, prompted simply by the technology being labelled by the word nuclear**. We note in passing the interesting similarities here with nice/nasty distinctions in parts of developmental psychodynamics (Klein, 1986), and in studies of the role of the notion of contamination in creating order and meaning (Douglas, 1966; Miller, 1997). Indeed, **one might speculate that in some way it taps into fundamental, or even primordial, aspects of human experience.**

**Won’t raise**

***Romney would raise it --- opposes spending even if he likes nuclear overall***

**NEI ‘12**

Nuclear Energy Insight, Summer 2012, Nuclear Energy Institute, Obama, Romney Support Nuclear Energy, Offer Views on Financing, Regulation <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/publicationsandmedia/insight/insightsummer2012/obama-romney-support-nuclear-energy-offer-views-on-financing-regulation/>, jj

**Romney** also wants to spur nuclear power plant development. His 2011 energy plan **calls for reform of the “cumbersome and restrictive” U.S. *N*uclear *R*egulatory *C*ommission**. **Romney wants the agency to review several new reactor designs and ensure that licensing decisions based on pre-approved designs are issued within two years. Romney** in 2011 **said he prefers streamlining the federal permitting process for the use of loan guarantees through the Department of Energy**. **If permits are not issued for approved sites and designs within a specified time period, the government should “refund the money to [nuclear energy utilities] that have invested to build the facility.”**

**Funding now**

***Link is unique --- any further support alienates them --- on the brink***

**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.**

***Voters just started paying attention and media spotlight is intensified***

**Garofoli 9-8**. [Joe, journalist, "Critical time in presidential campaign" San Francisco Chronicle -- www.sfgate.com/politics/joegarofoli/article/Critical-time-in-presidential-campaign-3850847.php]

**Americans will choose** their next president **in less than two months** and **the race** is a statistical dead heat as it **enters the season that matters most**: **The one where Americans** who are not political geeks ***start paying attention***.¶ The race will turn on how voters feel about the economy. Should President Obama be re-elected because it is headed in the right direction - 30 consecutive months of private sector job growth after precipitous losses during the George W. Bush presidency - or should GOP nominee Mitt Romney take the wheel because unemployment has been above 8 percent for more than three years, the longest stretch since the Great Depression?¶ RealClearPolitics.com's average of major polls shows 62 percent of Americans feel the country is headed in the wrong direction.¶ **Coming out of a fortnight of back-to-back political party conventions that ended last week, each side has little room for error as the spotlight intensifies** - and September is traditionally the cruelest months for gaffes. It was in September 2008 when GOP vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin became a running joke on "Saturday Night Live" after positing that being the governor of Alaska enhanced her foreign policy credentials because her state was so close to Russia.

***DOE funding is indefinite and being delayed by election concerns***

**Nelson and Northey**, EandE reporters, **9-24-12**

(Gabriel, and Hannah, “DOE funding for small reactors languishes as parties clash on debt,” http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3)

**It's not just wind and solar projects that are waiting for federal help** as Congress duels over the importance of putting taxpayer dollars on the line for cutting-edge energy projects. **Some of the nation's largest nuclear power companies are anxious to hear whether they will get a share of a $452 million pot** from the Department of Energy for a new breed of reactors that the industry has labeled as a way to lessen the safety risks and construction costs of new nuclear power plants. The grant program for these "small modular reactors," which was announced in January, would mark the official start of a major U.S. foray into the technology even as rising construction costs -- especially when compared to natural-gas-burning plants -- cause many power companies to shy away from nuclear plants. DOE received four bids before the May 21 deadline from veteran reactor designers Westinghouse Electric Co. and Babcock & Wilcox Co., as well as relative newcomers Holtec International Inc. and NuScale Power LLC. Now the summer has ended with no announcement from DOE, even though the agency said it would name the winners two months ago. As the self-imposed deadline passed, companies started hearing murmurs that a decision could come in September, or perhaps at the end of the year. To observers within the industry, it seems that election-year calculations may have sidelined the contest. "The rumors are a'flying," said Paul Genoa, director of policy development at the Nuclear Energy Institute, in an interview last week. "**All we can imagine is that this is now caught up in politics, and the campaign has to decide whether these things are good for them to announce, and how."** Small modular reactors do not seem to be lacking in political support. The nuclear lobby has historically courted both Democrats and Republicans and still sees itself as being in a strong position with key appropriators on both sides of the aisle. Likewise, top energy officials in the Obama administration have hailed the promise of the new reactors, and they haven't shown any signs of a change of heart. DOE spokeswoman Jen Stutsman said last week that the department is still reviewing applications, but she did not say when a decision will be made. "This is an important multiyear research and development effort, and we want to make sure we take the time during the review process to get the decision right," she wrote in an email. **That the grants haven't been given out during a taut campaign season**, even as President Obama announces agency actions ranging from trade cases to creating new national monuments to make the case for his re-election, **may be a sign that the reactors are ensnared in a broader feud over energy spending.** Grant recipients would develop reactor designs with an eye toward eventually turning those into pilot projects -- and the **loan guarantees** that these first-of-a-kind nuclear plants are using today to get financing **would be blocked under the "No More Solyndras" bill** that passed the House last week (Greenwire, Sept. 14).

***Obama’s silent on fusion specifically --- it’s a non starter in today’s budget climate***

**Vastag 12** Brian Vastag is a science reporter at The Washington Post, where he covers general science, the environment, climate change, and space. He covered the 2011 Japanese earthquake and the subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant; the heavy storms that battered the Southeast in 2011; parrot conservation efforts in Qatar; and the final launch of the space shuttle. From 2004 to 2010, Vastag freelanced for some 40 publications, including U.S. News & World Report, New Scientist, Health, Nature, Science, Scientific American, Science News and National Geographic News. From 2000 to 2004, Vastag served as Washington news editor for the Journal of the American Medical Association. Vastag has made live radio appearances on BBC World Service, WNYC, and Public Radio International’s The World, and television appearances on MSNBC and CNN Headline News.

6 25 12, Washington Post, Budget cuts threaten pursuit of nuclear fusion as a clean energy source <http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/budget-cuts-threaten-pursuit-of-nuclear-fusion-as-a-clean-energy-source/2012/06/25/gJQAKlpS2V_story.html>, jj

“**There’s enormous debate on how to get there**,” says Prager. **And little political support in the United States for the needed investment**. **Obama has said that he favors an “all of the above” energy strategy:** more drilling for gas and oil, more investment in solar and wind, more traditional nuclear. **Fusion**, however, **is absent from the list**. Energy Secretary Steven **Chu rarely mentions it.** But at a March Senate hearing on his agency’s budget request, Sen. Diane Feinstein (D-Calif.) forced the Nobel Prize-winning physicist to address the president’s proposed cuts. Chu said, “[W]e are working . . . to see if we [can] satisfy both the needs of the fusion community in the U.S. and this ITER commitment, but **in these tight budget times, it’s tough**.”

***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."

**Fusion popular**

***Environmentalists hate it --- perceived as a waste of money, too far off, zero-sum with renewables, and they don’t buy your “clean and safe” spin***

**Power & Energy 10**

ITER and nuclear fusion: Pro or con-fusion? <http://www.ngpowereu.com/article/ITER-and-nuclear-fusion-Pro-or-con-fusion/>, jj

**Focusing on the environmental perspective, Greenpeace have had much to say on the subject** - albeit with an often-confused narrative. Jan Vande Putte, **Greenpeace International's head nuclear campaigner, declared, "With 10 billion euros** [the original estimated cost of ITER], **we could build 10,000 MW offshore wind farms, delivering electricity for 7.5 million** European households. **Governments should not waste our money on a dangerous toy, which will never deliver any useful energy. Instead, they should invest in renewable energy which is abundantly available; not in 2080, but today."**

Unfortunately, while Vande Putte sympathetically highlights the need to progress and implement today's renewable technologies, he falls short on a number of other points - points that seem to be picked up by many anti-ITER supporters and preached as gospel. First to be picked out of the confusion hat - and perhaps the biggest mistruth - is that renewable energy can support the world's energy needs on its own. While this is the dream, it's simply not true. Although commercial and domestic solar panels and wind generators are becoming increasingly common and do reduce demand on the relevant grid systems, unfortunately they don't decrease it anywhere close to the 'golden zero' level that Vande Putte implies.

There is also the negation, deliberate or otherwise, of acknowledging where energy will come from when the sun forgets to shine and the wind stops blowing. Reserve stores will work up until a point, but ultimately an energy-hungry population isn't going to stop consuming - another, more reliable alternative will always be needed. As David Mackay, Chief Science Advisor to the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change, said when asked about the possibility of running the world on renewables alone: "I'm not pro-nuclear. I'm just pro-arithmetic."

**The second misunderstanding stems from an obvious confusion between fission and fusion**. **Stating that: "Fusion energy - if it could ever operate - would create a serious waste problem, would emit large amounts of radioactive material and could be used to produce materials for nuclear weapons," Greenpeace has obviously got its wires crossed**. It is true that if a reactor uses deuterium-tritium fusion then there will be neutrons a-plenty, which will make the reactor vessel radioactive over time. **But Greenpeace refers to the emission of radioactive material, implying gaseous waste**. And as helium is the end product of this type of fusion - and not radioactive in the slightest - then surely it must be a reference to tritium? But as ITER plans to use tritium as a fuel, one would presume that they wouldn't be too keen on their prospective plants emitting any of the radioactive gas.

**Continuing the fusion/fission confusion**, where nuclear fusion, from projected estimates, would produce the equivalent of one coke can's worth of radioactive waste per consumer's lifetime, fission already produces 19,000 tonnes of CO2 waste everyday - nowhere near the same amounts. Of course, over time the potential DEMO plant would witness increased levels of radioactivity and would need to be decommissioned at the end of its cycle - but arguably that's a small price to pay when balanced against a clean source of energy.

**Another in a long line of arguments against the go-ahead of nuclear plants lies in a far greyer area**, with its relevance more often than not based in the subjective. Neither specific to fission or fusion, but rather to nuclear power plants in general, **protesters claim that building nuclear power plants will increase the proliferation of nuclear weapons**. While this obviously comes down to a matter of opinion, there are two main platforms the argument is commonly debated from.

First, it would make no logical sense for nuclear fusion plants to begin producing nuclear materials such as plutonium. Reactors could indeed be used to do so by surrounding them with uranium and allowing the neutrons to produce the much-dreaded element, but the relevant military bodies already do this with 'breeder' reactors designed specifically for the purpose, so it would make little sense to complicate an existing system.

Secondly, many proponents will argue that the old adage of 'war being inevitable' is finessing the point somewhat, as the vast majority of nations that want nuclear power and clean energy have already sorted out their weapons agendas and restrictions and are unlikely to jeopardise them at the cost of losing nuclear power security. Counteracting this, **opponents often retort by playing the 'terrorism' card, claiming that nuclear plants and waste-carrying vehicles could become potential terrorist targets further down the line**. The problem is that, **until the plants are up and running on a commercial scale, no-one can predict what is going to happen until it does - a sentiment that is bound to provoke scare tactics for both parties.**

**Rhetoric Trick**

***Even if they won’t directly attack – The republicans 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.**

**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.**

**Navy addon**

***US is not facing naval challengers—other aspects of heg outweigh***

**Goure 10** (Daniel Goure. PhD in IR, BA in government, VP of the Lexington Institute, member of the Department of Defense Transition Team, former director of Strategic Competitiveness for the Secretary of State, senior analyst on national security and defense issues with the Center for Naval Analyses. “Can the Case be Made for Naval Power?” 2 July 2010. Lexington Institute. http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/can-the-case-be-made-for-naval-power-?a=1&c=1171)

This is no longer the case. **The U.S. faces no great maritime challengers**. **While China appears to be toying with the idea of building a serious Navy this is many years off.** **Right now it appears to be designing a military to keep others**, including the United States, away**, out of the Western Pacific and Asian littorals**. But **even if it were seeking to build a large Navy, many analysts argue** that other than Taiwan **it is difficult to see a reason why Washington and Beijing would ever come to blows**. Our former adversary, **Russia, would have a challenge fighting the U.S. Coast Guard, much less the U.S. Navy**. **After that, there are no other navies of consequence.** **Yes**, there are some scenarios under which **Iran might attempt to close the Persian Gulf** to oil exports, **but how much naval power would really be required to reopen the waterway**? Actually, the U.S. Navy would probably need more mine countermeasures capabilities than it currently possesses.

**Clean tech**

***US clean tech leadership high now***

**Frankfurt School ‘12**

Frankfurt School, UNEP Collaborating Center, GLOBAL TRENDS IN RENEWABLE ENERGY INVESTMENT 2012

<http://fs-unep-centre.org/sites/default/files/publications/globaltrendsreport2012final.pdf>, jj

**The** second **highlight was a resurgence** – at least temporarily – **in the United States’ importance in the renewable energy sector**. Beaten into a distant second place by China in both 2009 and 2010, **the US rallied to neck-and-neck with China in 2011, on the back of a 57% surge in US investment in renewables to $51 billion**. Investment in renewable power and fuels in China gained a more modest 17% to $52 billion, still just a fraction ahead of the US (but actually behind the US if investment in energy-smart technologies such as efficiency and smart grids is also included). Investment in Germany – which pushed the US hard for second position in 2010 – dipped 12% to $31 billion1.

***Energy leadership high***

**Bode 11** (Denise, CEO, American Wind Energy Association, “Consistent Policy is Competitive Key”, October 24,http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2011/10/is-america-losing-the-clean-en.php, Acc: 8/2/12, og)

**The U.S. is very emphatically NOT losing to China in wind power.** However, we are rapidly approaching a fork in the road, where decisions Congress makes will determine whether the enormous progress America has made in building a domestic industry continues or is rolled back.¶ The numbers tell the story:¶ - **Wind turbine installations in the U.S. increased more than tenfold over the past decade,** from a total of 2,650 megawatts (MW) at the end of 2000 to 40,181 MW (enough to power the equivalent of 10 million homes) 10 years later.¶ - **In recent years, wind has muscled its way into the electric power mainstream. Wind energy’s cost has been reduced over 90% since 1980,** driven by a continuing stream of game-changing technology advances. Utilities are increasingly choosing to rely on wind, recognizing its ability to guarantee low electricity rates for the long term. In fact, wind power has provided 35 percent of all new electric capacity installed in America over the past four years, more than coal and nuclear combined.¶ - Even as domestic installations of wind turbines were expanding dramatically, the domestic content of those turbines grew even faster--from 25 percent prior to 2005 to 60 percent today. As the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS) recently found, **American wind manufacturing facilities have kept pace, growing from as few as 30 in 2004 to nearly 400 in 2010.** Overall, wind energy supports between 2,000 to 3,000 jobs in Rep. Stearns's Florida and 75,000 across the U.S. As the CRS commented, “**Wind turbine manufacturing is at the core of the multifaceted wind power industry. Because of the use of castings, forgings, and machining, turbine manufacturing is a significant contributor to U.S. heavy manufacturing**.”¶ The bottom line? ***Clean, homegrown American wind energy is not only a manufacturing market that America can compete in, it’s a market that we are winning*** – with the support of a key federal tax incentive.
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### 2NC/1NR Overview

***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.

### AT: Perm – Multiple

***4. Plan action short-circuits alt solvency - action necessarily precludes thinking***

**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. 10-11, bgm)

**At the height of the meltdown**, Joseph **Stiglitz wrote that, in spite of the growing consensus** among economists **that any bail-out** based on US Treasury Henry Paulson’s plan **would not work, “it is impossible for politicians to do nothing in such a crisis. So we** may **have to pray that an agreement crafted with the toxic mix of special interests, misguided economics, and right-wing ideologies that produced the crisis can somehow produce a rescue plan that works—or whose failure doesn’t do too much damage.” He is correct, since markets are effectively based on beliefs (even beliefs about other people’s beliefs), so when the media worry about “how the markets will react”** to the bail-out, **it is a question not only about its real consequences, but about the *belief* of the markets in the plan’s efficacy.** This is why the bail-out might work even if it is economically wrong-headed. **The pressure “to do something” here is like the superstitious compulsion to make some gesture when we are observing a process over which we have no real influence. Are not out acts often such gestures? The old saying, “Don’t just talk, do something!” is one of the most stupid things one can say**, even measured by the low standards of common sense. Perhaps, rather, **the problem lately has been that we have been doing too much, such as intervening in nature, destroying the environment**, and so forth… **Perhaps it is time to step back, think and *say* the right thing.** True, **we often talk** about something **instead of doing** it; **but sometimes we also do things in order to avoid talking and thinking about them. Such as throwing $700 billion at a problem instead of reflecting on how it arose in the first place.**

### AT: Cede the Political

***Their argument that criticism of the system only paves the way for the new right should be rejected on-face – it’s a strategy designed to buy off resistance so that the liberal-democratic capitalist consensus can proceed intact.***

**Zizek, ’02** (Slavoj, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 2002, Revolution at the Gates, p. 302)

It is true that, today, it is the radical populist Right which usually breaks the (still) prevailing liberal-democratic consensus, gradually making accept­able hitherto excluded ideas (the partial justification of Fascism, the need to constrain abstract citizenship on grounds of ethnic identity, etc.). However, the hegemonic liberal democracy is using this fact to blackmail the Left radicals: “We shouldn’t play with fire: against the new Rightist onslaught, we should insist more than ever on the democratic consensus — any criticism of it, wittingly or unwittingly, helps the New Right!” This is the key line of separation: we should reject this blackmail, taking the risk of disturbing the liberal consensus, even up to questioning the very notion of democracy. The ultimate answer to the criticism that radical Left proposals are utopian should thus be that, today, the true utopia is the belief that the present liberal-democratic capitalist consensus can go on indefinitely, with­out radical change. We are therefore back with the old ‘68 slogan “So yons realistes, demandons l’impossible!”: in order to be a true “realist”, we must consider breaking out of the constraints of what appears “possible” (or, as we usually put it, “feasible”).

## 2nr

***It’s Obama’s priority***

**Deaton**, 9/19/**2011** (Paul – Daily Kos member, On the 15th Anniversary of the CTBT, Daily Kos, p. http://www.dailykos.com/story/2011/09/19/1018266/-On-the-15th-Anniversary-of-the-CTBT)

During his 2009 speech in Prague, President **Obama said ratification of the CTBT would be a *priority*** for his administration. Others in the administration indicate that this continues to be the case. Despite some significant action on the administration’s arms control agenda, including entry into force of the New START Treaty ratified by the United States Senate last December, few now believe the President will take up CTBT ratification with the Senate before the 2012 election. **If** President **Obama fails to win re-election, the treaty seems unlikely to be ratified for a long time, *if ever***. It is not hard to read the tea leaves on this important issue. Despite the apparent hesitancy, **the State Department has begun a conversation on the CTBT** as part of its discussion about the administration’s arms control agenda **with members and staff on the hill**. Assistant Secretary of the State for Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, Rose Gottemoeller described the exchange of information to the Arms Control Wonk, “So it’s really like an information campaign and a discussion,” said Gottemoeller. “The reason I emphasize the discussion aspect of it is that clearly this is a debate, and it’s not like one side telling the other, and the other side is just in the ‘receive’ mode. But it is more like a true discussion and debate, and I think that’s the way people are going to come to their decisions about the treaty, through that process of very serious discussion and debate, and seeing the facts, and coming to understand them.” Gottemoeller indicated there was no deadline for ratification. The State Department has laid out the case for ratification in four points. The CTBT helps restrain further nuclear weapons proliferation, ratification of the CTBT is part of an integrated nuclear security strategy, the CTBT can be verified and the United States does not need to conduct nuclear tests. A simple and straightforward list, but for those of us advocating for ratification of CTBT, it is the same list we had when Democrats held 60 senate seats and ratification seemed assured. The trouble with time is it wears on a person and priorities change. If we take President Obama and the State Department at their word, **ratification of the CTBT remains a *priority* on the administration’s arms control agenda**.