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### 1NC Consumption K

#### First, the links: Resource switching will never solve for demand—need to change consumption patterns to effectively solve

Wallis, 2010

[Victor, teaches in the Liberal Arts department at the Berklee College of Music (in Boston) and is the managing editor of Socialism and Democracy, “Beyond green capitalism.” Monthly Review61. 9 (Feb 2010): 32-48, accessed online via proquest] /Wyo-MB

The desirability of shifting to certain inexhaustible or renewable energy sources is obvious. What is not so widely recognized, however, is that these sources too have their costs - in terms of installation, collection, maintenance, and transmission - and that therefore none of them, despite whatever abundance may characterize their occurrence in nature, can offer unlimited accessibility for energy supply.10 Some of the alternative sources, such as hydrogen and biomass, themselves require significant if not prohibitive energy inputs. Biomass (burning biological materials as fuel) also threatens to reduce the land-area available for growing food. Hydrogen, for its part, carries the danger of leakage and of rising to the stratosphere, where it could destroy the ozone layer. Tapping geothermal energy can, in certain regions, risk provoking seismic disturbances; in addition, there may be high costs associated with the depth of requisite drilling, and the emerging heat may be dissipated in various ways. Wind energy, despite its clear positive potential, is limited by materials and space requirements, as well as by the irregularity of its source in many locations. Tidal power is more continuous than wind energy, but in addition to the high installation cost of its requisite barrages or underwater turbines, it poses - as do wind turbines - certain dangers for resident or migrant wildlife. Solar energy, finally, is extraordinarily promising in direct localized applications, but for power generation on a large scale, it would risk impinging on space required for other purposes. As for solar collectors situated in otherwise unused desert regions, their dust-free maintenance in such sites would require the long-distance trans-shipment of vast quantities of water. All these technologies, with the partial exception of biomass, avoid adding to the net concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The same might perhaps be said of nuclear power, provided that, as the more up-to-date versions promise, it does not entail further largescale mining and refinement of fissionable material. Nuclear power has other problematic implications, however, beyond its daunting startup costs in both time and money. Even if we were to suppose - as is further claimed - that the problem of waste has been minimized via repeated re-use (until there is hardly any radioactive material left) and that the dangers of a Chernobyl-type disaster or of vulnerability to military attack have been addressed by engineering improvements,11 there still remains the fact that nuclear power is linked to the potential for making bombs, and no disarmament process is underway. The imperialist governments will therefore not allow nuclear power to be distributed on a scale sufficient to match the potential global demand for it. The longer-term ecological and political desideratum would not be to undo such restrictions, but rather to impose them on the imperialist powers themselves, as part of a full-scale conversion process. The upshot of all these considerations is that the question of how to supply the world's currently growing energy demand without continuing recourse to carbon dioxide-producing fossil fuels - coal, oil, and natural gas - has not yet been solved. In view of the problems associated with all the alternative energy sources, a radical and comprehensive reconsideration of the demand side of this equation would seem to be called for. This is the essence of the socialist response: while encouraging the use of various safe-energy alternatives, it can accept the fact that these alternatives are ultimately limited in their total power-generating capacity, and therefore that the world's aggregate energy consumption will actually have to be reduced. Once this is understood, one can then focus on the interrelated issues of how to identify and prioritize real needs, and how to correspondingly reorganize society in such a way as to assure everyone's well-being. This is beyond the purview of capitalist thought, whatever its level of awareness of the environmental danger.

#### Second, the Impact—consumption focus is the only way to solve for overconsumption and misconsumption that threaten human survival

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

A strictly ecological interpretation takes consumption as perfectly ‘‘natural.’’ To survive, all organisms must consume— that is, degrade resources. This interpretation of a given consumption act is background consumption. It refers to the normal, biological functioning of all organisms, humans included. Every act of background consumption by an individual alters the environment, the total environmental impact being a function of aggregate consumption of the population. Individuals consume to meet a variety of needs, physical and psychological, both of which contribute to the ability of the individual to survive and reproduce. From this limited, asocial, nonethical interpretation of consumption, all consumption patterns and consequences are natural, including population explosions and crashes and irreversibilities caused by the expansion of one species at the expense of other species. If, however, the interpretation is modified to include human concern for population crashes, species extinctions, permanent diminution of ecosystem functioning, diminished reproductive and developmental potential of individuals, and other irreversible effects, then ‘‘problematic consumption’’ becomes relevant. Two interpretive layers are overconsumption and misconsumption. Overconsumption is the level or quality of consumption that undermines a species’ own life-support system and for which individuals and collectivities have choices in their consuming patterns. Overconsumption is an aggregate-level concept. With instances of overconsumption, individual behavior may be perfectly sensible, conforming either to the evolutionary dictates of fitness or to the economically productive dictates of rational decision making. Collective, social behavior may appear sensible, too, as when increased consumption is needed in an advanced industrial economy to stimulate productive capacity and compete in international markets. But eventually the collective outcome from overconsuming is catastrophe for the population or the species. From a thermodynamic and ecological perspective, this is the problem of excessive throughput. 21 The population or species has commanded more of the regenerative capacity of natural resources and more of the assimilative capacity of waste sinks than the relevant ecosystems can support. And it is an ethical problem because it inheres only in populations or species that can reflect on their collective existence. What is more, for humans it becomes a political problem when the trends are toward collapse, power differences influence impacts, and those impacts generate conflict. The second interpretive layer within problematic consumption is misconsumption, which concerns individual behavior. The problem here is that the individual consumes in a way that undermines his or her own well-being even if there are no aggregate effects on the population or species. Put differently, the long-term effect of an individual’s consumption pattern is either suboptimal or a net loss to that individual. It may or may not, however, undermine collective survival. Such consumption can occur along several dimensions.

#### Third is the alt, rejection of the 1ac’s production focus in favor of a consumption based approach to energy resources.

#### And, A Consumption based approach is necessary to solve—must flip the production angle on its head--

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

If the production angle is inherently unecological, if it naturally overwhelms feedback that would otherwise reveal long-term net harm, then the consumption angle, if it has analytic and policy utility, ought to do just the opposite. It should direct analytic attention to what is lost, to what risks are incurred when, in this example, the harvest rate exceeds the regenerative rate of the forest ecosystem. Following the framework outlined above, I begin the consumption angle within the productionconsumption, supply-demand dichotomy, then shift to material activity up and down the chain of resource-use decisions. Within the production-consumption dichotomy, the first observation is that the production-oriented measures do not solve the problem of overharvesting. They mitigate the damage or extend the time until the forest is completely cut over. When resource-use decisions are largely governed by agents and managers and consumers highly removed from the forest itself, the problem is not inefficiencies or lack of political will or greed. The problem is not inefficient use of logs and lumber or the political difficulties of creating parks and buffer strips. Indeed, the problem is not the intricacies of meeting ever-increasing demand, satisfying customers, stockholders, and workers. Rather, the problem is the demand itself, the array of signals and incentives coming from actors highly distanced from ecological constraint. 27 A consumption perspective therefore asks about the nature of the demand, what is otherwise forbidden territory in the production angle where consumers are sovereign. The consumption angle asks whether the increasing demand is simply a matter of a growing population in need, say, of shelter; whether the price paid by buyers reflect full costs, social and ecological (however measured); whether consumption is facilitated, maybe subsidized, by low-cost transportation infrastructure or easy credit; 28 whether the benefits of new products are highlighted while the drawbacks are shaded; whether retailers launched a new line of luxury furniture or builders doubled the average house size (yet again). It asks whether consumers have the option of choosing less wood-intensive means of meeting the same needs. What is more, the consumption angle raises questions of nonpurchase. Is some segment of the population forgoing purchase of the product and, if so, is it because of income, availability, information, or alternative means of meeting the same needs? In other words, is nonpurchase a meaningful option and, if so, does the increasing demand truly reflect a net social-welfare gain, the implicit assumption in the production angle? Shifting to consumption as ‘‘using up,’’ a comprehensive analysis would examine each decision node from initial extraction to ultimate use and disposal. Here I focus on processing and initial extraction. From the production angle, a mill owner ‘‘produces’’ lumber from logs. Equally logically, yet from the consumption angle, the mill owner consumes logs from the timber owner’s forest. That is, what is used up is a log and its alternative uses. The log is irretrievably converted to one item— lumber— never to be used for veneer or paper or larger-dimension lumber. Applying the same logic to the timber owner and the forest, what is used up, it would appear at first glance, is trees. Each tree cut is irreversibly removed, its ability to photosynthesize and provide habitat for other plants and animals, completely eliminated. But at some rate and extent of harvest, more than single trees’ capacity to put on cellulose is consumed. Each tree constitutes a node in a complex system. As some trees fall to the ax (or to wind or insects), the system, being adaptive and resilient, adjusts. But as more trees fall, a threshold is passed and the integrity of the system is compromised. At this level of harvest, the system itself and all the species it entails and ecosystem services it provides are, indeed, consumed— that is, used up. Efficient production, erosion control, and preserves (unless on a system scale) do nothing to alter this ultimate effect of ever-increasing harvest. They may postpone the threshold or soften its impact, but the forest ecosystem is still consumed. From this analytic perspective, all decision makers along the chain from extraction to end use are ‘‘consumers.’’ As such, they and policy makers and citizens who condition their choices logically must ask what is ‘‘used up,’’ what services are put at risk, what features of the primary resource— the forest ecosystem (not the trees)—are being eliminated. Moreover, to ask these questions is unavoidably to ask about long-term effects. If the ecosystem is degraded, will there always be another? Do the benefits accrued by each actor along the material chain accumulate so as to unambiguously override the risk or loss of the ecosystem (especially if such a judgment is made in an open, well-informed forum rather than in the market)? Are future generations likely to recognize and accept the value of the trade-off: more human capital (lumber and furniture and their associated technologies) for less natural capital? These are questions of long-term sustainable resource use, not environmental improvement. They take high-integrity ecosystems as given, indeed necessary, not the social organization for resource use and economic expansion that happens to be hegemonic at this historical juncture. But I should stress that these questions derive logically from the consumption angle, not from the arbitrary or ideologically derived positions of those who ‘‘value nature’’ or who profess concern for future generations. These questions come from turning the dominant perspective on its head and asking not what goods are produced (and presuming that all such goods consumed are ‘‘good’’), but what services, what forms of social and natural capital, are consumed. Just as the production angle presumes goods are good and more goods are better, in the consumption angle, life-support systems are presumed fragile and critical irreversibilities possible. ‘‘Cautious consuming’’ is not only prudent but rational. In addition, not only do these questions derive logically from the consumption angle, whether emphasizing the demand side or viewing all economic activity as consuming, the perspective itself is at least as logical as the production angle. In fact, although the production angle may be the most logical in an ‘‘empty-world,’’ frontier economy, in a ‘‘full world,’’ in an ecologically constrained economy, the consumption angle can be judged more logical. It does, after all, draw attention to ecosystem functioning as an integral part of the analysis, not as an addon, not as an ‘‘externality,’’ the prevailing approach in the production angle.

### 1NC States 1NC

#### Text: The 50 states, Washington D.C., and relevant territories should fund Department of Defense small modular reactors for use in the United States.

#### State financial incentives solve – generate federal and private investment

EPA, “State Planning and Incentive Structure” In EPA’s, Clean Energy-Environment Guide to Action, April 2006.

States are achieving significant energy and cost sav­ ings through well-designed, targeted funding and incentives for clean energy technologies and services. Key types of financial incentives programs states offer include: • Loans • Tax incentives • Grants, buy-downs, and generation incentives • Nitrogen oxide (NOx) set-asides • Energy performance contracting • Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) States have achieved additional savings by coordinat­ ing financial incentives with other state programs and by leveraging utility-based clean energy programs. Over the past three decades, states have diversified their programs from grants or loans into a broader set of programs targeted at specific markets and customer groups. This diversification has led to port­ folios of programs with greater sectoral coverage, a wider array of partnerships with businesses and com­ munity groups, and an overall reduced risk associated with programmatic investments in energy efficiency and clean supply options. Objective State-provided funding and incentives meet the public purpose objectives of supporting technolo­ gies and products that are new to the market and encouraging and stimulating private sector invest­ ment. Funding and incentives can also reduce mar­ ket barriers by subsidizing higher “first costs,” increasing consumer awareness (the programs are often accompanied by education campaigns and the active promotion of products to help achieve a state’s energy efficiency goals), and encourage or “jump-start” private sector investment. Benefits States provide funding and incentives through a combination of sources (i.e., state and federal funds, utility programs, and ratepayers), to support a broad range of cost-effective clean energy tech­ nologies, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, and combined heat and power (CHP). State funding and incentive programs, some of which are self-sustaining (e.g., revolving loan funds), deliver energy and cost savings for governments, business­ es, and consumers. Program results vary depending on the configuration of funding and incentives used by each state. In Texas, the revolving loan fund has resulted in $152 million in savings since 1989 on an investment of $123 million (DOE 2005). In Oregon, more than 12,000 tax credits worth $243 million have been issued since 1980, which save or generate energy worth about $215 million per year (Oregon DOE 2005b). Providing funding and incentives for clean energy can offer the following environmental, energy, and economic benefits: • Reduces energy costs by supporting cost-effective energy efficiency improvements and onsite gener­ ation projects. • Ensures that clean energy is delivered, specifies which technologies are used, and offers incentives to install technologies. Providing funding and incentives also accelerates the adoption of clean energy technologies by improving the project eco­ nomics and offsets market, institutional, or regula­ tory barriers until those barriers can be removed. • Establishes a clean energy technology or project development infrastructure to continue stimulat­ ing the market after the incentives are no longer in effect. • Leverages federal incentives and stimulates private sector investment by further improving the eco­ nomic attractiveness of clean energy. A small investment may lead to broad support and adop­ tion of a clean energy technology or process. • Stimulates clean energy businesses and job cre­ ation within the state. • Supports environmental protection objectives, such as improving air quality.

### 1NC: Elections

#### Don’t buy statistical noise- Obama will win even post-debate slide

Silver Oct. 8th

[Nate Silver, political analyst, Amid Volatile Polling, Keep an Eye on Election Fundamentals, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/08/after-conventions-follow-the-bouncing-poll-numbers/>, uwyo//amp]

By the weekend, however — after the release of a favorable jobs report last Friday — Mr. Romney’s bounce seemed to be receding some. Tracking polls released on Monday by Gallup and Rasmussen Reports actually showed a shift back toward Mr. Obama, although another poll by Pew Research showed Mr. Romney with a four-point lead among likely voters. Polling data is often very noisy, and not all polls use equally rigorous methodology. But the polls, as a whole, remain consistent with the idea that they may end up settling where they were before the conventions, with Mr. Obama ahead by about two points. Such an outcome would be in line with what history and the fundamentals of the economy would lead you to expect.

#### Biden consolidated the working class white vote-Romney and Ryan can’t relate

Church Oct. 12th

[Glenn Church, contributor, October 12th, 2012, Joe Biden Rode His Working Class Background in the Debate, <http://foolocracy.com/2012/10/joe-biden-rode-his-working-class-background-in-the-debate/>, uwyo///amp]

Joe Biden spoke about the middle class 24 times in the VP debate. That is because the Vice President is about as middle class as a vice president can be. That helps explain why Biden came across as a blue-collar worker from a Scranton mill. During the debate, he looked like the guy who would come into a bar from a hard day’s work and let everyone know what he thinks. If you disagreed with him, then you might need to step outside into the alley for an attitude adjustment. The exact people whom Obama has difficulty relating to, white working-class males, are the very people that Biden relates to. Biden speaks their language. He understands their problems. Neither Obama, Romney nor Ryan bring that personal connection. Ryan, who showed off his knowledge and qualifications strongly, looked like the junior partner in a law firm. He was competent and decisive, but he isn’t going to relate to working-class voters like Biden. Will any of this change the way people vote? Probably not many. But it will buy a week for the Obama/Biden campaign. Biden may have bought a second look for Obama from working and middle class voters. What Obama does with it will have to wait until the next presidential debate.

#### Blue collar, working class whites will decide the election due to their swing state locations- Obama will alienate them and send them to Romney should he reject traditional FF expansion

Mead 2012

[Walter Russell Mead, James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine, and is recognized as one of the country's leading students of American foreign policy. June 6, 2012, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/>, Uwyo//amp]

Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “brown jobs” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election. Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign. As the FT reports: “Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio,” he said. Republicans, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . . Mr Romney has said he will approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work. As we’ve mentioned before, energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector. From a political perspective, Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.

**Romney election causes Iran strikes. Approach to Iran is the biggest contrast in Obama and Romney foreign policy – Obama will continue to push sanctions and negotiation while Romney will bow to Israeli desires to attack and pursue a bombastic foreign policy.**

**Daily KOs**, Editorial, “The Daily Kos, President Obama Versus Romney on Iran”, 4/16/**2012** <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>

To me, however **the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran.** Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, **we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come.** (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "**The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process**," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia. "But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. **Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent** a needless **war.** You can be sure that Mitt **Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”.** As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. **Bottom line, if** somehow **the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a** more than likely **bombardment of Iran. If** the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and **they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.**

#### That leads to a global nuclear holocaust which draws in Russia and China AND leads to the detonation of CBW’s

**Morgan 09**

[Dennis Ray Morgan, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies- South Korea, 10 July 2009, World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race, Futures 41 (2009) 683–693, uwyo//amp]

**Given the present day predicament regarding Iran’s attempt to become a nuclear power, particular attention should be given to one of Moore’s scenarios depicting nuclear war that begins through an attack on Iran’s supposed nuclear facilities**. According to Seymour Hersh [12] **the nuclear option against Iran has, in fact, been discussed** by sources in the Pentagon as a viable option. As Hersh reports, **according to a former intelligence officer, the lack of ‘‘reliable intelligence leaves military planners, given the goal of totally destroying the sites, little choice but to consider the use of tactical nuclear weapons. ‘Every other option, in the view of the nuclear weaponeers, would leave a gap,’** the former senior intelligence official said. ‘Decisive is the key word of the Air Force’s planning. **It’s a tough decision. But we made it in Japan**.’’ [12].10 The official continues to explain **how White House and Pentagon officials are considering the nuclear option for Iran, ‘‘Nuclear planners go through extensive training** and learn the technical details of damage and fallout - we’re talking about mushroom clouds, radiation, mass casualties, and contamination over years. This is not an underground nuclear test, where all you see is the earth raised a little bit. **These politicians don’t have a clue, and whenever anybody tries to get it out – remove the nuclear option – they’re shouted down’’** [12]. Understandably, some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not comfortable about consideration of the nuclear option in a first strike, and some officers have even discussed resigning. Hersh quotes the former intelligence officer as saying, ‘‘Late this winter, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sought to remove the nuclear option from the evolving war plans for Iran - without success. The White House said, ‘Why are you challenging this? The option came from you’’’ [12]. **This scenario has gained even more plausibility since a January 2007 Sunday Times report [13] of an Israeli intelligence leak that Israel was considering a strike against Iran, using low-yield bunker busting nukes to destroy Iran’s supposedly secret underground nuclear facilities. In Moore’s scenario, non-nuclear neighboring countries would then respond with conventional rockets and chemical, biological and radiological weapons. Israel then would retaliate with nuclear strikes on several countries, including a pre-emptive strike against Pakistan, who then retaliates with an attack not only on Israel but pre-emptively striking India as well. Israel then initiates the ‘‘Samson option’’ with attacks on other Muslim countries, Russia, and possibly the ‘‘anti-Semitic’’ cities of Europe. At that point, all-out nuclear war ensues as the U.S. retaliates with nuclear attacks on Russia and possibly on China** as well.11 Out of the four interrelated factors that could precipitate a nuclear strike and subsequent escalation into nuclear war, probably the accidental factor is one that deserves particular attention since its likelihood is much greater than commonly perceived. In an article, ‘‘20 Mishaps that Might Have Started a Nuclear War,’’ Phillips [14] cites the historical record to illustrate how an accident, misinterpretation,or false alarm could ignite a nuclear war. Most of these incidents occurred during a time of intense tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the Cuban Missile Crisis, but other mishaps occurred during other times, with the most recent one in 1995. Close inspection of each of these incidents reveals how likely it is that an ‘‘accident’’ or misinterpretation of phenomena or data (‘‘glitch’’) can lead to nuclear confrontation and war. In his overall analysis, Phillips writes: The probability of actual progression to nuclear war on any one of the occasions listed may have been small, due to planned ‘‘failsafe’’ features in the warning and launch systems, and to responsible action by those in the chain of command when the failsafe features had failed. However, the accumulation of small probabilities of disaster from a long sequence of risks adds up to serious danger. There is no way of telling what the actual level of risk was in these mishaps but if the chance of disaster in every one of the 20 incidents had been only 1 in 100, it is a mathematical fact that the chance of surviving all 20 would have been 82%, i.e. about the same as the chance of surviving a single pull of the trigger at Russian roulette played with a 6- shooter. With a similar series of mishaps on the Soviet side: another pull of the trigger. If the risk in some of the events had been as high as 1 in 10, then the chance of surviving just seven such events would have been less than 50:50. [14]12 **Aggression in the Middle East along with the willingness to use low-yield ‘‘bunker busting’’ nukes by the U.S. only increases the likelihood of nuclear war and catastrophe in the future. White House and Pentagon policy-makers are seriously considering the use of strategic nuclear weapons against Iran**. As Ryan McMaken explains, **someone at the Pentagon who had . . .not yet completed the transformation into a complete sociopath leaked the ‘Nuclear Posture Review’ which outlined plans for a nuclear ‘end game’ with Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria, none of which possess nuclear weapons. The report also outlined plans to let the missiles fly on Russia and China** as well, even though virtually everyone on the face of the Earth thought we had actually normalized relations with them. **It turns out, much to the surprise of the Chinese and the Russians, that they are still potential enemies in a nuclear holocaust.**

### 1NC – AT – DOD Grid/Islanding Advantage

#### The Military is moving off-grid now

Pacific Business News 10

[Sophie Cocke, “Barking Sands Going Off Grid” http://islandbreath.blogspot.com/2010/09/barking-sands-going-off-grid.html, \\wyo-bb]

Risks of disruption to foreign oil supplies, rising costs of a declining resources and concerns about the security of the nation’s electric grids have spurred efforts to cultivate alternative-energy sources and curtail energy use, according to reports from the U.S. Pacific Command and the Center for Naval Analyses Military Advisory Board. Security of the electric grid is of particular concern.

#### DOD taking efforts to shield itself from grid outages now

GAO 9

[Government Accountability Office, “Defense Critical Infrastructure:” , http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/297169.html, \\wyo-bb]

DOD has taken some steps to assure the availability of its electrical power supplies by identifying and addressing the vulnerabilities and risks of its critical assets to electrical power disruptions. For example, from August 2005 through October 2008, DOD issued Defense Critical Infrastructure Program guidance for identifying critical assets, assessing their vulnerabilities, and making risk management decisions about those vulnerabilities. Also, as previously discussed, DOD has conducted DCIP vulnerability assessments on 14 of the 34 most critical assets and has scheduled assessments for 13 of the remaining assets, but it has not yet scheduled assessments for 5 of the non-DOD- owned most critical assets.[Footnote 56] The DCIP vulnerability assessments conducted so far have identified specific electrical power- related vulnerabilities to some of the critical assets, including vulnerabilities associated with the reliability of the assets' supporting commercial electrical power grid, the availability of backup electrical power supplies, and single points of failure in electrical power systems supporting the assets.[Footnote 57] Addressing the risks associated with these vulnerabilities--by remediating, mitigating, or accepting those risks--can help DOD assure the availability of electrical power to the critical assets. For example, at all 6 most critical assets we visited, the DOD asset owners have installed diesel- based electrical power generators as backup sources of electricity during electrical power disruptions. Other (non-DCIP) DOD mission assurance programs also have the potential to help DOD assure the availability of electrical power supplies to its most critical assets. For example, we found that Joint Service Integrated Vulnerability Assessments and similar vulnerability assessments from the military services, which have been conducted on some of the installations with critical assets for antiterrorism and force protection purposes, also have identified vulnerabilities related to electrical power. Furthermore, DOD also has taken steps to coordinate with other federal agencies, including DOE and DHS, as well as electrical industry organizations, and these steps may help to assure the supply of electricity to its critical assets. For example, to represent its concerns and interests on electricity, DOD participates in the Energy Government Coordinating Council. The council provides DOD and other federal agencies with a forum for sharing their concerns, comments, and questions on energy-related matters--including critical infrastructure protection--with DOE, which chairs the group.[Footnote 58] In another effort involving DOE, several DOD combatant commands--including U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command--have recently agreed to accept a DOE departmental representative to serve as an energy attaché to the commands. The DOE representatives will provide energy-related expertise to their respective commands, particularly with respect to the commands' energy-related planning activities and the security and reliability of the commands' energy infrastructure. DOD has also partnered with various federal agencies and industry organizations to further increase the assurance of electrical power. For example, DOD serves as co-chair of the federal Task Force on Electric Grid Vulnerability of the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on Homeland and National Security, which was established in January 2009 to identify research and development needs for electrical grid vulnerabilities and to coordinate with other federal agencies to address those needs.[Footnote 59] In addition, DOD officials are collaborating with a working group established by the Edison Electric Institute in early 2009 called the Energy Security Partnership Group. The group focuses on improving communications between DOD and its utilities and on identifying and removing barriers to the development of comprehensive energy security programs at DOD installations. Also, in July 2009, DOD participated in an interagency exercise cosponsored by DHS, DOE, and DOD called Secure Grid 2009, Electric Grid Tabletop Exercise, for which officials from DOD, DOE, DHS, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, and the Edison Electric Institute, among others, jointly developed recommendations and potential responses to two scenarios involving theoretical physical and cyber-related attacks on U.S. electrical power grids. Our survey results confirm that some steps are being taken at various levels within DOD to improve the assurance of electrical power supplies to its most critical assets. For example, according to the survey and reports we reviewed, DOD conducted vulnerability and risk assessments involving electrical power on 24 of the most critical assets through a variety of DOD mission assurance reviews, including DCIP assessments, Joint Staff Integrated Vulnerability Assessments, combatant command assessments, DOD agency assessments, and local installation assessments. The survey results also indicate that secondary sources of electricity--such as uninterruptible power supply systems and diesel generators--provide some backup electrical power capabilities to almost all of the critical assets. In addition, according to the survey, asset owners and host installations for some of the critical assets whose vulnerabilities have been assessed have taken specific measures to address those vulnerabilities, such as eliminating single points of failure, developing electrical power disruption contingency plans, installing emergency electrical power generators, and increasing physical security measures around electrical power facilities.

#### **SMR’s are still in the early stages of design—can’t sovle til 2020**

NEI, 2012

[Nuclear Energy Institute, “Small Reactors.” Online, http://www.nei.org/keyissues/newnuclearplants/small-reactors/] /Wyo-MB

Still in the early stages of development, small reactors will benefit from the industry’s 50-year history of incremental safety improvements through design. They will include many of the same safety and security features that are in use today at the nation’s 104 nuclear plants. In addition, some small reactors will have long operating cycles between refuelings, and others can be air-cooled, making them suitable for arid regions. Most of the nation’s operating nuclear power plants use light water reactor technology, so this will likely be the first type of small reactor to receive design certification from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. ¶ The Energy Department’s 2012 budget includes research and development funding for small reactors. Legislation recently introduced in the U.S. Senate, S. 512, the Nuclear Power 2021 Act, and S. 1067, the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative Improvement Act, would help move two reactor designs through the safety certification process and study ways to reduce manufacturing and construction costs. The first small light water reactor could be licensed and in operation around 2020. The other types—high-temperature gas-cooled reactors and liquid-metal cooled and fast reactors—will follow.¶

**No motivation, no access and vaccines check the impact**

**Clark ‘8**

William R. Clark, emeritus professor in Immunology at UCLA. Bracing for Armageddon?: The Science and Politics of Bioterrorism in America, 2008, pg. 183

In the end, what may well stop groups like Al-Qaeda from using bioweapons to achieve their aims against us is that it is just too much trouble. Not only are biological weapons exceedingly difficult to build and operate, the United States has now developed vaccines or drugs to counter most known conventional pathogens. Countermeasures for the rest should be available over the next few years. We have the Strategic National Stockpile, Push Packages, and vendor-managed inventories, as well as the ability to deliver these materials and more to an attack site within a matter of hours. We could suffer casualties, yes, but not mass casualties. Conventional bombs and chemicals are must easier to obtain and use, and can achieve much the same ends with less risk. Sophisticated terrorist groups may well agree with virtually all professional of the military establishments around the world that actually had effective bioweapons in hand: they are simply not worth the bother. For at least the near future, bioterrorism for Al-Qaeda and its ilk may be a non-starter.

**Bioterrorism is exaggerated – wont cause extinction**

**Arms Control Center, 2010**

(Scientists Working Group on Biological and Chemical Weapons, report in response to the Graham-Talent Commission report on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism, Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, “Biological threats: a matter of balance” January 26, google)

**• The bioterrorist threat has been greatly exaggerated**. • New bioweapons assessments are needed that take into account the complex set of social and technical issues that shape bioweapons development and use by state and non-state actors, and that focus on more plausible threats than the worst-case scenarios that have largely driven discussion to date. • Continuing to emphasize and spend billions of dollars on measures to specifically counter bioterrorist threat scenarios distorts our national understanding of the important issues in public health, and diverts scarce scientific talent and resources away from more pressing public health and natural disease threats. • While it has been argued that spin-offs from biodefense programs contribute to countering natural diseases, the converse is more likely: direct targeting of effort and expenditure on natural disease threats would provide much greater public health benefit, and spin-offs from these programs would significantly strengthen resistance to bioterrorism. • Bioterrorist threats need to be seen and addressed within a wider public health context--as just one of the many possible ways in which infectious agents may harm human, animal, and plant health How Serious is the Bioterrorist Threat? • Beginning in the early 1990s, an increasing amount was written about the threat of bioterrorism. Prior to 2001 most examples of “bioterrorism” were in fact hoaxes or were only tenuously related to actual threats, with the single exception of the use of Salmonella to contaminate salad bars in Oregon in 1984. Much was made of the Japanese group Aum Shinrykio’s unsuccessful attempts to use anthrax and botulinum toxin without drawing the simple and obvious lesson that achieving success in such attempts is difficult. The 2001 anthrax letters were seen as validating large scale and catastrophic threat scenarios, despite the very real difficulties that isolated individuals or small groups would have had in making such material. By the time the source of those letters was identified in August 2008 as a government laboratory with capabilities vastly in excess of those of any terrorist organization, biodefense programs costing tens of billions of dollars were already established, producing a potent and vocal constituency for continued and increased funding. • **Offensive, including terrorist, use of biological agents presents major technical problems. This is why the Soviet Union,** U**nited** S**tates,** U**nited** K**ingdom and others needed to spend vast sums for decades in order to research and develop biological weapons. Even then the results were considered an unreliable form of warfare**, and there was little opposition to their elimination by international agreement (indeed the US unilaterally eliminated its biological weapons stockpiles). • **Fictional bioterrorism exercises** such as Atlantic Storm and Dark Winter **routinely used unrealistic values for critical parameters and were unrealizable by putative perpetrators. They tended to gloss over the very real problems involved in acquiring, growing and disseminating smallpox virus on a sufficient scale to represent a major threat. They also posited unreasonable assumptions about issues such as the rate of disease spread, which skewed the outcomes towards inflated and unlikely results.**

### 1NC Quickhitter

#### New great powers are rising and will soon be on par with the us—prefer our evidence because it cites the two most important indicators of a power shift

Layne 12

[Chris, Professor of IR and Political Science at Texas A&M, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana”, p. online //wyo-tjc]

American decline is part of a broader trend in international politics: the shift of economic power away from the Euro-Atlantic core to rising great and regional powers (what economists sometimes refer to as the ‘‘emerging market’’ nations). Among the former are China, India, and Russia. The latter category includes Indonesia, Turkey, South Korea, Brazil, and South Africa. In a May 2011 report, the World Bank predicted that six countries—China, India, Brazil, Russia, Indonesia, and South Korea—will account for one-half of the world’s economic growth between 2011 and 2025 (Politi 2011; Rich 2011). In some respects, of course, this emergence of new great powers is less about rise than restoration. As Figure 1 indicates, in 1700 China and India were the world’s two largest economies. From their perspective—especially Beijing’s—they are merely regaining what they view as their natural, or rightful, place in the hierarchy of great powers. The ascent of new great powers is the strongest evidence of unipolarity’s end. The two most important indicators of whether new great powers are rising are relative growth rates and shares of world GDP (Gilpin 1981; Kennedy 1987). The evidence that the international system is rapidly becoming multipolar—and that, consequently, America’s relative power is declining—is now impossible to deny, and China is Exhibit A for the shift in the world’s center of economic and geopolitical gravity. China illustrates how, since the Cold War’s end, potential great powers have been positioning themselves to challenge the United States.

#### Multipolarity will arrive in two decades as other powers catch up to the US—transition to offshore balancing now is key to avoid unending cycles of warfare\*\*

Layne 9

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, Review of International Studies, “America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq: the moment for offshore balancing has arrived”, 2009, p. asp]

Some primacists believe that the US is immune to being counter-balanced because, as the only great power in a ‘unipolar’ system, it is so much more powerful than its nearest possible competitors.4 Yet, recent studies by the CIA offer compelling evidence that by 2020 the era of America’s unipolar ascendancy will be drawing to a close as new poles of power in the international system approach the US share of world power.5 And, of course, growing apprehensions about the military, as well as economic, implications of China’s rapid ascent are – at the very least – an implicit acknowledgment that the days of unchallenged US dominance in world affairs are numbered. Offshore balancers believe the US must adjust to incipient multipolarity because they understand that – unless the US is prepared to fight an unending series of preventive wars – new great powers inevitably will emerge in the next decade or two.

#### We outweigh- only a risk of a global nuclear war in a world of US primacy

Layne in 6

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to Present, Cornell University Press (Ithica), p. 176 //wyo-tjc]

If we assume, just for the sake of argument, that the magnet effect was a factor leading to U.S. involvement in Eurasian wars before 1945, nuclear weapons have changed the geopolitical equation since then. There are many imponderables about nuclear strategy. Nuclear weapons today probably would deter war between nuclear-armed great powers in Eurasia. On the other hand, because of the stability-instability paradox (the standoff at the strategic nuclear level makes it more thinkable for nuclear-armed great powers to fight limited, conventional wars against one another), nuclear deterrence might allow great powers to begin wars in the hope that they would be fought with conventional weapons only. However, in a conventional conflict between nuclear-armed great powers, the risk of escalation would be omnipresent. Precisely because of these unknowns, American grand strategy should maximize U.S. autonomy, because the last thing the United States should want is to be caught in the cross fire of a nuclear war fought by Eurasian great powers. If the United States adopts an offshore balancing grand strategy, it simply is not the case that the United States would he sucked into a war between Eurasian great powers. A nuclear conflict in Eurasia cannot leap the Atlantic or Pacific oceans and engulf the United States unless the United States is embroiled from the outset because of its forward military presence in Eurasia. In a nuclear world, it would be irrational to risk being involved in such a conflict for economic reasons (and, probably, for any reason).

### 1NC – Solvency – AT: DOD SMRs

#### Multiple barriers to SMRs on military bases and risk theft overseas

Andres et al 11

[Richard Andres, Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and, Hanna L. Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications,”http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/SF%20262%20Andres.pdf, \\wyo-bb]

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. Using the emerging technology at expeditionary locations carries far greater risks. Besides the concerns outlined above, forward located reactors could be subject to attack. Today, forward operating bases in Iraq and Afghanistan are regularly subjected to mortar attacks, suggesting that reactors at such locations could make these bases prime targets for attack. Since forward bases are also subject to capture, any design proposal that envisions deployment at forward operating bases must incorporate contingency plans in the event that reactors fall into enemy hands.

#### Proliferation risk with SMRs – enables countries with high prolif risk to get nuclear energy

Moor 12 (Mr. Phillip O. Moor P.E., Consultant in nuclear technology, licensing, and business structuring and former Director of Project Management at GPU Nuclear, Chair of the American Nuclear Society (ANS) President’s Special Committee on SMR Licensing Issues, “Small Modular Reactor Panel Discussion Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee”, Summary Prepared by Derek Updegraff, Rebecca Lordan, Pierce Corden Dirksen-­‐366 May 9, 2012, http://cstsp.aaas.org/files/SummaryFinalSMR.pdf)

Moor also discussed one of the downsides of SMRs: The O&M costs are likely to be higher per MW than large reactors, unless new NRC regulations allow a reduction in staffing. However, additional costs for infrastructure would be avoided if SMR designs that mimic the larger LWRs were incorporated into the existing nuclear infrastructure. SMRs would use essentially the same fuel mixture and level of fuel enrichment (5% Uranium-­‐235) in fuel assemblies scaled to their size. The SMR designs that are designed to use higher enrichment (up to 20% for some designs) and longer fueling cycles would incur greater fuel costs. However, these models are not expected be competitive in the near term, both for reasons of infrastructure delay and concerns about proliferation.2 Proliferation is of particular concern in nations with lower security capacity and experience with nuclear materials. Since many of the nations who might accept SMRs for power generation fall into these categories, nonproliferation and materials safeguarding is paramount. One example Moor sited was Iran’s domestic enrichment to 20% — Iran could rationalize possessing highly enriched uranium if there were reactors that require it. However, if available technologies were using only low enriched uranium, it would be easier to decipher their intentions.To remedy these potential ambiguities, Moor said that a requirement could be to remove spent SMR fuel for disposal or reprocessing outside the country of concern.

#### Allied prolif causes nuclear war

**Lee 93**

Steven Lee, Professor, Ethics, Hobart and Smith College, Morality, Prudence, and Nuclear Weapons, 1993, p. 299.

First, nuclear war could result from the behavior of other states, especially those that had formerly seen themselves as receiving protection from the nation's opponent under the nuclear umbrella. Some of theses states might well seek to acquire nuclear weapons, or to enlarge their arsenals if they were already nuclear powers, in order to provide better protection of their own against the opponent. Were such armament to occur, the uncertainties on all sides may make major nuclear war more likely that it was prior to the nation's unilateral nuclear disarmament.

#### SMRs are a new way for terrorist to obtain nuclear material

MacPerson 2012 (writer for nuclear news online, “Small Modular Reactors – the way to making South Carolina the nation’s nuclear waste dump?” <http://nuclear-news.info/2012/07/21/small-modular-reactors-the-way-to-making-south-carolina-the-nations-nuclear-waste-dump/>) JA

The technology for the mini-reactors still is in its infancy. If South Carolina gets the green light to develop them, the state would be the testing ground for the rest of the nation. the project is not without substantial risk. Before South Carolina fully embraces this untested technology, we need answers to questions about possible accidents and their consequences, the potential for a terrorist strike or theft of nuclear material – but mostly about the waste.

#### Nuclear Terrorism risks Global Nuclear War

***Sid-Ahmed 2004*** (Mohamed; Al-Ahram staff) “Extinction!” Al-Ahram Weekly issue no. 705 WBW http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm

What would be the consequences of **a nuclear attack by terrorists**? Even if it fails, it **would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living**. **Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate**. **It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive**. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. **This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious**. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. **When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers**

#### Benefits of DOD acquisition of SMR is overstated- not the greatest thing since sliced bread- overlooks unknowns

Smith 11

[Terrence P. Smith 11, program coordinator and research assistant with the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy at the CSIS, February 16, 2011, "An Idea I Can Do Without: "Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations,"" <http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations>, \\wyo-bb]

The National Defense University’s Institute for National Strategic Studies recently released a report on Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications. The authors of the report, Richard B. Andres and Hanna L. Breetz, provide a thoughtful analysis of the benefits and key implications of a move towards the use of small nuclear reactors for the Defense Department and its fighting forces. However, in my opinion, the report’s focus is misplaced by encouraging the pursuit of small reactor technology for the purpose of controlling a competitive technological edge. In doing so, the report pushes the assumption that the technology is a good idea to begin with – an approval I am hesitant to give. The report makes some reference to the downsides, but too quickly brushes aside the risks, as well as the numerous unknowns. In recent years the “U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) has become increasingly interested in the potential of small (less than 300 megawatts electric [MWe]) nuclear reactors for military use.” The NDU report does an excellent job of exploring why the DoD would have in interest in such an endeavor, but stops short of thoroughly examining the wisdom behind DoD’s interest, which is ultimately the more important question. My point is demonstrated by a quick glance at the four key points the authors chose to emphasis on the front page: 1. Without Department of Defense (DOD) intervention, the United States runs the risk of a small reactor market dominated by foreign countries, further eroding U.S. commercial nuclear power capabilities and damaging U.S. control over nuclear energy proliferation. 2. DOD has recently expressed interest in the possibility of integrating small nuclear reactors on military bases as part of its strategy to “island” bases from the fragile civilian power grid. 3. Small nuclear reactor technology offers a host of benefits over traditional large reactors—namely, a smaller footprint, scalable design, factory-based construction, portability, and passive safety features. 4. DOD has a chance to become a “first mover” in the emerging small reactor market; by providing assistance and guidance to the private sector, DOD can ensure that successful designs meet its operational needs. Nowhere in these key points is there even a hint of, “Hey this is not necessarily the best thing since sliced bread.” My initial response to each of these “key points”: (1) Takes the assumption it is a good idea and pushes a pursuit of the capability soon and hard to maintain a competitive technological edge, before examining the wisdom of the idea to begin with; (2) Just because DoD is interested in it, does not make it a good idea; (3) Arguing that they are better than larger reactors is not an argument for them being a good idea; (4) See my first point, but add in military advantage.

# 2nc

#### Extend Morgan 2009 – US and Israeli strikes are likely to use nuclear bunker busters because of unreliable intelligence causing global nuclear holocaust.

#### The impact is extinction – 3 scenarios [1.] Causes US-China-Russia nuclear war.

#### [2.] Middle East CBW conflict – causes extinction

Ochs 2

Richard, June 9, pg. <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>.

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### [3.] Causes India-Pakistan conflict – that causes extinction

Fai 7/8/01 (Ghulam Nabi; Executive director - Kashmiri American Council) Washington Times l/n wbw

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. **The most dangerous place on the planet is** Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and **sandwiched between nuclear -capable India and Pakistan**. **It has ignited two wars** between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, **and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe**. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. **The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries**. **Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles**. **Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations**. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

#### US strike on Iran causes extinction

Hirsch 6

Jorge, Professor of Physics at the University of California San Diego, 2006“America and Iran: At the Brink of the Abyss”, Feb 20, <http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8577>.

The U.S. has just declared that it will defend Israel militarily against Iran if needed. Presumably this includes a scenario where Israel would initiate hostilities by unprovoked bombing of Iranian facilities, as it did with Iraq's Osirak, and Iran would respond with missiles targeting Israel. The U.S. intervention is likely to be further bombing of Iran's facilities, including underground installations that can only be destroyed with low-yield nuclear bunker-busters. Such nuclear weapons may cause low casualties, perhaps only in the hundreds [.pdf], but the nuclear threshold will have been crossed. Iran's reaction to a U.S. attack with nuclear weapons, no matter how small, cannot be predicted with certainty. U.S. planners may hope that it will deter Iran from responding, thus saving lives. However, just as the U.S. forces in Iraq were not greeted with flowers, it is likely that such an attack would provoke a violent reaction from Iran and lead to the severe escalation of hostilities, which in turn would lead to the use of larger nuclear weapons by the U.S. and potential casualties in the hundreds of thousands. Witness the current uproar over cartoons and try to imagine the resulting upheaval in the Muslim world after the U.S. nukes Iran. - The Military's Moral Dilemma - Men and women in the military forces, including civilian employees, may be facing a difficult moral choice at this very moment and in the coming weeks, akin to the moral choices faced by Colin Powell and Dan Ellsberg. The paths these two men followed were radically different. Colin Powell was an American hero, widely respected and admired at the time he was appointed secretary of state in 2001. In February 2003, he chose to follow orders despite his own serious misgivings, and delivered the pivotal UN address that paved the way for the U.S. invasion of Iraq the following month. Today, most Americans believe the Iraq invasion was wrong, and Colin Powell is disgraced, his future destroyed, and his great past achievements forgotten. Daniel Ellsberg, a military analyst, played a significant role in ending the Vietnam War by leaking the Pentagon Papers. He knew that he would face prosecution for breaking the law, but was convinced it was the correct moral choice. His courageous and principled action earned him respect and gratitude. The Navy has just reminded [.pdf] its members and civilian employees what the consequences are of violating provisions concerning the release of information about the nuclear capabilities of U.S. forces. Why right now, for the first time in 12 years? Because it is well aware of moral choices that its members may face, and it hopes to deter certain actions. But courageous men and women are not easily deterred. To disobey orders and laws and to leak information are difficult actions that entail risks. Still, many principled individuals have done it in the past and will continue to do it in the future ( see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].) Conscientious objection to the threat and use of nuclear weapons is a moral choice. Once the American public becomes fully aware that military action against Iran will include the planned use of nuclear weapons, public support for military action will quickly disappear. Anything could get the ball rolling. A great catastrophe will have been averted. Even U.S. military law recognizes that there is no requirement to obey orders that are unlawful. The use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country can be argued to be in violation of international law, the principle of just war, the principle of proportionality, common standards of morality ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]), and customs that make up the law of armed conflict. Even if the nuclear weapons used are small, because they are likely to cause escalation of the conflict they violate the principle of proportionality and will cause unnecessary suffering. The Nuremberg Tribunal, which the United States helped to create, established that "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." To follow orders or to disobey orders, to keep information secret or to leak it, are choices for each individual to make – extremely difficult choices that have consequences. But not choosing is not an option. - America's Collective Responsibility - Blaming the administration or the military for crossing the nuclear threshold is easy, but responsibility will be shared by all Americans. All Americans knew, or should have known, that using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country like Iran was a possibility given the Bush administration's new policies. All Americans could have voiced their opposition to these policies and demand that they be reversed. The media will carry a heavy burden of responsibility. The mainstream media could have effectively raised public awareness of the possibility that the U.S. would use nuclear weapons against Iran. So far, they have chosen to almost completely hide the issue, which is being increasingly addressed in non-mainstream media. Members of Congress could have raised the question forcefully, calling for public hearings, demanding public discussion of the administration's plans, and passing new laws or resolutions. So far they have failed to do so and are derelict in their responsibility to their constituents. Letters to the president from some in Congress [1], [2] are a start, but are not likely to elicit a meaningful response or a change in plans and are a far cry from forceful action. Scientific organizations and organizations dealing with arms control and nuclear weapons could have warned of the dangers associated with the Iran situation. So far, they have not done so ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). Scientists and engineers responsible for the development of nuclear weapons could have voiced concern [.pdf] when the new U.S. nuclear weapons policies became known, policies that directly involve the fruits of their labor. Their voices have not been heard. Those who contribute their labor to the scientific and technical infrastructure that makes nuclear weapons and their means of delivery possible bear a particularly heavy burden of moral responsibility. Their voices have barely been heard. - The Nuclear Abyss - The United States is preparing to enter a new era: an era in which it will enforce nuclear nonproliferation by the threat and use of nuclear weapons. The use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran will usher in a new world order. The ultimate goal is that no nation other than the U.S. should have a nuclear weapons arsenal. A telltale sign that this is the plan is the recent change in the stated mission of Los Alamos National Laboratory, where nuclear weapons are developed. The mission of LANL used to be described officially as "Los Alamos National Laboratory's central mission is to reduce the global nuclear danger" [1] [.pdf], [2] [.pdf], [3] [.pdf]. That will sound ridiculous once the U.S. starts throwing mini-nukes around. In anticipation of it, the Los Alamos mission statement has been recently changed to "prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to protect our homeland from terrorist attack." That is the present and future role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, to be achieved through threat (deterrence) and use of nuclear weapons. References to the old mission are nowhere to be found in the current Los Alamos documents, indicating that the change was deliberate and thorough. It is not impossible that the U.S. will succeed in its goal. But it is utterly improbable. This is a big world. Once the U.S. crosses the nuclear threshold against a non-nuclear country, many more countries will strive to acquire nuclear weapons, and many will succeed. The nuclear abyss may turn out to be a steep precipice or a gentle slope. Either way, it will be a one-way downhill slide toward a bottomless pit. We will have entered a path of no return, leading in a few months or a few decades to global nuclear war and unimaginable destruction. But there are still choices to be made. Up to the moment the first U.S. nuclear bomb explodes, the fall into the abyss can be averted by choices made by each and every one of us. We may never know which choices prevented it if it doesn't happen. But if we make the wrong choices, we will know what they were. And so will future generations, even in a world where wars are fought with sticks and stones.

#### War with Iran cements fears of pre-emptions – forces Russia and China conflict

AP 2012

[Associated Press, January 23, 2012, EU adopts Iran oil embargo; China, Russia worried over US war threats, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/europe/EU-adopts-Iran-oil-embargo-China-Russia-worried-over-US-war-threats/articleshow/11602863.cms>, uwyo//amp]

A leading state-run Chinese daily warned on Monday that Moscow and Beijing were seriously concerned over US attempts to go to war with Iran, IANS reported from Beijing. After Iraq and Afghanistan, the US "is preparing for a potential confrontation with Iran, and appears confident of another successful air strike. "Such a demonstration of armed might makes powers like Russia and China increasingly nervous," the commentary in the English language Global Times said. It said that "mainstream forces in Washington are trying to sell a ludicrous standpoint to the American people: that it is worthwhile to bear financial costs and even lose some lives to confront lurking dangers to US security in the Middle East. "This is not a rational analysis, but rather a pious belief in US politics. With an appetite for national security causes, the US becomes increasingly meticulous in eliminating potential challenges." The daily, which reflects the thinking in Chinese leadership, warned that by stirring up other powers' sense of insecurity, the US was actually undermining its own interests. "If the West slides into a war with Iran, the damages will not be any lower than the potential threat of Iran's nuclear power. "Perhaps the US is used to resorting to war to solve geopolitical problems," it said. "Many worry that such a mentality will sooner or later lead to a US clash with Russia and China." For Beijing and Moscow alike, it said, relations with the US had been stressful. In both countries, an increasing number of people now advocate a Moscow-Beijing alliance, Global Times said. "The two do have countermeasures against the US, and they are capable of deterring US allies," it added. "If they are really determined to join hands, the balance of power on many world issues will begin to shift."

### Obama= “All of the above” now 2n

#### -State of the Union and its in the party platform

Jordan **Weissmann**, “The Democrats' Single Least Credible Idea: An 'All of the Above' Energy Plan”, The Atlantic, **September** 2012

**Ever since his last State of the Union** address, President **Obama has** relied on four short words **to describe his administration's energy policy: "all of the above."** Should we rely on fossil fuels or renewables? Yes, says the White House. **That sentiment is** now **enshrined in the Democratic party platform that was officially adopted** in Charlotte Monday night. "We can move towards a sustainable energy-independent future if we harness all of America's great natural resources," the [document states](http://assets.dstatic.org/dnc-platform/2012-National-Platform.pdf). "That means **an all-of-the-above approach** to developing America's many energy resources, **including wind, solar, biofuels, geothermal, hydropower, nuclear, oil, clean coal, and natural gas**."

#### -Obama is pushing all of the above and friendly to FF now

Eric **Lipton and** Clifford **Krauss** Washington and Houston reporting, “Fossil Fuel Industry Ads Dominate TV Campaign”, New York Times, **9/13**/2012

But [climate change legislation](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/climate-and-energy-legislation/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier&pagewanted=all) died in Congress, Republicans gained a majority in the House, and pocketbook issues like the price of gasoline began dominating public discussion. **After imposing a yearlong oil and gas drilling moratorium** in the Gulf of Mexico in response to the disastrous BP spill in 2010, President **Obama recast himself as favoring an “all of the above” energy strategy, allowing** the **industry to drill offshore** as deep as ever **and** moving **to open up new regions** like Alaska’s Arctic waters. The shift left many fossil fuel critics disillusioned and unwilling to do much to support the president. “It’s hard to think of any environmental activist who is enthused about anything Obama does these days,” said Brendan Cummings, senior counsel for the [Center for Biological Diversity](http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/index.html), which challenges the industry on drilling plans. “**Obama’s explicit embrace of fossil fuels** and implicit embrace of all the environmental degradation that entails **are** almost **indistinguishable from the policies of the Bush administration.”**

#### The election is a 4 point race-something could still turn the tide

Lux Sept. 26

[Mike Lux, Partner of Democracy Partners, September 26, 2012, Winning the Election -- And a Successful Second Term, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mike-lux/democrat-house-campaigns_b_1916069.html?utm_hp_ref=elections-2012>, uwyo//amp]

I have been in politics way too long to take anything for granted in this presidential race, and I am way too superstitious to assume a victory no matter what. The strongly anti-Obama vote remains at a rock solid 45 percent no matter what ridiculous things Romney says or does, and there will be a few percent undecided right to the end, which means Romney will hang relatively close through the last weeks of this race. By everything I can tell, including both public and private polls I have seen, this is a 4 point race, and that is still close. World events, a weak Obama debate performance or some other kind of mistake, or any number of other things might still put Romney even closer before it is done.

#### Obama wins Ohio working class whites

Puryear & Becker Oct. 12th

[By Eugene Puryear and Ben Becker, article writers,‘Lesser-evil’ politics demoralize and demobilize progressives, <http://www.pslweb.org/liberationnews/newspaper/vol-6-no-15/lesser-evil-politics.html>, uwyo//amp]

The two parties have a different social composition and geographic base. The Democrats, based in the Northeast, Midwest and West Coast, draw support primarily from young urban professionals, organized labor, Black and Latino communities, and a significant sector of poor and working-class whites. The Republican Party is overwhelmingly white, more popular in suburban and rural areas, and draws heavily from the “Bible Belt” and “Sunbelt,” the heartlands of both evangelical Christianity and the military-industrial complex. The average Republican voter tends to have a higher income than the average Democrat, but the Republicans also draw from working–class whites. These are of course lots of individual exceptions but these are the broad trends.

#### Working class whites prefer labor over the tea party in key regions- Obama will win

Bolte Oct. 1st

[Chaz Bolte,contributor, October 1st, 2012, STUDY: Working Class Whites’ Support for Labor, Tea Party is Almost Equal. <http://wepartypatriots.com/wp/2012/10/01/study-working-class-whites-support-for-labor-tea-party-is-almost-equal/>, uwyo//amp]

A new study by the Public Religion and Research Institute (PRRI), “Understanding the Complexities of Working Class Whites in America,” shows that despite popular pundit talking points this demographic’s support for various major social movements is virtually equal across the country. The media continues to preach a White working class Tea Party party, the abandonment of the Labor Movement and a “working class Whites problem” for Obama, but this PRRI study, highlighted by the Up With Chris Hayes blog, suggests otherwise. Nationally, nearly 31% of respondents said that the Labor Movement shares their views while 34% aligned with the Tea Party. In what might be a likely predictor of the Presidential election outcome, White working class voters in the Midwest and Northeast — home to several key swing states — prefer the Labor Movement to the Tea Party.

#### Military Spending is unpopular with independents – their evidence only assumes the GOP

Pillar, 9/11

[Paul Pillar, National Intelligence Officer for the Middle East between 2000 and 2005, “Public Opinion, Foreign Policy and the Election”, The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/public-opinion-foreign-policy-the-election-7458?page=1, \\wyo-bb]

Daniel Drezner takes the conventional wisdom a step farther by arguing that insofar as Romney has appeared in his rhetoric to distance himself at all from Obama's foreign policies, acting on that rhetoric would mean going against the current predominant preferences of the American people. Citing findings in the recently released poll of American opinion on foreign policy conducted by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, Drezner observes that “most of America—and independents in particular—want pretty much the opposite of” what Romney says he wants regarding increased military spending and more hawkish policies toward Iran, Syria, Russia, China, North Korea and illegal immigration. Drezner further notes that what is striking in the poll results is “how much the majority view on foreign policy jibes with what the Obama administration has been doing in the world: military retrenchment from the Greater Middle East, a reliance on diplomacy and sanctions to deal with rogue states, a refocusing on East Asia, and prudent cuts in defense spending.”

#### [\_\_] Extend the Daily KOs 2012 evidence – the biggest foreign policy difference between Obama and Romney is their approach to Iran.

#### -Obama will continue to use negotiations and sanctions to pressure Iran without resorting to military action or kowtowing to Israeli pressure.

#### -Romney would do the opposite – his close friendship with Netanyahu and cowboy approach to foreign policy will result in a strike on Iran.

#### [\_\_] Romney ensures strikes:

#### – campaign rhetoric forces his hand

Collinson 2012

[Stephen Collinson, journalist, AFP, January 11, 2011, Republicans attack Iran, seek to wound Obama, http://news.yahoo.com/republicans-attack-iran-seek-wound-obama-025751227.html, uwyo//amp]

Talking tough on Iran, Republican White House hopefuls are trying to puncture President Barack Obama's national security armor in the cauldron of the 2012 election campaign. They disdain Obama as weak towards Tehran, demand regime change and propose military attacks on Iran's subterranean nuclear program. Ironically, the Republican assault comes as Obama aides and some independent analysts argue that US and allied pressure is actually working, as new sanctions take an unprecedented toll on the Iranian economy. But Republicans fault Obama for his vow to engage US enemies, expressed in his own White House campaign in 2008, and say the administration has balked at imposing the "crippling" sanctions it promised. Republican frontrunner Mitt Romney's rhetoric has been so stark that some critics worry he risks backing himself into a corner if elected president. "If we reelect Barack Obama, Iran will have a nuclear weapon. If you elect Mitt Romney ... they will not have a nuclear weapon," he said in November.

#### – he will present military action as the only option

Dilek 11

(Emine, “All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran”, 9-20, http://www.addictinginfo.org/2011/09/20/all-republican-candidates-favor-war-with-iran/, DOA: 11-12-11,)

All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran Prepare yourself my fellow Americans. If you elect a Republican President in the 2012 elections, more than likely we will be at war with Iran before his or her Presidency is over. In a disturbing new article written by Trita Parsi, a columnist for Salon.com, he expertly connects the dots on which single foreign policy issue is uniting all GOP candidates: Iran. He writes that when it comes to Arab Spring and all other foreign policy issues, GOP candidates are all over the place. But when it is about Iran, they all agree; USA must be tougher. Parsi asserts that “Republicans will present a narrative that diplomacy was tried and failed, sanctions are tough but insufficient, and the only remaining option is some form of military action. 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.”

#### – he has completely ruled out diplomacy

Tirman 1/3/12

[John (Executive Director, MIT Center for International Studies) “Forgetting Iraq, Republicans Thirst For War Against Iran” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-tirman/republicans-iran-war\_b\_1181236.html//wyo-ag]

So we have a phantom threat that is being used by nearly the entire Republican Party to generate war fever. Never mind that the consequences of bombing or invading Iran could be catastrophic across the region. Never mind that American lives would be at risk. Never mind that the largely pro-American Iranian public would turn against us overnight. Never mind the human costs of war. Rick Santorum, Newt Gingrich, and Mitt Romney all insist that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and Libya, plus drone and special ops attacks in Yemen and Somalia and Pakistan, just aren't quite enough to show American toughness against radical Islam. What is striking about this GOP pose is how reckless it is -- precisely the kind of recklessness that created such a bloody mess in Iraq. Their lack of common sense or simple knowledge is stunning. There was a time when the Republican Party stood for the somber judgment of gray men in gray suits exuding caution. There was always a cowboy wing, but even the paragon of that -- Ronald Reagan -- never got us into a major war. Today's Republicans are quite different and considerably more dangerous. Their ill-informed military adventurism matches their know-nothing economic policies and their anti-science bent. They campaign as if rationalism and knowledge are signs of weakness. This obviously is deleterious for challenges like climate change, but the more immediate consequence is in foreign policy. Let's remind ourselves of the Iraq War to illustrate the point. Saddam Hussein did not have nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons programs after the 1991 war. Yet we imposed sanctions that resulted in the deaths of between 300,000 and 500,000 children and gave rise to religious extremism in Iraq (sanctions that were sustained by President Bill Clinton). Without minimally competent intelligence, we insisted he was building lethal arsenals and invaded. Occupying Iraq was a model of incompetence and stirred a resistance that plunged the country into a nightmare of violence and destruction. It is likely that between 600,000 and 800,000 or more Iraqis died as a direct result of the war. All the while, the Republicans were cheering this war of choice, begun by President George W. Bush, and in fact have criticized President Obama for withdrawing from Iraq too soon, even though it was a fundament of Obama's 2008 election. Nearly nine years of this devastating war are apparently not enough for the leaders of the party. Obama's quiet but firm policies toward Iran -- while debatable in many respects -- have kept the pressure on without resorting to belligerence. Whether it's working is difficult to say, but early this week Iran asked the U.S. to return to negotiate on their nuclear program. The boundless thirst for war among Republicans, by contrast, underscores yet again how extreme their politics have become. Unable to devise diplomatic strategies or simply recognize how puny the Iran threat is, they reflexively reach for the bomber. And that we as a society have not adequately accounted for the human costs of the Iraq War gives the Republicans permission to be reckless again.

#### - promises to Israel

Bailey 7-29 (Holly, reporter, “Romney: ‘No option should be excluded’ in stopping a nuclear Iran”, *Yahoo! News*, <http://news.yahoo.com/blogs/ticket/romney-iran-no-option-excluded-181728095.html>)

JERUSALEM—Speaking against the backdrop of the historic Old City, Mitt Romney signaled he supports Israel's right to "defend itself" against its enemies and said "any and all measures" should be considered in the world's efforts to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.¶ The Republican candidate said preventing a nuclear Iran should be America's "highest national security priority." And while he argued that diplomatic efforts should continue, Romney insisted that all options should be on the table in dealing with Iran, including a military strike.
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#### nanotech is coming – solves disease

MDN 7

Medical Device Network, Inner Space, http://www.medicaldevice-network.com/features/feature999/

**Nanotechnology is a phenomenon poised to change our lives.** **One of the largest fields for nanotechnology use is the medical device market.** Over the next five to six years, technologies are set to become available that will have a massive impact across the whole market, changing it forever. But forget preconceived notions born of a misspent youth reading science fiction, as the truth about nanotechnology is **not all miniature robots rebuilding and restructuring a patient from the inside out. The truth is that nanotechnology will allow diseases to be detected earlier – at the level of one or two cells – and thus enable earlier treatment and a much improved prognosis for the patient**.

### States

#### 2NC AT: 50 State Fiat Illigit – Fairness

#### Fairness –

#### Offense

-Negative ground: key test of federal key warrant on domestic topics and check affirmative innovations.

-Protecting neg ground outweighs: Huge affirmative flexibility and directionality on this topic plus no coherent negative ground. Flexible and bidirectional energy sources and mechanism means we should err on the side of protecting negative ground.

- Disads don’t solve the ground - the counterplan is key defense against advantages and add-ons.

- Alternatives are worse – negs will just shift to process CPs like consult or conditions

-Won’t crowd out other options - States can’t solve ‘reduce regulations’ affs.

- Best policy option: debate should be a policy analyst not decision maker, means best policy witin reasonable constraints should guide division of ground

#### Defense:

-Only have to defense ‘federal government’ action: leadership, effectiveness, and signaling arguments all have a literature base to defend federal energy policy.

-Teams will have to be prepared for state energy policy on this topic because of ‘eliminate federal pre-emption regulations to allow state regulations’ affs.

-Reciprocity – affs can fiat a plethora of actors within the federal government like the Department of Energy and fiat a slew of agents within the federal government to make plan happen.

**-The alternative is worse** – the topic devolves into process counterplans that have no comparative literature and are increasingly unpredictable.

-Reject the arg, not team

#### Uniform 50 state action is legit

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publius, 2011

State Positioning In anticipation of an expanded federal role, states began to position themselves to influence federal policy, both through associations representing all fifty states as well as individual state attempts to shape the outcome of any future policy. Consequently, one could begin to consider states, both collectively and individually, as strategic actors engaged in intergovernmental lobbying in search of most favored status as the federal government moved onto terrain that they had long dominated. In some instances, this entailed state alliance with other entities, including industries and environmental advocacy groups. Organizations that represent the views of all states must of course contend with differences among their membership but generally find consensus positions that allow them to take fairly uniform stands in attempting to influence federal policy. Virtually all of these state-based entities took a fairly similar stance on possible expansion of the federal role in climate change, reflected in position papers, policy briefs, public workshops, and formal testimony aimed at the 111th Congress and the Obama Administration. They generally tended to endorse intergovernmental strategies that would protect existing state policies and allow for continued state innovation. They also sought to extract as much rent as possible, in the form of grants and other financial support, from the federal government to cover implementation costs, further promote their most promising renewable energy sources, and underwrite efforts to “adapt” to changing climates. Among those associations that represent elected state officials, for example, the National Governors Association and National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) took generally similar positions. This reflects some differences on issues such as vehicle emission standards, reflecting the regional divides noted above. But most other areas of climate change reflect a fairly uniform position, represented in a 2009 NCSL resolution that received overwhelming support: “Federal legislation should not preempt state or local governments from enacting policy options that differ from federal choices or from enacting stricter or stronger measures.” Those organizations that represent state agencies with a common function, such as the Environmental Council of the States (environmental protection agencies), the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (electricity regulatory boards), the National Association of State Energy Officials (energy departments), and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (state and local air quality units), took similar stances, though tailored to their particular area. In short, these groups sought to protect state interests under contested federalism, whether giving states latitude to sustain existing policies or take additional steps in the future.

#### A2 Perm

#### [ ] Federal action stifles state action in anticipation

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publlius, 2011

The limited scope and uncertain future of new federal climate policy initiatives thus far under contested federalism underscored the reality that much of the American approach to climate policy will in all likelihood continue to be state- and regionally-centered in the coming years. After the surge of sub-federal policy development in the period of state domination, states began to slow their efforts, in large part due to anticipated federal action on a large scale. The collapse of Congressional deliberation on major legislation returned much of the lead in climate governance to states. This raised significant questions of implementation, including a series of major challenges and opportunities.

#### [ ] No solvency – duplicate action increases implementation problems and undermines solvency

Christopher K. Leman and Robert H. Nelson, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C., and Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, , Economics Staff, Office of Policy Analysis, United States Department of the Interior, Summer 1982 (“The Rise of Managerial Federalism” – Environmental Law) p. lexis

When federal policy had limited goals, the hitches and compromises occasioned by intergovernmental bargaining were tolerable; today, however, when more social resources and values are at stake, the costs of joint action are much greater. Efforts to implement intergovernmental programs demonstrate that these programs are prone to disappointing results because of the complexity of joint action and the profusion of opportunities for participants to veto or alter results. The cost of joint action between levels of government may be too high when results are paramount. These views challenge the system of managerial federalism that has emerged since the New Deal. Joint intergovernmental program results may be worse than what either the states or the federal government would produce alone. Is the intergovernmental system, as it is currently conceived, simply unworkable? Would it be better to return to the classical federalism concept with a clear division of responsibilities, with most areas strictly assigned to the states? Or, conceivably, are the states anachronisms that should be replaced by a unified federal system with decentralization taking place through federal administrative regions designed for modern circumstances?

#### Signal

#### States incentives/regulations solve nuclear power – solves signals to financial community

NEI, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Policies That Support New Nuclear Power Plant Development”, October 2009

State Policies Several states have passed legislation or implemented regulations, or both, to support construction of new nuclear power plants.  These policies range from property tax incentives to pre-determination of rate-making principles for a project before construction begins. The policies that help most with financing new plants in regulated states are those that: Require the state public utility commission to determine if a proposed plant is prudent before construction begins and approve costs periodically during construction, thereby guaranteeing these capital costs will be added to the rate base when the plant comes online. Allow the carrying cost of construction work in progress (CWIP)—or the financing cost associated with construction—to be passed on to ratepayers during construction. Allowing CWIP reduces the cost ratepayers will pay for power from the plant when it goes into commercial operation. Some unregulated states assist with financing for unregulated plants by allowing pre-negotiated, long-term power purchase agreements (PPA). PPAs guarantee the project will have a source of cash flow (and cost recovery) once it is operational. State-level policies send positive signals to the financial community, helping companies finance projects reasonably, and, thereby, keeping the cost of electricity for consumers lower.

#### Coordinate state efforts to build smart grid solves – renewable production insufficient and solves rolling brownouts

David Roberts “The Next Grid”, [Popular Science](http://search.proquest.com/pqcentral/pubidlinkhandler/sng/pubtitle/Popular%2BScience/%24N/41345?accountid=14793), Jul 2009.

Even if we tap every renewable power source available, it won't mean a thing without a final, crucial step: reinventing the grid The American electric grid is an engineering marvel, arguably the single largest and most complex machine in the world. It's also 60 years old and so rickety that power interruptions and blackouts cost the economy some $150 billion a year. The idea of building a connected "smart" grid that can route power intelligently is beyond daunting, no matter how much stimulus money gets thrown at it. But if we want to cut carbon, we have no choice. Today's grid simply cannot handle a large-scale rollout of the clean-energy sources outlined in these pages. In part that's because we need new high-voltage power lines to connect parts of the country where renewable resources are abundant (the sunny Southwest deserts, the windy Great Plains) to the cities and suburbs where more people live. But the more fundamental problem is that most renewable power sources don't behave like fossil-fuel sources- they can't be turned on and off on demand. Wind farms produce power only when the wind blows; solar, only when the sun shines. This is problematic, because power demand is twofold: We need "baseload" power that's predictable and steady, and "peak" power for daily spikes in demand (when, say, everyone arrives home and turns on their air conditioning). Intermittent renewables are not well suited to either. But with more power lines connecting power sources over a broader geographical area, renewables can simulate baseload power. (The wind is always blowing somewhere.) And a smarter grid cleverly shifting power demand around can redirect enough clean electricity to handle it when demand increases suddenly. The idea behind the smart grid is to embed the system with sensors and computers so that utilities and consumers can precisely control power usage and delivery. Wireless nodes (on substations, transformers and wires) and smart meters Ion homes and businesses) will communicate over the Internet to you and your electrical supplier. That way, when everyone turns on the A/C, the electric company can lower the power headed for other appliances, or even draw electricity stored in the battery of your plug-in hybrid, which, when parked, would act as a backup power source. Rebuilding the entire grid and all its components could cost trillions, and it will require the coordinated efforts of hundreds of state and regional agencies, power-plant owners and electrical utilities. But the smart grid is already appearing piecemeal. By 2012, [Southern California Edison](http://search.proquest.com/pqcentral/docview/222938701/fulltext/137B3BBB474D76F266/2?accountid=14793), one of the country's largest electrical utilities, will install 5.3 million smart mete San Diego and Los Ar tell homeowners exactly how much power they're using at any given time- an imporant first step. The city of Boulder, Colorado, will soon finish building the country's first smart grid with smart metering and a variety of sustainable energy sources. And President Obama's stimulus package includes $1 1 billion for smart-grid technology, to be used for research and demonstration projects. Finally, a smart grid and a new network of high-voltage power lines support it will make rolling brownout a thing of the past. Let's get to it.-O.R

#### States action causes federal adoption means we solve 100% of case and don’t link to the DA

#### -- Vertical policy diffusion – prefer this evidence it is specific to incentives and energy policy

Roberta Mann, Professor and Dean’s Distinguished Faculty Fellow, University of Oregon School of Law, “BUSINESS LAW FORUM TAXATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAX POLICIES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE: COORDINATION OR CROSS-PURPOSE?”, Lewis and Clark Law Review, Summer 2011. 15 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 369

Several groups of researchers have examined the potential interactions between federal and state climate policies. n54 Andrew Aulisi [\*377] and other researchers from the World Resources Institute examined case studies to determine when leading state policies would "vertically diffuse" and be adopted by the national government. n55 The most significant factors for successful vertical policy diffusion were the push for diffusion by state champions, policy learning by example and innovation, and the spillover effect. n56 State officials may press for federal adoption of their policies because those policies may fail without expansion to the national level, due to "competition with other states with conflicting policies or weaker commitments to the policy goal." n57 State policies may demonstrate that a policy can be implemented and be effective. The spillover effect is "the extent to which the perceived benefits and costs of state policies cross over state lines to other states" or the nation. n58 The results of vertical diffusion may be full or partial preemption of the issue by the federal government, issuance of grants or incentives by the federal government to the states to perpetuate the activity, or federal mandates, with or without funding. n59 The researchers concluded that the RGGI cap-and-trade program contained all the significant vertical diffusion factors, including the somewhat less significant factor of business support for federal action. n60 The researchers predicted that the federal government is "likely to use partial preemption to respond to the RGGI ... standards." n61 The House-passed climate change bill (ACES) would have fully preempted existing regional cap-and-trade programs. n62 The choice of full preemption in the legislation may have been driven by the concerns of business constituents. Business interests have considerable influence on policymaking in the United States. n63 Business support for federal action is motivated by the desire for uniform standards, which enables businesses to avoid a patchwork of varying state rules that would increase compliance costs and create competitive advantages. n64

### Leadership

#### AMERICAN EXTENDED DETERRENCE GUARANTEES TO TAIWAN AND JAPAN ARE QUESTIONABLE—RISKS BREAKING DOWN

Layne in 6

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to Present, Cornell University Press (Ithica), p. 165 //wyo-tjc]

Preventing great power war in East Asia is an even more daunting challenge to America’s hegemonic grand strategy. China’s rapid ascendance illustrates concretely why America’s hegemonic grand strategy increasingly carries with it risks that the United States need not—and should not want to—incur. There is a long-standing antagonism between Japan and China, which are natural competitors for dominance in East Asia. In both countries, nationalist sentiment is growing, and has been inflamed by recent events. This is, in short, a—perhaps the—paradigmatic example of the kind of relationship that America’s regional pacifier role is supposed to prevent from escalating into a full-blown security competition (or worse). To prevent Japan from re-nationalizing militarily, however, the United States must reassure Tokyo that it can deter China, and, if deterrence fails, defend Japan and its interests. To maintain the credibility of its security commitment to defend Japan, and to contain China, the United States also must defend Taiwan. Whether America’s security guarantees to Japan and Taiwan are credible— and whether Washington should want to honor them if called on to do so— are open questions, however. Here, America’s hegemonic grand strategy in East Asia poses—or soon will—the same kinds of questions about extended deterrence that the United States confronted during the cold war.

####  AMERICAN LEADERSHIP WILL FAIL TO RESOLVE THE KOREAN CRISIS—MUST ACCEPT THE INEVITABLITY OF A NUCLEAR NORTH KOREA

Galen Carpenter in 4

[Ted, CATO Analyst, “Living With the Unthinkable”, National Interest, Winter 2003/2004, p. asp]

Ultimately, the competing strategies of dialogue and economic/diplomatic pressure are based on the same assumption: that the right policy mix will cause the North to give up its nuclear ambitions. But what if that assumption is wrong? CIA director George Tenet concedes that North Korea may believe there is no contradiction between continuing to pursue a nuclear weapons program and seeking a "normal relationship" with the United States--a relationship that would entail substantial concessions from Washington. "Kim Jong-il's attempts to parlay the North's nuclear program into political leverage suggest he is trying to negotiate a fundamentally different relationship with Washington, one that implicitly tolerates the North's nuclear weapons program", Tenet concludes.(n1) Robert Madsen, a fellow at Stanford University's Asia/Pacific Research Center is even more skeptical of the conventional wisdom that North Korea is using the nuclear program solely as a bargaining chip. As he argued in the Financial Times, The problem with this analysis is that Pyongyang probably does not intend to trade its nuclear weapons for foreign concessions. To the contrary, an examination of North Korea's national interests suggests the acquisition of a sizeable nuclear arsenal is a perfectly rational objective. Given the way the United States has treated non-nuclear adversaries such as Serbia and Iraq, such a conclusion by North Korean leaders would not be all that surprising. Pyongyang's long-standing pattern of making agreements to remain non-nuclear and then systematically violating those agreements also casts doubt on the bargaining chip thesis. In addition to violating the 1994 Agreed Framework, the North violated its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (which Pyongyang joined in 1985) and the 1991 joint declaration with South Korea to keep the peninsula non-nuclear. Such repeated cheating raises a very disturbing possibility: Perhaps North Korea is determined to become a nuclear power and has engaged in diplomatic obfuscation to confuse or lull its adversaries. If that is the case, the United States and the countries of East Asia may have to deal with the reality of a nuclear-armed North Korea.

#### SECOND, NORTH KOREAN WAR CAN ONLY BE AVERTED BY SWITCHING TO ROBUST DETERRENT STRATEGY, WITHDRAWING TROOPS AND ENCOURAGING JAPANESE/SOUTH KOREAN PROLIFERATION

Galen Carpenter in 4

[Ted, CATO Analyst, “Living With the Unthinkable”, National Interest, Winter 2003/2004, p. asp]

INSTEAD OF placing faith in the efficacy of negotiations with a country that has violated every agreement it has ever signed on the nuclear issue or considering the dangerous option of pre-emptive war, the United States needs a strategy to deal with the prospect of North Korea's emergence as a nuclear power. Washington should pursue a two-pronged strategy, since there are two serious problems that must be addressed. One problem is the possibility that Pyongyang might be aiming to become a regional nuclear power with a significant arsenal that could pose a threat to its neighbors and, ultimately, to the American homeland. The latter is not an immediate danger, but a North Korean capability to do so over the longer-term is a problem Washington must anticipate. Countering the threat of a "bolt out of the blue" attack on the United States is relatively straightforward. America retains the largest and most sophisticated nuclear arsenal in the world, as well as a decisive edge in all conventional military capabilities. The North Korean regime surely knows (although it might behoove the administration to make the point explicitly) that any attack on American soil would mean the obliteration of the regime. The United States successfully deterred a succession of aggressive and odious Soviet leaders from using nuclear weapons, and it did the same thing with a nuclear-armed China under Mao Zedong. It is therefore highly probable that Kim Jong-il's North Korea, which would possess a much smaller nuclear arsenal than either the Soviet Union and China, can be deterred as well. As an insurance policy to protect the American population in the highly unlikely event that deterrence fails, and for other reasons besides, Washington should continue developing a shield against ballistic missiles. To counter North Korea's possible threat to East Asia, Washington should convey the message that Pyongyang would be making a serious miscalculation by assuming it will possess a nuclear monopoly in northeast Asia. North Korea's rulers are counting on the United States to prevent Japan and South Korea from even considering the option of going nuclear. American officials should inform Pyongyang that, if the North insists on joining the global nuclear weapons club, Washington will urge Tokyo and Seoul to re-evaluate their earlier decisions to decline to acquire strategic nuclear deterrents. Even the possibility that South Korea and Japan might do so would come as an extremely unpleasant wakeup call to North Korea. The United States does not need to press Tokyo and Seoul to go nuclear. It is sufficient if Washington informs those governments that the United States would not object to them developing nuclear weapons. That by itself would be a major change in U.S. policy. In addition, Washington needs to let Seoul and Tokyo know that the United States intends to withdraw its forces from South Korea and Japan. In an environment with a nuclear-armed North Korea, those forward-deployed forces are not military assets; they are nuclear hostages.