### Reg Neg C/P

#### Text: The United States federal government should begin a process of negotiated rulemaking with nuclear power producers over the construction of small modular Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors in the United States, including an announced intention to offer loan guarantees for small modular Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors in the United States, within a year and convene affected parties for binding mediation over the substance of this policy. We’ll clarify.

#### Counterplan competes: The counterplan and the plan are mutually exclusive. The counterplan is not “resolved” - Dictionary.com defines resolved as a “definite course of action” – regulatory negotiations are not resolved, because they allow involved parties to amend or nullify the affirmative’s regulation.

#### It doesn’t fiat topical action. The process is uncertain and open-ended —- mutually exclusive with the plan.

Endelman 3 (Gary, “Go as Far as You Can: How Negotiated Rulemaking in Immigration Benefits America: Part 2 of 2” July 18th 2003)

Those who believe, as I do, that immigration is good for America have their principles right. Our challenge is to translate these principles into practice. If America is to move beyond paralysis and create a national immigration policy that works for all of us, we who most champion immigration must engage in the down and dirty work of building true alternatives to traditional rulemaking. Right now, there is such a balance of will between competing factions, the forces for and against positive change are so evenly balanced, that only a third way with absolute clarity of vision can chart a path forward towards sustainable compromise. Negotiated rulemaking is that third way. Absent this, precisely because any meaningful progress seems so remote, ideological combatants shrink back from assuming the very real risks that progress demands

#### Counterplan solves:

#### Reg-neg is the only appropriate structure to ensure solvency—coordination in energy policy is the vital internal link

Nolon 11

[Sean Nolon, Associate Professor of Law and Dispute Resolution Program Director. Vermont Law School 2011 Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines //Wyo-BF]

The U.S. has enough wind capacity to generate a significant amount of our domestic energy yet our progress to realize that potential is limited. One problem is the lack of a comprehensive federal policy to promote wind power.188 Telephone, highway, electricity generation infrastructure, and, more recently, cell phone and Internet infrastructure have benefited from coordinated and comprehensive federal laws and regulations. Obviously, the federal government will play an important role in the build out of our wind power generation infrastructure; the question remains as to how. Many of the proposed solutions fail to incorporate the involvement of citizens. For example, some advocates suggest increased involvement of administrative agencies,189 the creation of new administrative agencies with sweeping approval authority,190 or top-down statutory mechanisms that limit local control.191 A missing component in many of these proposals is recognition of the need for governmental coordination with effective citizen involvement. As noted by scholars and practitioners, building out our renewable energy infrastructure requires participation from all levels of government.192 The need for this level of coordination is well established in other areas of environmental policy.193 The federal government is best suited to identify the contours of appropriate policy, create incentives, and provide technical assistance to those who are willing to participate. State governments are the best entities to designate appropriate areas and develop guidance (with citizens) on model local ordinances, draft regulations, and decommissioning. Local governments are best suited for siting turbines because they are most likely to know what is best for their area and know what is appropriate for their constituents. Without more intergovernmental coordination wind energy policy will continue to produce disappointing results. Our current approach does exactly that—it relies on state renewable portfolio standards and on temporary federal incentive programs, and provides little guidance or support to local governments making the siting decisions.194 A successful federal model could offer greater federal tax incentives than currently exist, subsidies to landowners and producers, technical assistance for policy development and siting decisions, and risk abatement to qualifying states. In order to qualify, states would need to implement a robust citizen involvement program in at least three crucial aspects of wind turbine siting: (1) designating regions that are appropriate for different sizes of wind turbines; (2) addressing adverse impacts through model ordinances, leases, compensation provisions, decommissioning, and mitigation measures; and (3) enabling siting negotiations at the local level. This model of providing incentives to encourage state and local action has been used successfully in the past. The Coastal Zone Management Act (“CZMA”) offers model approach for providing incentives.195 Congress enacted the Coastal Zone Management Act to help preserve natural and man made resources of coastal areas while promoting economic development of those areas. The program does not mandate that states develop their own plan, but provides policies to guide those states that decide to create a plan. States that develop Coastal Management plans consistent with the policies enumerated by the Department of State may receive funding to complete portions of their plans. Once a state adopts a plan, compliance is mandatory.196 A structure similar to the CZMA could be adopted to encourage the goals of this framework. While the current system of federal incentives outlined in Section I provide some support for wind turbines, many of these programs are short-term and limited in scope. To effectively encourage the construction of wind turbines, investors need to have more opportunity to recover costs and to receive a return on their investment. Nuclear power plants, with the catastrophic risk of a core meltdown, would never be built without federally backed liability insurance. Similar assurances should be made to wind turbine operators to level the playing field. In addition, direct financial incentives for wind energy, like those available to oil refineries and other conventional fuel producers, should be expanded beyond the current portfolio of production tax credits and other incentives. In addition to tax incentives and related devices, the federal government is in an ideal position to offer direct subsidies to wind energy producers. These subsidies can be through direct grants for planning, construction and operation. Funding for these grants can come from a variety of sources, including existing and future taxes on fossil fuel energy producers, and revenue from any carbon trading mechanism implemented in the future. Conventional fossil fuel producers benefit from a host of subsidies that decrease the cost of exploration, extraction, production and energy generation. It has been observed that these subsidies artificially depress the cost of energy production, thus making it harder to finance renewable energy projects. For example, in Italy, where the cost of electricity is three to four times as high as in the U.S., energy generated from wind turbines cost the same, if not less, than energy generated from fossil fuels.197 To make the right decisions about where turbines should go, communities need substantive assistance and process assistance. Substantive assistance can include information about the location of adequate wind resources, best available turbine technologies, a database of existing and model local wind ordinances, sample leases for landowners, and best practices for mitigating adverse environmental impacts. Process assistance comes in the form of decisionmaking practices that can be used for gathering large groups of citizens for a participatory planning exercise, convening a citizen committee to help with siting a turbine, or running meetings for a negotiated rulemaking process. In most states, the siting of wind turbines is a local matter. Local and regional governments are, most often, the subdivision of government that must either approve or deny an application to construct a wind turbine. In controversial situations, the losing party often challenges these decisions. These judicial appeals are expensive, time consuming, and often have a chilling effect on actions taken in the future. While some of these decisions deserve to be challenged, many are filed to harass and intimidate local boards. One way for any wind energy plan to assist local governments is to allow for the recovery of legal fees for prevailing parties.198 There are “more than 100 different federal statutes with a ‘fee shifting’ provision permitting the trial court to award reasonable fees and costs if plaintiff has substantially prevailed.”199 These provisions help local boards make the difficult decisions necessary to implement a wind energy plan. Boards that are sued for denying applications inconsistent with the state plan should be able to recover legal fees and costs if they prevail. Such provisions encourage good faith applications, discourage frivolous lawsuits, and insulate local governments from intimidation. These incentives should only be made available to states that meet the goals of the program. In order to qualify, states must adopt a wind turbine siting policy that incorporates significant citizen involvement into the following tasks: identifying areas that are appropriate for different sizes and densities of turbines, identifying best practices for mitigating adverse impacts, and enabling the negotiation of wind turbine siting decisions at the local level. As part of the second requirement—mitigating adverse impacts—states should draft model ordinances that regulate the placement of turbines, draft model leases for land owners to use when contracting with turbine companies, provide for decommissioning of defunct turbines, set goals for energy production from wind power and identify corresponding reductions in fossil fuel use, and establish a public-private entity to provide process and technical support to local siting commissions. Normal policy making requires a minimal level of public participation to meet the statutory and constitutional requirements of due process while this framework sets a higher bar. To comply with the federal structure, these policy provisions must be adopted through the use of citizen engagement techniques such as participatory planning and negotiated rulemaking. Participatory planning techniques can be used to designate areas appropriate for wind turbines while negotiated rulemaking can be used to identify appropriate mitigation measures. Texas used deliberative polling, a form of participatory planning, to identify citizens’ energy policy priorities. In a report titled, Listening To Customers: How Deliberative Polling Helped Build 1,000 MW of New Renewable Energy Projects in Texas, the authors present a case study for how participatory planning techniques can be used to shape energy policy and produce results.200 Similar techniques can be used very effectively to engage citizens in wind energy policy. Specifically, participatory planning can be used in identifying appropriate areas for wind turbines, appropriate turbine technologies, the amount of wind energy desired as well as other sources of energy. Negotiated rulemaking approaches can be used to help reach agreement on mitigation measures, compensation mechanisms, decommissioning, model ordinances, and sample leases. Reg-neg provides the appropriate structure for reaching agreement among stakeholders on the adverse impacts of wind turbines and appropriate mitigation measures. Section I.B above identifies some of the mitigation measures already in use. Mechanisms to compensate for lost property value (both real and perceived) can be very effective to address local opposition. Through reg-neg, parties can explore successful approaches used in other contexts or invent their own approaches. Decommissioning can be addressed through a number of strategies, such as establishing a trigger for decommissioning, posting of bonds to fund dismantling the turbines, and establishing a public review board to monitor progress.201 The structure found in the Negotiated Rulemaking Act can be used to identify a representative group of affected parties and help them reach agreement on the types of impacts and appropriate mitigation measures.202

#### Solves case—reg-neg facilitates a consensus decision that’s legitimate and quickly enforced

Harter 97

[Philip J., Visiting Associate Professor and Director of the Program on Consensus, Democracy, and Governance – Vermont Law School, "Fear of Commitment: An Affliction of Adolescents", Duke Law Journal, April, 46 Duke L.J. 1389, Lexis //Wyo-BF]

The most well-developed of these techniques, other than the public hearings and meetings that are adjuncts of the APA itself, is negotiated rulemaking (reg neg).' Fifteen years ago, when the theory of negotiated rulemaking was just emerging, I predicted a number of major benefits from the practice.' Among them was the fact that the parties would be able to participate directly and immediately in the decision, thereby providing a legitimacy that is missing from hybrid rulemaking. In addition, the costs of developing the rule may be lower since the parties would not have to engage in as much adversarial research and positioning. The parties could focus on the issues that actually separate them and on the issues of importance to them. "Rulemaking by negotiation can ieduce the time and cost of developing regulations by emphasizing practical and empirical concerns rather than theoretical predictions."' 45 The parties have the experience and ability to focus on the details necessary to make a rule work day-to-day in the field. Interestingly, the lack of judicial review was not advocated as a prime benefit. It would be a likely ancillary benefit of the parties' mutual acceptance of the rule and its ensuing legitimacy, but was not an end in itself. Such were the predictions before any reg negs were actually undertaken. Formal evaluations are extraordinarily expensive and face the difficulties inherent in making counter-factual predictions (i.e., what would have happened if some other process were used to develop the rule), or finding a suitably analogous rule with which to compare a given proceeding.' As a result, few formal evaluations have been conducted, so that it is difficult to deter-mine in a rigorous way the extent to which the theory has been borne out. One major evaluation has been undertaken to compare negotiated rules at the EPA with those developed by the traditional notice-and-comment process. The study is currently being conducted for the EPA by Cornelius M. Kerwin, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at American University and Professor Laura I. Langbein. They have released a draft report of their analysis of the reg neg portion of their study.47 Their initial conclusions include: Based on the data presented above, negotiated rulemaking is successful on several critical dimensions. It is widely perceived by participants as an effective means for developing regulations on virtually all important qualitative dimensions. The criteria established in literature and law for the selection of candidates for reg neg appear to be relevant in the selection process used by EPA, although their importance appears to vary from case to case and the discretion exercised by key Agency officials in the use of techniques is obviously considerable. The opportunity to participate in the process appears to be extended broadly, albeit not universally, and EPA or the facilitator it secured were frequently identified as an initiator of participation. The process of negotiation itself emerges as a very powerful vehicle for learning what the participants in the process value highly, and there are many types of information that is exchanged. The interviews suggest further that what is learned has long-term value and is not confined to a particular rulemaking.... The negotiation process employs a number of devices to subdivide issues, such as working groups and caucuses, that were viewed as effective by a substantial number of respondents. And the use of non-committee observers serves as a device to expand participation without inflating the negotiating groups past workable limits. Facilitators were generally viewed as competent, unbiased and providing a number of services that promoted consensus. Most participants believe their participation had a substantial effect on the agreement that was produced and report that the opportunity to have an impact on the outcome was one of the aspects of the process they considered most valuable.O

### States

#### Text: The 50 states, Washington D.C., and relevant territories should expand loan guarantees for small modular Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors in the United States.

#### States solve nuclear power production

NEI, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Industry Applauds Recognition of Nuclear Policies in NCSL Energy Task Force Report”, July 26, 2010

WASHINGTON,D.C.—The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), the nation’s largest policy organization for state lawmakers, has released a report identifying several recommendations to expand the use of nuclear energy as state lawmakers pursue policies that provide secure sources of energy. The policy options range from lifting moratoria on new nuclear power plants that exist in some states to tax incentives for new reactor construction to defining nuclear as a clean power source. The report describes these “effective” policies and identifies instances in which they already have been put in place across the nation. The policy prescriptions, disseminated this past weekend by NCSL’s Energy Supply Task Force at the organization’s Legislative Summit in Louisville, Ky., represent an attempt to balance “cleaner, domestic sources of electricity with the need for job growth and economic development.” “In the past, most energy decisions have focused on reliability and cost,” the report states. “Today, utilities and policymakers consider many other factors as well, including job creation, economic development, energy security, and the environment.” The NCSL task force notes that a growing number of states are passing clean energy legislation with significant provisions to expand nuclear energy. “These policies, along with the potential for federal regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, have changed the landscape when it comes to building new power plants,” the report states. “There is no ‘one size fits all’ approach on energy policy that will work for every state, but clearly nuclear has to be part of the mix,” said Rep. Al Carlson, North Dakota House majority leader and NCSL Energy Supply Task Force co-chair. “States do need to take a lead on energy, and baseload generation is an important component,” added task force co-chair Tom Holbrook, who serves as chairman of the Illinois House Utilities Committee. Nuclear energy policy options identified in the task force report include: • state laws making the permitting process more efficient without sacrificing safety, resulting in new reactor construction in a shorter time frame; • state-level financing support mechanisms; • tax incentives; • education and training for America’s nuclear work force; • incentives for domestic supply chain production; • revisions or repeal of nuclear energy moratoria; • nuclear power plant site suitability studies; • defining nuclear as “clean energy”; and • decommissioning trust fund support. “Increasingly we are seeing states assume leadership over key energy issues that fail to secure commitment or enactment in Washington,” said Marshall Cohen, senior director for state and local government affairs at the Nuclear Energy Institute. “In its acknowledgment of the role nuclear energy can play in securing a clean, reliable and domestic supply of electricity going forward, this NCSL report affords state policymakers an attractive menu of tested and proven policy options that promise to revitalize our economy while also help achieve our aggressive emissions reductions ambitions. “NCSL leadership and its task force are to be commended for providing this comprehensive policy guide to lawmakers across the country at a crucial time.”

### Elections

#### Obama winning now- he’s winning the messaging war

Weinger Oct. 3rd

[Mackenzie Weinger, reporter, October 3rd, 2012, Poll exclusive: President Obama winning message war, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1012/81937.html>, uwyo//amp]

President Barack Obama is a campaign messaging guru, while Mitt Romney is struggling to find a theme that works, according to a new poll Wednesday that used methods for measuring the effectiveness of corporate branding and applied them to political candidates. Pollsters from the Democratic firm of Penn Schoen Berland said there were several striking findings in their survey — for one, Obama is successfully making the election a referendum on Republicans, while Romney’s attempt to make the race a referendum on the last four years is falling flat with voters. And the Republican hopeful had only one theme that was breaking through with independent voters — his attacks on Obama’s handling of violence in the Middle East, the survey showed. Of the 24 messages tested — 12 quotes by each candidate from their respective convention addresses and subsequent stump speeches — the top eight were all from Obama.

#### Obama leading women now

Salant & Giroux Oct. 2nd

[Jonathan D. Salant and Greg Giroux , October 2nd, 2012, Obama Leads Romney by 18 Points Among Women, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-10-02/obama-leads-romney-nationally-with-18-point-edge-among-women>, uwyo//amp]

President Barack Obama’s advantage over Republican challenger Mitt Romney among female voters is similar to his pre-election margins four years ago, though Obama’s edge among all voters is smaller than at a similar point in 2008. Obama leads by 56 percent to 38 percent among women in a survey of likely voters released today by Quinnipiac University. Romney leads among men, 52 percent to 42 percent. He had a four- percentage-point advantage among all voters.

#### Women hate nuke power

Newport 12

[Frank, PhD, Editor in Chief, “Americans Still Favor Nuclear Power a Year After Fukushima” Gallup -- March 26 -- http://www.gallup.com/poll/153452/Americans-Favor-Nuclear-Power-Year-Fukushima.aspx]

Although Republicans continue to be more supportive than Democrats of the use of nuclear energy, these political differences are dwarfed by the 30-point gender gap in views on nuclear energy. Men are more likely than women to be Republicans, but politics alone do not explain the gap in support for nuclear energy between men and women. Something about nuclear energy apparently strikes a strongly negative chord in the minds of the nation's women, making them one of the few demographic segments of any type in which opposition to nuclear power is higher than 50%.

#### They’re key to swing states

Casserly 12

[Meghan, staff writer, “Where women matter most in election 2012” Forbes -- June 7 -- <http://www.forbes.com/sites/meghancasserly/2012/06/07/election-2012-mitt-romney-obama-women-battleground-states/>]

But why is the female vote so attractive to presidential candidates? According to Dianne Bystrom, the director of the Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics at Iowa State University, the reason the gender gap is so important isn’t the popularity points, but the fact that more women are registered to vote than men in most states, and a much higher female turnout rate at the polls. “It’s sheer numbers,” she says. In the 2008 election, 60.4% of the female population over the age of 18 showed up at the polls. Men? Just under 56%. In plainer terms, 10 million more women than men voted. Quite simply: more female voters=more female power, particularly in battleground states.¶ Swing states, or the undecided “battleground” states that don’t historically vote with a specific party, are traditionally where candidates spend the most time eating pancakes, shaking hands and kissing babies and old people, particularly towards the end of campaign season. At this point, notes Susan Carroll, a senior scholar at the Center for American Women and Politics at Rutgers University, we begin to hear a lot of talk about “soccer moms.” Why’s that? As elections draw near, the few remaining undecided voters become priority. According to Carroll, “It’s traditionally the case that these voters are women.”¶ Presidential candidates, then, must be ready to snap them up—at town hall meetings and barbecue joints where they attempt to speak with female voters on the issues they weigh the most important. “The set of issues tend to be the same but the priorities men and women give them are different,” says Carroll, who says that men weigh the economic debt at a top priority where women tend to hold healthcare and education in high regard. “Women voters are incredibly important at the end of an election cycle,” she says, “They’re the voters who are up for grabs and candidates are prepared to win them over on the issues that matter most.”¶ And so, in battleground states where women out-vote men in the hundreds of thousands, the female voice becomes even more powerful than that of her sisters in solidly blue or red states. With that in mind, Obama and Romney would be smart to court Pennsylvanian women over New Yorkers, Floridians over Oklahomans. “Of course women are targeted,” says Bystrom. “When you look at the difference between the number of men and number of women, there are simply more women to woo.” For their ease (and yours, as it’s forever important for a women to known her own value—and that of her vote), we’ve crunched the Census data on the gender divide on voting in the most contentious states this fall.

#### 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.

#### Strikes on Iran cause global nuclear holocaust. Strikes would be nuclear from the outset, regional CBW use, Pakistan and India draw-in, US, Russia and China draw-in.

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.

### Kritik

#### Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production, this only contributes to environmental problems

Princen et al, 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, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### 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.

#### Challenging consumption solves consumer sovereignty and solves for the health of the planet

Princen et al, 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, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Consumption and consumerism have long been consigned to the edges of polite talk among North Americans concerned about environmental degradation and the prospects for sustainability. How much, and what, do we consume? Why? Are we made happier in the process? How much is enough? How much is too much for the social fabric or health of the planet? Small wonder that these questions are addressed only obliquely, if at all. They are hard to answer, and when answers emerge they can be problematic, for they have an awkward tendency to challenge deeply held assumptions about progress and the ‘‘good life’’; they call into question the very idea of consumer sovereignty, a cornerstone of mainstream economic thinking. They also challenge prevailing distributions of power and influence and smack of hypocrisy, coming as they so often do from those who consume the most. To confront such questions is to bite off, in one chunk, a large and vexing body of social, political, and cultural thought and controversy. It is no exercise— intellectual or practical— for the timid.

### Case

### Heg

#### 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).

#### Thorium isn’t that abundant- Must be processed to be useful

Tickell 12

[Oliver Tickell, British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative, “Thorium: Not Green, Not Viable and Not Likely,” Nuclear Pledge, June, <http://www.nuclearpledge.com/reports/thorium_briefing_2012.pdf>, \\wyo-bb]

3.2 Relative utility of thorium and uranium as fuel Claim: 100% of the thorium is usable as fuel, in contrast to the low (~0.7%) proportion of fissile 235U in natural uranium. Response: Thorium must be subjected to neutron irradiation to be transformed into a fissile material suitable for nuclear fuel (uranium, 233U). The same applies to the 238U that makes up depleted uranium, which has already observed, is plentiful. In theory, 100% of either metal could be bred into nuclear fuel. However, uranium has a strong head start, as 0.7% of it is fissile (235U) in its naturally-occurring form.

### AT – Proliferation

#### Thorium requires Uranium to start the chain reaction- Proliferation is still a risk

Boyd 09

[Arjun Makhijani and Michele Boyd, Fact Sheet Produced by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research and Physicians for Social Responsibility, “Thorium Fuel: No Panacea for Nuclear Power”,

<http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/thorium2009factsheet.pdf>, \\wyo-bb]

Thorium is not actually a “fuel” because it is not fissile and therefore cannot be used to start or sustain a nuclear chain reaction. A fissile material, such as uranium-235 (U-235) or plutonium-239 (which is made in reactors from uranium-238), is required to kick-start the reaction. The enriched uranium fuel or plutonium fuel also maintains the chain reaction until enough of the thorium target material has been converted into fissile uranium-233 (U233) to take over much or most of the job. An advantage of thorium is that it absorbs slow neutrons relatively efficiently (compared to uranium-238) to produce fissile uranium-233. The use of enriched uranium or plutonium in thorium fuel has proliferation implications. Although U-235 is found in nature, it is only 0.7 percent of natural uranium, so the proportion of U-235 must be industrially increased to make “enriched uranium” for use in reactors. Highly enriched uranium and separated plutonium are nuclear weapons materials. In addition, U-233 is as effective as plutonium-239 for making nuclear bombs. In most proposed thorium fuel cycles, reprocessing is required to separate out the U-233 for use in fresh fuel. This means that, like uranium fuel with reprocessing, bomb-making material is separated out, making it vulnerable to theft or diversion. Some proposed thorium fuel cycles even require 20% enriched uranium in order to get the chain reaction started in existing reactors using thorium fuel. It takes 90% enrichment to make weapons-usable uranium, but very little additional work is needed to move from 20% enrichment to 90% enrichment. Most of the separative work is needed to go from natural uranium, which has 0.7% uranium-235, to 20% U-235. It has been claimed that thorium fuel cycles with reprocessing would be much less of a proliferation risk because the thorium can be mixed with uranium-238. In this case, fissile uranium-233 is also mixed with non-fissile uranium-238. The claim is that if the uranium238 content is high enough, the mixture cannot be used to make bombs without a complex uranium enrichment plant. This is misleading. More uranium-238 does dilute the uranium-233, but it also results in the production of more plutonium-239 as the reactor operates. So the proliferation problem remains – either bomb-usable uranium-233 or bomb-useable plutonium is created and can be separated out by reprocessing. Further, while an enrichment plant is needed to separate U-233 from U-238, it would take less separative work to do so than enriching natural uranium. This is because U-233 is five atomic weight units lighter than U-238, compared to only three for U-235. It is true that such enrichment would not be a straightforward matter because the U-233 is contaminated with U-232, which is highly radioactive and has very radioactive radionuclides in its decay chain. The radiation-dose-related problems associated with separating U-233 from U-238 and then handling the U-233 would be considerable and more complex than enriching natural uranium for the purpose of bomb making. But in principle, the separation can be done, especially if worker safety is not a primary concern; the resulting U-233 can be used to make bombs. There is just no way to avoid proliferation problems associated with thorium fuel cycles that involve reprocessing. Thorium fuel cycles without reprocessing would offer the same temptation to reprocess as today’s once-through uranium fuel cycles.

### Solvency

#### Doesn’t solve prolif or safety- creates a Uranium 233 source which can yield bombs

Makhijani 12

[Arjun, president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, “Is Thorium A Magic Bullet For Our Energy Problems?”, Science Friday, NPR, 5.4, p. pq //wyo-tjc]

ARJUN MAKHIJANI: I don't think so. I think the problems of nuclear power, fundamentally, would remain. The safety problems would be different. I mean, Mr. Martin and proponents of thorium are right in the sense that the liquid fuel reactor has a number of safety advantages, but it also has a number of disadvantages. For instance, this breeder reactor lost out with the sodium-cooled breeder, in the incident that Mr. Martin mentioned, because the liquid - the molten sodium reactor, the sodium-cooled reactor has a much better breeding ratio. It produces a lot more excess fuel that you can then take to the next reactor. In this reactor, because thorium is not a fissile material, you actually need either plutonium or enriched uranium to start it. In fact, this reactor that operated in Oak Ridge for a few years, it actually started up in 1964, it never used thorium to breed uranium-233. Some uranium-233 was put into the reactor at one point, but it had been made in another reactor. It hadn't been made in that reactor. It operated with enriched uranium, some plutonium and some uranium-233, but not made in that reactor. So what are the problems? The problem is that with this particular reactor, most people will want a reprocessing, that is separating the fissile material on-site. so you have a continuous flow of molten salt out of the reactor. You take out the protactinium-233, which is a precursor of uranium, and then you put the uranium back in the reactor, and then you keep it going. But if you look at the Princeton University paper on thorium reactors from a few years ago, you'll see that this onsite reprocessing allows you to separate protactinium altogether. Now, the U.S. wouldn't do it, but if you were a county without nuclear materials and had a reprocessing plant right there, you'd separate the protactinium-233, you'd get pure uranium-233, which is easier to make bombs with than plutonium. I can read you the quote from the Princeton University paper, but I won't bother.

#### Reactors with thorium are uneconomical and still risk proliferation

Lovins, 2009

[Amory, Chairman and Chief Scientist of Rocky Mountain Research Institute, “"New" Nuclear Reactors, Same Old Story.” Online, http://www.rmi.org/Knowledge-Center/Library/2009-07\_NuclearSameOldStory] /Wyo-MB

Some enthusiasts prefer fueling reactors with thorium—an element 3× as abundant as uranium but even more uneconomic to use. India has for decades failed to commercialize breeder reactors to exploit its thorium deposits. But thorium can’t fuel a reactor by itself: rather, a uranium- or plutonium-fueled reactor can convert thorium-232 into fissionable (and plutonium-like, highly bomb-usable) uranium-233. Thorium’s proliferation,[[1]](#endnote-1) waste, safety, and cost problems differ only in detail from uranium’s: *e.g.*, thorium ore makes less mill waste, but highly radioactive U-232 makes fabricating or reprocessing U-233 fuel hard and costly. And with uranium-based nuclear power continuing its decades-long economic collapse, it’s awfully late to be thinking of developing a whole new fuel cycle whose problems differ only in detail from current versions.

#### Technology is unproven and institutional inertia locks in conventional generators for the next several decades

New Scientist 11

[End our atomic legacy. Source: New Scientist; 3/26/2011, Vol. 209 Issue 2805, p5-5, 5/8p]

In the case of nuclear power, this approach could bring great benefits. One good example is the liquid fluoride thorium reactor, which as the name suggests, relies on the element thorium as a less risky alternative to uranium. Though the technology is as yet unproven, these reactors promise tantalising safety advantages, as we explain on page 8. These include cooling systems that sidestep the risk of hydrogen explosions of the kind that shattered Fukushima. So why don't we start anew? One reason is institutional inertia. It is so much easier to license a plant of known design, based on decades of experience, than spend time, effort and possibly a lot of money developing a novel design. That's probably why countries with vibrant economies and less bias towards legacy technologies, such as China and India, are showing most interest in thorium. As New Scientist argued last week, we have more to fear from climate change than nuclear power. That means, at least in the short term, nuclear power will remain an essential ingredient of efforts to curb carbon emissions. But given that four-fifths of our nuclear generating capacity is more than 20 years old, it would be sensible to make changes. While thorium reactors are still some way off, the latest generation of conventional reactors offers more comprehensive safety features (see page 11). In the wake of Fukushima, renewables will undoubtedly play a greater role. But the nuclear industry should also seize the opportunity to cut the umbilical cord with its military origins once and for all.

#### Proliferation inevitable: (A)nsg india agreement

IPS News 8

9/8/8. <http://japanfocus.org/-Praful-Bidwai/2886>.

The special waiver granted to India by the Nuclear Suppliers' Group (NSG) from its nuclear trade rules is being seen as a massive setback to the cause of global nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. The NSG's waiver will allow India to resume nuclear commerce with the rest of the world with very few restrictions although India is not a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and has refused to accede to any other agreement for preventing the spread of, reducing the numbers of, or abolishing nuclear weapons. The 45-nation conglomerate, a private arrangement set up after India's first nuclear weapons explosion in 1974, turned a full circle at its special meeting in Vienna, on the weekend, the second one in a fortnight, held at the behest of the United States. The NSG was originally established "to ensure that nuclear trade for peaceful purposes does not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". But it has now done the very opposite by agreeing to the exceptional waiver for India as part of New Delhi's controversial nuclear cooperation deal with the U.S. inked three years ago. Washington hailed the waiver as "historic" and one that would boost nuclear non-proliferation, while New Delhi described the deal as an "important step" towards meeting the challenges of climate change and sustainable development. Clearly though, the waiver only became possible because of the strong-arm methods used by the U.S. to bludgeon dissenting NSG members into agreeing to the exemption text it had drafted in consultation with India. Contrary to the claim that the waiver, and more generally, the U.S.-India nuclear deal, will bring India into the global "non-proliferation mainstream" or promote nuclear restraint on India's part, it will allow India to expand its nuclear weapons arsenal and encourage a nuclear arms race in Asia, particularly in the volatile South Asian subcontinent, where Pakistan emerged as India's nuclear rival 10 years ago.

#### Hegemony sparks proliferation—overextension through counterproliferation creates security fears while simultaneously making allies less confident about American guarantees

Jervis 9

[Robert, a professor of international politics at Columbia University, World Politics, “Unipolarity: A structural perspective”, January 2009, p. asp]

Failure would not mean that the system will soon cease being unipolar, however. Only if Europe truly unites (an increasingly distant prospect) could bipolarity be restored. Barring drastic internal instability, the PRC is likely to continue to rise but cannot be a global challenger in the foreseeable future. The most likely system-changing force is proliferation, and ironically unipolarity gives many states good reasons to seek nuclear weapons. Although allies sometimes doubted the American commitment during the cold war, the very strength of the Soviet Union meant that the U.S. would pay a high price if it did not live up to its promises to defend them. The unipole has more freedom of action. Even if the unipole’s costs of protecting others are lower, those states have less reason to be confident that it will stand by them forever. The existence of a security community does not entirely displace the fear of an uncertain future that is the hallmark of international politics. American enemies like North Korea and Iran face more immediate incentives to defend themselves, incentives that were increased but not created by the overthrow of Saddam’s regime. Indeed, the U.S. has spurred proliferation by stressing the danger posed by “rogue” states with nuclear weapons, treating North Korea much more gingerly than Iraq, and indicating that it can be deterred by even a few atomic bombs. Its very efforts to stop other countries from getting nuclear weapons imply that the consequences of their succeeding will be great, a belief that is questionable but could easily be self-fulfilling. Furthermore, regional domino effects are likely: a growing North Korean nuclear force could lead Japan to develop nuclear weapons, and if Iran continues its program others in the region may follow suit. Thus both American overexpansion and the fear that it will eventually withdraw will encourage others to get nuclear weapons.

#### US presence in the Middle East incites terrorism—must drawdown presence to solve

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]

The US presence on the ground in the Middle East also incites terrorists to attack American interests. In his study of suicide terrorist groups, Pape has found that ‘what nearly all suicide terrorist attacks have in common is a specific secular and strategic goal: to compel modern democracies to withdraw military forces from territory that the terrorists consider to be their homeland’.46 Al-Qaeda fits this pattern, and one of its principal objectives ‘is the expulsion of American troops from the Persian Gulf and the reduction of Washington’s power in the region’.47 Here, the Bush administration’s inflexible determination to maintain a long-term American military presence in Iraq is exactly the wrong policy to reduce terrorism.Instead of reducing American vulnerability to terrorism, the presence of US troops in Iraq and the Middle East increases it by reinforcing the widespread perception in the Islamic world that the US is pursuing a neo-colonial policy in the Middle East in furtherance of its own imperial ambitions. The huge US politico-military footprint in the Middle East region – including Iraq – is, along with America’s policy on the Israel/Palestinian issue, the primary driver of Middle Eastern terrorism. The administration’s overall policy in the Middle East has inflamed anti-American sentiment, and turned the entire region into a source of recruits for various radical terrorist groups. Instead of solving this problem, staying in Iraq will exacerbate it.

#### THE IMPACT IS EXTINCTION

Alexander in 2k

[Yonah, “Terrorism in the 21st Century”, Depaul Business Law Journal, p. ln //wyo-tjc]

More specifically, present-day terrorists have introduced into contemporary life a new scale of terror violence in terms of both threats and responses that has made clear that we have entered into an Age of Terrorism with all of its serious implications to national, regional, and global security concerns. n25 Perhaps the most significant dangers that evolve from modern day terrorism are those relating to the safety, welfare, and rights of ordinary people; the stability of the state system; the health of economic [\*67] development; the expansion of democracy; and possibly the survival of civilization itself.

1. Most proposed thorium cycles need reprocessing to separate U-233 for use in fresh fuel. Some also use 20%-enriched uranium-235, which needs very little further enrichment to become bomb-usable. Diluting U-233 with U-238 also makes more separable plutonium. See A.B. Lovins, “Thorium Cycles and Proliferation,” *Bull. atom. Scient.* **35**(2):16–22 (1979), **35**(5):50–54 (1979), **35**(9):57–59 (1979), all at books.google.com/books?id=GgsAAAAAMBAJ&source=gbs\_summary\_s&cad=0#all\_issues\_anchor. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)