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### 1

#### A. INTERPRETATION. A restriction must actually prevent production, not just indirectly make it more difficult. Legal interpretations in the context of a similar kind of regulation support.

New York Court of Appeals Chief Justice Pound in 33

Roscoe, Nebbia v. New York, 262 N.Y 259, 264, lexis

**The fixing of minimum prices is one of the main features of the act**. The question is whether the act, so far as it provides for fixing minimum prices for milk, is unconstitutional under New York Constitution, article 1, section 6, and United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment, in that it interferes with the right of the milk dealer to carry on his business in such manner as suits his convenience, without State interference as to the price at which he shall sell his milk.

He continues [New York Court of Appeals Chief Justice Pound in 33]

Roscoe, Nebbia v. New York, 262 N.Y 259, 271, lexis

**The New York law** creates no monopoly; **does not restrict production**; was adopted to meet an emergency; milk is a greater family necessity than ice.

US Supreme Court Justice Roberts in 34

Owen, Majority opinion in Nebbia v. New York, 291 U.S. 502, 531, http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cgi-bin/getcase.pl?court=us&vol=291&invol=502

Notwithstanding **the admitted power to correct existing economic ills by appropriate regulation of business, even though an indirect result may be a restriction of the freedom of contract or a modification of charges for services or the price of commodities**, the appellant urges that direct fixation of prices is a type of regulation absolutely forbidden. His position is that the Fourteenth Amendment requires us to hold the challenged statute void for this reason alone. The argument runs that the public control of rates or prices is per se unreasonable and unconstitutional, save as applied to businesses affected with a public interest; that a business so affected is one in which property is devoted to an enterprise of a sort which the public itself might appropriately undertake, or one whose owner relies on a public grant or franchise for the right to conduct the business, or in which he is bound to serve all who apply; in short, such as is commonly called a public utility; or a business in its nature a monopoly. The milk industry, it is said, possesses none of these characteristics, and, therefore, not being affected with a public interest, its charges may not be controlled by the state. Upon the soundness of this contention the appellant's case against the statute depends. We may as well say at once that the dairy industry is not, in the accepted sense of the phrase, a public utility. We think the appellant is also right in asserting that there is in this case no suggestion of any monopoly or monopolistic practice. It goes without saying that those engaged in the business are in no way dependent upon public grants or franchises for the privilege of conducting their activities. But if, as must be conceded, the industry is subject to regulation in the public interest, what constitutional principle bars the state from correcting existing [291 U.S. 502, 532] maladjustments by legislation touching prices? We think there is no such principle.

#### B. Violation – The affirmative does not remove a restriction that actually prevents production.

#### Standards

#### 1. Declaring sole authority to regulate Nuclear Power is an INCREASE in RESTRICTIONS because regulations are restrictions. This makes the topic bidirectional, which kills predictability.

#### 2. The affirmative is effects topical—declaration of sole authority isn’t an explicit repeal of state regulations. The plan could as easily be implemented via the NRC declaring its authority and agreeing with and re-implementing state regulations. The topical version of the aff is to just have the NRC repeal state restrictions.

#### 3. Bright line - Their interpretation requires that you look at the intent or effects of regulations rather than on the words. Our interpretation sets a bright line -- if the words of the law mandate a limit on energy production, then it is topical to remove it. Avoiding subjective judging decisions is good for the exercise of jurisdiction. Also, any advantages based on removing restrictions would be extratopical, not reasons to vote aff.

#### Voter for fairness and education.

### 2

#### The 50 states and all relevant U.S. territories should remove all of their restrictions and regulations on nuclear power that conflict with federal law. They should also defer to federal authority on nuclear power in all instances.

#### Their Garvey evidence states that conflict within power between states and federal have prevented nuclear plants from being constructed.

#### CP solves – it defers to the federal authority which is key to solve.

THEIR AUTHOR Harper 11 (Richard S. Harper, attorney for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission “Pacific Gas and Electric Revisited: Federal Preemption of State Nuclear Moritoria, Journal of Energy and Environmental Law, Summer 2011)

Barring any litigation, it would establish the NRC’s intent to preempt any state law that attempts to regulate nuclear waste or use nuclear waste considerations as part of the state’s determinations, as done by California in PG&E. Should the NRC’s authority to preempt state law be challenged, however, these regulations would provide the necessary means for reversing the precedent established in PG&E.

### 3

#### 1. Obama wins – new jobs numbers

Silver 10-5 (Nate, statistician and election guru, 2012, “Jobs News Makes Obama’s Case Easier”, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/05/jobs-news-makes-obamas-case-easier/>) PY

The rate of jobs growth is now just slightly behind the [one that was enough to re-elect George W. Bush in 2004](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/03/in-looking-back-four-years-voters-have-short-memories/), when an average of 168,000 jobs were created between January and September 2004.¶ Although the unemployment rate remains stubbornly high, the recent trajectory now looks more favorable. Unemployment has fallen by 0.7 percent since December 2011, to 7.8 percent from 8.5 percent.¶ Historically, there has been [no relationship at all](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/02/on-the-maddeningly-inexact-relationship-between-unemployment-and-re-election/) between the unemployment rate on Election Day and the incumbent’s performance.¶ However, there has been a relationship between the change in the unemployment rate in the months leading up to the election and how well the incumbent does. The decline in unemployment under Mr. Obama this year since December is the largest in an election year since Ronald Reagan’s re-election bid, when it declined to 7.3 percent in Sept. 1984 from 8.3 percent in Dec. 1983.

#### 2. Nuclear power is unpopular with the public – best polling

Mariotte 12 (Michael, Executive director and the chief spokesperson for NIRS, has testified in the United States Senate and before the U.S. House of Representatives on nuclear power, a graduate of Antioch College, Jun 5th, “Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the polls say” <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say>)

Public opinion on nuclear power matters. Should we build new reactors or not? If so, who should pay for them? Should we close existing reactors? Where should nuclear power rank among all the other possible sources of electricity generation? Where should we put our limited resources to attain the best possible energy future?¶ These are all fundamental questions, the answers to which could affect our future far more than, say, who will be the next Senator from Indiana. Yet, perhaps surprisingly, until recently—really the past two or three years—other than regularly-conducted, loudly-trumpeted and rarely relevant industry-sponsored polls, polling of public opinion on nuclear power (and a lot of other energy issues) was haphazard at best.¶ Gallup, for example, over the past 18 years as best as we can find out, has conducted only 10 polls (and most of these only asked a half-sample, putting their numbers into question) asking people their opinion on nuclear power. But beginning in 2009, Gallup has begun polling annually. Unfortunately, Gallup asks the exact same question, with the same wording, that the Nuclear Energy Institute’s (NEI) own well-tested polling does. And the NEI doesn’t ask questions that it doesn’t want the answers to. Even so, Gallup’s answers don’t quite match those NEI gets, and which are usually heavily promoted in the media by NEI.¶ To try to get a better sense of what the public really thinks about nuclear power (and since we can’t afford to conduct our own polling), we took a look at every poll we could find on the issue, and related energy issues, over the past two years, and in some cases further back. Yes, that includes GOP/Fox News favorite Rasmussen.¶ As DailyKos readers know, if not the general public, examining all the possible polls leads to a much greater confidence in conclusions than relying on a single poll. Thus, we have a fairly strong confidence that our conclusions are a good statement of where the American public is at on nuclear power and our energy future in the Spring of 2012.¶ Conclusion 1: The public does NOT want to pay for new nuclear power. It IS willing to pay for renewable energy.¶ This one is a slam dunk.¶ New nuclear reactors are simply too expensive for utilities to build with their own assets. Nor are banks willing to lend money for most nuclear projects; they’re considered too risky given the long history of cost overruns, defaults, cancellations and other problems. Thus, the only two means of financing a new reactor are to either get money from taxpayers, through direct federal loans or taxpayer-backed loan guarantees, or from ratepayers in a few, mostly Southern states, which allow utilities to collect money from ratepayers before reactors are built—a concept known either as “early cost recovery” or Construction Work in Progress (CWIP).¶ ORC International (which polls for CNN, among others) has asked a straightforward question for the past two years (March 2011 and February 2012) in polls commissioned by the Civil Society Institute: “Should U.S. Taxpayers Take on the Risk of Backing New Nuclear Reactors?” The answer? Basically identical both years: 73% opposed in 2011, 72% opposed in 2012.¶ Maybe using the work “risk” skews the poll, you think? So ORC also asked, “Do you favor or oppose shifting federal loan guarantees from nuclear energy to clean renewables?” The answer was basically the same: 74% said yes in 2011, 77% in 2012 with 47% “strongly” holding that opinion both years.¶ A third poll conducted by ORC for Civil Society Institute in March 2012 asked this question: ¶ “Utilities in some states are allowed to charge electricity ratepayers for “Construction Work in Progress” for new power plants. This means that ratepayers – instead of the companies – pay for construction of new nuclear reactors and other major power plants before any electricity ever reaches customers, thereby lowering the financial risks to shareholders. Knowing this, which of the following statements about “Construction Work in Progress” most closely reflects your view?”¶ The answer: fully 80% opposed CWIP.¶ Most pollsters have not asked similar questions; interestingly though, Rasmussen did in May 2012 for an undisclosed client. Their question: “The government is providing billions in loan guarantees to help the development of new nuclear plants. Would that money be better spent on the development of alternative new energy sources?” Unfortunately, Rasmussen did not publicize the results and hid them behind a paywall, which we were not inclined to pursue. But if anyone has access to that, we’d love to know what Rasmussen found.

#### 3. Romney will bomb Iran

Tilford 12 (Robert, Military Affairs writer for the ExaminerAugust 25th, “Romney promises the American people war if elected” http://www.examiner.com/article/romney-promises-the-american-people-war-if-elected)

U.S. presidential candidate from the Republican Party Mitt Romney is promising the American people war if elected.¶ Romney told CBS news he'd be willing to go to war to stop Iran from "becoming nuclear” (see article: Romney Ready to Invade Syria, Strike Iran's Nuclear Program http://www.novinite.com/view\_news.php?id=142607 ).¶ "No question in my view that we can put all manner of pressure on the regime that's there, but they have to also know that a military option is one which we'd be willing to consider if they do not take action to dissuade a course towards nuclearization," Romney said of Iran.¶ On Face the Nation on Sunday, Mitt Romney said that if elected president “he wouldn't have to get congressional permission for a military strike on Iran” – which, of course would violate the U.S. Constitution.

#### 4. Iran strikes causes multiple scenarios for nuclear war, CBW use and terrorist attacks.

Russell 9 (James A. Russell, managing editor of Strategic Insights, the quarterly ejournal published by the Center for Contemporary Conflict at the Naval Postgraduate School, Spring 2009, Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East, Security Studies Center)

Iran’s response to what would initially start as a sustained stand-off bombardment (Desert Fox Heavy) could take a number of different forms that might lead to escalation by the United States and Israel, surrounding states, and non-state actors. Once the strikes commenced, it is difficult to imagine Iran remaining in a Saddam-like quiescent mode and hunkering down to wait out the attacks. Iranian leaders have unequivocally stated that any attack on its nuclear sites will result in a wider war81 – a war that could involve regional states on both sides as well as non-state actors like Hamas and Hezbollah. While a wider regional war need not lead to escalation and nuclear use by either Israel or the United States, wartime circumstances and domestic political pressures could combine to shape decision-making in ways that present nuclear use as an option to achieve military and political objectives. For both the United States and Israel, Iranian or proxy use of chemical, biological or radiological weapons represent the most serious potential escalation triggers. For Israel, a sustained conventional bombardment of its urban centers by Hezbollah rockets in Southern Lebanon could also trigger an escalation spiral. Assessing relative probability of these scenarios is very difficult and beyond the scope of this article. Some scenarios for Iranian responses that could lead to escalation by the United States and Israel are: Terrorist-type asymmetric attacks on either the U.S. or Israeli homelands by Iran or its proxies using either conventional or unconventional (chemical, biological, or radiological) weapons. Escalation is more likely in response to the use of unconventional weapons in populated urban centers. The potential for use of nuclear retaliation against terrorist type attacks is problematic, unless of course the sponsoring country takes official responsibility for them, which seems highly unlikely. Asymmetric attacks by Iran or its proxies using unconventional weapons against U.S. military facilities in Iraq and the Gulf States (Kuwait, Bahrain, UAE, Qatar); • Long-range missile strikes by Iran attacking Israel and/or U.S. facilities in Iraq and the Gulf States: • Conventional missile strikes in and around the Israeli reactor at Dimona • Airbursts of chemical or radiological agents in Israeli urban areas; • Missile strikes using non-conventional weapons against US Gulf facilities such as Al Udeid in Qatar, Al Dhafra Air Base in the UAE, and the 5th Fleet Headquarters in Manama, Bahrain. Under all scenarios involving chemical/biological attacks on its forces, the United States has historically retained the right to respond with all means at its disposal even if the attacks come from a non-nuclear weapons state.82 • The involvement of non-state actors as part of ongoing hostilities between Iran, the United States, and Israel in which Hezbollah and/or Hamas became engaged presents an added dimension for conflict escalation. While tactically allied with Iran and each other, these groups have divergent interests and objectives that could affect their involvement (or non-involvement in a wider regional war) – particularly in ways that might prompt escalation by Israel and the United States. Hezbollah is widely believed to have stored thousands of short range Iranian-supplied rockets in southern Lebanon. Attacking Israel in successive fusillades of missiles over time could lead to domestic political demands on the Israeli military to immediately stop these external attacks – a mission that might require a wide area-denial capability provided by nuclear weapons and their associated PSI overpressures, particularly if its conventional ground operations in Gaza prove in the mid- to longterms as indecisive or strategic ambiguous as its 2006 operations in Lebanon. • Another source of uncertainty is the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) – referred to here as “quasi-state” actor. The IRGC manages the regime’s nuclear, chemical and missile programs and is responsible for “extraterritorial” operations outside Iran. The IRGC is considered as instrument of the state and reports directly to Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei. So far, the IRGC has apparently refrained from providing unconventional weapons to its surrogates. The IRGC also, however arms and funds various Shiite paramilitary groups in Iraq and Lebanon that have interests and objectives that may or may not directly reflect those of the Iranian supreme leader. Actions of these groups in a wartime environment are another source of strategic uncertainty that could shape crisis decision-making in unhelpful ways. • The most likely regional state to be drawn into a conflict on Iran’s side in a wider regional war is Syria, which is widely reported to have well developed missile and chemical warfare programs. Direct Syrian military involvement in an Israeli-U.S./Iranian war taking the form of missile strikes or chemical attacks on Israel could serve as another escalation trigger in a nuclear-use scenario, in particular if chemical or bio-chem weapons are used by the Syrians, technically crossing the WMD-chasm and triggering a retaliatory strike using any category of WMD including nuclear weapons. • The last – and perhaps most disturbing – of these near-term scenarios is the possible use by Iran of nuclear weapons in the event of conventional strikes by the United States and Israel. This scenario is built on the assumption of a U.S. and/or Israeli intelligence failure to detect Iranian possession of a nuclear device that had either been covertly built or acquired from another source. It is possible to foresee an Iranian “demonstration” use of a nuclear weapon in such a scenario in an attempt to stop an Israeli/U.S. conventional bombardment. A darker scenario would be a direct nuclear attack by Iran on Israel, also precipitated by conventional strikes, inducing a “use them or lose them” response. In turn, such a nuclear strike would almost certainly prompt an Israeli and U.S. massive response – a potential “Armageddon” scenario.

### 4

#### Nuclear energy embodies the essence of enframing objects as standing reserve

Kinsella 7 Dr. William J. Kinsella 2007 (Heidegger and Being at the Hanford Reservation: Standing Reserve, Enframing, and Environmental Communication Theory; Environmental Communication Vol. 1, No. 2, November 2007, pp.194-217 Dr. William J. Kinsella is an associate professor at North Carolina State University. His work on nuclear energy communication has encompassed the areas of nuclear fusion, environmental cleanup across the US nuclear weapons complex, and commercial nuclear energy in US and global contexts.)

In his essay on ‘‘the question concerning technology,’’ Heidegger (1977a) critiqued the reduction of nature to a ‘‘standing reserve’’ (bestand), a stockpile of phenomena appropriated for human exploitation. Hanford is a compelling example, as the place was taken from its former residents, farmers and ranchers who had taken it in turn from their Native American predecessors, by the government for use as a plutonium factory. Hanford’s plutonium ‘‘product,’’ as it is known in the jargon of workers and officials, remains an essential element in the US nuclear ‘‘stockpile.’’ The example is even more fitting, however, because Heidegger viewed atomic energy as the quintessential product of modern science, technology, and Western metaphysics, which he linked in an instrumental ‘‘enframing’’ (gestell ) of the natural world (Foltz, 1995; Heidegger, 1966, 1969, 1977a). Enframing involves a stance toward the world that ‘‘challenges,’’ ‘‘regulates,’’ and ‘‘secures’’ its elements to create a standing reserve of usable resources (Heidegger, 1977a, p. 16). Human intervention in nuclear processes enframes nature in a way that is historically unprecedented, but was already implicit in the founding premises of modernism (Kinsella, 2004, 2005).

#### The rapacious drive to secure energy is a symptom of “challenging-forth,” a mindset that renders everything as disposable. Only through rejecting challenging forth and embracing bringing forth can we avoid this hollowing out of Being

Waddington 5 A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding 'The Question concerning Technology' more by David Waddington Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 37, No. 4, 2005 http://concordia.academia.edu/DavidWaddington/Papers/538046/A\_Field\_Guide\_to\_Heidegger\_Understanding\_The\_Question\_concerning\_Technology

Most essays on technology focus primarily on practical issues surrounding the use of particular technologies . Heidegger’s essay, however, does not—instead, it focuses on the ways of thinking that lie behind technology. Heidegger (1977, p. 3) thinks that by coming to understand these ways of thinking, humans can enter into a ‘free relationship’ with technology. After dismissing the conventional account of technology, which supposedly states that technology is simply a means to an end, Heidegger commences a discussion on ancient craftsmanship. He suggests that the ancient craftsmanship involves the four Aristotelian causes: material, formal, ﬁnal, and efﬁcient. Intuitively, one might think that the efﬁcient cause of a given craft-item (the craftsman) was the most signiﬁcant of the four. However, although the craftsman has an important role in that she unites the four causes by considering each of them carefully, each of the four causes is equally co-responsible for the particular craft-item that is produced. Heidegger comments, ‘The four ways of being responsible bring something into appearance. They let it come forth into presencing’ (1977, p. 9). Appropriately enough, Heidegger names this process bringing-forth . Notably, bringing-forth is not merely a descriptive genus under which the four causes are subsumed—rather, it is a uniﬁed process, ‘a single leading-forth to which [each of the causes] is indebted’ (Lovitt, 1972, p. 46).Heidegger writes that bringing-forth ‘comes to pass only insofar as something concealed comes into unconcealment’ (1977, p. 11). Thus, instead of the craft-item being created by the craftsman, as one would think, it was revealed or unconcealed .In ‘The Thing’, Heidegger comments on the making of a jug, The jug is not a vessel because it was made; rather, the jug had to be made because it is this holding vessel. The making … lets the jug come into its own. But that which in the jug’s nature is its own is never brought about by its making. (1971, p. 168)Clearly, revealing/unconcealing in the mode of bringing-forth contains strong hints of Platonism. Bringing-forth is the mode of revealing that corresponds to ancient craft. Modern technology, however, has its own particular mode of revealing, which Heidegger calls challenging-forth . Thinking in the mode of challenging-forth is very different from thinking in the mode of bringing-forth: when challenging-forth, one sets upon the elements of a situation both in the sense of ordering (i.e. setting a system upon) and in a more rapacious sense (i.e. the wolves set upon the traveler and devoured him). In bringing-forth, human beings were one important element among others in the productive process; in challenging-forth, humans control the productive process. Efﬁciency is an additional important element of thinking in the mode of challeng-ing forth; the earth, for example, is set upon to yield the maximum amount of ore with the minimum amount of effort. Essentially, challenging-forth changes the way we see the world—as Michael Zimmerman pointedly remarks, ‘To be capable of transforming a forest into packaging for cheeseburgers, man must see the forest not as a display of the miracle of life, but as raw material, pure and simple’ (1977, p. 79).Production in the mode of challenging-forth reveals objects that have the status of standing-reserve . Objects that have been made standing-reserve have been reduced to disposability in two different senses of the word: (1) They are disposable in the technical sense; they are easily ordered and arranged. Trees that once stood chaotically in the forest are now logs that can be easily counted, weighed, piled, and shipped. (2) They are also disposable in the conventional sense; like diapers and cheap razors, they are endlessly replaceable/interchangeable and have little value. For the most part, challenging things forth into standing-reserve is not a laudable activity, and thus it makes sense to wonder what drives human beings to think in this way. Heidegger’s answer to this motivational question is unconventional— instead of suggesting that the origins of this motivation are indigenous to human beings, he postulates the existence of a phenomenon that ‘sets upon man to order the real as standing-reserve’ (1977, p. 19). Heidegger calls this mysterious phenomenon enframing ( Ge-stell in German). The word ‘Ge-stell’ gathers together several meanings of the -stellen family of German verbs: in Ge-stell, humans are ordered ( bestellen ), commanded ( bestellen ), and entrapped ( nachstellen ) (Harries 1994,p. 229). Heidegger thinks that our default state is that of being trapped by Ge-stell; this is what he means when he writes, ‘As the one who is challenged forth in this way, man stands within the essential realm of [Ge-stell]. He can never take up a relationship to it only subsequently’ (1977, p. 24; Sallis, 1971, p. 162). According to Heidegger (1977, p. 25), there are different ‘ordainings of destining’ for human beings. Although the default destining is that of Ge-stell, it is possible to choose an alternate road. Heidegger thinks that human beings have been granted the special role of ‘Shepherds of Being’—we have been granted the power to reveal the world in certain ways (Ballard, 1971, p. 60). Trapped in Ge-stell, we tend to reveal things in the mode of challenging-forth, but we can also choose to reveal things in the mode of bringing-forth. Heidegger comments, ‘Placed between these possibilities, man is endangered from out of destining’ (1977, p. 26). However, by carefully considering the ways of thinking that lie behind technology, we can grasp the ‘saving power’. We can realize that we, the Shepherds of Being, have a choice : we can bring-forth rather than challenge-forth. Thus, once we understand the thinking behind technology, we become free to choose our fate—‘… we are already sojourning in the open space of destining’ (Heidegger, 1977, p. 26).

## Case

### Solvency

#### No nuclear renaissance – global trend.

Mez, Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universitat Berlin, ‘12

[Lutz, “5-7-12, “Nuclear Energy—Any Solution for Sustainability and Climate Protection?”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421512003527]

Is the entire world really building nuclear power plants? By no means. According to the IAEA, 63 blocks with a rating of 61,032 MW are currently under construction (see Table 1). The building projects are spread out among fourteen countries: China (26), Russia (10), India (6), South Korea (5), the Ukraine (2), Japan (2), Slovakia (2), Bulgaria (2) and Taiwan (2) and one block each in Argentina, Brazil, Finland, France, and the USA. The World Nuclear Association (WNA) only lists 61 reactors under construction, but another 156 reactors in the category ‘planned.’ Actual development of nuclear technology teaches us, however, that planned reactors by no means automatically move into the category of ‘under construction.’ In 1979, before the Three Mile Island accident in Harrisburg, there were 233 reactors under construction in the world, and over 100 cancellations followed (Schneider, Froggatt, Thomas, 2011). In view of these facts, the metaphor ‘renaissance of nuclear power’ must be viewed as an ideological weapon. Examined more closely, it would appear that nuclear power has even taken a nose-dive in the Western industrialized countries. In the European Union there were 177 reactors in 1989, whereas the IAEA only lists 134 operational reactors in February 2012. Of the 192 members of the United Nations, only 31 countries had nuclear power plants in operation at the beginning of 2012. Three countries (Italy, Kazakhstan and Lithuania) have in the meantime closed down their nuclear power plants, while in Austria a reactor was built in Zwentendorf but never connected to the grid. A similar reactor project is the completed but never fueled Bataan Nuclear Power Plant in the Philippines. The six biggest countries operating nuclear power plants (USA, France, Japan, Russia, Germany and South Korea) include several countries possessing nuclear weapons (USA, France and Russia) and produce three-fourths of total nuclear power. In 2009 nuclear power plants only produced 13.4 percent of electrical power worldwide. This corresponds to 5.8 percent of Total Primary Energy Supply and a little more than two percent of global final energy consumption. In comparison to nuclear power, the potential contribution of renewable energies to easing the strain on the environment and tackling climate change is much higher because they account for 19.5 percent of global power production and more than 12 percent of primary energy production (IEA, 2011). The United States has the most nuclear capacity and generation among the 31 countries in the world that have commercial nuclear power plants. There are currently 104 operational nuclear reactors at 65 nuclear sites in 31 states. Most of the commercial reactors are located east of the Mississippi River, near water sources. Illinois has 11 reactors and the most nuclear capacity. Since 1990, the nuclear power share of the total electricity generation has averaged about 20%. Nuclear generation of electricity has roughly tracked the growth in total electricity output. Between 1985 and 1996, 34 reactors were connected to the grid. In addition, nuclear generation has increased as a result of higher utilization of existing capacity and from technical modifications to increase nuclear plant capacity. In 2007 the American construction site Watts Bar-2 overtook first place for years as far as delays in construction were concerned, replacing the Bushehr nuclear power plant in Iran, for which cement was first poured on 1 May 1975. The construction of Watts Bar-2 began 40 years ago on 1 December 1972, with the project then being frozen in 1985. The company which owns the plant, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), announced in October 2007 that it would complete the reactor at a cost of US-$ 2.5 billion. Connection to the electricity grid is scheduled for August 2012. In August 2009, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued an Early Site Permit for two new reactors at Southern Nuclear's Vogtle site. The two new units are the reference plant for the Westinghouse AP1000 pressurized water reactor design. In February 2010, President Obama announced that the DOE had offered a loan guarantee up to 80% of the project estimated cost of $14.5 billion. Southern Nuclear will only have to pay a credit subsidy fee for the $11.6 billion loan. On February 9, 2012, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) voted 4 to 1 to issue the Combined Operating License for Vogtle units 3 and 4. This is the first license to be approved in the United States in over 30 years. In the European Union thirteen out of the twenty-seven member states do not produce any nuclear power themselves or have abolished this technology for technical or economic reasons following political decisions. Fourteen EU member states are currently using nuclear energy, while three countries have shut down their nuclear power plants. Two countries decided after Fukushima to phase-out nuclear power and the remaining countries do not have a nuclear energy program. Eight high-risk reactors were closed down in the new accession countries in the expansion of the EU to Eastern Europe, with the EU and other Western donor countries contributing more than one billion Euros to meet the costs of closure. Four reactors are labeled “under construction” in all of Eastern Europe at present, although a series of new nuclear power plants are being planned. In spite of liberalization and partial privatization of the electrical power sector, the completion or construction of new nuclear power plants constitutes a virtually insurmountable financing problem. Looking at the historical development, there were still a total of 134 nuclear power blocks in operation in Europe in February 2012–116 of them in Western Europe and, following the closure of Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania, a total of 18 in Central and Eastern European countries. According to the IAEA, there are two reactor blocks under construction in Western Europe: one in Finland and since December 2007 one in France. Construction of the first so-called European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) with a rating of 1,600 MW began in Olkiluoto, Finland on 12 August 2005. Since then the project has been overshadowed by exploding costs and delays: originally slated for 2009, commercial operation will probably not take place before August 2013 and instead of the originally planned € 3.2 billion, the reactor will cost almost € 6 billion. An EPR is also being built in France. Construction officially commenced on 3 December 2007 and it was expected that it would take 54 months to complete the plant, i.e. by May 2012. According to inspection reports from the supervisory authority ASN, a host of problems have also cropped up here. As a result, the ambitious time schedule cannot be met and connection to the grid is now scheduled for the end of 2016. The three biggest emerging market countries—India, China and Brazil—embarked on their nuclear energy programmes decades ago, but have only partially achieved their goals. Nuclear energy only accounts for a small percentage of electrical power production and the energy supply in these countries. The People's Republic of China has the most ambitious plans for expanding nuclear power, operating sixteen nuclear power plants at present generating 71 TWh, which accounted for 1.8 percent of power production in 2010. As of February 2012, 26 additional nuclear power reactors are under construction. China had an estimated total installed electricity generating capacity of over 1,000 GW at the end of 2011 and will expand to 1,600 GW by 2020. According to China's National Development and Reform Commission the installed nuclear capacity shall be 80 GW (6%) by 2020 and a further increase to 200 GW (16%) by 2030. But following the Fukushima accident, the State Council announced that it would suspend approval for new nuclear power stations and halted work on four approved units. “The announcement marked a significant policy change” (Green-Weiskel, 2011). Nuclear has remained a small fraction of China's total energy mix, because government has given priority to solar and wind for future energy growth. While China has invested the equivalent of about $10 billion per year into nuclear power in recent years, in 2010 it spent twice as much on wind energy alone and some $54.5 billion on all renewables combined. There are several reasons for China to shelve its nuclear industry. China's energy sector is competing with agriculture for water, and the country is not immune to a temblor-triggered disaster. In India 20 smaller reactors are in operation, meeting 2.9 percent of electricity needs, with six more under construction. In Brazil two reactors are in operation, producing 3.2 percent of electrical power, with one additional reactor block under construction. A closer look shows, however, that twelve out of the 63 reactors under construction (see Table 1) were already included in the statistics with the status of “under construction” more than 20 years ago. Construction of the reactor blocks Khmelnitski 3 and 4, for instance, began in the Ukraine as far back as 1986 and 1987. These blocks are listed under the category of “planned” in the WNA statistics, however. Three out of the ten Russian nuclear power plant construction projects also began in 1985 and 1986—recently completed after 25 years under construction was Kalinin 4 in November 2011. The Atucha-2 nuclear power plant in Argentina has been under construction since 1981 and still no date has been set for its commissioning. Construction of both of the blocks in Belene, Bulgaria, began in 1987 and no dates are scheduled when they will be connected to the grid. And construction at Mochovce 3 and 4 in the Slovak Republic started in 1987, with commercial operation scheduled for 2013. This shows that the statistics contain a whole host of unfinished plants. In view of all these facts, it is erroneous to speak of any “global renaissance,” all the more so because such long building periods lead to exorbitant cost overruns which scarcely any bank would finance—unless the financial risk is assumed by a government. The complexity of the licensing procedure as well as the risks involved in a building project of this type should at any rate not be underestimated (Mez et al., 2009).

#### Nuclear plants are vulnerable to terrorist attack – both the waste and the reactors themselves.

Kamps, specializes in high-level waste management and transportation at Beyond Nuclear, ‘4

[Kevin, “Get the Facts on High-Level Atomic Waste Storage Casks!”, Beyond Nuclear, 7-15-2004, RSR]

The terrorist threat to nuclear power reactors -- brought home so clearly by the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001 as well as the U.S. federal government’s admission that nuclear reactors are high on al-Qaida’s list of potentially catastrophic terrorist targets – also raises concern about waste stored on-site at reactors. Pool fires caused by terrorist attacks could release massive amounts of radioactivity into the environment for hundreds of miles downwind, risking death and injury to hundreds of thousands of people. But dry casks, stored in concentrated rows (not unlike bowling pins) in clearly visible outdoor locations, are also very vulnerable to terrorist attack. Some concerned citizens groups have advocated “hardening” at-reactor waste storage, fortifying it against terrorist attack, such as by emptying vulnerable pools and dispersing and bunkering dry storage casks behind thick concrete, steel, and earthen shields to defend against attacks by high explosives or missiles.

#### Nuclear terrorism is likely and causes extinction – security experts agree.

Rhodes 9 (Richard, affiliate of the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University, Former visiting scholar at Harvard and MIT, and author of “The Making of the Atomic Bomb” which won the Pulitzer Prize in Nonfiction, National Book Award, and National Book Critics Circle Award, “Reducing the nuclear threat: The argument for public safety” 12-14, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/reducing-the-nuclear-threat-the-argument-public-safety>, RSR)

The response was very different among nuclear and national security experts when Indiana Republican Sen. Richard Lugar surveyed PDF them in 2005. This group of 85 experts judged that the possibility of a WMD attack against a city or other target somewhere in the world is real and increasing over time. The median estimate of the risk of a nuclear attack somewhere in the world by 2010 was 10 percent. The risk of an attack by 2015 doubled to 20 percent median. There was strong, though not universal, agreement that a nuclear attack is more likely to be carried out by a terrorist organization than by a government. The group was split 45 to 55 percent on whether terrorists were more likely to obtain an intact working nuclear weapon or manufacture one after obtaining weapon-grade nuclear material. "The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is not just a security problem," Lugar wrote in the report's introduction. "It is the economic dilemma and the moral challenge of the current age. On September 11, 2001, the world witnessed the destructive potential of international terrorism. But the September 11 attacks do not come close to approximating the destruction that would be unleashed by a nuclear weapon. Weapons of mass destruction have made it possible for a small nation, or even a sub-national group, to kill as many innocent people in a day as national armies killed in months of fighting during World War II. "The bottom line is this," Lugar concluded: "For the foreseeable future, the United States and other nations will face an existential threat from the intersection of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction." It's paradoxical that a diminished threat of a superpower nuclear exchange should somehow have resulted in a world where the danger of at least a single nuclear explosion in a major city has increased (and that city is as likely, or likelier, to be Moscow as it is to be Washington or New York). We tend to think that a terrorist nuclear attack would lead us to drive for the elimination of nuclear weapons. I think the opposite case is at least equally likely: A terrorist nuclear attack would almost certainly be followed by a retaliatory nuclear strike on whatever country we believed to be sheltering the perpetrators. That response would surely initiate a new round of nuclear armament and rearmament in the name of deterrence, however illogical. Think of how much 9/11 frightened us; think of how desperate our leaders were to prevent any further such attacks; think of the fact that we invaded and occupied a country, Iraq, that had nothing to do with those attacks in the name of sending a message.

#### Nuclear’s too expensive.

Folbre, Professor of Economics at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, ‘12

[Nancy, 3-26-12, “The Nurture of Nuclear Power,” <http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/26/the-nurture-of-nuclear-power/>]

Remember the brouhaha about $563 million in Obama administration loan guarantees to Solyndra, the solar panel manufacturer that went belly up last fall? Neither President Obama nor Republicans in Congress have voiced opposition to an expected $8.3 billion Energy Department guarantee to help the Southern Company, a utility giant, build nuclear reactors in Georgia. Pressed to respond to the comparison, Representative Cliff Stearns, Republican of Florida and chairman of the Energy and Commerce subcommittee on oversight and investigations, explained that the loan guarantee for nuclear power plant construction was for a “proven industry that has been successful and has established a record.” The nuclear power industry has certainly established a record – for terrifying accidents. Most recently, the Fukushima Daiichi disaster in Japan led to the evacuation of 90,000 residents who have yet to return home and to the resignation of the prime minister. It prompted the German government to begin phasing out all nuclear generation of electricity by 2022. Yet the industry has proved remarkably successful at garnering public support in the United States, ranging from public insurance against accident liability to loan guarantees. An article last year in The Wall Street Journal observed that subsidies per kilowatt hour during its initial stages of development far exceeded those provided to solar and wind energy technologies. According to a detailed report published by the Union of Concerned Scientists, subsidies to the nuclear fuel cycle have often exceeded the value of the power produced. Buying power on the open market and giving it away for free would have been less costly. Heightened concerns about safety have driven recent cost estimates even higher, scaring off most private investors. Travis Hoium, an analyst who has written extensively about the industry on the investment Web site The Motley Fool, calls nuclear power a dying business. In an article, “Warren Buffett Wants a Subsidy From You,” he clearly explains recent efforts to shift risk from investors to ratepayers by allowing utilities to charge for construction in advance. Investor interest in nuclear-generated electricity has declined partly as a result of the boom in shale gas extraction. But energy sources that don’t increase carbon emissions are also playing a major role, with wind, hydropower and other renewables projected to provide about 30 percent of expected additions to power generation capacity in the United States between 2010 and 2035.

#### Natural gas will wreck the industry

WSJ, ’12

[“Cheap Natural Gas Unplugs U.S. Nuclear-Power Revival”]

What killed the revival wasn't last year's nuclear accident in Japan, nor was it a soft economy that dented demand for electricity. Rather, a shale-gas boom flooded the U.S. market with cheap natural gas, offering utilities a cheaper, less risky alternative to nuclear technology. "It's killed off new coal and now it's killing off new nuclear," says David Crane, chief executive of NRG Energy Inc., NRG +3.58% a power-generation company based in Princeton, N.J. "Gas has come along at just the right time to upset everything." Across the country, utilities are turning to natural gas to generate electricity, with 258 plants expected to be built from 2011 through 2015, federal statistics indicate. Not only are gas-fired plants faster to build than reactors, they are much less expensive. The U.S. Energy Information Administration says it costs about $978 per kilowatt of capacity to build and fuel a big gas-fired power plant, compared with $5,339 per kilowatt for a nuclear plant. Already, the inexpensive natural gas is putting downward pressure on electricity costs for consumers and businesses. The EIA has forecast that the nation will add 222 gigawatts of generating capacity between 2010 and 2035—equivalent to one-fifth of the current U.S. capacity. The biggest chunk of that addition—58%—will be fired by natural gas, it said, followed by renewable sources, including hydropower, at 31%, then coal at 8% and nuclear power at 4%. "What utility doesn't want cheap fuel?" says Steve Piper, associate director of energy fundamentals at SNL Financial, a research company. He predicts natural gas will remain the "default fuel" for as long as gas production remains high and prices stay low.

#### Waste destroys long term industry growth and causes public backlash

GAO, Government Accountability Office, ‘11

["Commercial Nuclear Waste, Effects of a Termination of the Yucca Mountain Repository Program and Lessons Learned," April, GAO-11-229]

The proposed termination of Yucca Mountain, which had been planned to be opened in 2020, will likely prolong storage at reactor sites, which would increase on-site storage costs. Because of delays in opening the Yucca Mountain repository, on-site storage at commercial nuclear facilities has been the de facto near-term strategy for managing spent nuclear fuel. Most spent nuclear fuel is stored at reactor sites, immersed in pools of water designed to cool it and isolate it from the environment. With the extension of on-site storage because of the delays in opening Yucca Mountain, some reactors are running out of space in their pools and have turned to dry-cask storage systems. In 2009, we reported that such systems for reactor operators cost from about $30 million to $60 million per reactor, with costs increasing as more spent nuclear fuel is added to dry storage.34 We also reported that the spent nuclear fuel would likely have to be repackaged about every 100 years, although experts said this is uncertain and research is under way to better understand the longevity of dry-cask systems. This repackaging could add from about $180 million to nearly $500 million, assuming initial repackaging operations, with costs dependent on the number of casks to be repackaged and whether a site has a transfer facility, such as a storage pool. Prolonging on-site storage would add to the taxpayer burden by increasing the substantial liabilities that DOE has already incurred due to on-site storage at commercial nuclear reactors. Were DOE to open Yucca Mountain in 2020, as it had planned, and begun taking custody of spent nuclear fuel, it would still have taken decades to take custody of the entire inventory of spent nuclear fuel. Assuming a 2020 opening of Yucca Mountain, DOE estimated that the total taxpayer liabilities for the backlog as of 2020 would be about $15.4 billion and would increase by $500 million for each year of delay thereafter.35 It is important to recognize that these liabilities are outside of the nearly $15 billion already spent on developing a repository and the estimated $41 to $67 billion still to be spent if the Yucca Mountain repository were to be constructed and become operational, most of the cost of which is borne by the Nuclear Waste Fund. Instead, these liabilities are borne by taxpayers because of the government’s failure to meet its commitment to take custody of the waste has resulted in lawsuits brought by industry.36 Furthermore, not all of the lawsuits have been resolved and industry has claimed that the lawsuits still pending could result in liabilities of at least $50 billion. Some former DOE officials and industry and community representatives stated that the termination of the Yucca Mountain program could result in an additional delay in the opening of a repository by at least 20 years, which would lead to additional DOE liabilities in the billions of dollars. Until a final disposition pathway is determined, there will continue to be uncertainties regarding the federal government’s total liabilities. At decommissioned reactor sites, prolonged on-site storage could further increase costs or limit opportunities for industry and local communities, according to industry and community representatives.37 As long as the spent nuclear fuel remains, the sites would not be available for other purposes, and the former operators may have to stay in business for the sole purpose of monitoring, storing, and providing costly security for the fuel. Local communities could lose the potential use of the site for alternative purposes, potentially impacting economic growth and tax revenue. For example, according to an industry representative, a local government in Illinois would like to encourage development of property fronting Lake Michigan near a shutdown nuclear reactor planned for decommissioning. A local government official stated in an interview with the media, however, that it may be difficult to develop and sell the property because prospective buyers may feel uneasy about living next to a site storing spent nuclear fuel. Similarly, a local government official from Minnesota expressed concern about having to provide security and emergency response for the Prairie Island reactor site and its spent nuclear fuel because tax revenues from the facility will decrease substantially after it is decommissioned. However, these issues may not affect all reactor sites. For example, officials in Oregon told us they did not feel dry-cask storage at Trojan, a decommissioned reactor, adversely affected economic growth or tax revenue. This site is about 42 miles north of Portland, Oregon, and is not in a major metropolitan area. Prolonging on-site storage could also increase opposition to expansion of the nuclear industry, according to state and industry officials. Without progress on a centralized storage facility or repository, some experts have stated that some state and local opposition to reactor storage site recertification will likely increase and so will challenges to nuclear power companies’ applications for reactor license extensions and for new reactor licenses.38 For example, Minnesota officials noted that negative public reaction to a proposal to increase dry-cask storage at a nuclear plant led the state legislature to impose a moratorium on new nuclear plants. At least 12 other states have similar prohibitions on new construction, 9 of which can be lifted when a means of disposing of spent nuclear fuel can be demonstrated. Representatives from some tribal and environmental organizations said they were concerned with the long-term on-site storage of spent nuclear fuel. They said nuclear plants should take additional measures to ensure the safety and security of dry-cask storage sites, and they have raised these concerns in objecting to the relicensing of commercial reactors in Minnesota and New Jersey. For instance, tribal officials from the Prairie Island Indian Community in Minnesota told us they opposed relicensing the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant because of environmental and safety concerns they have about living just 600 hundred yards from spent nuclear fuel.

### Econ

#### Growth high now—housing, energy, banking, industrial base, and deficit reduction by the end of the year—history proves

Altman, former US deputy Treasury secretary, 9/3

(9/3/12, Roger Altman is founder and chairman of Evercore Partners and a former US deputy Treasury secretary, “The US economy may surprise us all”, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f7ec3e66-f5ac-11e1-bf76-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25j9wVhop>)

But when they do, it is possible that the US economy will surprise on the upside. A housing revival, the revolution occurring in energy, a rejuvenated banking system and a leaner industrial base could lead to US growth beyond the 2.5 per cent rate that is widely seen as its long-term potential. In other words, the famine could be followed by a feast. There are precedents for such a growth spurt. We saw it in the recovery from the deep 1981-82 recession and over the latter half of the 1990s. True, those periods were not preceded by a financial collapse. But they did not involve a monetary response as powerful as that unleashed by the US Federal Reserve in 2008 and 2009. There are now serious forecasts, for example from the International Monetary Fund and The Conference Board, which suggest the annual growth rate may reach 3-4 per cent within five years. There are five factors that suggest there could be a surge in US growth. First, the housing sector is improving. Between 1980 and 2005 it accounted for an average 4.5 per cent of gross domestic product and before the crash it employed more than 3m Americans. But in 2012 it represents only 2.4 per cent of GDP and 2m jobs. Almost 1.5m mortgages are still in foreclosure. But the first signs of renewal have appeared: prices are rising in almost half of the country’s major housing markets. Pent-up demand is huge. Goldman Sachs expects housing starts to hit 1.4m annually by 2015, up from 700,000 this year. After 2015, the total will rise further and boost GDP, as household formation rates and the starts-to-population ratio revert to historical norms. The second cause for optimism is the breathtaking increase in oil and gas production. Data from the US Energy Information Administration support this. Natural gas output reached an all-time high this year, with shale gas accounting for half of it. On the oil side, US production fell 48 per cent from its 1970 high to only 5m barrels a day in 2008. Driven by shale, it is up almost 20 per cent from 2008 to 2012. IHS Cera, a research group, projects that oil production will rise another 3m b/d and reach a new high by 2020. Within five years, the oil gains alone could add more than 1 percentage point to annual GDP growth and up to 3m jobs. The fall in natural gas prices will reduce the average utility bill by almost $1,000 a year. It will also reinvigorate the US petrochemical industry and some manufacturing sectors. Third, amid the political controversy and negative publicity, the US banking system has recovered faster than anyone could have imagined. Capital and liquidity have been rebuilt to levels unseen in decades. Legacy mortgage problems are fading. Profits are very strong. Lending is growing quickly: total bank credit outstanding now stands at $9.8tn, according to Fed data, a record high. The proportion of bank lending going to business will next year probably reach a record level. Fourth, the US has made a huge leap in industrial competitiveness. Unit production costs are down 11 per cent over the past 10 years, while costs have risen in almost every other advanced nation. The differences in labour costs compared with China are narrowing. Consider the automotive sector. In 2005, Detroit’s hourly labour costs were 40 per cent higher than at US plants owned by foreign carmakers, according to research by Evercore Partners. Today these costs are virtually identical and the big three carmakers have regained market share. Furthermore, personal savings rates are up to 4 per cent – from near zero before the crisis – and are expected to stabilise. This will spur higher levels of private investment and even further productivity gains. Finally (and more speculatively), the US may surprise itself and the world by rectifying its deficit and debt problems. If Barack Obama is re-elected, he may allow the George W. Bush tax cuts to expire at the end of 2012. That step could force Congress to the negotiating table and produce a large, balanced deficit-reduction programme that would boost confidence, the stock market and private investment

#### Treat all of their evidence as suspect. It’s from the Nuclear Energy Initiative which has an incentive to promote nuclear power.

#### No chance of a recession – we’re in the clear.

Roubini, doctorate in international economics at Harvard University, ‘12

[Nouriel, receiving a BA in political economics at Bocconi University, he became an academic at Yale and a practicing economist at the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Federal Reserve, World Bank, and Bank of Israel. Much of his early research focused on emerging markets. During the administration of President Bill Clinton, he was a senior economist for the Council of Economic Advisers, later moving to the United States Treasury Department as a senior adviser to Timothy Geithner, who in 2009 became Treasury Secretary, and Ian Bremmer, “$200 Oil and the Moscow-Beijing Alliance,” 3/7/12, Foreign Policy,

ttp://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/09/200\_oil\_roubini\_bremmer?page=0,0, RSR]

Really, since 2008, if it's not been one thing, it's been something else. We no longer believe that there's meaningful likelihood that a shock is going to send the world back into recession. That's in part true because of the strengthening of American numbers. Nouriel's right, these are not exciting growth numbers -- this isn't the robust bounce-back that we think is going to power a global economy with the kind of figures you saw before the crisis, but it's a very different environment from the last four years. That's very important in terms of getting consumer confidence back, but it's also very important in terms of the orientation of CEOs to start spending some of the major cash that they've left off the table. I think the answer that they'll start doing it -- and not just in the United States. I don't want to say they're getting ebullient, but they're less fearful about medium and long-term trajectory.

#### The nuclear industry is a net loss for jobs – researchers prove.

Warnock 2012 (Wall street Journal, Fukushima Watch: No Reactors, Fewer Jobs?, <http://blogs.wsj.com/japanrealtime/2012/07/13/fukushima-watch-no-reactors-fewer-jobs/>) JA

Losing jobs in the nuclear power industry would likely mean an increase in jobs elsewhere. [A group of researchers from Osaka University](http://www.iser.osaka-u.ac.jp/library/dp/2012/DP0846.pdf) estimate that eliminating nuclear power in Japan by 2020 and increasing renewable energy use to 20% of the total could create 200,000 to 300,000 new jobs annually. Central Research Institute, Inc., a consulting company in Tokyo, predicts that the renewable energy sector, including wind and solar power, [will employ 1.4 million people by 2020](http://www.sodan.info/change/energy.html), as the renewables market expands in size to ¥50 trillion and beyond. The Ministry of the Environment, in a report published in 2010, said that increasing the amount of renewable energy to more than 10% of the nation’s total energy output by 2020, [could create between 458,000 to 627,000 jobs](http://www.env.go.jp/earth/report/h22-05/00_gaiyo.pdf).

#### Jobs dictate the direction of the economy.

Madho 12 [Parasnand. “Weekly Economic Indicators: Jobs Data Key For US Economy” Exchanges June 4, 2012 <http://exchanges.nyx.com/node/3372>]. FYI - Steve Grasso, Director of Institutional Sales at Stuart Frankel & Co., and frequent commentator on CNBC  
Grasso expects the jobless claims data to come in below the 400K mark, around the forecast, although he has been hearing rumblings about a jump back up over the mental 400K number. This is crucial because he believes the jobs data will continue to dictate where the economy goes. With so many people out of work, he is starting to see a rekindling of the American entrepreneurial spirit, as more and more young people are starting their own businesses. This is very important to the economy, as the unemployment rate among blue collar workers is much higher than in the white collar sector. He urges young people to keep educating themselves to compete globally, particularly at the higher service end jobs. With the selloff today, based on US data, versus European headlines, the US “safe haven status” is in jeopardy. Not only has the market given back all of its gains for the year, is could be poised to come in 5% to 10% lower based on breaking key technical levels this week.

#### They say manufacturing is down now, meaning that their impacts should have already been triggered.

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

### Warming

#### Can’t solve warming

#### A.) Deforestation

Howden 7(Daniel Howden, The Independent “Deforestation: The Hidden Cause of Global Warming” 14 May 2007. DOA August 15, 12 sphinx.tsf.hu/new/iny/files/1645.doc)

**Most people think of forests** only in terms of the CO2 they absorb. The rainforests of the Amazon, the Congo basin and Indonesia are thought of **as the lungs of the planet.** But **the destruction of those forests will in the next four years** alone, in the words of Sir Nicholas Stern, **pump more CO2 into the atmosphere than every flight in the history of aviation to at least 2025.¶** Indonesia became the third-largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world last week. Following close behind is Brazil. Neither nation has heavy industry on a comparable scale with the EU, India or Russia and yet they comfortably outstrip all other countries, except the United States and China.¶ What both countries do have in common is tropical forest that is being cut and burned with staggering swiftness. Smoke stacks visible from space climb into the sky above both countries, while satellite images capture similar destruction from the Congo basin, across the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and the Republic of Congo.¶ According to the latest audited figures from 2003, **two billion tons of CO2 enters the atmosphere** every year **from deforestation.** That destruction amounts to 50 million acres - or an area the size of England, Wales and Scotland felled **annually.¶** The remaining standing forest is calculated to contain 1,000 billion tons of carbon, or double what is already in the atmosphere.¶ As the GCP's report concludes: **"If we lose forests, we lose the fight against climate change."**

#### B.) Live stock

FAO 6 ("Spotlight: Livestock Impacts on the Environment." FAO: FAO Home. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Nov. 2006. Web. 15 August 12. <<http://www.fao.org/ag/magazine/0612sp1.htm>>.)

The livestock sector is by far the single largest anthropogenic user of land. Grazing occupies 26 percent of the Earth's terrestrial surface, while feed crop production requires about a third of all arable land. Expansion of grazing land for livestock is a key factor in deforestation, especially in Latin America: some 70 percent of previously forested land in the Amazon is used as pasture, and feed crops cover a large part of the reminder. About 70 percent of all grazing land in dry areas is considered degraded, mostly because of overgrazing, compaction and erosion attributable to livestock activity.¶ At the same time, the livestock sector has assumed an often unrecognized role in global warming. Using a methodology that considered the entire commodity chain *(see box below)*, FAO estimated that livestock are responsible for 18 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, a bigger share than that of transport. It accounts for nine percent of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions, most of it due to expansion of pastures and arable land for feed crops. It generates even bigger shares of emissions of other gases with greater potential to warm the atmosphere: as much as 37 percent of anthropogenic methane, mostly from enteric fermentation by ruminants, and 65 percent of anthropogenic nitrous oxide, mostly from manure.

#### Can’t solve for warming their Reilly evidence says, “utilities have abandoned nearly completed nuclear power plants in the face of current overregulation”. Not specific to states.

#### Nuclear power increase CFCs which contribute more to warming than carbon dioxide and depletes the ozone.

Stein, Chairman of Three Mile Island Alert Inc., ‘8

[Eric Joseph, “The "Brown Side" of Nuclear Power,”

http://www.depweb.state.pa.us/ news/cwp/view.asp?A=3&Q=501756]

Nuclear advocates argue that the problem of greenhouse gases can be solved by nuclear power plants which do not emit carbon dioxide - at the point of production. What they don¹t tell you is what happens to the nuclear wonder pill before it is magically transformed into green penicillin. The nuclear-carbon shell game only works if you ignore the environmental cost on the "front end" of nuclear power production. From the moment uranium is mined - then milled, enriched, fabricated and transported - it releases large of airborne pollutants. How much? Glad you asked. The enrichment of uranium at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion plant releases massive amounts of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) which are more damaging as a global warmer than carbon dioxide. Nuclear fuel production in America creates at least 800,000 pounds of CFCs annually. CFCs remain the primary agent for stratospheric ozone depletion. The industry's official strategy to reduce CFC emissions was to close its Portsmouth enrichment plant and eliminate "roughly half as many miles of leaky pipes." The Ohio fuel plant is closed, but is undergoing a massive site cleanup to recover uranium, treat and isolate contaminated water and sewage, and decontaminate and remove miles of radioactive tubes, pipes and equipment. The production of fuel for nuclear reactors is extremely energy intensive. The Paducah plant, which is currently the plant is also undergoing a $191 million cleanup, requires the electrical output of two 1000-megawatt carbon dioxide producing, coal-fired plants.

#### Independently, Ozone depletion causes extinction.

Williams, Author of Tetron Natural Unified Field Theory, ‘96

[David Crockett, “THE SCIENTIFIC SPIRITUAL REVOLUTION”, 2-7-96,

http://www.angelfire.com/on/GEAR2000/video96.htmls]

Today all life on earth is threatened by many problems associated with the materialistic and shortsighted human activities out of harmony with nature that have led to an oxygen crisis from massive deforestation and fossil fuel combustion which has created global warming responsible for increased weather extremes, flooding, droughts, disease vectors, etc., and an ozone layer depletion that threatens all life on earth by the imminent destruction of the ocean's phytoplankton which produce over half of earth's oxygen and form the beginning of the oceanic food chain. Nuclear testing has caused lasting increases in seismic and volcanic activity, explainable by free energy science, which threatens cataclysmic earth changes. The danger of nuclear conflagration still exists. All these conditions have been predicted independently by many different religious prophecies since many hundreds of years ago. How can this be understood and resolved?

#### Nuclear power produces heat emissions which exacerbate global warming

Science Daily 9 (July 13th, Trapping Carbon Dioxide Or Switching To Nuclear Power Not Enough To Solve Global Warming Problem, Experts Say, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/07/090713085248.htm)

Attempting to tackle climate change by trapping carbon dioxide or switching to nuclear power will not solve the problem of global warming, according to energy calculations published in the July issue of the International Journal of Global Warming. Bo Nordell and Bruno Gervet of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Luleå University of Technology in Sweden have calculated the total energy emissions from the start of the industrial revolution in the 1880s to the modern day. They have worked out that using the increase in average global air temperature as a measure of global warming is an inadequate measure of climate change. They suggest that scientists must also take into account the total energy of the ground, ice masses and the seas if they are to model climate change accurately. The researchers have calculated that the heat energy accumulated in the atmosphere corresponds to a mere 6.6% of global warming, while the remaining heat is stored in the ground (31.5%), melting ice (33.4%) and sea water (28.5%). They point out that net heat emissions between the industrial revolution circa 1880 and the modern era at 2000 correspond to almost three quarters of the accumulated heat, i.e., global warming, during that period. Their calculations suggest that most measures to combat global warming, such as reducing our reliance on burning fossil fuels and switching to renewables like wind power and solar energy, will ultimately help in preventing catastrophic climate change in the long term. But the same calculations also show that trapping carbon dioxide, so-called carbon dioxide sequestration, and storing it deep underground or on the sea floor will have very little effect on global warming. "Since net heat emissions accounts for most of the global warming there is no or little reason for carbon dioxide sequestration," Nordell explains, "The increasing carbon dioxide emissions merely show how most net heat is produced. The "missing" heat, 26%, is due to the greenhouse effect, natural variations in climate and/or an underestimation of net heat emissions, the researchers say. These calculations are actually rather conservative, the researchers say, and the missing heat may be much less. The researchers also point out a flaw in the nuclear energy argument. Although nuclear power does not produce carbon dioxide emissions in the same way as burning fossil fuels it does produce heat emissions equivalent to three times the energy of the electricity it generates and so contributes to global warming significantly, Nordell adds.

#### Don’t solve warming – tipping point inevitable, timeframe and insufficient amount of reductions block solvency.

Smith, Environmental Journalist, ‘11

[Gar, He is the former editor of Earth Island Journal, and currently edits Earth Island Institute's weekly "eco-zine" The-Edge, “NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE”

http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf]

More than 200 new reactors have been proposed around the world but not enough reactors can be built fast enough to replace the world’s vanishing fossil fuel resources.2 Even if nuclear output could be tripled by 2050 (which seems unlikely in light of the industry’s record to date), this would only lower greenhouse emissions by 25 to 40 billion annual tons—12.5 to 20 percent of the reductions needed to stabilize the climate.3 The International Energy Agency estimates that renewables and efficiency measures could produce ten times these savings by 2050. The IEA estimates that cutting CO2 emissions in half by mid-century would require building 1,400 new 1,000-MW reactors—32 new reactors every year. But since it usually takes about 10 years from groundbreaking to atom-smashing, these reactors could not be constructed fast enough to prevent an irreversible “tipping” of world climate. This hardly seems feasible since the industry has only managed to bring 30 new reactors on-line over the past ten years. Of the 35 reactors the IEA listed as “under construction” in mid-2008, a third of these had been “under construction” for 20 years or longer. Some may never be completed. By contrast, a 1.5 MW wind turbine can be installed in a single day and can be operational 4 | The Watts Bar-1 reactor, 60 miles southwest of Knoxville, Tennesee, took 24 years to build. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION in two weeks.4 Still, the pace of nuclear construction has picked up lately. In 2010, the number of reactor projects underway had ballooned to 66—with most located in China (27) and Russia (11). And it’s not just a matter of designing and building new reactors.The construction of 1,400 new nuclear reactors also would require building 15 new uranium enrichment plants, 50 new reprocessing plants and 14 new waste storage sites—a deal-breaker since the sole proposed U.S. storage site at Yucca Mountain is apparently dead .The cost of this additional nuclear infrastructure has been estimated at $3 trillion.5 Moreover, since the operating lifetime of these new reactors would still be a mere 40 years, even if new construction was practical, quick and affordable, it would only “solve” the global-warming problem for another 40 years, at which point the plants would need to be decommissioned.

#### Can’t solve China, India, etc. No tech transfer – subsidies distort the market.
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[Bronwyn H. Hall, Professor of the Graduate School – UC Berkeley, Christian Helmers, University of Oxford - Department of Economics, The role of patent protection in (clean/green) technology transfer 24 October 2010 http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/5706]

There are a number of other issues apart from intellectual property rights that are of first-order importance in setting incentives for the development and transfer of technologies. Developing countries themselves may generate powerful distortions inhibiting the production and transfer of green technologies. A report by Copenhagen Economics (2009) suggests that subsidies for the consumption of fossil fuels in some developing countries, such as Venezuela, Iran and Indonesia, may represent a significant barrier to the development and transfer of green technologies in these countries. Barton (2007) suggests that import tariffs on photo-voltaic and wind technology in place in India and China may also act as a barrier to technology development and transfer. In contrast, import tariffs and subsidies for biofuels in place in industrialised countries, above all the EU and US, are viewed as hampering the development of this industry in developing countries, such as Brazil (World Bank 2010). Such import barriers on green technologies represent a complex issue. Due to the environmental externality, it is desirable to have policy interventions in place in developed countries dedicated to market creation, such as subsidies, to promote demand for green technologies (Taylor 2008). From a political economy perspective, however, it is unclear to what extent developed economies are willing to subsidise demand for green technology produced abroad, in particular in large emerging economies.