### AT: Microgrid

#### Microgrids fail – failure of renewables during power outage

Sater 2011 - Research Fellow at Global Green USA’s Security and Sustainability Office in Washington, DC (August, Daniel, “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions” http://globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf)

Microgrids are not without their drawbacks. Similar to the problems with the departing load charge utilities levy on installations that produce renewable energy, many utilities try to restrict the use of renewable energy generation as backup power during a power outage. The utilities’ reasoning is that, if there was any electricity in the grid during an outage, their workers would be at risk while repairing any damage. According to the GAO, four out of five installations it visited could not use their renewable energy during a power outage due to utility worker safety concerns. However, one of the bases was able to negotiate a contract to allow the installation’s solar array to provide power to the critical loads of the base during a power outage. 70 For an installation to fully benefit from the installation of a microgrid, the base must first negotiate with the utility to allow for renewable energy sources to remain in use during a power outage. The ability of a microgrid to island an installation from the civilian grid should nullify any danger to utility workers as they perform any maintenance work.

### AT: SCS

#### No SCS war – in no one’s rational interest

Ba, Professor IR Delaware, ’11 (Alice, December, “Staking Claims and Making Waves in the South China Sea: How Troubled Are the Waters?” Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs, Vol 33 No 3, Project Muse)

Conclusion To varying degrees, authors in this issue generally agree that conflict can be avoided and that there are spaces for potential compromise. Fravel, for example, cites historical precedents where China has been willing to make territorial compromises in support of larger strategic and political objectives; he also sees opportunities in China’s exclusion of the Spratlys from its drawing of its baselines.52 Goldstein draws attention to the concern for moderation and compromise from China’s senior leadership, as well as key naval higher-ups; Thayer highlights the mechanisms and interests that exist to counter more emotional and violent reactions. Womack, along with Fravel and Thayer, sees China and ASEAN states’ 2011 agreement and attention to implementing the DoC as a significant recognition by states of the need to reduce tensions, especially as it involved critical and symbolic concessions, especially on the parts of China and Vietnam. Much like the original DoC, the 2011 agreement and [End Page 285] states’ ability to overcome their stalemate expressed a common interest to ratchet down the dispute from where it was in 2009 and 2010. While acknowledging the need for “bolder” measures, Womack sees the DoC as both “reasonable” and “promising” as a framework that moreover can provide the basis for “a more robust Spratly Management Authority”. Most of all, authors mostly see the prospects for major conflict being mitigated by an unfavourable cost-benefit calculus where the costs of conflict and militarization will be high and the benefits far from clear. Certainly, this is true of Southeast Asia’s weaker states, but it is also true of the major powers — China and the United States. For China, for example, Womack is strongest in seeing militarization of the dispute as contrary to China’s “quarter century of broad and peaceful development” and reform-era policies and diplomacy that have served it very well. A South China Sea conflict scenario would also likely have ripple effects along China’s periphery among other neighbouring and lesser states that are most vulnerable to Chinese power. Given the attention and priority that has been given to stabilizing China’s periphery these past two decades, it hardly seems in China’s interest to militarize the South China Sea in such a way that invites more active interventions from others in the seas around it, especially given its own reliance on those waters to get goods in and out. At minimum, militarization would divert resources and attention from both domestic and other global objectives, with active defence of claims requiring “diplomatic and military efforts of the utmost magnitude”.53 Womack is blunt in his argument that the Spratlys, in the larger scheme of Chinese objectives, is insignificant: “[T]here is no threshold of military superiority that would make it beneficial for China to establish its control over all the Spratlys at the cost of strategic hostility with Southeast Asia.” By one argument, China has the most to lose with the militarization of the South China Sea dispute. As for the United States, Goldstein is most direct in considering the risks and costs of US involvement. Much as is the case in his discussion on US assessments of China, Goldstein’s concern is that too much is assumed of US power and attraction, and too much weight has already been placed on a dispute that is not that important to US larger interests or global balance of power. As already noted, Washington’s diplomatic intervention has already been at cost to US-China relations in other areas. US-China tensions also [End Page 286] potentially push away Southeast Asian states who fear great power conflict more than they want the US to balance China.54 Most of all, Goldstein warns the United States against “competing for the sake of competing” and to guard against over-involving itself in a conflict that risks US credibility, if not lives (as it did forty years ago in Vietnam).

### AT: Not Competitive

#### This is an add-on – plan spurs private investment –

#### a. SMRs are cheaper – avoids the crushing cost of current reactors – that’s Sanders

#### b. PPAs solve – gets utilities to invest because it reduces risk – that’s Madia

#### c. DOD action – first mover role demonstrates viability – that’s Andres and Breetz and Loudermilk

### **AT: T – Financial Incentive**

#### 1) We meet –

#### 2) Counter interpretation – Financial incentives are a disbursement of funds directly tied to an express objective

Webb**,**  – lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa, 93

(“Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures. Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies. In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created. Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used. And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration. By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effects which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming, are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well. Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### 3) For implies a direct relationship

Words and Phrase 04

(Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “For,” Volume 17, p. 338-343)

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

#### **4) Limits – the counterinterpretation prevents an explosion of cases because it excludes aff’s that indirectly incentivize energy. Solvency advocates for loan guarantees only exist for construction**

#### 5) Predictable ground – neg arguments about energy production will always be responsive because the incentive has to be explicitly tied to energy production

#### **6) Aff mechanism flexibility – their interpretation prevents the aff from being able to access important solvency mechanisms and forces obscure and contrived debates. Democracy assistance topic proves.**

#### 7) Prefer contextual support – power purchase agreements are financial incentives for nuclear power

Carroll, Senior Vice President and General Counsel at Terra-Gen Power, 05

(January, International Power & Utilities Finance Review, New nuclear power plants in the US: Governmental incentives for non-recourse project finance)

In its report dated January 10, 2005, the NETF identified the unavailability of financing as a significant obstacle to new nuclear power plant construction. The NETF recommended that the US government offer a range of financial incentives for the construction of the first few reactors, such as: secured loans, loan guarantees, accelerated depreciation, investment tax credits, production tax credits and government power purchase agreements.

### AT: Obama Good Elections (Kentucky)

#### The plan won’t pass before the election --- the affirmative only has to defend the most realistic and likely means of passage. Forcing the affirmative to defend abnormal means undermines political decision making skills.

#### A. Congress is in recess now for campaign --- nothing will be done until after election

#### B. Promotes best reasoning skills --- the politics disad is good because it teaches an understanding of the political process and policy tradeoffs but their interpretation of fiat bastardizes this because it forces an illogical, abnormal means of passage.

#### C. Improves debate content --- causes the negative to dispute why the expansion of SMRs is bad or read other political arguments --- like a lame duck or Obama 2nd term disad.

#### Better i/l to asia war – grid collapse means decapitation

#### Obama win inevitable ----

#### --- Women

Edwards-Levy, 8/31 (Ariel, 8/31/2012, “Female Voters Prefer Obama To Romney, Are Focused On Economy, Poll Says,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/30/female-voters-obama-romney-poll\_n\_1844312.html?1346360706)

WASHINGTON -- As women have found themselves in the center of much of 2012's political wrangling -- their bodies a topic for debate, and their hearts and minds a top campaign priority -- many are embracing their status as key voters, according to a poll released Thursday by Lifetime television.

Female voters strongly favor President Barack Obama over GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney, according to the survey, which was conducted by Republican pollster Kellyanne Conway of the polling company, inc./WomanTrend and Democratic pollster Celinda Lake of Lake Research Partners.

"Both parties have women that they can appeal to," Lake said. "Women are the key swing vote and will probably decide the election, but I think women are more self-conscious about the role. I think the really interesting part is that women are poised to take things into their own hands."

Obama received support from 52 percent of likely female voters, compared to 36 percent for Romney. That double-digit lead tracks with Obama's performance in 2008 exit polls, although it's a few points higher than Obama's lead among women in other recent polls.

Half of the women polled said Obama deserved an "A" or "B" for his time in office, while 29 percent gave him a "D" or an "F."

Michelle Obama also fared well, with 72 percent of women viewing her favorably. Ann Romney, who exclaimed "I love you women!" during her Wednesday convention speech, was far less well-known, with 30 percent viewing her favorably, and 45 percent saying they hadn't heard of her or had no opinion. The survey was conducted prior to the speech.

As with the general electorate, women largely gave top priority to the economy and jobs. And although nine out of 10 women said it was important that a candidate understand women, even more prioritized an understanding of the middle class, with 94 percent calling it important.

Many women have been turned off by the campaign's tendency to veer toward issues like abortion, Lake said. "Women want to know, why are we talking about this at all? Why aren't we focusing on the economy?"

Four years after she lost the Democratic primary, Hillary Clinton retains strong support among women voters, with 60 percent of all women saying she should run again. Fifty-eight percent said they would definitely or probably vote for her. A third said she would have done better as president than Obama.

Only 27 percent of women expressed concern that the nation never has had a female president, although a higher number -- 45 percent -- said the United States would be in better shape to face the future with a female leader. Nine in 10 said they would encourage the young women in their life to run for office; 8 percent said they were likely to run themselves.

"There's been a gradual evolution of women as engaged voters ... They're no less skeptical or cynical toward politics, but they're more open to the importance of participating in the process," Conway said. "They're finally realizing that saying, 'I hate politics' means you don't care about education, or wars or the state of health care. Politics is the means to achieve the policy ends about which they care, and you can't win if you don't play."

#### --prediction models

Fox 10/3

Lauren, Reporter, US News, “'Never Wrong' Pundit Sticks By Obama in 2012”, Lexis

A year ago, Whispers asked political pundit Allan Lichtman to look to his crystal ball (or his highly accurate "key" formula) and make a prediction about who would win the White House in 2012.¶ Lichtman was confident then that there was no way President Barack Obama could lose.¶ But that was back when Texas Gov. Rick Perry was leading the polls and threatening Ben Bernanke on the campaign trail, Herman Cain's 9-9-9 tax reform was picking up steam, and Iowa Straw Poll winner Michele Bachmann suggested Hurricane Irene was a "wake up call from God for politicians."¶ [Check out the U.S. News Collection of Mitt Romney Cartoons]¶ Now, business-savvy Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney is in the hot seat, the economy is still anemic, and the polls are close.¶ Yet, Lichtman, the mastermind behind the Keys to the White House, continues to cast his lot with Obama.¶ "Obama is going to win. Nothing has changed. Not a single key has shifted," Lichtman says.¶ Lichtman predicts presidential elections using 13 "keys," or various scenarios that predict whether the incumbent party will stay in power. The formula is simple. If the political party in power loses six or more keys, they lose the presidency.¶ Since Lichtman used it to predict Regan's win in 1984, the keys have never been wrong. And they are legendary in the world of political science.¶ Lichtman says the formula is so trusted that it convinced former president Bill Clinton to take the presidential plunge in 1992.¶ "They've never missed. They've been right seven elections in a row. A number that goes way beyond statistical significance in a record no other system even comes close to," Lichtman said last year.¶ Obama's lost three keys so far, but he'd have to lose six to be defeated in November, a highly unlikely scenario with one month to go.¶ [RELATED: Huntsman: For GOP, Romney Loss Would be Like Yugoslav Breakup]¶ "The notion that an October surprise is going to turn things around is virtually precluded by the keys," Lichtman says.¶ Here's a rundown of Lichtman's keys predicting an Obama victory.¶ Where Obama Loses¶ \* Party mandate: After 87 freshman Republicans swept the House in 2010, the Democrats have fewer seats in the House of Representatives than they had in 2008. Obama loses big here.¶ \* Long term economy: Obama lost this key last fall and still hasn't won it back. Real per capita economic growth during this term still isn't equal to or better than the average growth during the two previous terms.¶ \* Incumbent Charisma: Lichtman says the message of "hope" and "change" isn't as intoxicating for voters as it was in 2008. Obama loses this key.¶ Where Obama Wins¶ \* Contest: No one stepped up to unseat Obama in the primary this year.¶ \* Incumbency: Spending four years in the White House can only be an advantage.¶ \* Third party: Despite their best efforts, Ron Paul's supporters couldn't convince the libertarian-leaning congressman to jump in the presidential race as an independent. Also, libertarian Gary Johnson hasn't broken through the poll threshold needed to deem him a significant threat. Obama wins this key.¶ \* Short-term economy: As long as the country stays out of a double-dip recession, Obama can claim this key as a victory. "The economy is not in recession," Lichtman says. "It may be in a unhappy recovery, but that is not the same as a recession."¶ \* Significant policy change: Obama won this key after he overhauled the country's healthcare system and implemented the largest stimulus in history.¶ \* Social unrest: Occupy Wall Street protests and the Tea Party movement don't count as signs of social unrest, Lichtman says. Obama picks up this key.¶ \* Scandal: Lichtman says Obama's presidency has been squeaky clean so far, with Solyndra and the "Fast and Furious" gun-running scandal not enough to disqualify him. "There is no whiff of a Watergate," Lichtman says.¶ \* Foreign/Military Success: Osama bin Laden is dead and the troops are out of Iraq, which is enough to keep Obama winning overseas.¶ \* Foreign/Military Failure: While Lichtman admits the death of an ambassador is never good for a president's re-election bid, it's no Bay of Pigs. "It is not big enough to be a foreign policy disaster, and it doesn't come close to past examples," Lichtman says. "Anything can still happen in foreign policy, but it would have to be huge to flip this key."¶ \* Challenger Charisma: While the keys no longer deem Obama as being charismatic, he still has his challenger beat in that department. "Mitt Romney? Are you joking? If you pick up the dictionary for uncharismatic, there is his picture."

#### If the first debate didn’t swing the election nothing is likely to

Klein, 10/4 (Ezra, 10/4/2012, “How much will the debate move the polls?” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/10/04/how-much-will-the-debate-move-the-polls/>)

Overall, I’d expect the polls to tighten, perhaps even substantially. But how much they tighten will be very telling. Wednesday was as good a night as Romney can expect to have in the rest of this campaign, in front of as big an audience as he’ll get, with a maximum of media coverage. So his bounce will help tell us how many voters really remain persuadable, or at least how many of the persuadable voters are paying attention to the final events of the campaign. If that number is high, Romney should close the gap substantially, if not pull slightly ahead. If it’s low, he won’t see much bounce, and it will be that much harder to see his path to victory.

Think about the people you know: How many of the Obama voters who thought Romney won the debate seem ready to change their vote today? Personally, I don’t know any Obama voters who thought he won the debate. But I also don’t know any Obama voters who have said they’re now supporting Romney. Now, my circles are unusually politically active, and so their preferences are unusually hard to move. But remember that the most persuadable voters pay the least attention to politics, so they may not know or care that Obama lost a debate. The polls, in other words, will quickly tell us whether Obama simply looked bad or whether he lost real support.

#### Single event won’t swing the election

Feldmann, 10/3 (Linda, 10/3/2012, “Why Mitt Romney trails in polls, as presidential debates begin,” <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2012/1003/Why-Mitt-Romney-trails-in-polls-as-presidential-debates-begin-video>)

Fully two-thirds of voters know that it was Romney who made the statement, and among those voters, 55 percent reacted negatively, versus 23 percent who saw it positively, according to Pew. Most damaging to Romney is the reaction of independent voters. Some 55 percent of independents who are aware of Romney’s comment say they had a negative reaction to it, while only 18 percent viewed it positively.

But Gallup asked voters if the 47 percent comment has made them more or less likely to vote for Romney, and a plurality said it made no difference.

Indeed, analysts say it’s nearly impossible to isolate an individual event or comment as being decisive in turning a race.

“Voters are confronting a big wide Mississippi River of information flowing at them, and as a consequence it’s difficult to isolate the effect of any one thing,” says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University in Washington. “That said, there’s no question it’s been several weeks of relatively bad news for the Romney campaign. It hasn’t enabled him to close the post-convention gap. If anything, that gap has grown.”

#### Winning allows Obama to build momentum and swing the reverse the tide

Creamer, 11 --- long-time political organizer and strategist (12/23/2011, Robert, “Why GOP Collapse on the Payroll Tax Could Be a Turning Point Moment,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-creamer/gop-payroll-tax\_b\_1167491.html)

The outcome of the battle was unambiguous. No one could doubt who stood up for the economic interests of the middle class and who did not. And no one could doubt who won and who lost.

National Journal reported that, "House Republicans on Thursday crumpled under the weight of White House and public pressure and have agreed to pass a two-month extension of the two percent payroll-tax cut, Republican and Democratic sources told National Journal."

In the end, Republican intransigence transformed a moment that would have been a modest win for President Obama into an iconic victory.

2) Strength and victory are enormous political assets. Going into the New Year, they now belong to the president and the Democrats.

One of the reasons why the debt ceiling battle inflicted political damage on President Obama is that it made him appear ineffectual -- a powerful figure who had been ensnared and held hostage by the Lilliputian pettiness of hundreds of swarming Tea Party ideological zealots.

In the last few months -- as he campaigned for the American Jobs Act -- he has shaken free of those bonds. Now voters have just watched James Bond or Indiana Jones escape and turn the tables on his adversary.

Great stories are about a protagonist who meets and overcomes a challenge and is victorious. The capitulation of the House Tea Party Republicans is so important because it feels like the beginning of that kind of heroic narrative.

Even today most Americans believe that George Bush and the big Wall Street banks -- not by President Obama -- caused the economic crisis. Swing voters have never lost their fondness for the President and don't doubt his sincerity. But they had begun to doubt his effectiveness. They have had increasing doubts that Obama was up to the challenge of leading them back to economic prosperity.

The narrative set in motion by the events of the last several weeks could be a turning point in voter perception. It could well begin to convince skeptical voters that Obama is precisely the kind of leader they thought he was back in 2008 -- a guy with the ability to lead them out of adversity -- a leader with the strength, patience, skill, will and resoluteness to lead them to victory.

That now contrasts with the sheer political incompetence of the House Republican leadership that allowed themselves to be cornered and now find themselves in political disarray. And it certainly contrasts with the political circus we have been watching in the Republican Presidential primary campaign.

3) This victory will inspire the dispirited Democratic base.

Inspiration is the feeling of empowerment -- the feeling that you are part of something larger than yourself and can personally play a significant role in achieving that goal. It comes from feeling that together you can overcome challenges and win.

Nothing will do more to inspire committed Democrats than the sight of their leader -- President Obama -- out-maneuvering the House Republicans and forcing them into complete capitulation.

The events of the last several weeks will send a jolt of electricity through the progressive community.

The right is counting on progressives to be demoralized and dispirited in the coming election. The president's victory on the payroll tax and unemployment will make it ever more likely that they will be wrong.

4) When you have them on the run, that's the time to chase them.

The most important thing about the outcome of the battle over the payroll tax and unemployment is that it shifts the political momentum at a critical time. Momentum is an independent variable in any competitive activity -- including politics.

In a football or basketball game you can feel the momentum shift. The tide of battle is all about momentum. The same is true in politics. And in politics it is even more important because the "spectators" are also the players -- the voters.

People follow -- and vote -- for winners. The bandwagon effect is enormously important in political decision-making. Human beings like to travel in packs. They like to be at the center of the mainstream. Momentum shifts affect their perceptions of the mainstream.

For the last two years, the right wing has been on the offensive. Its Tea Party shock troops took the battle to Democratic members of Congress. In the mid-terms Democrats were routed in district after district.

Now the tide has turned. And when the tide turns -- when you have them on the run -- that's the time to chase them.

We won't know for sure until next November whether this moment will take on the same iconic importance as Clinton's battle with Gingrich in 1995. But there is no doubt that the political wind has shifted. It's up to progressives to make the most of it.

#### No link – Obama avoids crises

Rogers, 9/17 (Ed, 9/17/2012, “Obama's 21st-century Teflon is working,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-insiders/post/obamas-21st-century-teflon-is-working/2012/09/17/82b05da8-00bf-11e2-bbf0-e33b4ee2f0e8_blog.html?wprss=rss_opinions> )

It is safe to say that America's outreach to the world under President Obama has been a complete failure. Does America enjoy more or less respect than it did four years ago? If you think more, please let me know where.

Last weekend was the end of Obama's foreign policy. Diplomats are being called in and troops are being sent out — at least to where our enemies will allow them. The likes of Sudan know they can refuse Obama's wish for more troops to protect our embassies. Obama will probably tell us the Sudanese promise to provide adequate protection for Americans was a hard-fought concession.

Anyway, for the first time since the 2012 campaign began, Obama might want to talk about the economy. The images of the fires burning and the angry crowds on the Arab streets all underscore the complete failure of Obama's foreign policy, reminding us of his naivete and the price we pay for his on-the-job-training. Remember, this is a man who thought he was worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize just for being who he was.

The planet would heal because of his desire for it to do so. His very presence meant tension in the Middle East would subside. And why not? He had some new ideas: Remember his instructions to his NASA administrator that there was no higher priority than to make Arabs feel better about themselves?

With the world mostly either disrespecting America or just sadly shaking its head and wondering where America has gone, perhaps the Obama campaign could use a few days of blaming George W. Bush for the Obama administration's economic failures.

Foreign policy can't win elections, but it can lose them. Obama is pushing his luck as it becomes more and more clear that he can't influence events that endanger America and American interests. Meanwhile, he has outsourced America's economic management to the Federal Reserve, an abdication of responsibility that will be the subject of books to come. By announcing another quantitative easing program, the Federal Reserve was irrefutably saying that Obama's policies are not working, that the economy is so weak it has to step in to do something to try and generate the jobs that Obama's policies haven't — and won't — deliver.

So as the campaign heads for the debates, voters must be asking themselves what a vote for Obama is really about. It's not about peace and prosperity. It's not about respect abroad and certainty at home. There is nothing about Obama's tenure in office that voters should want more of. So why is he winning? I'm not sure, but based on his record at home and the sorry state of affairs his foreign policy has produced, the fact that he isn't cratering suggests a 21st-century coat of Teflon that makes Reagan's legendary resilience look small-time.

[insert specific link defense]

#### Military spending is immune to political backlash

Norris, Executive director of Sustainable Security program at Center for American Progress, 12

(7/31, Money Pit on the Potomac, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/31/money\_pit\_on\_the\_potomac?page=0,0)

July was a tough month for the Pentagon. The Washington Post revealed that three U.S. special operations soldiers died in Mali when their vehicle plunged off a bridge with three Moroccan prostitutes in the vehicle at the time. The special inspector general for Iraq reconstruction issued one of his final reports on U.S. reconstruction efforts in that country and estimated that $6 billion to $8 billion of the $51 billion spent on reconstruction was likely wasted, embezzled, or misplaced. The inspector general's investigations have produced 90 indictments, 72 convictions, and $177 million in fines and other penalties, with the highest percentage of convictions coming against military officers and defense contractors. Worse still, this came not long after the bean counters at the Government Accountability Office had issued yet another damning report on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, finding that the cost estimate for developing the F-35 had jumped an additional $15 billion since 2010. The reaction from the political class was swift and decisive, but not in the way you would think. Republican standard-bearer Mitt Romney called for an additional $2.1 trillion in defense spending over the next decade and called for adding 100,000 additional active-duty military personnel -- even as the United States winds down wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, Adam Smith, made an impassioned plea supporting the Defense Department's foreign assistance programs. And much of Congress continues to react as if sequestration budget cuts -- a sword of Damocles that they themselves voted for -- would prove apocalyptic even though they only reduce Pentagon spending to 2006 levels. The Pentagon has become the federal bureaucracy's version of a perpetual motion machine. Despite the fact that the military budget has roughly doubled over the last decade and the United States spends more on defense than China, Britain, France, Japan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Germany, India, and Brazil combined, most members of Congress continue to see a vote for more defense spending as the safest vote in town. And for good reason. But because voting for defense spending is a painless vote for members of Congress, more and more lobbyists and interest groups have pushed their activities under the broad umbrella of the Pentagon in order to find safe harbor. This has led to the Pentagon to take on more and more activities that have very little to do with traditional definitions of national security. Take breast cancer, for example. As the Post notes, the Pentagon has received more than $3.6 billion for cancer research over the last 20 years, despite the fact that no president has ever requested this funding and that breast cancer research has nothing to do with the Pentagon's traditional limited purview in health -- battlefield medicine. Iowa Sen. Tom Harkin once bragged to his constituents that he had been able to double spending on breast cancer research by putting the additional funds in the Pentagon's budget. Of course, since the Defense Department doesn't have much expertise in breast cancer research, it turns around and relies on agencies like the National Institutes of Health, where the money should have been put in the first place, to oversee its grants under these programs. But Congress is not solely to blame for the Pentagon's ever growing mandate. The Defense Department itself has become increasingly fixated on the idea of "expeditionary economics." In a nutshell, the concept is that small teams of military professionals well versed in economics will be deployed to assist in the reconstruction of war-torn and disaster-prone countries. Any post-conflict expert worth his or her salt agrees that getting economic life restarted after a conflict is vital. However, the idea of putting an institution that has become synonymous with billion-dollar cost overruns in charge of setting economic policy in postwar settings seems risible. Indeed, there is probably no agency in the world that has been more insulated from basic economic realities over the last decade than the Pentagon. But still, no other federal agency is willing to say that the emperor across the Potomac has no clothes. Let us remember that Pentagon-led projects in Iraq and Afghanistan have been flush with cash but rife with problems. Just this week, the special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction reported that about $400 million in large infrastructure projects in Afghanistan are badly behind schedule and unlikely to make a dent in the Taliban insurgency. And this only underscores the Pentagon's power to get what it wants. When every other agency fails, Congress threatens to reduce its budget. When the Defense Department fails or makes grievous mistakes, it is automatically assumed that it went astray because it did not have enough money. But both Congress and the Pentagon itself should recognize the fundamental long-term risk of turning America's military budget into a catchall for everything from breast cancer research to roving teams of economists in combat boots. Military officers are great at fighting and winning wars because that is what they are trained to do. It's bad enough that there are already more people in U.S. military bands than in the entire Foreign Service, but does the country really want to train fighting men and women to build swimming pools in Iraq? The more amorphous America makes the U.S. military's purpose as an institution, the more likely the Pentagon will turn into a giant, muddled marshmallow of bureaucratic excess. Back in the 1990s, Republicans routinely wrung their hands over the idea that "mission creep" was undermining the military. Those concerns seem to have been quietly set aside as both parties acquiesce in building a military that can't say no. With major budget battles brewing, don't be surprised when people try to slip everything from domestic road building to arts funding into the behemoth defense budget.

#### Strong public support for federal nuclear power incentives – no effect from Fukushima

WNA 12

(September, World Nuclear Association, US Nuclear Power Policy, www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41\_US\_nuclear\_power\_policy.html)

Public opinion regarding nuclear power has generally been fairly positive, and has grown more so as people have had to think about security of energy supplies. Different polls show continuing increase in public opinion favourable to nuclear power in the USA. More than three times as many strongly support nuclear energy than strongly oppose it. Two-thirds of self-described environmentalists favour it. A May 2008 survey (N=2925) by Zogby International showed 67% of Americans favoured building new nuclear power plants, with 46% registering strong support; 23% were opposed. Asked which kind of power plant they would prefer if it were sited in their community, 43% said nuclear, 26% gas, 8% coal. Men (60%) were more than twice as likely as women (28%) to be supportive of a nuclear power plant. A March 2010 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed that strong public support for nuclear energy was being sustained, with 74% in favour of it11. In particular, 87% think nuclear will be important in meeting electricity needs in the years ahead, 87% support licence renewal for nuclear plants, 84% believe utilities should prepare to build more nuclear plants, 72% supported an active federal role in encouraging investment in "energy technology that reduces greenhouse gases", 82% agree that US nuclear plants are safe and secure, 77% would support adding a new reactor at the nearest nuclear plant, and 70% say that USA should definitely build more plants in the future. Only 10% of people said they strongly opposed the use of nuclear energy. In relation to recycling used nuclear fuel, 79% supported this (contra past US policy), and the figure rose to 85% if "a panel of independent experts" recommended it. Although 59% were confident that used reactor fuel could be stored safely at nuclear power plant sites, 81% expressed a strong desire for the federal government to move used nuclear fuel to centralised, secure storage facilities away from the plant sites until a permanent disposal facility is ready. Half of those surveyed considered themselves to be environmentalists. A February 2011 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed similar figures, and that 89% of Americans agree that all low-carbon energy sources – including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy – should be taken advantage of to generate electricity while limiting greenhouse gas emissions. Just 10% disagreed. Also some 84% of respondents said that they associate nuclear energy "a lot" or "a little" with reliable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with affordable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with economic growth and job creation; and 77% associate nuclear energy and clean air. A more general March 2010 Gallup poll (N=1014) on energy showed 62% in favour of using nuclear power, including 28% strongly so, and 33% against, the most favourable figures since Gallup began polling the question in 1994. However, only 51% of Democrat voters were in favour12. An early March 2011 Gallup poll just before the Fukushima accident showed 57% in favour and 38% against, and in March 2012 (N=1024) still 57% in favour with 40% against (men: 72%-27%, women 42%-51%). Regarding plant safety, the polls showed consistent 56-58% positive views over 2009-12, but men-women split similar. A survey conducted in September 2011 by Bisconti Research Inc. with GfK Roper showed that although support for nuclear power decreased following the Fukushima accident and compared with a year earlier (a survey carried out in March 2010 by Bisconti Research found 74% of Americans favoured nuclear power), 62% of the 1000 adults surveyed in the latest poll were supportive of utilizing nuclear power while 35% expressed opposition. The survey found that 82% of Americans believed that lessons had been learned from Fukushima and 67% of respondents considered US nuclear power plants safe (the same level as reported one month before the nuclear accident in Japan occurred). Also 85% of said that an extension of commercial operation should be granted to those plants that comply with federal safety standards, and 59% believed more nuclear power plants should definitely be built in the future, while 75% contend that “Electric utilities should prepare now so that new nuclear power plants could be built if needed in the next decade.” Finally, further expansion of the site of the nearest already operating nuclear power plant is supported by 67% and opposed by 28%.

#### No president can get anything done after the election

Dadush, et. al, 8/2---director of Carnegie’s International Economics Program (8/2/2012, Uri Dadush, Shimelse Ali --- economist in the International Economics Program, and Zaahira Wyne --- managing editor of Carnegie’s International Economic Bulletin, “What Does the U.S. Election Mean for the World Economy?” <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/08/02/what-does-u.s.-election-mean-for-world-economy/d5mp> )

Few things are certain, especially given the threat to the U.S. economy posed by the crisis in Europe. But some pundits have already begun forecasting that Obama will beat Romney by a fair number of electoral votes despite a dead heat in the popular vote. The FiveThirtyEight blog in the New York Times, one of the few outlets venturing a forecast for toss-up states, projects 294 electoral votes for Obama versus 244 for Romney and a one-percentage-point win for Obama in the popular vote. The Washington Post’s The Fix blog offers a more cautious assessment, one that nonetheless shows Obama winning and closer to the decisive 270 mark. However, Republicans are expected to easily retain control of the House of Representatives and may also regain control of the Senate by a small margin.

Two crucial points emerge. First, even if Obama wins and Democrats retain the Senate, the president will have to seek a compromise with a Republican House. Second, in no scenario, including a Romney win, would either party gain a filibuster-proof 60 seats in the Senate. This means that the victorious candidate, whoever he is, would have to try to compromise with senators of the opposite party, not to mention members of his own party whose views may differ on a particular issue, in order to pass meaningful legislation.

It follows that the implications of the U.S. elections for the global economy depend less on precise electoral platforms than on the shape of the compromise reached on the big issues, and, against a background of fraying consensus, whether compromise can be reached at all. Thus, the U.S. electoral outcome is likely far less predictive of policy than, say, the Socialists’ sweep in France in May or even last year’s Conservative/Liberal Democrat victory in the UK.

[insert specific impact answer ]

### 2ac China Bashing Impact

#### Romney won’t follow through and it won’t spark a trade war

White, 9/15 (Ben, 9/15/2012, “Doubts grow on Mitt Romney’s China threats,” <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/81254.html>)

Mitt Romney is hoping his tough talk on China policy will win him votes — but few of his big business donors or fellow Republicans support what he’s saying or believe he’d follow through if elected.

And if he did, many analysts say, he’d likely spark a disastrous and counter-productive trade war that would hurt both American consumers and the workers he says he’s trying to protect. But Romney advisers say voters shouldn’t expect him to back off the tough talk if he gets elected, and other experts say fears of a “trade war” are overblown since the Chinese need the American market just as much consumers like cheap Chinese imports.

#### China won’t retaliate --- not in its self interest

Bosco, 9/6 --- senior associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, was China country director in the office of the secretary of defense from 2005 to 2006 (Joseph A., “China and a Mitt Romney presidency,” washingtonpost.com/opinions/china-and-a-mitt-romney-presidency/2012/09/06/32917432-f76f-11e1-a93b-7185e3f88849\_story.html)

In his Sept. 3 op-ed column, “A foreign policy choice,” Jackson Diehl wrote that a President Romney “will surely drop his threats to start a trade war with China, just as [George W.] Bush and Bill Clinton did.”

First, it takes two to wage a “trade war.” When China realizes that Mr. Romney is serious about declaring it a currency manipulator (which it is), wiser counsel may well prevail in Beijing. Playing by international rules is far more in China’s interest than is retaliating against free and fair trade. China could avoid the choice between dangerous escalation and embarrassing submission by preemptively starting to free its currency before a Romney inauguration.

Second, U.S.-China relations encompass far more than trade: China’s terrible human rights record at home; its support for murderous regimes in Damascus and elsewhere; its proliferation of nuclear and missile technology, and enabling of North Korea’s programs; its increasingly aggressive actions in the East China and South China seas; and its ongoing military threat against Taiwan.

A President Romney will surely continue the diplomatic pivot/rebalancing to Asia begun by President George W. Bush and accelerated by President Obama and, one hopes, will back the rhetoric with military resources.

#### Romney will just use threats to leverage concessions

White, 9/15 (Ben, 9/15/2012, “Doubts grow on Mitt Romney’s China threats,” <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/81254.html>)

Romney hopes his tougher words will make Obama look weak. But the question remains whether Romney’s tough talk is just that: talk.

“It’s kind of a head scratcher,” said the senior financial services executive who supports Romney but questions his China policy. “Is this just rhetoric or is this really the view of the candidate?”

Other executives see Romney’s tough stance as a head fake to the Chinese, an opening gambit that will give him leverage once he takes office. This view holds that Romney can score an early win with the Chinese by wresting certain concessions in return for not labeling the country a currency manipulator or taking other actions right away.

### 2AC Renewables

#### 1) Inherent limitations ensure small market and high prices

Zycher, Professor of Economics and Business at CSU Channel Islands, 12

(1/17, Wind and solar power, part III: chasing the green tail, aei.org/outlook/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/wind-and-solar-power-part-iii-chasing-the-green-tail/)

This poor competitive performance of wind and solar energy is not limited to the United States. As a crude generalization, Europe’s experience with renewable electricity also can be summarized as high costs combined with low reliability. That is the unavoidable outcome given the basic economic realities afflicting wind and solar electricity generating technologies. Accordingly, renewable power generation has achieved only a small market share in the United States, and official projections are for slow growth at best, notwithstanding large subsidies and other policy support.

This market resistance to investment in renewable generation capacity can be explained by the problems intrinsic to renewable power—that is, the inherent limitations on its competitiveness—that public policies can circumvent or neutralize only at very substantial cost. Those problems can be summarized as:

unconcentrated energy content;

siting constraints and resulting high costs for transmission; and

the costs created by low capacity factors, the intermittent nature of wind flows and sunlight, and the resulting need for backup capacity.

#### 2) Renewables can’t beat existing competitors

Zycher, Professor of Economics and Business at CSU Channel Islands, 12

(1/17, Wind and solar power, part III: chasing the green tail, aei.org/outlook/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/wind-and-solar-power-part-iii-chasing-the-green-tail/

This general argument has become familiar over many years. As we learned in the previous two Outlooks (No. 1 and No. 2, January 2012), the competitive performance of wind and solar power is less than impressive, to put it mildly; the greater the competitive difficulties faced by wind and solar generation, seemingly ever-louder have become the official arguments promoting them. And amid this utter disconnect between the rhetoric and the reality of renewable electricity, lower costs for renewables’ competitors—in particular, natural gas prices, both current and prospective—have worsened this competitive environment. Wind and solar technologies must compete with conventional electric generation—coal and natural gas technologies in particular—so that long-run price dynamics for those conventional fuels have a significant effect on the competitiveness of renewables. As I will explain here, recent technological advances in the production of natural gas from shale formations and coal beds have created enormous new problems for the competitiveness of renewable electricity.

#### 3) All neg evidence assumes loan guarantees for large nuclear power plants – no evidence about SMRs and DOD purchasing

#### 4) SMR’s solve high prices

Marston, CTO Electric Power Research Institute, ’12

[Dr. Theodore U. Marston, Former Chief Technology Officer of the Electric Power Research Institute, PhD Mechanical Engineering from the University of Michigan, Fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, “Status of Small Modular Light Water Reactors in the US,” The Nuclear Decarbonization Option: Profiles of Selected Advanced Reactor Technologies, March 2012]

Regulatory challenges could make smLWRs non-competitive. If the licensing of smLWRs become protracted affairs, the attractiveness of such small plants will vanish. The best hope for smLWRs to be competitive lies in the assumption that they can be licensed, built and commissioned quickly. The primary economic challenge to the commercialization of smLWRs is whether the electricity production costs are (1) affordable and (2) competitive with other forms of generation. With regard to affordability, smLWRs offer potential optionality to the US electric utilities, when the only real options for large generation additions are gas fired, coal fired or large nuclear plants. SmLWRs, being smaller and modular, potentially offer a more manageable nuclear option. SmLWRs are more ‘affordable’, i.e. less of a fiscal risk. They can be deployed in much smaller increments, matching the utilities’ load growths better and reduce the ‘single shaft’ generation risk to an acceptable level. Competing with other forms of electricity generation is a much greater challenge today. Vast amounts of natural gas are being discovered across the US in so-called tight gas (shale) deposits, resulting in cheap and abundant natural gas. The current spot market price of natural gas is less than $3.00/MMBTU. Carbon restraints (taxes or credits), which would improve the competitiveness of smLWRs, appear unlikely to arise in the near future. However it is expected that carbon emissions from large stationary sources will be reduced systematically over time one way or another, and US utilities are very interested in reducing their ‘carbon footprints’. If the economics of the smLWRs are what some of the designs claim, there is a real chance to compete with natural gas fired plants, particularly when carbon constraints are in place. The cost competitiveness of smLWR depend heavily on achieving the following opportunities: lStreamline design and manufacturing are necessary to ffset the economies of scale of other generation op- tions, particularly nuclear plants. ALWRs are becoming larger and larger due to the economies of scale. The only prospect to reverse this effect for the smaller smLWRs is to streamline the shop fabrication of the NSSS and other modules, ship them to the site and install them rapidly. The requisite quality standards must be maintained throughout the entire process. l Modularity of the smLWRs provides the opportunity to transform how we design, build, operate and decom- mission nuclear power plants. lReduce construction time by modularization and con- struction efficiencies. SMRs do not require loan guarantees. This sets the smLWR apart from the larger ALWR, which currently benefit from federal loan guarantees, especially for regulated utilities. Experience shows the loan guarantee process to be a protracted and expensive affair, requiring the expenditure of significant political and fiscal capital.

#### 5) SMR’s solve warming – renewables fail

Rosner & Goldberg, Physics Prof @ U Chicago, ’11

[Robert Rosner, William E. Wrather, Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics, and Physics at The University of Chicago, Director, Energy Policy Institute, Harris School of Public Policy, Stephen Goldberg, Professor of Law Emeritus at Northwestern Law, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.,” Energy Policy Institute at The University of Chicago, November 2011]

As stated earlier, SMRs have the potential to achieve significant greenhouse gas emission reductions. They could provide alternative baseload power generation to facilitate the retirement of older, smaller, and less efficient coal generation plants that would, otherwise, not be good candidates for retrofitting carbon capture and storage technology. They could be deployed in regions of the U.S. and the world that have less potential for other forms of carbon-free electricity, such as solar or wind energy. There may be technical or market constraints, such as projected electricity demand growth and transmission capacity, which would support SMR deployment but not GW-scale LWRs.

#### 7) SMR’s key to renewables

Loudermilk, Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, 2011

(Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375)

Limitations of renewables Renewable energy technologies have made great strides forward during the last decade. In an increasingly carbon emissions and greenhouse gas (GHG) aware global commons, the appeal of solar, wind, and other alternative energy sources is strong, and many countries are moving to increase their renewable electricity generation. However, despite massive expansion on this front, renewable sources struggle to keep pace with increasing demand, to say nothing of decreasing the amount of energy obtained from other sources. The continual problem with solar and wind power is that, lacking efficient energy storage mechanisms, it is difficult to contribute to baseload power demands. Due to the intermittent nature of their energy production, which often does not line up with peak demand usage, electricity grids can only handle a limited amount of renewable energy sources—a situation which Germany is now encountering. Simply put, nuclear power provides virtually carbon-free baseload power generation, and renewable options are unable to replicate this, especially not on the scale required by expanding global energy demands. Small nuclear reactors, however, like renewable sources, can provide enhanced, distributed, and localized power generation. As the US moves towards embracing smart grid technologies, power production at this level becomes a critical piece of the puzzle. Especially since renewable sources, due to sprawl, are of limited utility near crowded population centers, small reactors may in fact prove instrumental to enabling the smart grid to become a reality.

#### Domestic nuclear industry key to prevent global accidents

Wallace and Williams, Senior Adviser on U.S. Nuclear Energy Project at CSIS and Nuclear Policy Analyst at Partnership for Global Security, 12

(Nuclear Energy in America:Preventing its Early Demise, csis.org/files/publication/120417\_gf\_wallace\_williams.pdf)

Second, setting global norms and standards for safety, security, operations, and emergency response. As the world learned with past nuclear accidents and more recently with Fukushima, a major accident anywhere can have lasting repercussions everywhere. As with nonproliferation and security, America’s ability to exert leadership and influence in this area is directly linked to the strength of our domestic industry and our active involvement in the global nuclear enterprise. A strong domestic civilian industry and regulatory structure have immediate national security significance in that they help support the nuclear capabilities of the U.S. Navy, national laboratories, weapons complex, and research institutions. Third, in the past, the U.S. government could exert influence by striking export agreements with countries whose regulatory and legal frameworks reflected and were consistent with our own nonproliferation standards and commitments. At the same time, our nation set the global standard for effective, independent safety regulation (in the form of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission), led international efforts to reduce proliferation risks (through the 1970 NPT Treaty and other initiatives), and provided a model for industry self-regulation. The results were not perfect, but America’s institutional support for global nonproliferation goals and the regulatory behaviors it modeled clearly helped shape the way nuclear technology was adopted and used elsewhere around the world. This influence seems certain to wane if the United States is no longer a major supplier or user of nuclear technology. With existing nonproliferation and safety and security regimes looking increasingly inadequate in this rapidly changing global nuclear landscape, American leadership and leverage is more important and more central to our national security interests than ever. To maintain its leadership role in the development, design, and operation of a growing global nuclear energy infrastructure, the next administration, whether Democrat or Republican, must recognize the invaluable role played by the commercial U.S. nuclear industry and take action to prevent its early demise.

#### Fukushima proves accidents getting worse – extinction

Chossudovsky, Professor of Economics at University of Ottawa, 12

(1/25, Fukushima: A Nuclear War without a War: The Unspoken Crisis of Worldwide Nuclear Radiation, www.globalresearch.ca/fukushima-a-nuclear-war-without-a-war-the-unspoken-crisis-of-worldwide-nuclear-radiation/)

The World is at a critical crossroads. The Fukushima disaster in Japan has brought to the forefront the dangers of Worldwide nuclear radiation. The crisis in Japan has been described as “a nuclear war without a war”. In the words of renowned novelist Haruki Murakami: “This time no one dropped a bomb on us … We set the stage, we committed the crime with our own hands, we are destroying our own lands, and we are destroying our own lives.” Nuclear radiation –which threatens life on planet earth– is not front page news in comparison to the most insignificant issues of public concern, including the local level crime scene or the tabloid gossip reports on Hollywood celebrities. While the long-term repercussions of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster are yet to be fully assessed, they are far more serious than those pertaining to the 1986 Chernobyl disaster in the Ukraine, which resulted in almost one million deaths (New Book Concludes – Chernobyl death toll: 985,000, mostly from cancer Global Research, September 10, 2010, See also Matthew Penney and Mark Selden The Severity of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Disaster: Comparing Chernobyl and Fukushima, Global Research, May 25, 2011) Moreover, while all eyes were riveted on the Fukushima Daiichi plant, news coverage both in Japan and internationally failed to fully acknowledge the impacts of a second catastrophe at TEPCO’s (Tokyo Electric Power Co Inc) Fukushima Daini nuclear power plant. The shaky political consensus both in Japan, the U.S. and Western Europe is that the crisis at Fukushima has been contained. The realties, however, are otherwise. Fukushima 3 was leaking unconfirmed amounts of plutonium. According to Dr. Helen Caldicott, “one millionth of a gram of plutonium, if inhaled can cause cancer”. The Impacts in Japan The Japanese government has been obliged to acknowledge that “the severity rating of its nuclear crisis … matches that of the 1986 Chernobyl disaster”. In a bitter irony, however, this tacit admission by the Japanese authorities has proven to been part of the cover-up of a significantly larger catastrophe, resulting in a process of global nuclear radiation and contamination: “While Chernobyl was an enormous unprecedented disaster, it only occurred at one reactor and rapidly melted down. Once cooled, it was able to be covered with a concrete sarcophagus that was constructed with 100,000 workers. There are a staggering 4400 tons of nuclear fuel rods at Fukushima, which greatly dwarfs the total size of radiation sources at Chernobyl.” ( Extremely High Radiation Levels in Japan: University Researchers Challenge Official Data, Global Research, April 11, 2011) Worldwide Contamination The dumping of highly radioactive water into the Pacific Ocean constitutes a potential trigger to a process of global radioactive contamination. Radioactive elements have not only been detected in the food chain in Japan, radioactive rain water has been recorded in California: “While Chernobyl was an enormous unprecedented disaster, it only occurred at one reactor and rapidly melted down. Once cooled, it was able to be covered with a concrete sarcophagus that was constructed with 100,000 workers. There are a staggering 4400 tons of nuclear fuel rods at Fukushima, which greatly dwarfs the total size of radiation sources at Chernobyl.” ( Extremely High Radiation Levels in Japan: University Researchers Challenge Official Data, Global Research, April 11, 2011)

### AT: States CP 2AC

#### 50 state fiat is a voting issue –

#### Interpretation – the negative should not be able to fiat sub-national actors without a comparative solvency evidence

#### First, not logical – no precedent for uniform action – not real world

#### Second, literature base – no solvency advocate for the CP in terms of the plan – not predictable

#### Third, infinitely regressive – legitimizes any permutation of non-USFG actors – kills clash and forces substance crowdout

#### Perm – do both – states can fund DOD PPAs

GAO 9, “Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Take Actions to Address Challenges in Meeting Federal

Renewable Energy Goals”, December, http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/299755.html

DOD has also joined with private sector entities, entering into various types of arrangements to develop renewable energy projects. Because these different arrangements with the private sector provide DOD with an alternative to using only up-front appropriations to fund renewable energy projects, we refer to these arrangements as alternative financing approaches. For the purposes of this report, we define an alternative financing approach as any funding arrangement other than projects in which total project costs are funded only through full up- front appropriations. DOD has entered into several different types of these approaches that have resulted in renewable energy projects.

#### Doublebind – either

#### a. the CP doesn’t result in DOD action and can’t address military grid concerns

#### b. CP links to the net benefit – DOD has to spend money to integrate the electricity

#### Federal signal key to adoption of new tech

CNA 10, non-profit research organization that operates the Center for Naval Analyses and the Institute for Public Research, “Powering America’s Economy: Energy Innovation at the Crossroads of National Security Challenges”, July, http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/WEB%2007%2027%2010%20MAB%20Powering%20America%27s%20Economy.pdf

In our final discussion, we consider the end of the innovation pipeline—deployment—and we look at how fine-tuning the incentives might help pull more innovative, new energy technologies through the pipeline. Energy use at installations is governed under a stricter rubric than operational energy: a variety of regulatory and legislative mandates have steered DOD toward lowering energy consumption, increasing use of renewables, and promoting conservation and energy efficiency. However, the adoption of new clean energy technologies is still hampered in key installation acquisition programs. To help achieve its energy goals, DOD often employs two mechanisms: the Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP) and Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPCs). The ECIP program is backed by Congressional appropriations (through military construction funding), and it is designed to allow installations to purchase technologies that save money through conserving energy [55]. The program is viewed widely as being successful, cited as saving more than two dollars for each dollar invested. ESPCs are contracting vehicles that allow DOD to invest in energy-related improvements without expending funds appropriated by Congress. Through ESPCs, DOD partners with private firms that make the energy improvements; in return, the firms’ investments are paid back through the energy savings. While these programs have improved installation energy use, as they are currently structured, they favor older technologies that are well-established on the commercial market. This is especially the case for ESPCs, which are inherently risk averse. The private sector firms that enter into these contracts only do so if they are guaranteed to make a profit; as such, the energy improvements are done so with tried-and-tested technologies whose payback schedules and energy savings are well-defined. Many of these investments are also made with small profit margins. As such, companies are not willing to take risks on these contracts by using new and perhaps unproven technologies. Altering these programs to reduce the advantages provided to already commercialized products will encourage the acquisition of more innovative technologies on installations. One change could include a guaranteed return on investment (similar to that given on older technologies) for those developers proposing cutting-edge technologies. Another change could include giving first preference to innovations that come from public/private partnerships (incubators, energy hubs, etc.). Given DOD’s size and the fact that installations mirror U.S. infrastructure, the use of innovative technologies on its installations provides a clear demand signal to the developer.

#### Federal action is necessary to avoid licensing delay

CSPO 10, Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes at ASU, “four policy principles for energy innovation & climate change: a synthesis”, June, http://www.catf.us/resources/publications/files/Synthesis.pdf

Government purchase of new technologies is a powerful way to accelerate innovation through increased demand (Principle 3a). We explore how this principle can be applied by considering how the DoD could purchase new nuclear reactor designs to meet electric power needs for DoD bases and operations. Small modular nuclear power reactors (SMRs), which generate less than 300 MW of power (as compared to more typical reactors built in the 1000 MW range) are often listed as a potentially transformative energy technology. While typical traditional large-scale nuclear power plants can cost five to eight billion dollars, smaller nuclear reactors could be developed at smaller scale, thus not presenting a “bet the company” financial risk. SMRs could potentially be mass manufactured as standardized modules and then delivered to sites, which could significantly reduce costs per unit of installed capacity as compared to today’s large scale conventional reactor designs. It is likely that some advanced reactors designs – including molten salt reactors and reactors utilizing thorium fuels – could be developed as SMRs. Each of these designs offers some combination of inherently safe operation, very little nuclear proliferation risk, relatively small nuclear waste management needs, very abundant domestic fuel resources, and high power densities – all of which are desirable attributes for significant expansion of nuclear energy. Currently, several corporations have been developing small nuclear reactors. Table 2 lists several of these companies and their reactor power capacities, as well as an indication of the other types of reactor innovations that are being incorporated into the designs. Some of these technologies depend on the well-established light water reactor, while others use higher energy neutrons, coolants capable of higher temperature operation, and other innovative approaches. Some of these companies, such as NuScale, intend to be able to connect as many as 24 different nuclear modules together to form one larger nuclear power plant. In addition to the different power ranges described in Table 2, these reactors vary greatly in size, some being only 3 to 6 feet on each side, while the NuScale reactor is 60 feet long and 14 feet in diameter. Further, many of these reactors produce significant amounts of high-temperature heat, which can be harnessed for process heating, gas turbine generators, and other operations. One major obstacle is to rapid commercialization and development are prolonged multi-year licensing times with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Currently, the NRC will not consider a reactor for licensing unless there is a power utility already prepared to purchase the device. Recent Senate legislation introduced by Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) has pushed for DOE support in bringing down reactor costs and in helping to license and certify two reactor designs with the NRC. Some additional opportunities to facilitate the NRC licensing process for innovative small modular reactors would be to fund NRC to conduct participatory research to get ahead of potential license applications (this might require ~$100million/year) and potentially revise the current requirement that licensing fees cover nearly all NRC licensing review costs. One option for accelerating SMR development and commercialization, would be for DOD to establish SMR procurement specifications (to include cost) and agree to purchase a sufficient amount of SMR’s to underwrite private sector SMR development. Of note here may be that DARPA recently (3/30/10) issued a “Request for Information (RFI) on Deployable Reactor Technologies for Generating Power and Logistic Fuels”2 that specifies may features that would be highly desirable in an advanced commercial SMR. While other specifications including coproduction of mobility fuel are different than those of a commercial SMR power reactor, it is likely that a core reactor design meeting the DARPA inquiry specifications would be adaptable to commercial applications. While nuclear reactors purchased and used by DOD are potentially exempt from many NRC licensing requirements3, any reactor design resulting from a DOD procurement contract would need to proceed through NRC licensing before it could be commercially offered. Successful use of procured SMR’s for DOD purposes could provide the knowledge and operational experience needed to aid NRC licensing and it might be possible for the SMR contractor to begin licensing at some point in the SMR development process4. Potential purchase of small modular nuclear reactors would be a powerful but proven way in which government procurement of new energy technologies could encourage innovation. Public procurement of other renewable energy technologies could be similarly important.

#### Doesn’t solve – states can’t make military basing policy

Tymkovich 12

(Seymour, Circuit Judge, “ALLISON v. BOEING LASER TECHNICAL SERVICES” <http://www.leagle.com/xmlResult.aspx?xmldoc=In%20FCO%2020120810042.xml&docbase=CSLWAR3-2007-CURR>, SEH)

Under a body of constitutional law applicable to federal enclaves, U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 17, state law that is adopted after the creation of the enclave generally does not apply on the enclave. A federal enclave is created when a state cedes jurisdiction over land within its borders to the federal government and Congress accepts that cession. These enclaves include numerous military bases, federal facilities, and even some national forests and parks. Federal enclave doctrine operates as a choice of law doctrine that dictates which law applies to causes of action arising on these lands.¶ It is well-established that after a state has transferred authority over a tract of land creating a federal enclave, the state may no longer impose new state laws on these lands. But state laws enacted before the cession continue to apply unless Congress specifically overrides them. The question here is whether state common law causes of action recognized after the state ceded the enclave to the federal government are available on federal enclaves. This question is governed by a long string of Supreme Court precedent that makes it clear that the law on a federal enclave is the state law that governed the land at the time the federal government established the enclave, not state law enacted thereafter—unless that law was expressly adopted by the enclave's new sovereign, the federal government.

#### Multiple conditional options bad – it’s a voter – rejecting the arg incentivizes abuse

#### First is skew – aff can’t read their best offense because the neg can just kick their argument and can cross-apply offense, kills fairness

#### Second is research – they can advocate contradictory positions, kills education and advocacy skills

#### One conditional advocacy solves their offense – we should get to advocate perms – only reciprocal option

#### CP gets rolled back

Fentiman 1

(Audeen W., Associate Professor in Nuclear Engineering at The Ohio State University, "What Is an NRC Agreement State?" 2-6-01, <http://ohioline.osu.edu/rer-fact/rer_71.html-http://ohioline.osu.edu/rer-fact/rer_71.html>)

Under federal law, the commercial use of most types of radioactive materials in the United States is controlled by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). A company that wants to use radioactive materials obtains a license from the NRC. The NRC inspects each licensed facility periodically to ensure that it is complying with all applicable regulations and the requirements of its license. Federal law also permits a state to reach an agreement with the NRC allowing that state to regulate the use of the NRC-licensed radioactive materials within its borders. That state is then called an NRC Agreement State. Thirty states are now Agreement States, but Ohio is not. State statute permits Ohio to seek NRC Agreement State status. As an Agreement State, Ohio would assume most of the regulatory responsibilities that the NRC now has within the state, including regulating the construction and operation of Ohio's low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. Regulation of nuclear power plants cannot be delegated to a state, although Ohio participates with the NRC in a joint inspection and observation program at these plants. This fact sheet discusses how a state becomes an Agreement State, why Ohio is applying to become an Agreement State, and the status of Ohio's efforts to become an Agreement State. How a State Becomes an Agreement State A governor may notify the NRC by letter that his or her state wishes to become an NRC Agreement State. After being notified of a state's intent to pursue Agreement State status, the NRC works with the state government to develop the capability to perform the tasks required under the Agreement State program. Before the NRC transfers authority to a state, the state must show that it can properly regulate the use of radioactive materials. The state must write its own regulations governing the use of radiation and radioactive materials. When NRC Agreement State status is approved, these regulations will replace NRC regulations, Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), within the borders of the state. State regulations must conform to Federal regulations in certain areas which the NRC feels are key (such as allowable radiation exposure) and must be at least as strict as NRC regulations in all areas. In some cases, a state's regulations may be more stringent than Federal regulations. Prior to becoming an Agreement State, the state must hire and train a sufficient number of people to enforce the regulations. The competence of the technical staff must be maintained at a level acceptable to the NRC after Agreement State status has been granted. Once the regulations are written and the state is prepared to assume regulatory responsibility, a formal application, signed by the Governor, is forwarded to the NRC. The NRC then reviews the application package and announces in the Federal Register that the state wishes to become an Agreement State. The public will have an opportunity to send written comments to the NRC following the Federal Register announcement. If the NRC determines that the state is competent to take on Agreement State responsibilities, it will approve the application. When the Agreement State status is granted: The NRC turns over its files and delegates its regulatory authority to the state All organizations that currently have an NRC license retain that license until it expires The authority to enforce the NRC license is transferred to the Agreement State (except for the licenses of nuclear power plants) When a license expires, it is reviewed and renewed by the Agreement State (except for nuclear power plants) Why Ohio Wants to Become an Agreement State The Ohio Department of Health, Bureau of Diagnostic Safety and Personnel Certification, currently regulates radiation generating machines such as x-ray machines. The Department's Bureau of Radiation Protection regulates radiation from naturally-occurring and accelerator-produced radioactive materials which are commonly used in medicine and research. Regulating these sources of radiation has always been the responsibility of the State. If Ohio becomes an Agreement State, the Ohio Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Protection, would have responsibility for regulating many of the NRC-controlled facilities in the state, including the low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. The Ohio Department of Health has said that, with control of the additional facilities, it can develop a comprehensive radiation safety program that will serve Ohioans better than the current system for several reasons including: A state agency may be able to respond more quickly to radiological incidents and regulatory violations, since the investigators and responders are located in Ohio State government is in a position to be more aware of, and potentially more responsive to, its citizens' concerns than the Federal Government Licensing and inspection fees may be lower The State has increased control over activities related to radiation safety inside its own borders. Status of Ohio's Efforts to Become an Agreement State In 1991, the Governor of Ohio notified the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that Ohio might be interested in becoming an NRC Agreement State. In 1995, the state statute that provided for the location, construction, and operation of a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility in Ohio, designated the Department of Health as Ohio's Radiation Control Agency. It also required that the Department of Health use regulations compatible with and at least as stringent as NRC regulations. In addition, the Department of Health has begun to hire and train personnel necessary to meet the requirements to become an Agreement State. Regulating Nuclear Power Plants and Department of Energy Facilities Federal law does not permit the NRC to delegate its responsibility for regulating Ohio's nuclear power plants when Ohio becomes an Agreement State. In addition, the NRC will continue to regulate the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, now owned and operated by the United States Enrichment Corporation. Facilities such as the Fernald Environmental Management Project (near Cincinnati) and Mound Laboratories (near Dayton) are owned and operated by the Department of Energy (DOE) and have never been regulated by the NRC. As long as they continue to operate under DOE regulations, by the State of Ohio will have oversight through an Agreement in Principle with the Department of Energy. Loss of Agreement State Status The NRC will not allow Ohio to become an Agreement State unless it determines that Ohio can properly oversee the regulatory process. The NRC will then periodically monitor Ohio's work as an Agreement State. If the NRC determines that radioactive materials are not being controlled acceptably by the state, the NRC can take this authority back from the state. In addition, if Ohio decides that it no longer wants to be an Agreement State, it can request that the NRC resume its previous duties.

#### Federal signal key to investor confidence

Yurman 10

(Dan, consultant to firms in the global nuclear energy industry in the area of social media and marketing communications, "NEI seeks consensus on licensing small reactors," 8-18-10, http://djysrv.blogspot.com/2010/08/nei-seeks-consensus-on-licensing-small.html)

What NEI hopes to do, according to Genoa, "is to create a new regulatory paradigm for small reactors," and to do it in the next 18 months. NEI's priorities are laid out in remarks Genoa made to the SMR conference last February. In this interview, he ticks off the items at the top of the list including annual fees, decommissioning costs, emergency response, and modularity, e.g., how to manage multiple small reactors at a single site. Other issues include design certification, the licensing application process, and Price-Anderson liability issues. The last one will be tough, Genoa said. "It is hard any time you have to make a statutory change." That doesn't mean it will be easier to change the regulatory requirements to adapt them to SMRs. The NRC has a mature view of reactor safety issues especially for LWRs. Genoa said the NRC "is doing a good job to encourage the industry to organize itself to address the issues." Despite this assessment, the industry still has to make its case with the agency. Part of it is what the NRC calls a “chicken and egg” issue. The agency wants to see customers showing interest in SMRs before it commits itself to diving deep into the regulatory issues for them. In a speech to a Platts Energy conference in Washington DC June 28, 2010, NRC Commissioner William C. Ostendorff said: “On the one hand, you have the industry and vendors seeking a high level of certainty and assurance from the federal government that related legislation and regulations will provide for a future return on their investment. On the other hand, you have the federal government looking to the industry and vendors for actions and signals that indicate the existence of a market for SMR technology . . .”

#### DoD procurement professionals will ignore the CP–only fiat overcomes bureaucratic reluctance

Warwick 8

W.M. Warwick, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Dept. of Energy, 2008, Purchasing Renewable Power for the FederalSector: Basics, Barriers, and Possible Options, www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\_reports/PNNL-16485.pdf

To date, DOD has not used 10 USC 2394 or 10 USC 2922 (a) to enter into long-term power purchase agreements for renewable power. The lack of precedent is a major reason why this authority has not been used. Committing an agency to longer term contracts is risky and thus far, procurement professionals have been reluctant to do so. Their reasons are many and varied. One of the major stumbling blocks is inherent to the “ideal” renewable power contract model. As discussed, the best terms appear to be available by entering into a contract with a developer needing a power purchase contract to obtain construction financing. In other words, the contract is a promise to provide power from an as yet unbuilt project. There are limits to how far in advance the government can enter into contracts for future delivery of products and services. This also raises questions about how to pick a “winner.” To comply with Federal procurement requirements (10 USC 2922 (a) and 41 USC 253), the procurement should be competitive, which opens the door to offers from proposers and projects that may not be equal. Unfortunately, most procurement professionals feel (and are) unqualified to assess the merits of such proposals. Similarly, the power supply has to be synchronized with the current supplier’s contract termination. What happens if the new provider’s project isn’t operational when the current contract ends? Finally, what is the government cost estimate for a project like this? That requires a projection of future power costs, which does not exist and would be imperfect if it did. Available projections are not site specific enough to answer this question, and none extend out to the 30 plus years needed for the economic analysis. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) determined that LCC procedures are also inadequate for markets that are as volatile as energy and power markets have been and are likely to be into the future. Similarly, although the renewable power price can be forecasted with some precision, the necessary firming, shaping, and other services cannot. This point can be illustrated using the wind farm example cited previously (Figure 1). Finally, use of 10 USC 2922 (a) requires approval of the Secretary of Defense (SecDef). This means a contract will need to pass up the chain-of-command within a Service, through the Service Secretary, and then on to the SecDef. According to an Army general, decisions for SecDef approval pass through over 20 inboxes before they reach the SecDef. Because energy contracts are often time sensitive (many price offers expire within a day), this process may be too unwieldy to be effective.

#### All defense funds are going to designated, pre-existing programs—DoD ignoring new programs

Harrison 11

Todd Harrison, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Analysis, 2011, [www.csbaonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/2011.07.16-FY-2012-Defense-Budget.pdf](http://www.csbaonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/2011.07.16-FY-2012-Defense-Budget.pdf)

On January 6, 2011, prior to the official release of the FY 2012 budget request, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates announced the results of his efficiency initiative. The initiative, begun nearly a year ago, identified a total of $178 billion in potential savings over five years (FY 2012 to FY 2016), or six percent of the planned funding over that time period. Some $100 billion of the savings came from the Services and the remainder from defense-wide agencies, a government-wide pay freeze that applies to DoD civilians, and revised economic assumptions.3 Several high-profile weapon systems were affected by the announcement, including the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV), the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF), and the Surface-Launched Advanced Medium-Range AirtoAir Missile (SLAMRAAM), which are discussed in more detail in Chapter IV of this report. Of the $178 billion in potential savings identified, $78 billion is being used to reduce total defense spending from FY 2012 to FY 2016 compared to what was projected in the FY 2011 FYDP. For example, the effect on the FY 2012 budget is a reduction of $13 billion from the $566 billion in base discretionary budget authority that was previously planned for FY 2012. The remaining $100 billion in potential savings is being reinvested within the defense budget in high-priority programs and activities, such as a new long-range bomber, next-generation jammer, and carrier-based unmanned strike and surveillance aircraft. The funding for these new programs, however, could be at risk in future years if the potential savings identified through the efficiency initiative do not materialize as projected. Previous attempts at achieving similar efficiencies have fallen short of their intended goal. For example, former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld suggested that DoD could save some $15 billion annually from efficiencies when he took office, roughly 5 percent of the annual budget at the time. But instead of declining, DoD’s peacetime operating costs grew substantially over the years that followed. Current DoD Comptroller Bob Hale wrote in a 2002 report, “After adjusting for changes in force size and inflation, day-to-day operating costs have consistently and persistently increased for decades.” Hale went on to conclude, “These barriers suggest that DoD should be realistic in assessing the prospects for future efficiency savings. The idea that multiple tens of billions of dollars a year can be saved through efficiencies over the next few years—and used to pay for new programs—is almost certainly unrealistic.”4 Unfunded Priori ties Each year, the Services rank and prioritize items for inclusion in the budget request. Unfunded priorities are those items not included in the budget request because they are a lower priority and do not fit within the funding ceiling set for the Department. The Services’ lists of unfunded priorities, sometimes referred to as “wish lists,” are routinely requested by Congress for consideration during their markup of the budget. The total amount of unfunded priorities grew dramatically over the past decade, rising from $9.5 billion in FY 2001 to a peak of $38 billion in FY 2008 (both figures in FY 2012 dollars). In the FY 2010 budget process, Secretary Gates required the Services to present their unfunded priorities to him for review before submitting them to Congress. Unfunded priorities for that year fell by an order of magnitude to just $3.5 billion. In FY 2011 unfunded priorities fell to $1.8 billion, and in FY 2012 they total only $1.2 billion. Nearly all of the unfunded priorities submitted to Congress are in procurement and O&M. This indicates that if the Services had additional funding available they would prioritize the maintenance of existing equipment and would procure additional equipment or spares to augment their inventory.