#### Superpower transitions necessitate global wars.

**Khanna 09** – Director of the Global Governance Initiative at the New America Foundation (Parag, The second world: how emerging powers are redefining global competition in the twenty-first century, p. 337-338)

Even this scenario is optimistic, for superpowers are by definition willing to encroach on the turf of others—changing the world map in the process. Much as in geology, such tectonic shifts always result in earthquakes, particularly as rising powers tread on the entrenched position of the reigning hegemon.56 The sole exception was the twentieth century Anglo-American transition in which Great Britain and the United States were allies and shared a common culture—and even that took two world wars to complete.57 As the relative levels of power of the three superpowers draw closer, the temptation of the number-two to preemptively knock out the king on the hill grows, as does the lead power’s incentive to preventatively attack and weaken its ascending rival before being eclipsed.58 David Hume wrote, “It is not a great disproportion between ourselves and others which produces envy, but on the contrary, a proximity.”59 While the density of contacts among the three superpowers makes the creation of a society of states more possible than ever—all the foreign ministers have one anothers’ mobile phone numbers—the deep differences in interests among the three make forging a “culture of peace” more challenging than ever.60 China seas, hyperterrorism with nuclear weapons, an attack in the Gulf of Aden or the Straits of Malacca. The uncertain alignments of lesser but still substantial powers such as Russia, Japan, and India could also cause escalation. Furthermore, America’s foreign lenders could pull the plug to undermine its grand strategy, sparking economic turmoil, political acrimony, and military tension. War brings profit to the military-industrial complex and is always supported by the large patriotic camps on all sides. Yet the notion of a Sino-U.S. rivalry to lead the world is also premature and simplistic, for in the event of their conflict, Europe would be the winner, as capital would flee to its sanctuaries. These great tensions are being played out in the world today, as each superpower strives to attain the most advantageous position for itself, while none are powerful enough to dictate the system by itself. Global stability thus hangs between the bookends Raymond Aron identified as “peace by law” and “peace by empire,” the former toothless and the latter prone to excess.61 Historically, successive iterations of balance of power and collective security doctrines have evolved from justifying war for strategic advantage into building systems to avoid it, with the post-Napoleonic “Concert of Europe” as the first of the modern era.62 Because it followed rules, it was itself something of a societal system.\* Even where these attempts at creating a stable world order have failed—including the League of Nations after World War I—systemic learning takes place in which states (particularly democracies) internalize the lessons of the past into their institutions to prevent history from repeating itself.63 Toynbee too viewed history as progressive rather than purely cyclical, a wheel that not only turns around and around but also moves forward such that Civilization (with a big C) could become civilized.64 But did he “give too much credit to time’s arrows and not enough to time’s cycle”?65 Empires and superpowers usually promise peace but bring wars.66 The time to recognize the current revolutionary situation is now—before the next world war.67

#### Value to life is inevitable, subjective, and they don’t control the link to it.

**Shermer, 8** –Michael, founder of the Skeptics Society and Editor of Skeptic Magazine, “"The Meaning of Life, the Universe, and Everything"”—Commencement Speech at Whittier College, 5/23/08 http://www.whittier.edu/News/Articles/2008CommencementSpeech.aspx

Purpose is personal, and there are countless activities people engage in to satisfy this deep-seated need.There are, however, a handful of powerful means by which we can bootstrap ourselves toward higher goals that have proven to be especially beneficial to both individuals and society. Science tells us that there are five things you can do to create meaning and purpose in your life. Here they are: 1. Love and family—the bonding and attachment to others increases one's sphere of moral inclusion to care about others as much as, if not more than, oneself. And here I shall take a moment to acknowledge the courage of the California State Supreme Court to increase the possibility of marital happiness to the tens of thousands of gays and lesbians in our state who wish to enjoy the same rights and liberties as everybody else. 2. Meaningful work and career—the sense of purpose derived from discovering one's passion for work drives people to achieve goals so far beyond the needs of themselves that they lift all of us to a higher plane, either directly through the benefits of the work, or indirectly through inspiration. And here let me shift my politics slightly rightward to tell you that not only is it okay to make a lot of money, it is a moral virtue to earn your way to wealth and prosperity, and that market capitalism—conjoined with liberal democracy—is the best hope for humanity's future that we have. 3. Recreation and play—it is vital to take time off from work, get away from the office, hang out with your friends, see new places, veg out, goof off, and explore new activities with no purpose other than their shear enjoyment. (In other words, build into your purpose no purpose at all.) 4. Social and political involvement—as a social primate species endowed by evolution with the moral emotions of guilt and pride, shame and joy, we have a social obligation to our local community and our larger society to participate in the process of determining how best we should live together, and a moral duty to reach out and help those in need. Research shows that those who do so are happier and more fulfilled people. 5. Transcendency and spirituality—a capacity unique to our species, as far as we can tell, that includes aesthetic appreciation, spiritual reflection, and transcendent contemplation through a variety of expressions such as art, music, dance, exercise, meditation, prayer, quiet contemplation, and religious revere, connecting us on the deepest level with that which is outside of ourselves.

#### Extinction outweighs ontology

Jonas 96 [Hans, Former Alvin Johnson Prof. Phil. At the New School for Social Research & Former Eric Voegelin Visiting Prof. at U. Munich, \*do not agree with gendered language, Mortality and Morality: A Search for the Good after Auschwitz, pg 111-2

With this look ahead at an ethics for the future, we are touching at the same time upon the question of the future of freedom. The unavoidable discussion of this question seems to give rise to misunderstandings. My dire prognosis that not only our material standard of living but also our democratic freedoms would fall victim to the growing pressure of a worldwide ecological crisis, until finally there would remain only some form of tyranny that would try to save the situation, has led to the accusation that I am defending dictatorship as a solution to our problems. I shall ignore here what is a confusion between warning and recommendation. But I have indeed said that such a tyranny would still be better than total ruin; thus, I have ethically accepted it as an alternative. I must now defend this standpoint, which I continue to support, before the court that I myself have created with the main argument of this essay. For are we not contradicting ourselves in prizing physical survival at the price of freedom? Did we not say that freedom was the condition of our capacity for responsibility—and that this capacity was a reason for the survival of humankind? By tolerating tyranny as an alternative to physical annihilation are we not violating the principle we established: that the How of existence must not take precedence over its Why? Yet we can make a terrible concession to the primacy of physical survival in the conviction that the ontological capacity for freedom, inseparable as it is from man’s being, cannot really be extinguished, only temporarily banished from the public realm. This conviction can be supported by experience we are all familiar with. We have seen that even in the most totalitarian societies the urge for freedom on the part of some individuals cannot be extinguished, and this renews our faith in human beings. Given this faith, we have reason to hope that, as long as there are human beings who survive, the image of God will continue to exist along with them and will wait in concealment for its new hour. With that hope—which in this particular case takes precedence over fear—it is permissible, for the sake of physical survival, to accept if need be a temporary absence of freedom in the external affairs of humanity. This is, I want to emphasize, a worst-case scenario, and it is the foremost task of responsibility at this particular moment in world history to prevent it from happening. This is in fact one of the noblest of duties (and at the same time one concerning self-preservation), on the part of the imperative of responsibility to avert future coercion that would lead to lack of freedom by acting freely in the present, thus preserving as much as possible the ability of future generations to assume responsibility. But more than that is involved. At stake is the preservation of the Earth’s entire miracle of creation, of which our human existence is a part and before which man reverently bows, even without philosophical “grounding.” Here too faith may precede and reason follow; it is faith that longs for this preservation of the Earth (fides quaerens intellectum), and reason comes as best it can to faith’s aid with arguments, not knowing or even asking how much depends on its success or failure in determining what action to take. With this confession of faith we come to the end of our essay ontology.

#### Management is inevitable- it’s only a question of what kind of intervention is used. Past interventions will result in extinction unless actively reversed

Levy 99- PhD @ Centre for Critical Theory at Monash

Neil, “Discourses of the Environment,” ed: Eric Darier, p. 215

If the ‘technological fix’ is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our use of resources, we are, nevertheless unable simply to leave the environment as it is. There is a real and pressing need for space, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have already set in train will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to develop real, concrete proposals for action, to reverse or at least limit the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behavior towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also preserve patterns of very **unequal access to their resources and their consolations** (Soper 1995: 207).in fact, we risk exacerbating these inequalities. It is not us, **but the poor** of Brazil, **who will bear the brunt** of the misery which would result from a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternatives which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current greenhouse gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals for concrete action must be formulated by ecologists, environmentalists, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impact which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, very much the province of Foucault’s specific intellectual, the one who works ‘within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them’ (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as ‘the strategists of life and death’ than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man’s ‘politics places his existence as a living being in question’ (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the hate of our species, and of those with whom we share this planet, will be decided?

#### And, it doesn’t come first – the alt is nihilism – internal link turns value to life

Fain 11—Lecturer in the Committee on Degrees in Social Studies at Harvard University, Ph.D. in Philosophy and Psychoanalysis (Lucas, March 2011, *The Review of Metaphysics*, “Heidegger's Cartesian nihilism,” Academic OneFile, RBatra)

That Heidegger transforms happiness, classically understood as the completion of human nature, into the anxiety of being-towards-death may be deduced from the fact that it is death which signifies Dasein's "authentic potentiality-for-being-a-whole," (45) **with the consequence that ethical virtue is replaced by Dasein's pure resolve in the face of nothing**. That Heidegger's conception of care may likewise be construed as an impoverished version of the Platonic doctrine of eros is plainly evident by its purely formal structure, which renders it devoid of any capacity to rank-order objects of desire. (46) By way of contrast, Platonic eros moves hierarchically between the human and the divine (that is to say, between the base and the noble), whereas Heideggerian care moves horizontally, we should even say "horizonally," in the sense that "the ontological meaning of care is temporality," and "the existential-temporal condition of the possibility of the world lies in the fact that temporality, as an ecstatical unity [of future, past, and, present], has something like a horizon." (47) That horizon is circumscribed by Dasein's thrownness into the future, and Dasein's ownmost future is, of course, its death. Hence we read, "The primary phenomenon of primordial and authentic temporality is the future," and "The ecstatical character of the primordial future lies precisely in the fact that the future closes one's potentiality-for-being." (48) It is therefore through Dasein's resolute anticipation of its death that the meaning of being reveals itself as the "temporalizing of temporality." (49) But temporality reduced to itself is stripped of all love, beauty, and value. **It means simply the opening up of one's future possibilities, which is to say that the authentic meaning of being is without value, and being without value is meaningless, which is finally to say that the meaning of being terminates in nihilism.** (50) Heideggerian fundamental ontology does not therefore escape from Nietzschean chaos. Rather, it returns us to it, only without the noble illusion that life requires us to make it lovable. (51) **And this remains the case no matter whether we prefer the early language of "resoluteness" or Heidegger's later "turn" into Gelassenheit or "releasement."** For insofar as Heidegger's turn (Kehre) is meant to free the meaning of being from its attachment to any notion of active or passive willing, for example, of the kind indicated by the language of resolution, it releases us ever deeper into the nullity within which the world comes to presence. (52)

So much for the meaning of being. Despite his revolutionary proclamations, Heidegger holds us in a double bind. On the one hand, the history of metaphysics (and its completion in the era of modern technology) (53) grips us in a nihilistic forgetting of the question of being. On the other hand, fundamental ontology empties the meaning of being of value, and this too is nihilism. (54) What matters in the last analysis, however, is not whether Heidegger is a nihilist, but whether his teaching is the true teaching. And if, as Leo Strauss once said, our capacity to evaluate Heidegger's teaching comes down to a question of competence, our measure of competence depends on our capacity for valuation, or more accurately, for prudential judgment or a capacity to discern what makes it right. (55) Yet, on the basis of Heidegger's existential analysis, there can be no such ground of legitimation apart from the pure instance of resolution (Entschluss). And this is because fundamental ontology cannot tell us on the basis of its questioning into being why such questioning should be desirable, or why we should want to invoke a spiritual revolution that founds itself on the abstract question of being. **Instead, there must be some more primordial notion of the good that first directs us to the question of being**--as Nietzsche would say, to the question of being as a value. In saying this, however, I do hot wish to suggest that there must be some objective or quasi-objective standard of the good that is somehow "out there" waiting to be discovered, as if it were a vein of gold embedded in the rock. Yet it is plainly evident that a more primordial access to the good must underlie any capacity for rank-ordering values or existential possibilities, and it is precisely this feature of human experience that fundamental ontology abandons or occludes by abstracting the question of being from the so-called ontic or inauthentic dimension of ordinary experience.

Stated simply, **there is no reason why the question of being should be foundational for the future of philosophy**. Yet it must be said that Heidegger never relinquished his revolutionary aspirations for bringing metaphysics to its end. For as clearly as the text of 1927 stated the need to put the future of philosophy on "new foundations" (neue Fundamente), (56) Heidegger persisted up to and through 1959 in the hope that the turn to the question of being would promise a "new ground and foundation" (neuen Grand und Boden) upon which it might be possible to confront the epoch of metaphysical nihilism. (57) Of course, it may be entirely true that our releasement into the mystery of being grants us "the possibility of dwelling in the world in a totally different way." (58) **The question is why this should be at all desirable, especially if the thinking of being expires in nihilism.** And it is here that we find Heidegger without argument. As we read in a relevant passage from the "Letter on Humanism" of 1949:

Whether the realm of the truth of being is a blind alley or whether

it is the free space in which freedom conserves its essence is

something each one may judge after he himself has tried to go the

designated way, or even better, after he has gone a better way,

that is, a way befitting the question. (59)

I note in passing that we shall also have to judge whether the essence of freedom is itself a blind alley. But this just affirms my larger point. Heidegger returns us to the question of competence. But since fundamental ontology cannot stand the question of competence, we are left simply with a decision that leaves the future of philosophy hanging on the angst-ridden resolve that affirms itself in the face of death. (60) And this is Cartesianism all over again, in the sense that Heidegger's subordination of ethics to ontology--the decisive severing of the human relation to the good from the foundations of philosophy--amounts to the most radical late modern expression of the Cartesian legacy. **Rather than saving us from our fall into modern decadence, Heidegger's thought results finally in a deepening of the modern crisis.**

#### And, the alt collapses politics and causes global destruction

Biskowski 95 [Lawrence J. professor of political theory and political economy at the University of Georgia, “Politics versus Aesthetics: Arendt's Critiques of Nietzsche and Heidegger”, The Review of Politics, Vol. 57, No. 1, Winter 1995, pg 59-89]

Although Arendt considered Heidegger to be perhaps the most important philosopher of the twentieth century, she always objected to the political dangers and deformations inherent in this emphasis on the self. Heidegger's philosophy led him away from the common, public world and directed his gaze inward toward the self.67 But this could not help but distort his political judgment, which must take its bearings from the public world. Instead, as we have seen, Heidegger associates the public world with inauthentic existence, a pernicious form of socialization, and a falling away from true Being. In fact, Arendt says, he dismisses all those modes of human existence which rest on the fact that Man lives together in the world with his fellows. To put it historically, Heidegger's Self is an ideal which has been working mischief in German philosophy and literature since Romanticism. In Heidegger this arrogant passion to be a self has contradicted itself; for never before was it so clear as in his philosophy that this is probably the one being which Man cannot be.6

Without the world as a source of political and moral orientation, the self and its death become Heidegger's central concern: Only in the realization of death, which will take him away from the world, has Man the certainty of being himself...in other words, the essential character of Man's Being is determined by what he is not, his nothingness...Death may indeed be the end of human reality; at the same time it is the guarantee that nothing matters but myself. With the experience of death as nothingness I have the chance of devoting myself exclusively to being a Self, and once and for all freeing myself from the surrounding world.69 For Arendt, on the contrary, authentic existence is never isolated in this egoistic way but rather exists only in acknowledgment of and communication with others. It can develop only in the togetherness of human beings in the common, public world. The sort of fascination with the self advocated by Heidegger leaves one disconnected from the multiform, multiperspectival reality of the political world. Among its consequences are a failure to comprehend political events, poor judgment, and a peculiar form of political irresponsibility. Arendt first develops this theme in Rahel Varnhagen where the not altogether different Romantic cult of interiority is criticized. The turn inward toward the self made Rahel and the intellectuals and artists in her circle blind to political reality.70 Similarly, in The Origins of Totalitarianism, Arendt sees romantic self-fascination as contributing to the general conditions which made the twentieth century mass movements and their horrors possible.71 A resurgent romanticism in intellectual life may be symptomatic of a general playfulness of modern thought in which almost any opinion can gain ground temporarily. No real thing, no historical event, no political idea was safe from the all-embracing and all-destroying mania by which these first literati could always find new and original opportunities for new and fascinating opinions.72 This playfulness, which certainly has its advocates among today's literati, is one manifestation of the general condition of world-alienation which appears as a persistent theme in much of Arendt's work. Whatever the undoubted aesthetic, agonistic, or expressivist aspects or moments of action (which Arendt recognizes and emphasizes, particularly in contradistinction to instrumental rationality and those philosophies and worldviews which tend to reduce history and human life to a mere process), she makes clear that action and politics cannot be reduced to or even thought of merely in terms of aesthetic self-expression: "Human plurality, the faceless 'They' from which the individual Self splits to be itself alone is divided into a great many units, and it is only as a member of such a unit, that is, of a community, that men are ready for action."73 These communities and their institutions depend for continued existence upon acting men; their conservation is achieved by the same means that brought them into being...[U]tter dependence upon further acts to keep it in existence marks the state as a product of action.74 Finally, Arendt tells us, "the inspiring principle of action is love of freedom, and this both in the negative sense of freedom from oppression and in the positive sense of the establishment of Freedom as a stable, tangible reality."75 Precisely this is the task of politics. But Heidegger's turn inward and away from the political world has a pedigree that goes beyond romanticism. Arendt consistently maintained that even though Heidegger rivals Nietzsche as a critic of the philosophical tradition, he too shares its general regard for "the incomprehensible triviality" of the common, public world, the only escape from which is withdrawal "into that solitude which philosophers since Parmenides and Plato have opposed to the political realm."76 Indeed, Heidegger no less than Plato personified to Arendt what might be called the professional thinker, and succumbed to the characteristic temptations of the profession.77 Arendt makes clear that all thinking requires some measure of aloofness, seclusion, and distance from the world,78 but this characteristic is amplified and expanded in Heidegger's philosophy. In Dasein, thinking and being alive fold in on one another and become one.79 Authentic existence requires thinking, which in turn requires distance from "the they" and everyday life. Immersion in everyday life constitutes and requires withdrawal from true Being. For Heidegger, not unlike Plato, thinking requires one to leave the cave of worldly affairs. But as we have seen, Arendt suggests that such a departure may result in a loss of moral-practical orientation.80 And this constitutes in the end perhaps the best explanation of why Heidegger's awesome ability to think did not prevent him from evil-doing in the form of **his support for** the **Nazis**.81 Heidegger eventually turned away from the emphasis on self-assertion and Dasein's "ownmost" state of being found in Being and Time.8 As Arendt tells the story, Heidegger's intense study of Nietzsche led him to see even his own previous philosophy as having been motivated by a form of will to power.83 Still concerned that instrumental rationality, science, and technology degraded Dasein by reducing everything to presence-at-hand, he came to see his own philosophy as "enframed" in the very same refusal to let beings be at the heart of the Western technological worldview he so detested. The new alternative Heidegger formulated was a Zen-like attitude or disposition of serene, gliding aloofness-Gelassenheit-in which state thinkers would refrain from attempting to impose their own will on beings (whether through technology or even through arguing for "ownmost" or "most authentic" modes of being). Thus, like Nietzsche, Heidegger eventually repudiates the will, a capacity Arendt sees as necessary for action and freedom. But more significantly, Heidegger's turn or reversal leaves him as alienated from politics and the common, public world as before. From the point of view of Arendtian politics, Heidegger has merely exchanged one form of world-alienation (glorification of self-assertion and extrication from "the they") for another (a regarding of the world simply as an object of contemplation). Arendt shares with the early Heidegger the notion that to be in the world is to be a locus of understanding, possibility, and freedom in the midst of a surrounding texture of meaning and significance. For the early Heidegger, however, the world serves primarily as a medium for the aesthetic expression of the self. After his Kehre, the world became something primarily to be regarded with serene, disinterested, contemplative wonder. This marked a return to the origins of philosophy in thaumazein. But philosophy and politics **are not the same**; the latter requires active engagement with the world, at least if the world is to be a fit home for mortal beings endowed with the capacity for action and the possibility of freedom.

#### And, the alt fails – thought is too engrained

Riis 11—Carlsberg Research Fellow and Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Science Studies at Roskilde University, Ph.D. from Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Søren, 8 February 2011, “Towards the origin of modern technology: reconfiguring Martin Heidegger’s thinking,” RBatra)

\*\* Gestell (or sometimes Ge-stell) is a [German](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German_language) word used by twentieth century German [philosopher](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy) [Martin Heidegger](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Heidegger) to describe what lies behind or beneath modern [technology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Technology).[[1]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gestell#cite_note-0)

Moreover, Heidegger maintains: ‘‘Readiness-to-hand is the way in which entities as they are ‘in themselves’ are defined ontologico-categorially.’’47 According to Heidegger’s fundamental phenomenology, which he unfolds in detail in Being and Time and reaffirms a decisive part of in ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology,’’ nature is ‘‘primally’’ revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-;’’ that is to say, **‘‘nature’’ is a resource long before the actual rise of modern** and ancient **technology**, namely **simultaneously with the** very **origin of human beings**. That something is primordially revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-’’ does not imply that it is actually used or serves accordingly, but that it is revealed as standing ready to be utilized in the corresponding context. As such, it is revealed as ‘‘standing-reserve.’’ This, for example, also corresponds to the empirical fact that prehistoric humans settled close to woods and rivers. In these areas they always had stockpiles of timber, power for transportation, and easy access to drinking water. Based on ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and completed through references to Being and Time, we now have an interpretation of the origin of the essence of modern technology, which traces back the characteristic revealing of das Gestell to the beginning of humankind.48 This does not imply that prehistoric technology is identical with contemporary technology; rather the third genealogy of the rule of das Gestell suggests that when ‘‘we still more primally’’ try to consider the origin of the challenging revealing characterizing the rule of das Gestell, we in fact rediscover that it is connected to being human. The rule of das Gestell has challenged humans **as long as they have existed**. In this sense, humans **first and foremost exist under the rule of das Gestell**.49 This also entails a revision and precision of Heidegger’s renowned formula characterizing the world-connectedness of human existence: being-in-the-world. Based on the comparison of ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and Being and Time, human existence is better described as being-under-the-spell-of-das-Gestell. Trying to understand the various more-or-less explicit accounts of the origin of the rule of das Gestell in ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and the resulting ambiguity is not just an exercise, nor only a way to criticize Heidegger. Rather, it is a way to better understand the nuances and layers in Heidegger’s thinking concerning technology and to warn against a short-sighted ‘‘saving’’ from an alleged danger. If the challenging revealing of nature, which characterizes the rule of das Gestell is taken seriously, then we cannot avoid it just by revolutionizing our technology, instead, we must revise our very human existence.

That solves best – incorporation affirms unavoidable use, but denies domination

Dreyfus, 06 (Professor of Philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley (Hubert, "Nihilism, Art, Technology, and Politics", the Cambridge Companion to Heidegger)

Heidegger, however, sees that "it would be foolish to attack technology blindly. It would be shortsighted to condemn it as the work of the devil. We depend on technical devices; they even challenge us to ever greater advances."(DOT 53, G 24) Instead, Heidegger suggests that there is a way we can keep our technological devices and yet remain true to ourselves as receivers of clearings: **We can affirm the** unavoidable **use of technical devices, and** also **deny them the right to dominate us**, and so to warp, confuse, and lay waste our nature. (DOT 54, G 24-25) To understand how this might be possible, we need an illustration of Heidegger's important distinction between technology and the technological understanding of being. Again we can turn to Japan. In contemporary Japan traditional, nontechnological practices still exist alongside the most advanced high-tech production and consumption. The TV set and the household gods share the same shelf – the styrofoam cup co-exists with the porcelain tea cup. We thus see that the Japanese at least, can enjoy technology without taking over the technological understanding of being. For us to be able to make a similar dissociation, Heidegger holds, we must rethink the history of being in the West. Then we will see that although a technological understanding of being is our destiny, it is not our fate. That is, although our understanding of things and ourselves as resources to be ordered, enhanced, and used efficiently has been building up since Plato, we are not stuck with that understanding. Although the technological understanding of being governs the way things have to show up for us, we can hope for a transformation of our current cultural clearing. Only those who think of Heidegger as opposing technology will be surprised at his next point. Once we see that technology is our latest understanding of being, we will be grateful for it. This clearing is the cause of our distress, yet if it were not given to us to encounter things and ourselves as resources, nothing would show up as anything at all, and no possibilities for action would make sense. And **once we realize** -- in our practices, of course, not just as matter of reflection -- that we receive our technological understanding of being, **we have stepped out of** the **technological understanding** of being, for **we then** see that what is most important in our lives is not subject to efficient enhancement -- indeed, the drive to control everything is precisely what we do not control. This transformation in our sense of reality -- this overcoming of thinking in terms of values and calculation -- is precisely what Heideggerian thinking seeks to bring about. Heidegger seeks to make us see that our practices are needed as the place where an understanding of being can establish itself, so we can overcome our restricted modern clearing by acknowledging our essential receptivity to understandings of being.

#### Globalized technological thought is good. Rejecting technological thought also rejects technological innovation and dooms us to extinction. This also defends our ontology

**Heaberlin, 4** – nuclear engineer, led the Nuclear Safety and Technology Applications Product Line at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (Scott, A Case for Nuclear-Generated Electricity, p. 31-40)

Well, then let's not do that, huh? Well, no, not hardly, because without that use of fertilizers we couldn't produce the food to feed the population. We just couldn't do it. Here are some comparisons."

If you used no fertilizers or pesticides you could get 500 kilograms of grain from a hectare in a dry climate and as much as 1000 kilograms in a humid cli­mate. If you got organic and used animal manure as fertilizer, assuming you could find enough, you might get as much as 2000 kilograms per hectare. For a sense of scale, the average in the United States, where recall we only get half the food value to hectare as the intensively farmed Chinese crop land, we get about 4500 kilograms per hectare on the average. In serious cornfields with fertilizer, irrigation, and pesticides, the value is 7000 kilograms per hectare.

Modern mechanized, chemically supported agriculture produces 7 to 14 times the food that you would get without those advantages. Even the best organic farming would produce only 30 to 45% of the food value you would get from the same sized chemically fertilized farm, and that is assuming you could get the manure you needed to make it work.

In very stark terms, without the chemically enhanced farming we would have probably something like one-fifth the food supply we have now. That means four-fifths the population would not be fed, at least as we are organized now. So, no, just giving up on fertilizers is not in the deal.

However, we could get the hydrogen and energy from sources other than natural gas. Nuclear energy could be used to provide electricity to extract hydrogen from water and produce the process heat required to combine the hydrogen and nitrogen from the air. That is just a thought to stick in your mind. While we are looking at energy use in agriculture, here are a few more numbers for you.10 If you look at the energy input into agriculture and the energy you get out, you see some interesting facts. By combining the energy used to make fertilizers and pesticides, power irrigation, and run the farm machinery in the United States, we use about 0.7 kcal of fossil fuel energy for each 1 kcal of food we make. This doesn't include the energy needed to process and transport the food. In Europe where they farm more intensely, the amount of energy out is just about the same as energy in. In Germany and Italy the numbers are 1.4 and 1.7 kcal energy input to each 1 kcal output respectively. The point is you need energy to feed people, well at least a lot of people.

Which gets us back to Cohen and his question. One of the studies he examined looked at a "self-sustaining solar energy system." For the United States, this would replace all fossil energy and provide one-fifth to one-half the current energy use. The conclusion of the study was that this would either produce" a significant reduction in our standard of living ... even if all the energy conservation measures known today were adopted" or if set at the current standard of living, "then the ideal U.S. population should be targeted at 40-100 million people." The authors of that study then cheerfully go on to point out that we do have enough fossil fuel to last a least a century, as long as we can work out the pesky environmental problems. So, you can go to a "self-sustaining" energy economy as long as you are willing to shoot between 2 out of 3 and 6 out of 7 of your neighbors.

And this is a real question. The massive use of fossil fuel driven agriculture to provide the fertilizers and pesticides, and power the farm equipment, is a) vitally important to feed everyone, and b) something we just can't keep up in a business-as-usual fashion. Sustainable means you can keep doing it. Fossil energy supplies are finite; you will run out some time. Massive use of fossil energy and the greenhouse gases they produce also may very well tip the planet into one of those extinction events in which a lot of very bad things happen to a lot of the life on the earth.

O.K. to Cohen's big question, how many people can the earth support? What it comes down to is that the "Well, it depends" answer depends on

• what quality of life you will accept,

• what level of technology you will use, and

• what level of social integration you will accept.

We have seen some of the numbers regarding quality of life. Clearly if you are willing to accept the Bangladesh diet, you can feed 1.8 times more people than if you chose the United States diet.

If you choose the back-to-nature, live like our hearty forefathers, level of technology, you can feed perhaps one-fifth as many people as you can with modern chemical fertilized agriculture. The rest have to go.

And here is the tough one. You can do a lot better, get a lot more people on the planet, if you just force a few things. Like, no more land wasted in growing grapes for wine or grains for whiskey and beer. No cropland used for tobacco. No more grain wasted on animals for meat, just grain for people. No more rich diets for the rich countries, share equally for everyone. No more trade barriers; too bad for the farmers in Japan and France, those countries would just have to accept their dependence on other countries for their food. It is easy to see that at least some of those might actually be a pretty good thing; however, the kicker is how do you get them to happen? After all, Mussolinill did make the trains run on time. How could you force these things without a totalitarian state? Are you willing to give up your ability to choose for yourself for the common good? It is not pretty, is it?

Cohen looked at all the various population estimates and concluded that most fell into the range of 4 to 16 billion. Taking the highest value when researchers offered a range, Cohen calculated a high median of 12 billion and taking the lower part of the range a low median of 7.7 billion. The good news in this is 12 billion is twice as many people as we have now. The bad news is that the projections for world population for 2050 are between 7.8 and 12.5 billion. That means we have got no more than 50 years before we exceed the nominal carrying capacity of the earth. Cohen also offers a qualifying observation by stating the "First Law of Information," which asserts that 97.6% of all statistics are made up. This helps us appreciate that application of these numbers to real life is subject to a lot of assumptions and insufficiencies in our understanding of the processes and data.

However, we can draw some insights from all of this. What it comes down to is that if you choose the fully sustainable, non-fossil fuel long-term options with only limited social integration, the various estimates Cohen looked at give you a number like 1 billion or less people that the earth can support. That means 5 out of 6 of us have got to go, plus no new babies without an offsetting death.

On the other hand, if you let technology continue to do its thing and perhaps get even better, the picture need not be so bleak. We haven't made all our farmland as productive as it can be. Remember, the Chinese get twice the food value per hectare as we do in the United States. There is also a lot of land that would become arable if we could get water to it. And, of course, in case you need to go back and check the title of this book, there are alternatives to fossil fuels to provide the energy to power that technology.

So given a positive and perhaps optimistic view of technology, we can look to some of the high technology assumption based studies from Cohen's review. From the semi-credible set of these, we can find estimates from 19 to 157 billion as the number of people the earth could support with a rough average coming in about 60 billion. This is a good time to be reminded of the First Law of Information. The middle to lower end of this range, however, might be done without wholesale social reprogramming. Hopefully we would see the improvement in the quality of life in the developing countries as they industrialize and increase their use of energy. Hopefully, also this would lead to a matching of the reduction in fertility rates that has been observed in the developed countries, which in turn would lead to an eventual balancing of the human population.

The point to all this is the near-term future of the human race depends on technology. If we turn away from technology, a very large fraction of the current and future human race will starve. If we just keep on as we are, with our current level of technology and dependence on fossil fuel resources, in the near term it will be a race between fertility decrease and our ability to feed ourselves, with, frankly, disaster the slight odds-on bet. In a slightly longer term, dependence on fossil fuels has got to lead to either social chaos or environmental disaster. There are no other end points to that road. It doesn't go anywhere else.

However, if we accept that it is technology that makes us human, that technology uniquely identifies us as the only animal that can choose its future, we can choose to live, choose to make it a better world for everyone and all life. This means more and better technology. It means more efficient technology that is kinder to the planet but also allows humans to support large numbers in a high quality of life. That road is not easy and has a number of ways to screw up. However, it is a road that can lead to a happier place, a better place.

Two Concluding Thoughts on the Case for Technology

Two more points and I will end my defense of technology. First, I want to bring you back from all the historical tour and all the numbers about population to something more directly personal. Let me ask you two questions.

What do you do for a living?

What did you have for breakfast?

Don't see any connection between these questions or of their connection to·the subject of technology? Don't worry, the point will come out shortly. I am just trying to bring the idea of technology back from this grand vision to its impact on your daily life.

Just as a wild guess, your answer to the first question was something that, say 500 years ago, didn't even exist. If we look 20,000 years ago, the only job was" get food." Even if you have a really directly socially valuable job like a medical doctor, 20,000 years ago you would have been extraneous. That is, the tribe couldn't afford you. What, no way! A doctor could save lives, surely a tribe would value such a skill. Well, sure, but the tribe could not afford taking one of their members out of the productive */I* getting the food" job for 20 years while that individual learned all those doctor skills.

If you examine the "what you do for a living" just a bit I think you will see a grand interconnectedness of all things. I personally find it pretty remarkable that we have a society that values nuclear engineers enough that I can make a living at it. Think about it. Somehow what I have done has been of enough value that, through various taxpayer and utility ratepayers, society has given me enough money for food and shelter. The tribe 20,000 years ago wouldn't have put up with me for a day.

You see, that is why we as humans are successful, wildly successful in fact. We work together. "Yeah, sure we do," you reply, " read a newspaper lately?" Well, *O.K.,* we fuss and fight a good deal and some of us do some pretty stupid and pretty mean things. But the degree of cooperation is amazing if you just step back a bit.

O.K., what did you have for breakfast: orange juice, coffee, toast, maybe some cereal and milk? Where do these things come from? Orange juice came from Florida or California. Coffee came from South America. Bread for the toast came perhaps from Kansas; cereal, from the Mid-West somewhere. The jam on the toast may have come from Oregon, or maybe Chile. Milk is probably the only thing that came from within a hundred miles of your breakfast table. Think about it. There were hundreds of people involved in your breakfast. Farmers, food-processing workers, packaging manufacturers, transportation people, energy producers, wholesale and retail people. Perhaps each one only spent a second on their personal contribution to your personal breakfast, but they touch thousands of other people's breakfasts as well. In turn, you buying the various components of your breakfast supported, in your part, all those people. They in turn, in some way or another, bought whatever you provide to society that allowed you to buy breakfast. Pretty amazing, don't you think?

Now when you look at all that, think about what ties all the planetwide interconnection, Yep, you guessed it: technology. Without technology, you get what is available within your personal reach, and what you produce is available only to those who are near enough that you can personally carry it to them on your own two feet. Technology makes our world work. It gives you personally a productive and socially valuable way to make both a living and to provide your contribution to the rest of us**.**

I want you to stop a minute and really think about that. What would your life be like without technology? Could you do what you currently do? Would anyone be able to use what you do? Would anyone pay you for that? "But I am a school teacher," you say, "of course, they would pay me!" Are you sure? Why do you need schools if there is no technology? All I need is to teach the kid how to farm and how to hunt. Sons and daughters can learn that by working in the fields along with their parents. See what I mean?

Now, I have hopefully reset your brain. Sure, you are still going to be hit with daily "technology is bad" messages. Hopefully, you are a bit more shielded against that din, and you have been given some perspective to balance that message and are prepared to see the true critical value of technology to human existence. The point is that technology is what makes us human. Without it, we are just slightly smarter monkeys.

You may feel that 6 billion of us are too many, and that may very well be. I personally don't know how to make that value decision. Which particular person does one select as being one of the excess ones?

However, the fact is that there are 6 billion of us, and it looks like we are headed for 10 to 12 billion in the next 50 years, Without not only the technology we have, but significantly better and more environmentally friendly technology, the world is going to get ugly as we approach these numbers,

On the other hand, with the right technologies we can not only support those numbers, we can do it while we close the gap between the haves and have-nots. We can make it a better place for everyone. It takes technology and the energy to drive it. Choosing technology is what we have to do to secure the evolutionary selection of us as a successful species, Remember, some pages back in discussing the unlikely evolutionary path to us, I said we are not the chosen, unless. Unless we choose us. This is what I meant. We are totally unique in all of evolutionary history. We humans have the unique ability and opportunity to choose either our evolutionary success or failure. A choice of technology gives us a chance. A choice rejecting technology dooms us as a species and gives the cockroaches the chance in our place. Nature doesn't care what survives, algae seas, dinosaurs, humans, cockroaches, or whatever is successful. If we care, we have to choose correctly.

As an aside, let me address a point of philosophy here. If any of this offends your personal theology, I offer this for your consideration. Genesis tells us God gave all the Earth to humanity and charged us with the stewardship thereof. So it is ours to use as well as we can. That insightful social philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli put it this way in 1501:

"What remains to be done must be done by you; since in order not to deprive us of our free will and such share of glory as belongs to us, God will not do everything Himself."

*O.K.,* you are saying, "I give." You have beaten the socks off me. Technology is good; technology is the identifying human trait and our only hope. But what is this stuff about choosing technology or not? Technology just happens doesn't it? I mean, technology always advances, it always has, so why the big deal?

Well, that is my last point on technology. It doesn't always just happen, and people have chosen to turn away from technology. In what might have seemed at the time to be a practical social decision, huge future implications were imposed on many generations to come. It has happened. Let me take you on one more trip through history. I think you will find it enlightening. In *Guns, Germs, and Steel,* Jared Diamond explores the question of why the European societies came to be dominate over all the other human cultures on earth. It is a fascinating story and provides a lot of insight into how modern societies evolved. In moving through history, he comes across a very odd discontinuity. He observes that if you came to earth from space in the year 1400 A.D., looked around, and went home to write your research paper on the probable future of the earth, you would clearly conclude the Chinese would run the entire planet shortly. Furthermore, you could conclude they would do it pretty darn well. If those same extraterrestrial researchers were to pop into their time machine and come back to earth in any year from say 1800 to now, they would be totally amazed to see China as a large, but relatively backward, country, struggling to catch up with their European and American peers.

To understand the significance of this, you have to go on that research trip with the extraterrestrials and look at China before 1400. In *The Lever af Riches,* Joel Mokyr dedicates one chapter looking at the comparisons of technology development in China to that in Europe. He lists the following as technology advantages China had in the centuries before 1400:

• Extensive water control projects, alternately draining and irrigating

land, significantly boosting agricultural production

• Sophisticated iron plow introduced sixth century B.C.

• Seed drills and other farm tools, introduced around 1000 *A.D.*

• Chemical and organic fertilizers and pesticides used

• Blast furnaces and casting of iron as early as 200 B.C., not known in Europe until fourteenth century

• Advanced use of power sources in textile production, not seen in Europe until the Industrial Revolution

• Invention of compass around 960 A.D.

• Major advances in maritime technology (more in a bit on this)

• Invention of paper around 100 A.D. (application as toilet paper by *590 A.D.).*

In the year 1400 AD., China was a world power, perhaps the only true world power. Their technology in agriculture, textiles, metallurgy, and maritime transportation were far in advance of any other country. They had a strong central government and a very healthy economy.

Their naval strength provides a real insight into the degree of this dominance. Dr. Diamond sends us to an extremely readable book *When China Ruled the Seas-The Treasure Fleet of the Dragon Throne 1405-1433* by Dr. Louise Levathes. Dr. Levathes takes us on an inside tour of the Chinese empire during these years. She focuses on the great treasure fleets that China set forth in these early years of the fifteenth century. In her book she has a wonderful graphic that overlays a Chinese vessel of the treasure fleet (-1410) with Columbus's *St. Maria* (1492). At 85 feet in length and three masts, the *St. Maria* is dwarfed by the nine-masted, 400-foot-long Chinese vessel.

The Chinese sailed fleets of these magnificent vessels throughout oceans of South Asia, to India, and even as far as the eastern coast of Africa. With this naval domination China claimed tribute from Japan, Korea, the nations of the Malay Archipelago, and various states within what is now India. Through both trade and the occasional application of military force, China provided an enlightened and progressive direction for all the nations within this sphere of influence. If two princes in India were fighting over a throne, it was the recognition, or lack thereof, from the Chinese emperor that decided who would rule. Setting a policy of religious inclusion and tolerance, the Chinese engaged the Arabian traders and calmed religious disputes within Asia.

With applications of power sources in textiles and advanced metallurgy, the Chinese were in the same position in 1400 as the British were in 1750, ready to launch into the Industrial Revolution. They traded with nations thousands of miles from home with vast, sophisticated shipping fleets. They were poised to extend this trade all the way to Europe and perhaps find the New World by going east instead of the European's going west in search of the rich Chinese markets.

But if we pop into that extraterrestrial time machine and drop into China in 1800, we find a technologically backward nation, humbled by a relatively small force of Europeans with "modern" military technology who wantonly imposed their will on the Chinese. The Chinese have been struggling to catch up with European and American technology ever since and so far not quite being able to do that. The domination of China by the Japanese during World War II shows how complete the turnaround was. In 1400 Japan was but one of many vassal states huddled about the feet of the Imperial Chinese throne. In 1940 the Japanese military crushed the Chinese government while marching on to control much of South Asia.

What could have happened to turn this clear champion of technology, trade, enlightened leadership with all its advantages over both its neighbors and yet-distant foreign competitors into such a weak, backward giant?

Mokyr goes through a pretty complete list of potential causes. He looks at diet, climate, and inherent philosophical mindset rejecting each as a credible actor mainly on the bases that all of these conditions were present during the period of technological and economic growth as well as the subsequent stagnation. Therefore, these were not determining factors in the turnabout. In the end he concludes, as does Diamond and Levathes, that it was just politics.

Yep, that is right. It was good, old human politics. Dr. Levathes gives us a delightful insider's view of the personalities and politics of Imperial progressions during this critical time period. To make a short story of it, the party that had been in control during the expansionist period supported the great treasure fleets, commerce with foreign nations, use and expansion of technology, and a rather harsh control of the rival party. The rival party was based on Confucian philosophy that preached a rigid, inward-looking, controlled existence.

When the Confucian party gained control of the throne, they had their opportunity to push back on the prior ruling party that had oppressed them so harshly for so long. And they did. They wanted nothing to do with foreigners; we have all we need at home, here in China, they said. The fleet was disbanded and the making of ocean-going vessels forbidden. Technology was no longer "encouraged." Again, their position was what we have is good enough, stop with all this new nonsense. Over a period of just a few years, the course of the entire nation was shifted from what would have appeared to be a bright future as the leading power in the world to a large, but relatively insignificant, backwater, rich in history and culture, but all backward looking to a former glory.

That was it. A shift in the political agenda. At the time, to the leaders in control, one that made sense. Focus at home, use what you have now, create order, discipline, control. In 50 years Japanese pirates controlled the coast of China, and the former ruler of the seas from Asia to Africa could not get out of their harbors safely.

So, you see **if the "technology is bad" message gets incorporated into too many of our daily decisions,** we can turn from our bright future into something else. The difference is that this time the stakes are much higher than they were in fifteenth century China. If we, in the developed nations, make the wrong choices, we doom all of humanity by our folly. It is not just that we miss the potential bright future, we miss the chance to avoid the combined human population growth and resources exhaustion disaster coming at us like a runaway train. Technology is the only way to prevent that train wreck. We can hear the siren's call of anti-technology, come back to nature and let the train run us down in a bloody mess, or we can try our best to use technology wisely and win free to make a better life for everyone.

### 2ac states

#### Doesn’t solve the case – restrictions are codified in federal law – prevents the **requisite licensing**, means the cp fails to cause commercialization – that’s 1ac Martin AND

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

In the United States, it is the responsibility of industry to design, construct, and operate commercial nuclear power plants. However, DOE has statutory authority under the Atomic Energy Act **to promote** and support **nuclear** energy **technologies** **for commercial applications**. In general, appropriate government roles include researching high-potential technologies beyond the investment horizon of industry **and** also **reducing the technical risks** of new technologies. In the case of new commercial reactor designs, potential areas of NE involvement could include: Enabling new technologies to be inserted into emerging and future designs by providing access to unique laboratory resources for new technology development and, where appropriate, demonstration. • Working through the laboratories and universities to provide unique expertise and facilities to industry for R&D in the areas of: o Innovative concepts and advanced technologies. o Fundamental phenomena and performance data. o Advanced modeling and simulation capabilities. APRIL 2010 22 34 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP o New technology testing and, if appropriate, demonstration. o Advanced manufacturing methods. Representative R&D activities that support each of the roles stated above are presented below. The level of DOE investment relative to industry investment will vary across the spectrum of these activities, with a generally increasing trend in DOE investment for longer-term activities. Finally, there is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaborations with other nations through multilateral and bilateral agreements including the Generation IV International Forum, which is investigating multiple advanced reactor concepts. DOE is also a participant in OECD/NEA and IAEA initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems.

only federal action solves nuclear cred

Fertel, 05 - Senior Vice President And Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute (Marvin, CQ Congressional Testimony, “NUCLEAR POWER'S PLACE IN A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY,” 4/28, lexis) //DH

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation **of** the federal government's **nuclear** energy **programs, and to maintain America's** **leadership in nuclear technology** development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation. Such efforts have provided a dramatic contribution to global security, as evidenced by the U.S.-Russian nonproliferation agreement to recycle weapons-grade material from Russia for use in American reactors. Currently, more than 50 percent of U.S. nuclear power plant fuel depends on converted Russian warhead material. Nowhere is continued congressional oversight more important than with DOE's program to manage the used nuclear fuel from our nuclear power plants. Continued progress toward a federal used nuclear fuel repository is necessary to support nuclear energy's vital role in a comprehensive national energy policy and to support the remediation of DOE defense sites. Since enactment of the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, DOE's federal repository program has repeatedly overcome challenges, and challenges remain before the Yucca Mountain facility can begin operation. But as we address these issues, it is important to keep the overall progress of the program in context. There is international scientific consensus that a deep geologic repository is the best solution for long-term disposition of used military and commercial nuclear power plant fuel and high-level radioactive byproducts. The Bush administration and Congress, with bipartisan support, affirmed the suitability of Yucca Mountain for a repository in 2002. Over the past three years, the Energy Department and its contractors have made considerable progress providing yet greater confirmation that this is the correct course of action and that Yucca Mountain is an appropriate site for a national repository. --During the past year, federal courts have rejected significant legal challenges by the state of Nevada and others to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the 2002 Yucca Mountain site suitability determination. These challenges questioned the constitutionality of the Yucca Mountain Development Act and DOE's repository system, which incorporates both natural and engineered barriers to contain radioactive material safely. In the coming year, Congress will play an essential role in keeping this program on schedule, by taking the steps necessary to provide increased funding for the project in fiscal 2006 and in future years. Meeting DOE's schedule for initial repository operation requires certainty in funding for the program. This is particularly critical in view of projected annual expenditures that will exceed $1 billion beginning in fiscal 2007. Meeting these budget requirements calls for a change in how Congress provides funds to the project from monies collected for the Nuclear Waste Fund. The history of Yucca Mountain funding is evidence that the current funding approach must be modified. Consumer fees (including interest) committed to the Nuclear Waste Fund since its f6rmation in 1983 total more than $24 billion. Consumers are projected to pay between $750 million to $800 million to the fund each year, based on electricity generated at the nation's 103 reactors. This is more than $2 million per day. Although about $8 billion has been used for the program, the balance in the fund is nearly $17 billion. In each of the past several years, there has been a gap between the annual fees paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants and disbursements from the fund for use by DOE at Yucca Mountain. Since the fund was first established, billions of dollars paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants to the Nuclear Waste Fund-intended solely for the federal government's used fuel program-in effect have been used to decrease budget deficits or increase surpluses. The industry believes that Congress should change the funding mechanism for Yucca Mountain so that payments to the Nuclear Waste Fund can be used only for the project and be excluded from traditional congressional budget caps. Although the program should remain subject to congressional oversight, Yucca Mountain appropriations should not compete each year for funding with unrelated programs when Congress directed a dedicated funding stream for the project. The industry also believes that it is appropriate and necessary to consider an alternative perspective on the Yucca Mountain project. This alternative would include an extended period for monitoring operation of the repository for up to 300 years after spent fuel is first placed underground. The industry believes that this approach would provide ongoing assurance and greater confidence that the repository is performing as designed, that public safety is assured, and that the environment is protected. It would also permit DOE to apply evolving innovative technologies at the repository. Through this approach, a scientific monitoring program would identify additional scientific information that can be used in repository performance models. The project then could update the models, and make modifications in design and operations as appropriate. Congressional committees like this one can help ensure that DOE does not lose sight of its responsibility for used nuclear fuel management and disposal, as stated by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. The industry fully supports the fundamental need for a repository so that used nuclear fuel and the byproducts of the nation's nuclear weapons program are securely managed in an underground, specially designed facility. World-class science has demonstrated that Yucca Mountain is the best site for that facility. A public works project of this magnitude will inevitably face challenges. Yet, none is insurmountable. DOE and its contractors have made significant progress on the project and will continue to do so as the project enters the licensing phase. Congressional oversight also can play a key role in maintaining and encouraging the stability of the NRC's regulatory process. Such stability is essential for our 103 operating nuclear plants and equally critical in licensing new nuclear power plants. Congress played a key role several years ago in encouraging the NRC to move toward a new oversight process for the nation's nuclear plants, based on quantitative performance indicators and safety significance. Today's reactor oversight process is designed to focus industry and NRC resources on equipment, components and operational issues that have the greatest importance to, and impact on, safety. The NRC and the industry have worked hard to identify and implement realistic security requirements at nuclear power plants. In the three-and-a-half years since 9/11, the NRC has issued a series of requirements to increase security and enhance training for security programs. The industry complied-fully and rapidly. In the days and months following Sept. 11, quick action was required. Orders that implemented needed changes quickly were necessary. Now, we should return to the orderly process of regulating through regulations. The industry has spent more than $1 billion enhancing security since September 2001. We've identified and fixed vulnerabilities. Today, the industry is at the practical limit of what private industry can do to secure our facilities against the terrorist threat. NRC Chairman Nils Diaz and other commissioners have said that the industry has achieved just about everything that can be reasonably achieved by a civilian force. The industry now needs a transition period to stabilize the new security requirements. We need time to incorporate these dramatic changes into our operations and emergency planning programs and to train our employees to the high standards of our industry-and to the appropriately high expectations of the NRC. Both industry and the NRC need congressional oversight to support and encourage this kind of stability. CONCLUSION Electricity generated by America's nuclear power plants over the past half-century has played a key part in our nation's growth and prosperity. Nuclear power produces over 20 percent of the electricity used in the United States today without producing air pollution. As our energy demands continue to grow in years to come, nuclear power should play an even greater role in meeting our energy and environmental needs. The nuclear energy industry is operating its reactors safely and efficiently. The industry is striving to produce more electricity from existing plants. The industry is also developing more efficient, next-generation reactors and exploring ways to build them more cost-effectively. The public sector, including the oversight committees of the U.S. Congress, can help maintain the conditions that ensure Americans will continue to reap the benefits of our operating plants, and create the conditions that will spur investment in America's energy infrastructure, including new nuclear power plants. One important step is passage of comprehensive energy legislation that recognizes nuclear energy's contributions to meeting our growing energy demands, ensuring our nation's energy security and protecting our environment. Equally important, however, is the need to ensure effective and efficient implementation of existing laws, like the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and to provide federal agencies with the resources and oversight necessary to discharge their statutory responsibilities in the most efficient way possible. The commercial nuclear power sector was born in the United States, and nations around the world continue to look to this nation for leadership in this technology and in the issues associated with nuclear power. Our ability to influence critical international policies in areas like nuclear nonproliferation, for example, depends on our ability to maintain a leadership role in prudent deployment, use and regulation of nuclear energy technologies here at home, in the United States, and on our ability to manage the technological and policy challenges-like waste management-that arise with all advanced technologies.

#### And, policy through the DOE is essential to create effective international norms and spur tech development

MIT, 10 [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

A goal-driven, science-based approach is essential to achieving the stated objectives while exploring new technologies and seeking transformational advances. This science-based approach, depicted in Figure 1, combines theory, experimentation, and high-performance modeling and simulation to develop the fundamental understanding that will lead to new technologies. Advanced modeling and simulation tools will be used in conjunction with smaller-scale, phenomenon-specific experiments informed by theory to reduce the need for large, expensive integrated experiments. Insights gained by advanced modeling and simulation can lead to new theoretical understanding and, in turn, can improve models and experimental design. This R&D must be informed by the basic research capabilities in the DOE Office of Science (SC). NE maintains access to a broad range of facilities to support its research activities. Hot cells and test reactors are at the top of the hierarchy, followed by smaller-scale radiological facilities, specialty engineering facilities, and small non-radiological laboratories. NE employs a multi-pronged approach to having these capabilities available when needed. The core capabilities rely on DOE-owned irradiation, examination, chemical processing and waste form development facilities. These are supplemented by university capabilities ranging from research reactors to materials science laboratories. In the course of conducting this science-based R&D, viii APRIL 2010 10 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP infrastructure needs will be evaluated and considered through the established planning and budget development processes. There is potential to leverage and amplify effective U.S. R&D through collaboration with other nations via multilateral and bilateral agreements, including the Generation IV International Forum. DOE is also a participant in Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development/Nuclear Energy Agency (OECD/NEA) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems. In addition to these R&D activities, international interaction supported by NE and other government agencies will be essential in establishment of international norms and control regimes to address and mitigate proliferation concerns.

#### Only federal action solves worker shortages

**Kammen, 03** - professor of nuclear engineering at Berkeley (Daniel, Federal News Service, Prepared Testimony before the House Committee on Science, 6/12, lexis) //DH

The federal government plays the pivotal role in the encouragement of innovation in the energy sector. Not only are federal funds critical, but as my work and that of others has demonstrated6, private funds generally follow areas of public sector support. One particularly useful metric although certainly not the only measure --. of the relationship between funding and innovation is based on patents. Total public sector funding and the number of patents - across all disciplines in the United States have both increased steadily over at least the past three decades (Figure 5). The situation depicted here, with steadily increasing trends for funding and results (measured imperfectly, but consistently, by patents) is not as rosy when energy R&D alone is considered. In that case the same close correlation exists, but the funding pattern has been one of decreasing resources (Figure 6A). Figure 6A shows energy funding levels (symbol: o) and patents held by the national laboratories (symbol: ). The situation need not be as bleak as it seems. During the 1980s a number of changes in U.S. patent law permitted the national laboratories to engage in patent partnerships with the private sector. This increased both the interest in developing patents, and increased the interest by the private sector in pursuing patents on energy technologies. The squares (l) in figure 6 show that overall patents in the energy sector derived. Figure 6B reveals that patent levels in the nuclear field have declined, but not only that, publicprivate partnerships have taken placed (shaded bars), but have not increased as dramatically as in energy field overall (Figure 6A). There are a number of issues here, so a simple comparison of nuclear R&D to that on for example, fuel cells, is not appropriate. But it is a valid to explore ways to increase both the diversity of the R&D. This is a particularly important message for **federal** policy. Novel approaches are needed to encourage new and innovative modes of research, teaching, and industrial innovation in the nuclear energy field. To spur innovation in nuclear science a concerted effort would be needed to increase the types and levels of cooperation by universities and industries in areas that depart significantly from the current 'Generation III+' and equally, away from the 'Generation IV' designs. Similar conclusions were reached by M. Granger Morgan, head of the Engineering and Public Policy Program at Carnegie Mellon University, in his evaluation of the need for innovative in the organization and sociology of the U. S. nuclear power industrys. A second important issue that this Committee might consider is the degree of **federal** support for nuclear fission relative to other nations. Funding levels in the U.S. are significantly lower than in both Japan and France. Far from recommending higher public sector funding, what is arguably a more successful strategy would be to increase the private sector support for nuclear R&D and student training fellowships. Importantly, this is precisely the sort of expanded publicprivate partnership that has been relatively successful in the energy sector generally. It is incorrect, however, to think that this is a process that can be left to the private sector. There are key issues that inhibit private sector innovation. As one example, many nuclear operating companies have large coal assets, and thus are unlikely to push overly hard, in areas that threaten another core business. This emphasis on industry resources used to support and expanded nuclear program - under careful public sector management - has been echoed by a variety of nuclear engineering faculty members: I believe that if you. were to survey nuclear engineering department heads, most would select a national policy to support new nuclear construction, over a policy to increase direct financial support to nuclear engineering departments. A firm commitment by the federal government, to create incentives sufficient to ensure the construction of a modest number of new nuclear plants, with the incentives reduced for subsequent plants, would be the best thing that could possibly be done for nuclear engineering education and revitalization of the national workforce for nuclear science and technology. - Professor Per Peterson, Chair, Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

#### The impact is the case

**BENGELSDORF, 07** – consultant and former director of both key State and Energy Department offices that are concerned with international nuclear and nonproliferation affair (HAROLD, “THE U.S. DOMESTIC CIVIL NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE AND U.S. NONPROLIFERATION POLICY”, White Paper prepared for the American Council on Global Nuclear Competitiveness May, <http://www.nuclearcompetitiveness.org/images/COUNCIL_WHITE_PAPER_Final.pdf)//DH>

Thus the challenge the U.S. nuclear industry faces today is whether the U.S. civil nuclear infrastructure will be strong enough to support a hoped for nuclear revival in this country, which could entail the construction and commissioning of up to eight nuclear power units during the 2010 to 2017 period. Several studies have been devoted to this question, and the answer is by no means certain. The shortage in skilled labor is expected to double in this country by the year 2020 and the workforce will stop growing as the baby boomers start to retire.

#### The plan solves resource wars

Hargraves, 12 [July, Robert, Robert Hargraves has written articles and made presentations about the liquid fluoride thorium reactor and energy cheaper than from coal – the only realistic way to dissuade nations from burning fossil fuels. His presentation “Aim High” about the technology and social benefits of the liquid fluoride thorium reactor has been presented to audiences at Dartmouth ILEAD, Thayer School of Engineering, Brown University, Columbia Earth Institute, Williams College, Royal Institution, the Thorium Energy Alliance, the International Thorium Energy Association, Google, the American Nuclear Society, and the Presidents Blue Ribbon Commission of America’s Nuclear Future. With coauthor Ralph Moir he has written articles for the American Physical Society Forum on Physics and Society: Liquid Fuel Nuclear Reactors (Jan 2011) and American Scientist: Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors (July 2010). Robert Hargraves is a study leader for energy policy at Dartmouth ILEAD. He was chief information officer at Boston Scientific Corporation and previously a senior consultant with Arthur D. Little. He founded a computer software firm, DTSS Incorporated while at Dartmouth College where he was assistant professor of mathematics and associate director of the computation center. He graduated from Brown University (PhD Physics 1967) and Dartmouth College (AB Mathematics and Physics 1961). THORIUM: energy cheaper than coal, ISBN: 1478161299, purchased online at Amazon.com]

Increasing population stresses natural resources. The world population is growing to an estimated 9 billion people, all competing for diminishing natural resources - fresh water, oil, agricultural land, and food. The largest population growth is in the most impoverished countries, where people die young from starvation, disease, and war; and bear more children. Yet affordable, reliable electricity is a key to economic prosperity in the developing nations, which suffer from energy poverty. Basic electric power allows modest economic prosperity, with time for women to learn, work, become independent, and make reproductive choices, leading to a sustainable population. Cheap oil is ending. World economies depend on oil for transportation fuels. As conventional petroleum resources dwindle, supplies are being extended by drilling deeper, in more hostile environments, refining heavy crude, and mining tar sands, at ever higher costs and ever higher CO2 emissions. Yet powering small vehicles with electricity from nuclear power plants will reduce oil dependency. And high temperature heat from advanced nuclear reactors can synthesize substitute liquid fuels. Air pollution kills millions. Soot from burning coal causes respiratory illness and annually kills tens of thousands of people in the US, hundreds of thousands in China, and a million worldwide. Yet nuclear electric power plants emit no soot. Energy insecurity leads to conflict. Nations lack energy security for stability and peace. Japan depends on imported liquefied natural gas for energy; the US on petroleum; France on uranium. Supply disruptions can wreck national economies. Yet domestic thorium energy resources are sufficient for every nation to attain energy security.

#### Goes nuclear

**Wooldridge 9** – political writer and former lecturer at Cornell University (Frosty, “Humanity galloping toward its greatest crisis in the 21st century”

http://www.australia.to/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=10042:humanity-galloping-toward-its-greatest-crisis-in-the-21st-century&catid=125:frosty-wooldridge&Itemid=244)

It is clear that most politicians and most citizens do not recognize that returning to “more of the same” is a recipe for promoting the first collapse of a global civilization. The required changes in energy technology, which would benefit not only the environment but also national security, public health, and the economy, would demand a World War II type mobilization -- and even that might not prevent a global climate disaster. Without transitioning away from use of fossil fuels, humanity will move further into an era of resource wars (remember, Africom has been added to the Pentagon’s structure -- and China has noticed), clearly with intent to protect US “interests” in petroleum reserves. The consequences of more resource wars, many likely triggered over water supplies stressed by climate disruption, are likely to include increased unrest in poor nations, a proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, widening inequity within and between nations, and in the worst (and not unlikely) case, a nuclear war ending civilization.

### 2ac Obama good – (1)

**No impact to a strike – doesn’t escalate**

**Poor 2/16**—quoting Charles Krauthammer (Jeff, 2/16/12, <http://dailycaller.com/2012/02/16/krauthammer-israeli-strike-on-iran-will-not-cause-a-world-war-video/>, RBatra)

On Wednesday’s “Special Report Online” segment on FoxNews.com, syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer said that if Israel decides to attack Iran in order to thwart its development of nuclear weapons, the collateral damage wouldn’t start a third world war.

Krauthammer based that hypothesis on Iran not having allies that would be willing to intervene significantly on a military level. (RELATED: More analysis from Charles Krauthammer)

“It could cause a regional war,” Krauthammer said. “It will not cause a world war by any means. It’s not August 1914, because Iran has no great power allies who will intervene militarily. Iran is going to be alone with its clients, Syria, Hezbollah and Hamas — all of whom are on their heels right now.”

He said it would require Iran acting out in an irrational way and luring the United States into engagement for any conflict to become more widespread.

“If Iran is smart, it will not attack the United States in retaliation because that would involve us,” he said. “It would retaliate against Israel and it could remain a limited engagement. Now of course, irrationality is possible and you cannot predict. **If the Iranians either close the Strait of Hormuz or attack Americans at the naval facility in Bahrain, that would be suicide because that would occasion American intervention**, almost like Wilson in the First World War in the sinking of the Lusitania. You don’t do that if you’re rational, but who knows. The Iranians haven’t always been rational.”

#### Romney and Obama would both support a strike

Sheldon Richman 8- 6-2012 Obama, Sheldon Richman is editor of The Freeman, published by The Foundation for Economic Education in Irvington, New York, and serves as senior fellow at The Future of Freedom Foundation. Romney Are Reckless on Iran http://www.fff.org/comment/com1208d.asp

You will strain your eyes looking for a significant difference between President Obama’s and Mitt Romney’s positions on Iran and the prospects of an Israeli attack on the Islamic republic. Both say “all options are on the table.” All. That includes a full-scale military attack with even nuclear weapons. This isn’t alarmism. Iran’s facilities are undoubtedly well protected. No light force would be capable of taking them out. The Romney campaign created a stir recently when a key foreign-policy adviser, Dan Senor, seemed to up the ante by saying, “If Israel has to take action on its own, in order to stop Iran from developing that [nuclear weapons] capability, the governor would respect that decision.” The remark apparently went too far, because Romney had to clarify his position. “I respect the right of Israel to defend itself,” he told CBS. But “because I’m on foreign soil, I don’t want to be creating new foreign policy for my country or in any way to distance myself from the foreign policy of our nation.” This indicates that Senor said nothing that Romney wishes to disavow. Senor just said it in the wrong place — on foreign soil. Americans have this foolish rule that “politics stops at the water’s edge.” But as the classical-liberal critic of foreign intervention Felix Morley once said, politics stops at the water’s edge only when policy stops at the water’s edge — which, for the American empire, it does not.

#### No difference between Obama and Romney

Friedman 9/14—associate editor at Foreign Policy, former reporter for CSM (Uri, 9/14/12, Where's Romney's contrast with Obama on Iran?, <http://blog.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/09/14/wheres_romneys_contrast_with_obama_on_iran>, RBatra)

But, crucially, Romney **hasn't gone as far** as his surrogates have in drawing a red line at nuclear capability. Romney advisor Dan Senor, for example, previewed the candidate's Jerusalem remarks by saying "it is not enough just to stop Iran from developing a nuclear program" since "the capability, even if that capability is short of weaponization, is a pathway to weaponization." In an interview with the New York Times this week, advisor Eliot Cohen said Romney "would not be content with an Iran one screwdriver's turn away from a nuclear weapon" but did not specify the point at which the development of Iran's nuclear capability -- a highly technical process that may already be quite far along depending on how you define the slippery term -- would be unacceptable.

The ABC interview didn't offer many other insights **into how Romney's Iran policy would differ from Obama's.** Romney advocated for "crippling sanctions" -- a track the Obama administration has pursued aggressively. He said "Iran as a nuclear nation is unacceptable to the United States of America" -- echoing Obama's assertion that "when the United States says it is unacceptable for Iran to have a nuclear weapon, we mean what we say." He explained that the United States must make clear that it will "take any action necessary to prevent ... Iran becoming nuclear"; Obama has said that "when it comes to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, I will take no options off the table."

#### Nuclear power doesn’t swing the election -- identical positions mean it won’t get drawn into the debate.

**Wood, 9-13-12**

[Elisa, AOL, “What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy,” http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/]

Fossil fuels and renewable energy have become touchy topics in this election, with challenger Mitt Romney painting President Barack Obama as too hard on the first and too fanciful about the second – and Obama saying Romney is out of touch with energy's future. But two other significant resources, nuclear power and energy efficiency, are evoking scant debate. What gives? Nuclear energy supplies about 20 percent of US electricity, and just 18 months ago dominated the news because of Japan's Fukushima Daiichi disaster – yet neither candidate has said much about it so far on the campaign trail. Romney mentioned nuclear power only seven times in his recently released white paper, while he brought up oil 150 times. Even wind power did better with 10 mentions. He pushes for less regulatory obstruction of new nuclear plants, but says the same about other forms of energy. Obama's campaign website highlights the grants made by his administration to 70 universities for research into nuclear reactor design and safety. But while it is easy to find his ideas on wind, solar, coal, natural gas and oil, it takes a few more clicks to get to nuclear energy. The Nuclear Energy Institute declined to discuss the candidates' positions pre-election. However, NEI's summer newsletter said that both "Obama and Romney support the use of nuclear energy and the development of new reactors."

#### Energy not key to the election

Mike Shedlock, 7-31-2012; registered investment advisor representative for SitkaPacific Capital Management, “Is global trade about to collapse? Where are oil prices headed? A chat with Mish Shedlock by James Stafford” http://energybulletin.net/stories/2012-07-31/global-trade-about-collapse-where-are-oil-prices-headed-chat-mish-shedlock

Oilprice.com: You just mentioned that we don’t know who the next president is going to be and sticking to this topic how big an impact do you see energy prices having on this year's presidential elections? Mish: I don’t think energy prices are what's on people's minds. What's on people's minds right now are jobs. Oil prices have kind of stabilized and in the very short-term they are likely to stay stable unless there are some dramatic results in the Mid-East or a dramatic slowdown in the US economy. Both are possible, but a major US slowdown is arguably more likely. Regardless, I think energy prices are going to be a minor election issue.

#### Plan wouldn’t affect states that make the difference in the election

Joel Kotkin 3-30-2012; executive editor of NewGeography.com and is a distinguished presidential fellow in urban futures at Chapman University, and contributing editor to the City Journal in New York. He is author of The City: A Global History. His newest book is The Next Hundred Million: America in 2050, released in February, 2010. Is Energy the Last Good Issue for Republicans? <http://www.newgeography.com/content/002698-is-energy-last-good-issue-republicans>

In the short run, Obama’s political exposure in the energy wars is somewhat limited. Most of the big-producing states—Oklahoma, Wyoming, Utah, Texas, Louisiana, Alaska, and North Dakota—are unlikely to vote for him anyway. Nor does he have to worry about too much pressure from inside his party; Democratic ranks in Congress from energy-producing states have thinned considerably in recent years, removing contrary voices inside the party.

#### Gridlock inevitable with any election outcome

Curry, 9/11/12 - NBC News national affairs writer (Tom, NBC Politics, “Romney election could create new scenario for EPA and coal,” <http://nbcpolitics.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/09/11/13807749-romney-election-could-create-new-scenario-for-epa-and-coal?lite>)

Whether Mitt Romney or Barack Obama wins the presidential election, a congressional impasse in 2013 seems likely. That’s because under most conceivable election scenarios – with Romney or Obama in the White House, and with either Democrats maintaining their Senate majority, or the Republicans taking it – the minority party could use the filibuster threat to block proposals it opposed.

#### The debates and labor statistics will determine the election

**Lombardo, 9/12**/12 - Global CEO, StrategyOne (Steve, “Why This Election Comes Down to Two Days in October,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-why-this_b_1877815.html>)

Several national polls released this week show that President Obama received a small but meaningful bounce after the conventions. The bounce -- in the 3-5 point range -- is within the median for convention bounces since 1964. The problem for Republicans is that Romney got no bounce from his convention. In fact, his vote share likely shrunk a point or two in the last two weeks. While the Republican convention may have strengthened Romney's position with the base, it did little to expand his coalition. The momentum from "You didn't build that" has been halted.

However, we see nothing in the data yet to suggest this is anything but a dead heat. For all the hand wringing over the GOP convention and the Romney campaign they are in a dead heat with an incumbent President with 55 days to go. When you look at likely voters in key swing states, this thing is truly 50/50.

Here is our take as of 12 a.m. EST:

The murder of Ambassador Stevens and the unrest in Libya will thrust both candidates into the foreign policy fray. It will be very interesting to see how each handles the coming hours and days and how much the media -- and ultimately voters -- focuses on the issue.

Look for a higher level of advertising spend from the Romney campaign in key battleground states over the next two weeks. History has shown that the candidate who is clearly in the lead by mid to late September will likely be the winner in November. That doesn't mean things can't change in October -- they can. But sentiment will start to firm up in the next two weeks. The Romney campaign has a $60 million cash-on-hand advantage, and they should use it now. Team Obama defined Romney in the spring using their cash advantage; the Romney campaign should not wait until October. They need to change the dynamic before October 1.

The two biggest dates of the campaign are October 3rd and October 5th. The first debate will be held on Wednesday, October 3rd at the University of Denver at 9 p.m. EST. For three reasons this will be far and away the most important debate:

It is the first and therefore, unless there is a major blunder, is likely to be the one that sets the image of Romney in stone.

We really do not believe that the other two will matter if Romney has a poor debate performance here. Romney has to win this debate pure and simple.

This one is purely on domestic policy, i.e. the economy. If Romney can't win this one, he is unlikely to win the other two, barring a miscue by the President.

On October 5th at 8:30 a.m. EST the Bureau of Labor Statistics will release the September unemployment numbers. This will be the most impactful announcement of the campaign. If the unemployment rate goes up it could be devastating for the president's reelection chances. Similarly, if it goes down -- especially if it goes below 8 percent -- it may pretty much secure an Obama victory in November.

#### Romney will win because Obama’s approval ratings are too low

**Talgo, 9/16/12 –** commentator for Neon Tommy, a Los Angeles-based news source sponsored by the Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism covering breaking news (Tyler, “Why Romney Will Win The Election” <http://www.neontommy.com/news/2012/09/why-romney-will-win-election>)

Given the post-convention polling bounces, some may give Obama the advantage at this stage of the race, although the bounces are subsiding. For example, new NBC/WSJ polls of three swing states have Obama leading Romney by 49 to 44 percent in Florida and Virginia, and by 50 to 43 percent in Ohio. However, when we take a closer look at the numbers, a different story is revealed. In the Florida and Virginia polls, Democrats were oversampled by 5 percent, and in Ohio they were oversampled by 10 percent. Not convinced? Here’s another fact: recent CBS/NYT/Quinnipiac polls oversampled Democrats by nine percent in Florida and by eight percent in Ohio. The Florida poll had Obama at 51 percent and Romney at 45 percent, and the Ohio poll had Obama at 50 percent and Romney at 44 percent; so, both leads were smaller than the oversampling gap. If you ask me, the advantage here clearly goes to Romney; and, believe me, these are not the only examples.

All of this is revealed in the context of a time in which Republicans are much more enthusiastic than Democrats. Last month the number of Americans who consider themselves Republicans was the highest ever recorded since 2002 at 37.6 percent, compared to only 33.3 percent who consider themselves Democrats.

So, assuming that all else is equal, what does it mean when a national poll says something like 47 percent for Obama and 44 percent for Romney, or vise versa? The nature of the missing 10 percent is one of the most important factors that come to play in all presidential reelection campaigns. Historically, the final results in an election are almost always worse than polling suggests for an incumbent president. If you took the undecided vote, according to Gallup, from every general election since 1964 that featured an incumbent president seeking reelection, 89 percent of it went to the president’s challenger. You can bet that the Obama camp understands that a 47-44 poll in its favor is not good news at all. This is why it’s virtually unheard-of for an incumbent president to win reelection when he's polling below 50 percent.

#### The plan creates jobs in key swing states -- boosts reelection probability.

Korte, 4-27-12

[Gregory, USA Today, “Politics stands in the way of nuclear plant's future,” http://www.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/story/2012-04-13/usec-centrifuges-loan-guarantees/54560118/1]

. USEC estimates the project at its peak will generate 3,158 jobs in Ohio, and 4,284 elsewhere. Pike County, home to the centrifuges, has a 13% unemployment rate — the highest in Ohio. The median household income is about $40,000. The average job at USEC pays $77,316. Centrifuge parts are stacked up in Piketon. "It's as shovel-ready as they come," says spokeswoman Angela Duduit. Indeed, the project has enjoyed bipartisan support. A USA TODAY review of DOE records shows that no fewer than 46 members of Congress — 32 Republicans and 14 Democrats — have pressured the Obama administration to approve the loan guarantee for USEC. "Quick action is paramount," said one bipartisan letter. "It is imperative that this application move forward now," said another. The congressional support comes from states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia, Missouri, Alabama, Indiana, Maryland, North Carolina and South Carolina— an almost exact overlay of the states that would benefit from the 7,442 jobs the company says would be created.

#### Public supports nuclear power expansion -- no safety concerns.

Bowman, 4-18-12 [Karlyn, American Enterprise Institute, “Polls on the environment, energy, global warming and nuclear power,” http://www.aei.org/papers/politics-and-public-opinion/polls/polls-on-the-environment-energy-global-warming-and-nuclear-power-april-2012/]

\* President Obama is getting low marks on his handling of gas prices. In a February 2012 AP/GfK-Roper poll, 39 percent approved of the job he is doing in this area. Significant majorities say rising gas prices have caused difficulties in their households. \* The majority of Americans still think nuclear power is safe. In a March 2012 Gallup poll, 57 percent favored using nuclear energy as one way to provide electricity for the United States. But people still wouldn’t want to build a nuclear plant in their backyard. Only 35 percent told CBS pollsters in March 2011 that they would approve of a nuclear power plant in their community, and 62 percent disapproved. \* Americans like an “all-of-the-above” energy strategy that includes more energy production, developing alternative energy sources, more conservation and nuclear power.

#### Israel cannot attack Iran

**PanArmenian 2/16** (2/16/12, “Armenian expert says Israel can’t strike Iran alone,” http://www.panarmenian.net/eng/news/94108/Armenian\_expert\_says\_Israel\_cant\_strike\_Iran\_alone, RBatra)

The European Union has not officially confirmed yet the information regarding suspension of Iranian oil export to 6 countries, according to Armenian political analyst.

“Iran is certain about sanctions against the Iranian oil import to harm the EU first. Iran has already started searching for new markets. For instance, oil supplies to India increased by 37%,” Roman Smbatyan told PanARMENIAN.Net

Dwelling on Israel’s stance on Iran issue and statements on possible strike on Iran, the expert noted that Iran has no potential for launch of hostilities by itself.

“Israel can’t attack Iran alone, without the U.S. assistance which currently faces complex situation as to forthcoming presidential elections and international financial crisis,” Mr. Smbatyan said.

#### Their authors have been wrong before

**Friedman 1/25**—associate editor at Foreign Policy (Uri, 1/25/12, <http://blog.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/25/whats_new_in_the_latest_speculation_over_whether_israel_will_attack_iran>, RBatra)

The New York Times Magazine is out today with a 7,585-word piece by Ronen Bergman on whether Israel will attack Iran. After speaking with top Israeli civilian, military, and intelligence leaders, the Israeli journalist arrives at a frightening conclusion: "Israel will indeed strike Iran in 2012."

Of course, we've heard this claim before. In August 2009, Micah Zenko warned at the Los Angeles Times that if Iran failed to respond to international proposals on its nuclear program by September, the "world should be prepared for an Israeli attack on Iran's suspected nuclear weapons facilities." In September 2010, the Atlantic's Jeffrey Goldberg noted that "one day next spring," Israeli officials might very well inform their U.S. counterparts that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu had dispatched fighter jets to strike Iranian nuclear facilities. John Bolton, the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, has repeatedly issued timelines regarding an Israeli strike on Iran. Anshel Pfeffer predicts an attack this spring.

#### Their impact is empirically denied

**LA Times 2/3** (2/3/12, http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/02/will-israel-attack-iran-its-been-asked-before.html, RBatra)

Will Israel attack Iran? The question is everywhere since Israeli journalist Ronen Bergman concluded in the New York Times Magazine: "After speaking with many senior Israeli leaders and chiefs of the military and the intelligence, I have come to believe that Israel will indeed strike Iran in 2012."

It's a very serious question, and not just for Israel and Iran. "Rarely if ever have the stakes been higher," Harvard fellow Chuck Freilich recently opined for the Los Angeles Times:

... on the one hand, a threat to Israel's very existence, and the Jewish people have already undergone one Holocaust in recent history. Israel was established so that the Jewish people would never again face the threat of extermination. Never again.

Conversely, the consequences of acting are also potentially dire, even assuming a successful attack. Iran already has the technical means to produce a nuclear bomb, and an attack could set the program back by no more than a few years — of value in itself but not a solution.

But it's worth remembering that the same question has been all over the media before. At Foreign Policy magazine, Blake Hounshell dubs it "Washington's favorite parlor game." Just look at headlines, including both news articles and opinion pieces from newspapers and news websites:

November 2011: Chicago Tribune, Will Israel bomb Iran?

November 2010: The Atlantic, Will Israel Attack Iran by Christmas?

August 2010: The Week, Will Israel attack Iran in the next three days?

April 2010: Middle East Post, Will Israel attack Iran?

August 2009: Talking Points Memo, Will Israel Attack Iran This Year?, Los Angeles Times, Expect Israel to hit Iran without warning

April 2009: Salon.com, Will Israel attack Iran?

July 2008: The Atlantic, Will Israel Attack Iran?, ABC News, Will Israel Attack Iran?

May 2008: The Daily Star (Lebanon), As things look, Israel may well attack Iran soon

February 2008: Haaretz, Pentagon: Israel increasingly likely to attack Iran

December 2007: The Daily Beast, What Will Israel Do? (The writer says that a unilateral military strike against Iran has grown more likely.)

March 2005: Philippine Daily Inquirer, Israel has plans to attack Iran, says London Times

August 2004: The New York Times, Sharon on the warpath: Is Israel planning to attack Iran?