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#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

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

#### The impact to the mass consumption politics of the affirmative is planetary destruction, loss of value to life, and mass poverty and dehumanization—the alternative’s criticism of consumption is key to ethical engagement with the planet

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

As noted in the introduction, consumption presents itself as an area of ethical concern in at least three ways: first, because Western-­‐style consumption is putting an immense and unsustainable burden on the planet’s ecosystems, so much so that contemporary cultures of consumption are diminishing the capacity of the planet to support life as we know it in the future;50 second, because the high consumption, resource-­‐intensive lifestyles enjoyed by most people in the richest nations coexist in a world where great multitudes live lives oppressed by material deprivation;51 and thirdly, because there is a large and growing body of sociological and psychological literature indicating that once our basic material needs for food, shelter, clothing, etc. are met, the limitless pursuit of more money and possessions neither produces any lasting happiness nor satisfies the human need for meaning.52 Far from representing the peak of civilization, cultures of mass consumption are showing distinct signs of widespread social, even spiritual, malaise.53 Any one of these issues, it could be argued, would be sufficient for consumption to become a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ When the three issues are considered together, the case for ethical engagement is compelling. At once, however, we are confronted with a strange incongruity, even a contradiction, of sorts, one that seems to tear the present analysis apart. In an age when the facts of ecological degradation, extreme poverty, and consumer malaise lie quite plainly before our eyes, one might have thought that First World consumption practices were already a subject of widespread ethical engagement. That is, one might have expected consumption practices to be a domain of constant and dedicated ethical attention, given that overconsumption seems to be driving several of the world’s most pressing problems (including the problem of consumer malaise). And yet, it can hardly be denied that any ethical engagement that takes place within consumer cultures does not, as a rule, seek to reduce or moderate consumption but rather encourage, glorify, and increase consumption – and increase it without apparent limit.54 And here is the contradiction: consumption is at once an extremely obvious realm for ethical engagement, for the three reasons stated above, and, at the same time, engaging the self by the self for the purpose of deliberately reducing or moderating consumption seems to be more or less unthinkable within modern consumer societies. Indeed, there seems to be an almost unquestioned assumption throughout consumer societies that consumption practices are somehow ‘beyond ethics,’ in the sense that how much we consume does not really need to inform the answer we give to the question of ‘how one ought to live.’ On the contrary, it is presumed that everyone is justified seeking as high a material standard of living as possible, a pursuit that is limited, it would seem, only by the laws of a free market economy.

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion ourselves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western-­‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western-­‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption-­‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.

## CP

#### Counterplan Text: The Executive Branch of the United States should acquire small modular nuclear reactors near mission critical military installations in the United States. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should waive siting restrictions for Executive Branch small modular nuclear reactors.

#### Solves the case – SMR’s near the base can just as effectively provide power

King, Associate Director of Research and Associate Research Professor of International Affairs at George Washington, 11

(March, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations, http://www.cna.org/research/2011/feasibility-nuclear-power-us-military)

Having DoD as the exclusive user is not practical for almost all DoD installations because even small nuclear power plants generate more power than is needed on almost all DoD installations. If a nuclear plant doesn’t operate near capacity the cost of the power it supplies increases, making the business case unattractive. Having a DoD installation, or a group of DoD installations, as a priority user would allow an SMR plant to better contribute to energy assurance for those installations served by the plant. The installations could continue to be connected to the commercial power grid. When operation of the SMR plant was interrupted for some reason, like maintenance or refueling, the commercial grid could supply the installation power. When the SMR plant is operational it could supply power, even when power from the commercial grid is not available. The principal advantages of an arrangement where DoD is among the commercial users supplied by the nuclear power plant is that it would be easier to reliably operate the plant at full capacity. If contract arrangements could give DoD installations priority access to power when there is an interruption in power supplied by the commercial grid, then DoD electrical power assurance would still be significantly improved. And the nuclear plant would have sufficient capacity to supply many other users in the vicinity of the installations as well. With a long-term power purchase agreement, this could provide reliable power at a stable cost. This kind of arrangement would almost certainly require additional distribution infrastructure and more advanced electrical network control. Producing power for the commercial grid that sells to customers that include DoD would allow the plant to reliably operate at full capacity. Having a small nuclear power plant located on, or near, a DoD installation could make the power supply in that area more reliable than if the area depends on more distant power plants. Additional distribution infrastructure and electrical network controls would also contribute to electrical power assurance.

#### Putting an SMR ON a base disrupts training

King, Associate Director of Research and Associate Research Professor of International Affairs at George Washington, 11

(March, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations, http://www.cna.org/research/2011/feasibility-nuclear-power-us-military)

For many years, DoD installations have been under pressure and scrutiny aimed at divesting land that isn't needed for conducting military missions including training. Consequently, it will not be easy to find appropriate sites for nuclear power plants on military installations where there will be little or no impact on military operations or training. However, if a nuclear power plant is deemed to make significant contributions to military missions, then it could be worthwhile to displace, or interfere with, other activities in order to make room for the nuclear power plant.

#### Training is key to military readiness – effects risk of conflict in the Middle East and Asia

Bianca Falcone – The Heritage Foundation – 10/5/12, Defending Readiness: Keep Military Training Strong, http://blog.heritage.org/2012/10/05/defending-readiness-keep-military-training-strong/

Cutting the budget for training will have a direct effect on America’s servicemen and women. Troops who are not adequately trained can be faced with dire consequences when in combat. Chairman Howard “Buck” McKeon (R-CA)of the House Armed Services Committee warned, “When you say that we will be cutting back on training, that can cost lives and that to me is over the top. We’ve gone way too far.” In addition, training cuts will erode military readiness and have a formidable impact on the ability of the United States to adequately respond to future contingencies and conflicts. We do not know when or where our Armed Forces will be engaged next. However, we do know that “recent history tells us to expect the unexpected. The last four U.S. presidents…have each sent America’s military into harm’s way for wars that were not anticipated.” Right now, the United States is facing a destabilized Middle East, China’s growing military forces, and an Iran on the brink of gaining nuclear weapons—all while our service members are still engaged in Afghanistan. Now is not the time to reduce flight hours for our Air Force pilots, steaming days for our sailors, or training for any of our service members—it is dangerous and irresponsible. As General Joseph F. Dunford, U.S. Marine Corps, stated at the HASC hearing, “We have a readiness challenge today. It’ll be exacerbated.” Providing the correct amount of training to successfully complete a mission is imperative to troop safety and morale, as well as military readiness as a whole. It is the government’s job to make sure our troops are prepared and able to get the job done. Congress must work to stop sequestration before it goes into effect on January 2. As Comptroller Hale stated, “If you’re driving into a brick wall at 60 miles an hour, let’s find a way to avoid the wall, not figure out a way to pick up the pieces after we hit it.”

## Politics

#### Republicans will make deals on sequester now, calculus has changed post Obama’s reelection, but his political capital is key

Kaletsky, 1/23

[Anatole, Economist and journalist, “Cooperation isn’t coming to Washington – it’s already arrived,” Reuters, January 23, 2013, <http://blogs.reuters.com/anatole-kaletsky/2013/01/23/cooperation-isnt-coming-to-washington-its-already-arrived/> //uwyo-baj]

Before the election, Republicans and their business backers had two overriding reasons to obstruct any deals with Obama on borrowing, spending or taxes. First, most Republicans genuinely expected to win the presidential election and therefore had every incentive to defer important decisions until their man was in power. Secondly, they calculated that any collateral damage inflicted on the economy through fiscal warfare would harm the incumbent president, whose Achilles’ heel was economic policy. Once the election was over, this calculus completely changed. Having failed to unseat Obama, Republicans were suddenly in a situation where sabotaging the economy was no longer in their interests. As I argued immediately after the election, and again during the fiscal cliff negotiations, the GOP had few incentives after Nov. 7 to just thwart Obama. Republicans now had to persuade voters that their policies would promote jobs and growth — and would do so immediately, not in some distant future when budgets would have to balance or else the United States would turn into Greece. The election also changed motivations for the Republicans’ business supporters. Instead of viewing Washington gridlock as a weapon for defeating Obama, American businesses after the election had to accept the inevitable. They would have to live with Obama and his policies, however much they disliked them. For most U.S. businesses, the primary political consideration was no longer the ideological debate over taxing and spending, but a purely economic issue: How would the economic policies negotiated between the White House and Congress affect business conditions in the four years leading to 2016? This gestalt shift implies that Republicans are unlikely to press very hard for large-scale spending cuts, government layoffs or fiscal tightening that could be seen as harming economic recovery. Instead the focus should move to long-term budget reforms, designed to take effect only after the economy has largely recovered in 2015 or so – conveniently beyond the next congressional elections. The president will have strong incentives to cooperate with such gradual fiscal consolidation, with major budget cuts backloaded to the last years of his administration and beyond. He would rather go down in history as the man who delivered universal healthcare, saved the U.S. economy from its worst crisis since the Great Depression, and put U.S. fiscal policy on a sustainable footing than waste his entire second term haggling over budgets – especially since achieving fiscal austerity does not require any major cuts or austerity, except in the very long term. In fact, the White House has already said it will offer some long-term entitlement reforms as part of the bipartisan budget deal that now looks eminently attainable. This may infuriate left-wing Democrats, but Obama is unlikely to care much, now that he has been reelected. In any case, grassroots Democratic voters will probably care more about presidential efforts on gun control, immigration and climate change than about wonkish arguments over Chained CPI and Medicare spending caps in the next decade. Why then has there been little discussion of this change in political dynamics? Probably because the media mostly see it as their role to magnify political drama rather than to analyze how they are likely to be resolved. The same applies to many professional politicians. Extreme statements from both parties will always attract the most media attention. The congressional arithmetic, however, means that the views of radicals, highlighted by the media, are no longer very important. In the House, the minority Democrats can pass important votes, such as a budget compromise, with just 20 votes from moderate Republicans eager to compromise. The same applies in the Senate, where the Democrats can lose several of their left-wing caucuses but still easily pass a compromise bill. What matters in this situation is not how most Republicans vote but whether 20 moderates can be found to back a bill to raise taxes, passed mainly by the Democrats. Most likely the Republican leadership would tacitly even encourage and support this handful of defectors, who would allow their party to foster an image of reasonableness and compromise while forcing the Democrats to carry the entire responsibility for higher taxes.

#### Obama will prevail on sequestration now but his political capital is finite- it is key to both keep dems in line and prevent a unified GOP opposition

Tobin, 1/18

[Jonathan S., senior online editor of Commentary magazine, “Time-Out May Be the GOP’s Best Option,” Commentary, January 18, 2013, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/01/18/time-out-may-be-the-gop-best-option-debt-ceiling/> //uwyo-tjc]

The top news out of the House Republican retreat in Williamsburg, Virginia is that the party is considering a short-term extension of the debt limit in order to give the party more time to try and convince their Democratic antagonists to start cutting spending. The proposal, which according to the New York Times, is being floated by Rep. Paul Ryan, could wind up connecting the debt ceiling issue with the deadline for the implementation of sequestration that would mandate devastating across-the-board spending cuts. That would theoretically give the GOP some room to maneuver in order to avoid a confrontation with President Obama that few think they would win. But it is hard to avoid the impression that the main object of a delay would be to deal with the Republicans’ biggest problems: a lack of unity. Like a sports team in disarray, the GOP needs a time out where they can catch their breath and somehow get on the same page with each other. As the votes over House Speaker John Boehner’s Plan B and then the final fiscal cliff deal revealed, the party is badly split between those who don’t want to give an inch on spending and taxes, those who think that compromise with the president is inevitable and those who believe the best the party can do is to speak out for its principles and oppose tactics that will blow up the economy and help demonize the party. But the problem for the Republican leadership is that even if they can buy themselves some more time to get their fractious caucus in line, the likelihood that a confident and aggressive President Obama will either accept a short-term extension or deal honestly with them on the issues. The argument for a time out is that in its current condition with a leadership that can’t count on its members to agree to back a unified strategy on fiscal issues, Republicans are doomed to defeat no matter what option they choose. The president is counting on the GOP splintering into warring factions and has done his best to help that process along by goading his opponents whenever possible including his stunning attack on them even as the two sides were negotiating a deal to prevent the nation from going over the fiscal cliff earlier this month. As Robert Costa and Andrew Stiles noted in their sum up from the retreat, even though Republicans remain in control of the House, the tone of the gathering was that of a defeated party searching for answers. Given the shock felt by many in the party over the president’s re-election and the beatings they’ve received over the debt ceiling and the fiscal cliff, that’s understandable. But Bill Kristol’s advice to them to “suck it up,” is exactly what they need to hear. I think those Republicans who want to make a stand on the debt ceiling are right. Even though the odds are against them prevailing in such a battle, the party can’t simply stand by and let President Obama off the hook without at least trying to stop him by whatever means are at their disposal. That sort of surrender would split the GOP and make it harder for them to recover at the next midterm. But the one given in this equation is that without a united caucus, House Republicans haven’t a prayer of doing anything effective to halt the country’s drift toward insolvency and to head off new taxes. For all of their pessimism, the GOP still controls the power of the purse. President Obama may have the wind at his back right now but his political capital is finite. So is his time. If conservatives can use the coming weeks to agree on a strategy to exploit his weaknesses — such as the division among Democrats and the president’s refusal to deal with entitlement reform — their position could be stronger than they think. The question is do Boehner, Eric Cantor or even Paul Ryan have the ability to convince their colleagues that if they don’t hang together, their hopes of stopping Obama from worsening the nation’s problems are nonexistent.

#### SMRs unpopular – opposition due to fear of waste, contamination and terror targets.

Smith, ‘10

(Rebecca, Contributor, “Small Reactors Generate Big Hopes”, The Wall Street Journal, 2-18-10,

<http://www.generatorsystems.com/pdf/Small%20Reactors%20Generate%20Big%20Hopes%20WSJ%2002-18-2010.pdf>, accessed 8-1-12, RSR)

"We see significant benefits from the new, modular technology," said Donald Moul, vice president of nuclear support for First Energy, an Ohio-based utility company. He said First Energy, which operates four reactors at three sites in Ohio and Pennsylvania, has made no decision to build any new reactor and noted there's "a lot of heavy lifting to do to get this reactor certified" by the NRC for U.S. use. Indeed, the smaller reactors still could incite major opposition. They face the same unresolved issues of where to put the waste and public fear of contamination, in the event of an accident. They could also raise alarms about creating possible terrorism targets in populated areas. Still, the sudden interest in small reactors illustrates a growing unease with the route that nuclear power has taken for half a century. What many regard as the first commercial reactor built in the U.S., in 1957 at Shippingport, Pa., was only about 60 megawatts in size. By the time construction petered out three decades later, reactors had grown progressively bigger, ending up at about 1,000 megawatts of capacity.

#### Sequestration devastates the economy, collapses heg, and culminates in Middle Eastern war

Hutchison 9/21

[Kay Bailey Hutchison,, U.S. Senator from the great state of Texas, 9/21/2012 “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis]

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk. According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and a potentially catastrophic blow to our national defense and security capabilities in a time of increasing violence and danger. All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve. The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship. Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year. The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings. In the absence of U.S. military leadership, upheaval in the Middle East would be worse. As any student of history can attest, instability does not confine itself to national borders. Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region. Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological research, development and advantage - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities. Sequestration can still be avoided. But that will require leadership from the President that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

#### Middle East goes nuclear

Russell 9

[James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers, #26, http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf]

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

## CP

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase financial incentives for the development of offshore wind power in the United States

#### Wind uniquely solves blackouts because it creates inherent resiliency against disruptions, their design does not create cascades and it allows instantaneous power-up after a crisis, cutting the length of the blackout down dramatically

Elisa Wood, 11/1

“Hurricane Sandy Uncovers Strength and Simplicity of Renewable Energy Systems” <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/11/hurricane-sandy-uncovers-strength-and-simplicity-of-renewable-energy-systems?cmpid=WNL-Friday-November2-2012>, accessed 11/5/12,WYO/JF

Wind and solar are relatively safe forms of energy, a feature that we tend to overlook until a disaster hits like the "superstorm" that disabled New York City's power grid this week. Unlike fossil fuel plants, they require no combustible fuels to generate electricity. And there is no danger that they will leak radiation as did the Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear plant following last year’s tsunami in Japan. Hence, the Northeast’s wind and solar farms evoked little public anxiety this week when Hurricane Sandy hit – unlike the nuclear and fossil fuel infrastructure. Safety officials kept a careful eye on the nuclear power plants and three were shut down in New Jersey and New York. And the smell of natural gas in any flooded areas drew quick attention from those who understood the danger. These anxieties speak to a larger difference between renewables and conventional generation. Specifically, wind and solar operate under simpler systems that are prone to fewer problems, say renewable energy advocates. Simple Design, Simple Operations First of all, wind and solar do not need additional energy inputs to produce electricity or cool a reactor, said John Kourtoff, president and CEO of Toronto-based Trillium Power Wind. There is no need for natural gas, oil or coal to be excavated, transported and applied to the system. Instead, they produce electricity by taking advantage of a form of energy that is already available – wind and sun. Second, they mimic nature in design, so they tend to be more resilient and withstand natural disasters better, he said. “Renewables at their core are simple bio-mimicry based on nature. This simple and closed aspect makes them successful when storms and natural disasters happen, whether hurricanes, earthquakes, or tsunamis,” Kourtoff said. He pointed out that last year’s tsunami in Japan devastated a nuclear plant, but [wind turbines](http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2011/05/the-dangers-of-energy-generation) near the shore suffered no harm. Wind and solar farms mimic a natural cell-like structure, so they are less likely than conventional power plants to succumb to a cascading failure, according to Kourtoff. You lose a blade on a wind tower and you don’t lose the whole wind farm — just like you don’t kill a flower if a petal comes off. But for more complex energy systems, like fossil fuel and nuclear plants, failure in one part can bring down the entire production facility in a cascade, he said. “You can put a spike through a solar panel yet the rest of the solar farm runs because it runs on a cellular-like model. If one cell is not operational, the others continue to operate,” he said. He calls nuclear and fossil fuel plants industrial age technologies, and recent wind and solar, “Renewables 2.0,” designs that have grown simpler, with fewer moving parts and more efficient functioning. Kourtoff also likened wind and solar design – at least in philosophy – to the products created by Steve Jobs, which emphasized simplicity, elegance and human appeal. “Why do people like Apple products? They like them because of the simplicity of design. People see beauty in simplicity, in nature. You never hear anyone say, ‘Look at that beautiful nuclear plant.’ But if you see wind turbines moving gracefully in the water, they look beautiful,” Kourtoff said. The simplicity also offers practical benefits. “In terms of renewable energy, it can certainly help the grid come back quickly from weather situations like Hurricane Sandy,” said Carol Murphy, executive director, Alliance for Clean Energy New York. “It can take nuclear plants a week or more to come back online. Wind and solar, like other generators, do shut down during extreme weather conditions, but they can be back up and produce power quickly.” How Did Renewables Weather the Storm? Based on early assessments, renewable energy facilities seemed to fare well during Hurricane Sandy. ISO New England said it received no reports of any damage to wind or solar facilities from the storm. Iberdrola Renewables, which owns wind farms in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York and Pennsylvania, reported few problems. “We monitored the situation through the night and shut down sites as a precaution to protect equipment from extreme winds. Inspections today have revealed minimal damage so far. We are very satisfied with the response of our people and the performance of the sites through an exceptional event,” said Jan Johnson, Iberdrola Renewables’ communications director. Long Island suffered some of the most severe destruction, wiping out service to most of the Long Island Power Authority’s 1.1 million customers. But the island’s 32-MW Long Island Solar Farm appears to have come through fairly well. Nothing “catastrophic” happened at the facility, according to Matt Hartwig, spokesman for BP Alternative Energy, which operates the solar farm. “They are beginning their assessment, which initially shows damage to the fence around the facility as well as some module damage, the extent of which is not yet known.” New York, Connecticut and other hard hit areas happen to be in various stages of devising long-term energy plans. We’ll soon see if Hurricane Sandy – and lessons learned about renewable energy performance in storms – will add a new dimension to policy decisions about the future role of wind and solar.

## DA

**Water scarcity on the brink in the United States- increasingly becoming a paramount issue in 2013**

**Reichardt 1/10**

[Klaus, Waterless Co. CEO, the pioneer and originator of this most water and maintenance conserving fixture. “Water Scarcity a ‘Paramount Issue’ in 2013” 1.10.2013. <http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/>//wyo-hdm]

**The US water shortage is turning out to be even more pressing than** the General Accounting Office **predicted,** according to urinal maker Waterless Co. In 2003, **the GAO issued a** [**report**](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDcQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.gao.gov%2Fnew.items%2Fd03514.pdf&ei=uMDtUI3XOYHoiQLy1IDYAg&usg=AFQjCNEr4HQBWZH86jCtJOK6Dtg2Eg2tKA&sig2=ZRZQPIQJmlMjztRJ0rP52w&bvm=bv.1357316858,d.cGE) **warning that by 2013 at least 36 states could face water shortages.** But by 2008 at least 36 states were already dealing with periodic if not chronic water shortages, **with California, New Mexico, and Arizona at the top of the list**, Waterless says. The company makes no-water urinal systems and other restroom-related products. CEO and founder Klaus Reichardt says there has been some good news but predicts that **water scarcity and related water concerns will likely become paramount issues in 2013**. Among Reichardt’s water predictions for 2013: **Lake Michigan/Huron water systems will be at great risk of all-time low water levels, impacting lifestyles and a number of industries in the region**. **Water and sewer rates in the US will** [**continue**](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/) **to rise in most areas because of the increased costs of electricity** (to transport water to and from locations), **chemical treatments, and infrastructure upgrades. Water availability in many parts of the world will fall because of droughts, inefficient use of water, chemical runoff**, and/or salt water infiltration in water systems. There will be new requirements for [water purification](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/) in many areas of the world, but this may also cause water rates to increase. We will see more advocacy groups emerge, urging people to conserve water and use it more efficiently. As a result of these factors, finding ways to use water more efficiently in homes, offices, and especially in agriculture and industry will become the “new normal” in 2013. Water demand is falling in much of the US, according to Sharlene Leurig, a water-financing expert at Ceres, writing in [The Guardian](http://www.guardian.co.uk/sustainable-business/blog/us-water-paradox-demand-infrastructure). Leurig says that from the 1970s on, the amount of water used by American households decreased across the country, by amounts varying from tens of thousands of gallons each year in Louisville, Kentucky, to nearly 100,000 gallons a year in Las Vegas. But this declining demand, Leurig says, has created [funding](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/) problems for systems that rely on volume sales to repay infrastructure costs. Earlier this month, the US Army Corps of Engineers said it will begin issuing permits for industrial and municipal uses of Missouri River water, and is [considering charging for surplus river water](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/07/army-corps-could-charge-for-missouri-river-water/) in the future. **Additionally, low water levels — caused by the** [**worst US drought in 50 years**](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2012/08/13/worst-us-drought-in-50-years-drives-up-grain-prices-ethanol-under-pressure/) **— could** [**shut down commerce**](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/02/key-stretch-of-mississippi-could-shut-this-week/) **on the Mississippi River this month, disrupting shipments worth billions of dollars.**

**Nuclear Power uses more water than all other energy types**

**Smith 11**

[Gar Smith, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War, June, , “NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE”, International Forum on Globalization series focused on False Solutions, http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf-http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf, p. 30, wyo-bb]

By 2025, 3.5 billion people will face severe fresh-water shortages. **Nuclear proponents** **groping for justifications to expand nuclear power** have **argued** that the **waste heat from power plants can provide a “cheap and clean” solution to the inherently costly process of removing salt from seawater**. **Desalination plants** (there are 13,080 worldwide, mostly oil- and gas-fired and mostly in wealthy desert nations) already **produce more than 12 billion gallons of drinkable water a day**. 153 The first nuclear desalinator was installed in Japan in the late 1970s and scores of reactor-heated desalination plants are operating around the world today. But nuclear desalination is another False Solution.The problem with atomic water-purifiers is that using heat to treat seawater is an obsolete 20 th -century technology.**Thermal desalination has given way to new reverse osmosis systems that are less energy intensive and 33 times cheaper to operate**. 154 **Nuclear desalination** advocates claim that wind, solar, and wave power **aren’t up to the task while new low-temperature evaporation technology may be able to produce highpurity water at temperatures as low as 122° Fahrenheit**. 155 **Promoting reactors as a solution to the world’s water shortage is especially ludicrous since nuclear power plants consume more water than any other energy source. 156**

**Drought will cause massive energy shut down, blackout’s**

**Michael Webber, 12**

“Will Drought Cause the Next Blackout?” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/24/opinion/will-drought-cause-the-next-blackout.html?_r=0>, accessed 10/12/12,WYO/JF

**WE’RE** now **in the midst of the nation’s most widespread drought** in 60 years, **stretching across 29 states and threatening farmers, their crops and livestock**. But **there is another risk as water becomes more scarce. Power plants may be forced to shut down**, and oil and gas production may be threatened. **Our energy system depends on water**. **About half of the nation’s water withdrawals every day are just for cooling power plants.** In addition, the oil and gas industries use tens of millions of gallons a day, injecting water into aging oil fields to improve production, and to free natural gas in shale formations through hydraulic fracturing. **Those numbers are not large from a national perspective, but they can be significant locally.** All told, we withdraw more water for the energy sector than for agriculture. Unfortunately, this relationship means that water problems become energy problems that are serious enough to warrant high-level attention. **During the 2008 drought in the Southeast, power plants were within days or weeks of shutting down because of limited water supplies**. In Texas today, some cities are forbidding the use of municipal water for hydraulic fracturing. The multiyear drought in the West has lowered the snowpack and water levels behind dams, reducing their power output. **The United States Energy Information Administration recently issued an alert that the drought was likely to exacerbate challenges to** California’s **electric power market this summer,** with higher risks of reliability problems and scarcity-driven price increases. And in the Midwest, power plants are competing for water that farmers want for their devastated corn crops. Unfortunately, trends suggest that this water vulnerability will become more important with time.

**Blackouts cause nuclear meltdowns**

**Huffington Post, 11**

“Long Blackouts Pose Risk To U.S. Nuclear Reactors” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/29/blackout-risk-us-nuclear-reactors_n_841869.html>, accessed 10/12/12,WYO/JF

**Long before the nuclear emergency in Japan**, **U.S. regulators knew that a power failure lasting for days at an American nuclear plant, whatever the cause, could lead to a radioactive leak**. Even so, they have only required the nation's 104 nuclear reactors to develop plans for dealing with much shorter blackouts on the assumption that power would be restored quickly. In **one nightmare simulation** presented by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2009, **it would take less than a day for radiation to escape from a reactor at a Pennsylvania nuclear power plant** after an earthquake, flood or fire knocked out all electrical power and there was no way to keep the reactors cool after backup battery power ran out. That plant, the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station outside Lancaster, has reactors of the same older make and model as those releasing radiation at Japan's Fukushima Dai-ichi plant, which is using other means to try to cool the reactors. **And like Fukushim**a Dai-ichi, the Peach Bottom **plant has enough battery power on site to power emergency cooling systems for eight hours**. In Japan, that wasn't enough time for power to be restored. **According to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Energy Institute trade association, three of the six reactors at the plant still can't get power to operate the emergency cooling systems**. Two were shut down at the time. In the sixth, the fuel was removed completely and put in the spent fuel pool when it was shut down for maintenance at the time of the disaster. **A week after the March 11 earthquake, diesel generators started supplying power to two other two reactors**, Units 5 and 6, the groups said. **The risk of a blackout leading to core damage,** while extremely remote**, exists at all U.S. nuclear power plants, and some are more susceptible than others, according to an Associated Press investigation**. While regulators say they have confidence that measures adopted in the U.S. will prevent or significantly delay a core from melting and threatening a radioactive release, the events in Japan raise questions about whether U.S. power plants are as prepared as they could and should be.

**Meltdowns cause extinction**

**Lendman, 2011**

(Stephen, Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization, 03/ 13, “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan,”, The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>, accessed 10/12/12,WYO/JF

Reuters said **the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage**, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, **from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed**. Moreover, **under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination**, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: **Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown."** Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean **a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter.** According to Stratfor, "(**A)s long as the reactor core**, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, **remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete"** as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, **that disaster killed nearly one million people** worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. **Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki."** "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. **One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe.** Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. **This has never happened before,**" at least not reported. If now occurring, "**containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible**," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, **millions of lives will be jeopardized**. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. **The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted**. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "**This is a very serious situation**. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), **the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and** (if so) **you could** conceivably **have an explosion**," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It **could be, literally, an apocalyptic event.** The reactor could blow." If so, Russia, China, Korea and most parts of Western Asia will be affected. Many thousands will die, potentially millions under a worse case scenario, including far outside East Asia.

## Case

### Grid

#### 1st, status squo solves--

#### A. DOD already taking efforts to shield itself from grid outages

GAO 9

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

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

#### B. Civilian SMR’s solve grid—online by 2022

Sands, 2012

[Derek, Inside Energy with Federal Lands, Several states vie for chance to host DOE-funded small nuclear reactors, 7-9-12, Accessed online via Lexis Nexis] /Wyo-MB

Proposals to build new nuclear reactors in the US have not always been welcomed with open arms, especially after the 1979 accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant in Pennsylvania. But that's not the case with newly emerging devices called small modular nuclear reactors, which are touted for their safety and their ability to be transported to their deployment sites on freight trains or even semi-trailer trucks. Several states are champing at the bit to host SMRs, and the Energy Department is mulling how to dole out $452 million in federal funding for the sub-300-MW devices. Nikki Haley, South Carolina's Republican governor, wants to bring two SMRs to the Savannah River Site, a Cold War-era nuclear weapons facility that DOE operates in her state. "Every state wants it. Every state is going to fight to get it. Every state is going to try to make itself pretty enough," Haley said last month. "There are two projects that are going to be given by the Department of Energy this fall. We want both of them." To date, four companies have submitted SMR design concepts to DOE in the hopes of getting a chunk of the $452 million in federal funding, which the firms could use to complete and license their ideas with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Babcock & Wilcox is seeking DOE funding for its 180-MW mPower design; NuScale Power has submitted its 45-MW NuScale design; Westinghouse Electric has offered its 225-MW Westinghouse SMR design; and Holtec International has submitted its 160-MW SMR-160 design. DOE's program aims to have US-designed SMRs — which are no larger than 300 MW in size — in commercial operation by 2022.

#### No US-China war – regional stability

Ackerman 11

(Robert, quoting former admiral Timothy Keating, the official blog of the Armed Forces Communication and Electronics Association, 5/10/11, “War Between China, U.S. Not Likely,” <http://www.afcea.org/signal/signalscape/index.php/2011/05/10/11510/>)

The United States and China are not likely to go to war with each other because neither country wants it and it would run counter to both nations’ best interests. That was the conclusion of a plenary panel session hosted by former Good Morning America host David Hartman at the 2011 Joint Warfighting Conference in Virginia Beach. Adm. Timothy J. Keating, USN (Ret.), former head of the U.S. Pacific Command, noted that China actually wants the United States to remain active in the Asia-Pacific region as a hedge against any other country’s adventurism. And, most of the other countries in that region want the United States to remain active as a hedge against China. Among areas of concern for China is North Korea. Wallace “Chip” Gregson, former assistant secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, said that above all China fears instability, and a North Korean collapse or war could send millions of refugees streaming into Manchuria, which has economic problems of its own. As for Taiwan, Adm. Keating offered that with each day, the likelihood of a Chinese attack on Taiwan diminishes. Economic ties between the two governments are growing, as is social interaction. He predicts that a gradual solution to reunification is coming. The United States can hasten that process by remaining a powerful force in the region, he added.

#### Nuke power doesn’t solve the grid--

#### A. Nuke energy contributes to grid and electricity problems

Dittmar, 2012

[Michael, Institute of particle physics, “Nuclear energy: Status and future limitations.” Energy, Volume 37, Issue 1, January 2012, Pages 35–40, 7th Biennial International Workshop “Advances in Energy Studies” Accessed online via science direct] /Wyo-MB

The status of nuclear energy today and its potential evolution during the next 10–20 years is discussed. Nuclear energy contributes only about 14% of the world’s electric energy mix today, and as electric energy contributes itself only about 16% to the end energy use, its contribution is essentially negligible. Still, nuclear energy is plagued already with a long list of unsolved problems. Among the less known problems one finds the difficulties that nuclear plants cannot provide power according to needs, but have to be operated at full power also during times of low demand and regions with large contributions from nuclear power need some backup hydropower storage systems. The better known problems, without solutions since at least 40 years, are the final safe storage of the accumulated highly radioactive nuclear waste, that uranium itself is a very limited and non renewable energy resource and that enormous amounts of human resources, urgently needed to find a still unknown path towards a low energy future, are blocked by useless research on fusion energy. Thus, nuclear energy is not a solution to our energy worries but part of the problem.

#### 3rd, Plan fails and doesn’t solve--

#### B. SMR’s too expensive for DOD—they reject being a first mover

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Nucleonics Week Pg. 1 Vol. 52 No. 26, Small Reactors hard a sell for military, 6-30-11, Accessed via lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

"This MOU, in an early stage of implementation, could be used for cooperating to build small reactors on military installations," said the CNA report. But it suggested the DOD make sure it is "not responsible" for the expenses of building a first-of-a-kind reactor when negotiating for nuclear power purchases. "The costs associated with moving from the current stage of development of small nuclear reactors to being ready to build a fully operating power plant ? are expected to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars," the report said. Such expenses are a burden the DOD will not shoulder "in the current budgetary environment," when the government is looking for spending cuts to shrink the deficit, said Phil Shubert, manager of the Army Reactor Program. He spoke last month in Washington at a small modular reactor conference organized by Platts. The DOD's "Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan" published in August 2010 outlined a path towards meeting its emissions reduction goals by using energy efficiency measures and renewable energy development. It did not mention nuclear power.

#### C. Subsidies for SMR’s fail—stifle investment and development—plan fails

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Neucleonics week vol 52 no 6, Think tanks differ on government's role in SMR development, lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

Breakthrough Chairman Ted Nordhaus, who spoke at the same event, said the government needs to "accelerate the deployment and commercialization" of SMRs through a "procurement mechanism." A policy paper on energy innovation released by Breakthrough last fall urged that the departments of Energy and Defense "procure and demonstrate small modular reactors at DOE nuclear facilities and DOD military bases." The Washington-based Heritage Foundation, however, warned last week that government subsidies would stifle innovation in the fledgling SMR industry instead of nurturing it. The Heritage Foundation, which promotes conservative values including free enterprise and limited government, released a report February 2 in which it described "a young, robust, innovative and growing" industry with "companies of all sizes investing in these smaller, safer, and more cost-efficient nuclear reactors." But in order for this industry to thrive, "policymakers should reject the temptation to offer the same sort of subsidies and government programs" as it is doing for large reactors, it said. DOE is preparing to launch a program to pay for part of the costs of commercializing two SMR designs. The program is awaiting budget approval from Congress, but it has received bipartisan support at committee levels in both the House and the Senate and is popular among industry supporters. DOE officials have said only light water reactor designs, the type operating in the US, would be eligible to apply. Government subsidies like the DOE's cost-sharing program would be "detrimental to SMRs," the Heritage report said, because "the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted." Instead of offering subsidies, the report recommended that the government focus on reforming NRC's licensing process, which the report said is "ill-prepared ? for new reactor technologies." "The NRC is built to regulate large light water reactors. It simply does not have the regulatory capability and resources to efficiently regulate other technologies," the paper said. NRC spokesman Scott Burnell has said the NRC is focusing on reviewing LWR designs and the Next Generation Nuclear Plant, a high-temperature gas-cooled reactor project mandated by Congress. For any other applications, "we are budgeted for limited non-resource intensive activities," which would take "only a few hours of staff time on a non-routine, infrequent basis," Burnell said in a February 1 e-mail. The result of such limits at NRC "is that enthusiasm for building non-light-water SMRs is generally squashed at the NRC as potential customers realize that there is little chance that the NRC will permit the project within a time frame that would promote near-term investment," the Heritage report said. It suggested that Congress provide NRC funding "to develop additional broad expertise for liquid-metal cooled, fast reactors and high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors." The report also urged the SMR industry to resist government loan guarantees, an approach it said has not helped accelerate nuclear construction. A smaller, less expensive modular reactor "would be very attractive to private investors even without government intervention," it said.

#### A. DOD won’t use SMR—electricity isn’t cost competitive and doesn’t have the purchasing authority to buy more expensive energy

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Nucleonics Week Pg. 1 Vol. 52 No. 26, Small Reactors hard a sell for military, 6-30-11, Accessed via lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

But even if the DOD is convinced of nuclear power's merits, "the government doesn't really want to be investing its money in the power production capability," Roege said. That means DOD will not be a reactor owner-operator. "We don't want to tie up our people in operating and maintaining the power systems," Roege said in an interview last month, but added that the military could be convinced to sign a power purchase agreement with a utility that wants to build a reactor. The military would need no convincing, if nuclear power could be supplied "as cheaply as other power," he said, but we will have to get permission from Congress to spend more money if a military base has to pay more for electricity to help build a small reactor. "We don't have that authority today. We can't go out and buy more expensive power." The CNA study estimates that the cost of electricity produced by a small nuclear power plant ranged from a low of 6.6 cents per kWh to a high of 20 cents/kWh. The report said industrial users are paying less than 6.5 cents per kWh for electricity in half of the US and below 8 cents per kWh in 70% of the country. Therefore, while the floor price makes a small reactor economically attractive "almost everywhere," the report said, "the highest estimates make the option unattractive almost everywhere." Pacific islands, where the military maintains several bases, have the highest power prices of about 20 cents per kWh, it said. To convince the DOD and Congress, it is not enough to make the case that a nuclear reactor is more reliable than other energy sources, Roege said. The industry has to quantify such a "secure energy premium" — measured by "a scale" that assesses the prices of different levels of reliability," he said. So far, the industry has not presented such a model, nor has the military thought of how much it would be willing to pay for more stable power supply, Roege said.

### Leadership

#### 1st, the Squo solves:

#### A. Leadership Now- Generation III+

Bipartisan Policy Center 12

[Co-chaired by Senator Pete Domenici and Dr. Warren F. “Pete” Miller, Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets A Report of the Bipartisan Policy Center’s Nuclear Initiative, July 2012, pg 6, <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Leadership%20in%20Nuclear%20Energy%20Markets.pdf>, \\wyo-bb]

Given this near-term expansion, the United States will continue to be a world leader in the development of advanced reactor technologies, including Generation III+ advanced passive reactors and SMRs. International interest in developing new nuclear-generating capacity, on the other hand, presents potentially substantial business opportunities for the domestic nuclear industry. Commercial nuclear exports generate obvious economic benefits for U.S. firms and for the nation’s overall balance of trade. Importantly, they also help the United States retain a major role in the evolution and maintenance of international nuclear safety and nonproliferation regimes. Other nations not only look to the U.S. industry for operational expertise, they see the NRC as setting the international gold standard for safety and physical security regulation. DOE’s National Nuclear Security Administration, meanwhile, has a great deal of influence over the nonproliferation aspects of international fuel-cycle issues.

#### 2nd, Nuke power hurts leadership:

#### A. Expanding nuclear power hurts credibility – safety issues

Walsh 11 (Wednesday, Mar 16, 2011 05:17 PM MST The nuclear credibility gap As Japan and U.S. officials differ on risks, the Obama administration pushes ahead with nuclear power expansion By Joan Walsh, http://www.salon.com/2011/03/17/nuclear\_credibility\_gap/)

I’m inclined to believe Jaczko, as well as warnings from U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu and other U.S. officials. Japanese leaders have been slow to admit the extent of the Fukushima damage at every step of the way. But American leaders are putting their own credibility at risk by being so quick to reiterate the Obama administration’s commitment to expanding nuclear power in the U.S. On Wednesday Chu told Congress that officials planned to look at the “lessons” of the Japan disaster — but he also told Rep. Joe Barton (R-Energy Industry) that the president continues to support expanding nuclear power in the U.S. at a cost to taxpayers of $36 billion, mainly in loan guarantees for new reactors, and to fund new small, modular reactors. To meet the president’s clean energy goals, Chu said, “We believe we will have to have some fraction coming from nuclear.” Without knowing the “lessons” of the unforeseen Japanese disaster, I’m not sure why any administration leader is making a full steam ahead commitment to nuclear expansion.

#### Reactor development spurs resentment and proliferation—increases danger to have DOD as a first mover

Smith, 2011

[Terrence, CSIS institute, An Idea I Can Do Without: Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations, 2-16-11, http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations] /Wyo-MB

The report repeatedly emphasizes the point that “DOD’s “’first mover’ pursuit of small reactors could have a profound influence on the development of the industry,” and cautions that “if DOD does not support the U.S. small reactor industry, the industry could be dominated by foreign companies.” The U.S. nonproliferation agenda, if there is one, stands in opposition to this line of thinking. Pursuing a nuclear technology out of the fear that others will get it (or have it), is what fueled the Cold War and much of the proliferation we have seen and are seeing today. It is a mentality I think we should avoid.¶ I do not mean to say this report ignores the risks. In fact they explicitly say, “We acknowledge that there are many uncertainties and risks associated with these reactors.” For example it says,¶ Some key issues that require consideration include securing sealed modules, determining how terrorists might use captured nuclear materials, carefully considering the social and environmental consequences of dispersing reactors.¶ The report also points out that “from a financial perspective, small reactors represent substantial losses in economies of scale.”¶ These issues, which were briefly mentioned, hardly seem like small potatoes. The reports answer to the issues raised: “making reliable projections about these reactors’ economic and technical performance while they are still on paper is a significant challenge,” and “Nevertheless, no issue involving nuclear energy is simple.”¶ On the other hand, the report argues, “failing to pursue these technologies raises its own set of risks for DOD.” “First, small reactors may fail to be commercialized in the United States; second, the designs that get locked in by the private market may not be optimal for DOD’s needs; and third, expertise on small reactors may become concentrated in foreign countries.”¶ Yes these are important issue for a business stand, but I don’t find them to be the primary concern.¶ The reactors are purely for energy purposes, but in a world that seems to be growing tired of U.S. military intervention, the idea of ensuring our ability to do so through the proliferation of mobile nuclear reactors will hardly quell any hostile sentiment. In addition, it can only add fire to the “nuclear = good” flame. So, while even under best case scenario, the reactors are completely proliferation proof and pose no direct threat to the nonproliferation cause (ignoring the spreading of nuclear tech and knowledge in general), I have a tough time seeing how it helps.¶ The report concludes that the DoD “should seriously consider taking a leadership role on small reactors.” Since the 1970s, the report says, “in the United States, only the military has overcome the considerable barriers to building nuclear reactors. This will probably be the case with small reactors as well.” For now, the plans for small nuclear reactors are “unfortunately,” for the most part, “caught between the drawing board and production.”¶ My point is, maybe that is where they should stay.
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## Wind CP

#### OSW solves East Coast electricity demand- drops prices and solves grid congestion that creates cascades

Marcacci 12

[Silvio, Principal at Marcacci Communications, a full-service clean energy public relations company based in Washington, D.C., Clean Technica, “Offshore Wind On The Atlantic Cost Could Create 300,000 Jobs And $200 Billion In Economic Activity”, p. online//wyo-tjc]

Beyond creating new jobs and economic activity building and operating all these new turbines, plugging offshore wind into our nation’s grid can increase reliability and lower utility prices. Offshore winds blow strongest during the day and in heat waves – precisely the points when demand for electricity is highest and the risk of power shortages most acute. In addition, the greatest potential wind power lies along some of the East Coast’s biggest cities. Grid congestion has constrained the ability of cheaper power to reach these demand pools and created some of the highest power prices in the country.

But if these population centers could tap into steady electricity being generated just offshore, growing demand could be met cheaply. In fact, New York State’s grid operator recently found consumers save $300 million in wholesale electricity costs for every 1 GW of wind on the grid.

-Leadership

#### Failure to move forward on OSW guts American credibility on climate leadership

Kimmell and Stalenhoef 11

[Kenneth, general counsel to the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, was responsible for overseeing the state permitting of the Cape Wind project, and now serves as the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, and Dawn, environmental law attorney and Counsel for the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Golden Gate University Environmental Law Journal, “The Cape Wind Offshore Wind Energy Project: A Case Study of the Difficult Transition to Renewable Energy”, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

If completed, the Cape Wind offshore wind energy project would be one of the largest offshore wind farms in the world. The project is also one of the most significant greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction measures in our nation. It would reduce GHG emissions by an estimated 730,000 tons per year, which is the equivalent of taking 175,000 cars off the road each year.2 Due to its size, novelty, and colorful permitting history, the project has become a symbol of the United States’ resolve to take action to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions and its dependence on fossil fuels. However, if the project is not constructed, either because of the aesthetic concerns of tenacious beachfront property owners who oppose the project or because of its large up-front costs, the world may well begin to question the United States’ commitment to doing its part to avert climate change.

#### OSW is uniquely key to solve electricity demand in the United States- it overcomes issues with transmission costs, intermittency, and load capacity factors all because it is on the water\*\*

Schroeder 10

[Erica, J.D. from University of California, Berkeley, School of Law, 2010. And Masters in Environmental Management from Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, “Turning Offshore Wind On”, California Law Review, p. ln//wyo-tjc]

Many of the most compelling benefits of offshore wind are similar to those of onshore wind, though offshore wind has its own unique set of benefits. To start, wind power generation can help meet the growing energy demand in the United States. The U.S. Energy Information Administration predicts that the demand for electricity in the United States will grow to 5.8 billion MWh in 2030, a 39 percent increase from 2005.58 The more that wind power can help to meet this demand, the more diversified the United States’ energy portfolio will be, and the less susceptible the nation will be to dependency on foreign fuel sources and to price fluctuations in traditional fuels.59 In addition, wind power benefits the United States by creating a substantial number of jobs for building and operating the domestic wind energy facilities.60 In an April 2009 speech at the Trinity Structural Towers Manufacturing Plant in Iowa, President Obama predicted that if the United States ―fully pursue[s] our potential for wind energy on land and offshore,‖ wind power could create 250,000 jobs by 2030.61

Once a wind project is built, it involves only minimal environmental impacts compared to traditional electricity generation. Wind power emits negligible amounts of traditional air pollutants, such as sulfur dioxide and particulate matter, as well as carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.62 Lower emissions of traditional air pollutants means fewer air quality-related illnesses locally and regionally.63 Lower greenhouse gas emissions will help to combat climate change, effects of which will be felt locally and around the world.64 According to the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the effects of climate change will include melting snow, ice, and permafrost; significant effects on terrestrial, marine, and freshwater plant and animal species; forced changes to agricultural and forestry management; and adverse human health impacts, including increased heat-related mortality and infectious diseases.65 The U.S. Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States emits 6 billion metric tons of greenhouse gases annually, and it expects emissions to increase to 7.9 billion metric tons by 2030, with 40 percent of emissions coming from the electric power sector.66 Thus, if the United States can get more of its electricity from wind power, it will contribute less to climate change, and help to mitigate its negative impacts. Furthermore, wind power does not involve any of the additional environmental costs associated with nuclear power or fuel extraction for traditional electricity generation, such as coal mining and natural gas extraction.67 Wind power generation also does not require the water necessary to cool traditional coal, gas, and nuclear generation units.68

Moreover, offshore wind power has certain attributes that give it added benefits compared to onshore wind. Wind tends to be stronger and more consistent offshore—both benefits when it comes to wind power generation.69 This is largely due to reduced wind shear and roughness on the open ocean.70 Wind shear and roughness refer to effects of the landscape surrounding turbines on the quality of wind and thus the amount of electricity produced.71 While long grass, trees, and buildings will slow wind down significantly, water is generally very smooth and has much less of an effect on wind speeds.72 In addition, because offshore wind projects face fewer barriers—both natural and manmade—to their expansion, offshore developers can take advantage of economies of scale and build larger wind farms that generate more electricity.73

Importantly, offshore wind also could overcome the problems that onshore wind faces regarding the distance between wind power generation and electricity demand. That is, although the United States has considerable onshore wind resources in certain areas, mostly in the middle of the country, they are frequently distant from areas with high electricity demand, mostly on the coasts, resulting in transmission problems.74 By contrast, offshore resources are near coastal electricity demand centers.75 In fact, twenty-eight of the contiguous forty-eight states have coastal boundaries, and these same states use 78 percent of the United States’ electricity.76 Thus, offshore wind power generation can effectively serve major U.S. demand centers and avoid many of the transmission costs faced by remote onshore generation.77 If shallow water offshore potential (less than about 100 feet in depth) is met on the nation’s coasts, twenty-six of the twenty-eight coastal states would have sufficient wind resources to meet at least 20 percent of their electricity needs, and many states would have enough to meet their total electricity demand.78

#### OSW is getting approved by BOEM in the squo, but it’s being compared to Cape Wind and its legal battles

Silverstein 18 Jan

[Silverstein, Ken: global energy business writer. "Offshore Wind Projects Could Provide Refreshing Energy Source." *Forbes: Business*. Forbes, 18 Jan 2013. Web. 24 Jan 2013. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2013/01/18/offshore-wind-projects-could-provide-refreshing-energy-source/>. //Wyo-BF]

“The Atlantic Wind Connection provides a significant alternative to land-based upgrades to the grid,” says John Nathman, a retired naval officer before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. “Indeed, the project can be an important step in strengthening our national security through improvements to the electric grid.” The venture’s partners are not just Google but also Trans-Elect, Good Energies, Marubeni Corp., Bregal Energy and Elia, which are moving ahead. They have combined to invest $5 billion. The Department of Interior’s Bureau of Ocean Energy Management granted its permission to build the underwater line that could eventually stretch 380 miles from Virginia to New Jersey. The agency’s review concludes that no other similar competitors exist in that region that would object to giving the developers rights-of-way. Other federal and state permits are still necessary. The project, of course, can’t avoid the comparisons to Cape Wind, which has been encumbered in legal battles for more than a decade but which may start producing power in 2014. The Atlantic wind deal has broader public and political support. Still, the cost of the project could end up being enormous, or potentially twice as much as a land-based deal. The investors, though, are factoring in potential subsidies and tax benefits as well as tougher environmental regulations dealing with carbon emissions.

### Perms

#### Nuke power trades off with renewable development

Williams, 2011

[Chris Williams is a longtime environmental activist and an adjunct professor at Pace University, where he teaches courses in energy and the environment, physics and chemistry, “Why nuclear power must go.” Synthesis/Regeneration. .56 (Fall 2011): p7, Accessed online via academic onefile] /Wyo-MB

As nuclear plants have to be continuously operated as close to full capacity as possible to even come close to justifying their costs, they directly displace clean renewable sources of energy such as wind and solar. If governments re-license nuclear plants for another 20 years and build new ones that operate for 60 years more, then there will be no "transition" to clean power until almost the end of this century.¶ It's also a myth that nuclear power cannot be replaced by truly green energy. Many scientific studies show that it is possible to construct wind, solar, geothermal and tidal sources of energy that don't generate radioactive waste, don't lead to resource wars, don't have big carbon footprints, and don't require massive amounts of farmland, energy and water like agro-fuels such as corn-based ethanol.

## Water DA

**The brink is miniscule – one conflict over water would unleash a global nuclear war guaranteeing extinction**

**Weiner 90**

[Prof at Princeton Department of Molecular Biology (Johnathan, The Next 100 Years: Shaping the Fate of Our Living Earth, p. 214)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-Bomb and the H-Bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-Bomb, the change Bomb. And **in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other**. Already in the Middle East, from Northern Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, **tensions over dwindling water supplies** and rising populations **are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift** in that single battle-scarred nexus **might trigger international tensions that will unleash** some of the **60,000 nuclear warheads** the world has stockpiled since Trinity.

**Long-term drought conditions would devastate America’s key agricultural regions, destroying our economy and sending food prices soaring**

**Hansen 12**

[James, director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies and adjunct professor in the department of earth and environmental sciences at Columbia University, “NASA’s James Hansen Slams Obama’s Lack Of Climate Leadership And Our ‘Immoral’ Inaction”, 5.10, p. <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/10/481636/must-read-hansen-slams-obamas-lack-of-climate-leadership-and-our-immoral-inaction/> //wyo-tjc]

That is the long-term outlook. But **near-term**, things will be bad enough. **Over the next several decades, the Western United States and the semi-arid region from North Dakota to Texas will develop semi-permanent drought, with rain**, **when it does come, occurring in extreme events** with heavy flooding. **Economic losses would be incalculable**. **More and more of the Midwest would be a dust bowl**. **California’s Central Valley could no longer be irrigated**. **Food prices would rise to unprecedented levels**. **If this sounds apocalyptic, it is**.Again, **this is all from the recent scientific literature**.

**High food prices kills the economy—their impacts are inevitable if food prices are high**

**Schuman 12**

[Schuman, Michael: writes about Asia and global economic issues as a correspondent for TIME in Beijing. "Home Economics: Will Rising Food Prices Ruin the Recovery?." *Times: Business*. Times, 9 Aug 2012. Web. 10 Nov 2012. <http://business.time.com/2012/08/09/home-economics-will-rising-food-prices-ruin-the-recovery/>. //Wyo-BF]

Here we go again. **On two occasions since 2007, the world economy has endured rapid and extreme increases in food prices that have inflicted great pain, especially on the poor. Now, with drought in the Midwestern U.S. burning through one of the most important food-producing regions in the world, get ready for a dizzying feeling of déjà vu**. Corn and soybean prices recently reached record highs. Wheat has also spiked. **Jim Kim, President of the World Bank, is already warning that rising food prices can cause families to eat cheaper, less healthy food or pull kids out of school, steps that “can have catastrophic lifelong effects on the social, physical, and mental well-being of millions of young people.” That is bad news for the global economy. We are already facing all sorts of hurdles in our so far futile efforts to climb out of the Great Recession. Joblessness in the U.S. and Europe remains high. The euro-zone debt crisis continues to boil. The world’s emerging markets are slowing down. Rising food prices will just add to the gloom, since they can kill growth in two important ways. First, there is a consumption effect. When families are forced to allocate a larger share of their weekly income to milk, bread and other basics, they are unable to spend as much on clothes, toys and other stuff, dampening overall consumer spending.** This could be a big issue in the advanced economies, where unemployment is already straining the finances of the average household. **Second, there is a policy effect. Rising food prices often cause higher inflation, which could force central banks to react by hiking interest rates to control the upward pressure on prices, slowing down growth in the process.** This could prove a big problem in the developing world. **With economies in China, India, Brazil and elsewhere cooling off, central banks have been encouraged to cut rates to stimulate growth. Higher inflation, though, could stymie that effort by forcing central bankers to keep rates high to control inflation even if growth continues to sag.** Since emerging markets are playing a larger role in overall global growth, a continued slowdown in China, India and other big developing nations could dampen the entire global outlook. How likely is that? So far, **economists are taking the position that higher food prices won’t stop central bankers in China and elsewhere from easing money to spur more growth**. Here’s Capital Economics on this, from a late July report on China: **The recent surge in global agricultural commodity prices — if sustained — will add to the downside risks to China’s economy but it is unlikely to be a decisive factor. Overall inflationary pressures are weak and the authorities will not be deflected from loosening policy further** … The People’s Bank [China’s central bank] has raised interest rates and reserve requirements in the past when food price inflation has surged, but only when the Chinese and global economies were strong. This emphatically is not the case today. If the Chinese authorities want to alleviate food price inflation they are now more likely to do so via subsidies and stock releases, rather than tighter monetary policy. **Some economists feel similarly about the entire global economy**. They are so far staying calm about the impact the recent surge of food prices could have on global growth. Economists at Bank of America Merrill Lynch, in a recent report, argued that slower growth and other factors could limit how elevated food prices would translate into increased inflation, and thus limit their impact on overall economic growth.

**Water scarcity is drastically increasing- complete brink by 2025**

**Habibi et al 1/2**

[Azita Habibi, Rodrigo Sabato and Pia Schaefer, Wharton Innovation and Entrepreneurship at the University of Pennsylvania, “Water Scarcity: A Daunting Challenge with a Hopeful Future” 1.2.2013. <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=3164>//wyo-hdm]

Economists agree that one of the most critical examples of price variation for a specific product occurs when the product suffers from an imbalance between its supply and demand. What is not so evident, however, is the fact that, **due to continuous population growth, contamination of sources and inefficient utilization of available resources, water** -- perhaps **the most important resource for mankind -- is facing an ever-increasing supply/demand imbalance**. It is important to note that increasing demand is not the only explanation for water scarcity around the world. **According to the United Nations** (UN), **there is enough fresh water on the planet for six billion people. However, this water is distributed unevenly, and too much is wasted, polluted or managed unsustainably**. **Although there is no global water scarcity as such, an increasing number of regions are chronically short of this critical resource.** The problem of uneven distribution becomes obvious when we compare countries rich in water sources (such as Colombia and Canada) to areas suffering from severe scarcity (such as North Africa and the Middle East). According to the UN, approximately 1.2 billion people (or **nearly a fifth of the world's population) live in areas of physical scarcity, and another 500 million are approaching this situation.** **Projections show that, by 2025, 1.8 billion people will be living in countries or regions with absolute water scarcity, and two-thirds of the world's population could be living under water-stressed conditions.** The problem of water being wasted, polluted or managed unsustainably has become a serious issue in the last century, as **water use has been growing at more than twice the rate of the increase in population.** The UN estimates that water production lost due to leakage, theft and inadequate billing practices ranges from 10% to 30% in developed nations and from 40% to 50% in developing countries. By 2050, untreated wastewater could contaminate a third of global annual renewable freshwater supplies. Including those who currently do not live in areas of physical scarcity, 1.6 billion people face economic water shortages, where countries lack the necessary infrastructure to make water from rivers and aquifers accessible.

### Link

**Uranium mining uses massive amount of water for production**

**Price, 11**

James E. McMahon and Sarah K. Price Energy Analysis Department, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley “Water and Energy Interactions” Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2011. 36:163–91, accessed 10/12/12.WYO/JF

**Uranium, the raw material used to produce nuclear fuel, is mined in 14 countries**. In 2008, Australia, Kazakhstan, and Canada combined produced 25,951 of the 43,853 metric tonnes of uranium produced worldwide (39). **The water consumption for mining and processing the fuel for nuclear power generation is between 45 and 150 gallons (170 and 568 liters) of water for each megawatt-hour generated (40).**
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## Politics

#### Sequestration comes before immigration policies

Tobin, 1/18

[Jonathan S., senior online editor of Commentary magazine, “Time-Out May Be the GOP’s Best Option,” Commentary, January 18, 2013, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/01/18/time-out-may-be-the-gop-best-option-debt-ceiling/> //uwyo-baj]

GWEN IFILL: You mentioned strategy. It's not -- it's not -- it's all going to be fiscal policy. It's not going to be climate change necessarily or immigration, or is it? SUSAN PAGE: I think these next three months are going to be all about fiscal policy, by necessity. But I think immigration is going to get an early start.\

#### No fight will happen with Hagel- Schumer support proves.

Landler, 1-22

[“Hagel and McCain Sit Down to Iron Out a Few Differences”, By MARK LANDLER

Published: January 22, 2013. New York Times. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/23/us/politics/first-test-of-new-term-comes-in-cabinet-hearings.html?_r=0>//uwyokb]

But **White House officials say they are increasingly sanguine that Mr. Hagel will prevail**. Democratic **senators have largely fallen into line since he won the blessing of** Senator Charles E. **Schumer** of New York, **the most influential Jewish member of the Senate. Mr. Schumer’s endorsement was viewed as crucial** by the White House because it allayed concerns among Democrats about Mr. Hagel’s positions on Israel and his use of the phrase “Jewish lobby” to refer to pro-Israel lobbying groups. On Friday, Mr. Hagel met with several Jewish groups, including the [American Israel Public Affairs Committee](http://www.aipac.org/) and the Anti-Defamation League, to try to ease their concerns.

**Nuclear is uniquely cost-prohibitive—massive cost overruns**

**USA Today 9**

[USA Today, 8/1/2009, “Cost overruns for reactors in the offing.”, [www.thefreelibrary.com/Cost+overruns+for+reactors+in+the+offing.-a0206055211](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Cost+overruns+for+reactors+in+the+offing.-a0206055211), \\wyo-bb]

**The likely cost of electricity for a new generation of nuclear reactors would be 12 to 20** cents per kilowatt hour, **considerably more expensive** than the **average cost of increased use of energy efficiency and renewable energies at six cents per kWh**, according to a study by Mark Cooper, a senior fellow for economic analysis at the Institute of Energy and the Environment at Vermont Law School, South Royalton. The report finds that it would cost 1.9 trillion to 4.1 trillion dollars more over the life of 100 new nuclear reactors than it would to generate the same elecfricity from a combination of more energy efficiency and renewables. **Coopers analysis of more than three dozen cost estimates for proposed new nuclear reactors shows that the projected price tags for the plants have quadrupled since the start of the industry's so-called "Nuclear Renaissance" at the beginning of this decade,** a striking parallel to the eventually sevenfold increase in reactor cost estimates that doomed the "Great Bandwagon Market" of the 1960s and 1970s, when half of the planned reactors had to be abandoned or canceled due to massive cost overruns. [ILLUSTRATION OMITTED] The study notes that the required massive subsidies from taxpayers and ratepayers would not change the real cost of nuclear reactors; they simply would shift the risks to the public. **Even with huge subsidies, nuclear reactors would remain more costly than the alternatives, such as efficiency, biomass, wind, and cogeneration.** "**We are literally seeing nuclear reactor history repeat itself**," proclaims Cooper. "The Great Bandwagon Market that ended so badly for consumers was driven by advocates who confused hope and hype with reality. It is telling that, **in the few short years since the so-called Nuclear Renaissance began, there has been a fourfold increase in projected costs. In both time periods, the original lowbail estimates were promotional, not practical**," Adds former U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission member Peter Bradford: "**Having government** set a quota of 100 new nuclear reactors by a certain date presumes--against decades of evidence to the contrary--that **politicians can pick technological winners**. Such a **policy** combines **distraction**, **deception**, **debt, and disappointment** **in** a **mixture** reminiscent **of other failed Federal policies in recent years."**

#### Sequestration destroys US global military power—-collapses deterrence and triggers multiple scenarios for nuclear war

Hunter 9/30

[Duncan is a U.S. Representative from Alaska. "SEQUESTRATION SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE," 2012, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/sep/30/tp-sequestration-sends-wrong-message-to-us/?page=1~~%23article>]

The next 10 years are sure to be no different from the last. In the Middle East, Iran is desperately searching to fill a regional power vacuum and enhance its weapons program, while threatening to close the Strait of Hormuz and targeting Israel with unapologetic provocation. Meanwhile, the United States still has an obligation to Iraq. There is a necessity for diplomatic support and engagement, even though the ground combat mission is over. Africa is also experiencing power struggles of its own. The situations in Libya and Egypt are evolving, while Yemen and Somalia are acting as staging grounds for al-Qaeda. There is also the threat of Somali pirates in international waters. Multiple high-profile hostage situations and combat rescues show just how serious of a threat that rogue bands of pirates are to naval and commercial shipping lanes. There is also the threat of North Korea with its aggressive pursuit of advanced aerial weaponry, Russia with its focus on arms modernization, and China with its large-scale and rapid military buildup. China’s display of hostility toward Taiwan — a friend and ally of the United States — also shows no sign of diminishing. With all of this, more than 70,000 American troops are in Afghanistan, facing down a dangerous enemy. For the United States and other nations, interest in Afghanistan and the region will continue long after the last of the coalition ground forces leave and the next phase of the mission begins. Ignoring America’s obligation as a world leader and the patchwork of threats that exist today won’t eliminate the risk posed by an Iran that one day acquires nuclear weapons or a North Korea that eventually acquires effective strike capability. More likely, these and other threats will develop more quickly and efficiently, putting the global interests of the U.S. directly in the cross hairs. Through a robust national defense, the United States has always sent a clear message around the world that American intentions are good and we stand by our allies. The strength of the U.S. military has dissuaded conflict and suggested to adversaries that challenging freedom is a losing proposition. It was this deterrent, in fact, that won the Cold War and turned the U.S. military into the world’s most effective fighting force. Sequestration would change all of this, f or the worse. In the words of Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, sequestration is a “nutty formula, and it’s goofy to begin with, and it’s not something, frankly, that anybody responsible ought to put into effect.” He also said sequestration is the equivalent of “shooting ourselves in the head.” Tough words, but Secretary Panetta is right.Sequestration would produce the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest Navy since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in Air Force history. Ironically, the president’s defense policy shift to the Pacific increases reliance on the Navy, but with the smallest fleet in nearly a century, controlling the oceans and projecting force will become an even more difficult and selective process, requiring prioritization that would create vulnerabilities elsewhere. Resetting America’s armed forces after a decade-plus of combat action is another necessity that cannot be overlooked. There is also a guarantee of pink slips throughout the uniformed services and every industry that directly supports the U.S. military. In San Diego, the military sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs, and billions of dollars in economic productivity. San Diego — even for all of its strategic value — is not immune to job loss and other economic impacts accompanying deep budget cuts. Sequestration is a term Americans should get to know and understand, because it will have real and lasting consequences if left unchecked. The upside is that the risks and dangers can be avoided as long as Congress and the president act in the coming months. The clock is ticking to stave off sequestration — a move that would signal to our friends and enemies alike that we uphold our promises and stand ready to defend our interests against any threat.

## Case

### grid

#### Military ties increasing, shows relations are increasing

Xinhua, 11

China-U.S. military ties to be further advanced with implementation of heads-of-state consensus, <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/china/2011-05/20/c_13885931.htm>, accessed 5-24-2011, WYO/JF

**During a speech upon his arrival in the U.S., Chen said that his visit was aimed at implementing the consensus reached by the heads of state of the two nations on promoting bilateral military ties, boosting mutual understanding and trust and encouraging cooperation** as to build a new type of cooperative military relations featuring mutual respect and mutual benefit.

#### SMR’s too expensive for DOD—they reject being a first mover

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Nucleonics Week Pg. 1 Vol. 52 No. 26, Small Reactors hard a sell for military, 6-30-11, Accessed via lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

"This MOU, in an early stage of implementation, could be used for cooperating to build small reactors on military installations," said the CNA report. But it suggested the DOD make sure it is "not responsible" for the expenses of building a first-of-a-kind reactor when negotiating for nuclear power purchases. "The costs associated with moving from the current stage of development of small nuclear reactors to being ready to build a fully operating power plant ? are expected to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars," the report said. Suchaaaa expenses are a burden the DOD will not shoulder "in the current budgetary environment," when the government is looking for spending cuts to shrink the deficit, said Phil Shubert, manager of the Army Reactor Program. He spoke last month in Washington at a small modular reactor conference organized by Platts. The DOD's "Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan" published in August 2010 outlined a path towards meeting its emissions reduction goals by using energy efficiency measures and renewable energy development. It did not mention nuclear power.

#### C. Subsidies for SMR’s fail—stifle investment and development—plan fails

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Neucleonics week vol 52 no 6, Think tanks differ on government's role in SMR development, lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

Breakthrough Chairman Ted Nordhaus, who spoke at the same event, said the government needs to "accelerate the deployment and commercialization" of SMRs through a "procurement mechanism." A policy paper on energy innovation released by Breakthrough last fall urged that the departments of Energy and Defense "procure and demonstrate small modular reactors at DOE nuclear facilities and DOD military bases." The Washington-based Heritage Foundation, however, warned last week that government subsidies would stifle innovation in the fledgling SMR industry instead of nurturing it. The Heritage Foundation, which promotes conservative values including free enterprise and limited government, released a report February 2 in which it described "a young, robust, innovative and growing" industry with "companies of all sizes investing in these smaller, safer, and more cost-efficient nuclear reactors." But in order for this industry to thrive, "policymakers should reject the temptation to offer the same sort of subsidies and government programs" as it is doing for large reactors, it said. DOE is preparing to launch a program to pay for part of the costs of commercializing two SMR designs. The program is awaiting budget approval from Congress, but it has received bipartisan support at committee levels in both the House and the Senate and is popular among industry supporters. DOE officials have said only light water reactor designs, the type operating in the US, would be eligible to apply. Government subsidies like the DOE's cost-sharing program would be "detrimental to SMRs," the Heritage report said, because "the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted." Instead of offering subsidies, the report recommended that the government focus on reforming NRC's licensing process, which the report said is "ill-prepared ? for new reactor technologies." "The NRC is built to regulate large light water reactors. It simply does not have the regulatory capability and resources to efficiently regulate other technologies," the paper said. NRC spokesman Scott Burnell has said the NRC is focusing on reviewing LWR designs and the Next Generation Nuclear Plant, a high-temperature gas-cooled reactor project mandated by Congress. For any other applications, "we are budgeted for limited non-resource intensive activities," which would take "only a few hours of staff time on a non-routine, infrequent basis," Burnell said in a February 1 e-mail. The result of such limits at NRC "is that enthusiasm for building non-light-water SMRs is generally squashed at the NRC as potential customers realize that there is little chance that the NRC will permit the project within a time frame that would promote near-term investment," the Heritage report said. It suggested that Congress provide NRC funding "to develop additional broad expertise for liquid-metal cooled, fast reactors and high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors." The report also urged the SMR industry to resist government loan guarantees, an approach it said has not helped accelerate nuclear construction. A smaller, less expensive modular reactor "would be very attractive to private investors even without government intervention," it said.

#### A. DOD won’t use SMR—electricity isn’t cost competitive and doesn’t have the purchasing authority to buy more expensive energy

Xie, 2011
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But even if the DOD is convinced of nuclear power's merits, "the government doesn't really want to be investing its money in the power production capability," Roege said. That means DOD will not be a reactor owner-operator. "We don't want to tie up our people in operating and maintaining the power systems," Roege said in an interview last month, but added that the military could be convinced to sign a power purchase agreement with a utility that wants to build a reactor. The military would need no convincing, if nuclear power could be supplied "as cheaply as other power," he said, but we will have to get permission from Congress to spend more money if a military base has to pay more for electricity to help build a small reactor. "We don't have that authority today. We can't go out and buy more expensive power." The CNA study estimates that the cost of electricity produced by a small nuclear power plant ranged from a low of 6.6 cents per kWh to a high of 20 cents/kWh. The report said industrial users are paying less than 6.5 cents per kWh for electricity in half of the US and below 8 cents per kWh in 70% of the country. Therefore, while the floor price makes a small reactor economically attractive "almost everywhere," the report said, "the highest estimates make the option unattractive almost everywhere." Pacific islands, where the military maintains several bases, have the highest power prices of about 20 cents per kWh, it said. To convince the DOD and Congress, it is not enough to make the case that a nuclear reactor is more reliable than other energy sources, Roege said. The industry has to quantify such a "secure energy premium" — measured by "a scale" that assesses the prices of different levels of reliability," he said. So far, the industry has not presented such a model, nor has the military thought of how much it would be willing to pay for more stable power supply, Roege said.

### Leadership

#### B. Government investment kills tech leadership – creates confusion in the industry.

Spencer and Loris, ‘11

(Jack (Senior Research Fellow, Nuclear Energy Policy at The Heritage Foundation) and Nicolas (Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow at The Heritage Foundation), “A Big Future for Small Nuclear Reactors?”, The Heritage Foundation, No. 2514, Backgrounder, 2-2-11, RSR)

Too many policymakers believe that Washington is equipped to guide the nuclear industry to success. So, instead of creating a stable regulatory environment where the market value of different nuclear technologies can determine their success and evolution, they choose to create programs to help industry succeed. Two recent Senate bills from the 111th Congress, the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative Improvement Act (S. 2052) and the Nuclear Power 2021 Act (S. 2812), are cases in point. Government intervention distorts the normal market processes that, if allowed to work, would yield the most efficient, cost-effective, and appropriate nuclear technologies. Instead, the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted, and provides capital subsidies that allow investors to ignore the systemic problems that drive risk and costs artificially high. This approach is especially detrimental to SMRs because subsidies to LWRs distort the relative benefit of other reactor designs by artificially lowering the cost and risk of a more mature technology that already dominates the marketplace.

#### 3rd, the plan can’t solve:

#### A. Can’t Solve US Nuclear Leadership Protesters halt licensing while Competitors build away- Toshiba, Koreans, and Russians

Tucker 10
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Yet the blame does not lie solely with the NRC. To a loud and vocal portion of the population, nuclear technology is still the devil's work, while only a few mandates and government subsidies stand between us and a world powered by wind and sunshine. In mid-July Jaczko braved a trip to Brattleboro, Vermont, where he broke bread with nearly 100 anti-nuclear crusaders trying to shut down Vermont Yankee, the 660-megawatt reactor that supplies one-third of the Green Mountain State's electricity. The crowd was the usual collection of pony-tailed men in business suits, eager young lawyers from the Nader-ite Public Interest Research Group, and well-heeled, gray-haired women who can't imagine why anyone would ever fool with nuclear power. Their verdict was unanimous: "Shut it down this afternoon!" Jaczko, of course, was accused of giving the nuclear industry a free pass and "not listening to the people." Faced with these pressures, the NRC responds by regulating the industry into the ground. Only one new reactor--the Vogtle Plant in Georgia--has received permission to begin site preparation for construction. Last July the NRC informed the utility, Southern Electric, that the dirt it was using to grade the site was inadequate. Southern was forced to go further abroad and spend more money on better dirt. Two weeks later the NRC shut down the project entirely when it discovered that a subcontractor had only asked prospective employees about drug and alcohol in interviews but failed to secure statements in writing. Work halted for three weeks. It is easy to see where this is going. If the NRC ever issues a construction license, the builder will be second-guessed on every rivet until the project is years behind schedule and $5 billion over budget. That will prove, once again, that nuclear is "too expensive to be built in this country." Meanwhile, China and Japan are building their reactors in less than four years for $5 billion. To the swift goes the race. SIX MONTHS AGO, Secretary of Energy Steven Chu electrified the industry by suggesting in a Wall Street Journal editorial that the U.S. might find a niche in building small modular reactors--something about the size of a gazebo--that can be buried in the ground and power a town of 20,000 while running for 20 years without refueling. Both Babcock & Wilcox and a California company named Hyperion have designs. Moving in this direction could break the logjam at the NRC and offer utilities bite-sized projects that would not require them to risk their entire net worth. Yet Hyperion already enquired about a license application at the NRC in 2006 and was told to go away--the Commission didn't have time for such small potatoes. (License applicants must pay the entire cost of the process, which means an investment of tens of millions.) Meanwhile, the dream that the U.S. might regain some technological lead is already fading. Toshiba has a mini-reactor it has been trying for years to sell to Galena, Alaska, an isolated village entirely dependent on diesel imports. The Russians are outfitting small reactors on barges and floating them into Siberian coastal villages. Then three months after Chu's op-ed, the Koreans announced they would also enter the field with their own mini-reactor. The idea t