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### 1NC Consumption K

#### First, the links: Resource switching will never solve for demand—need to change consumption patterns to effectively solve

Wallis, 2010

[Victor, teaches in the Liberal Arts department at the Berklee College of Music (in Boston) and is the managing editor of Socialism and Democracy, “Beyond green capitalism.” Monthly Review61. 9 (Feb 2010): 32-48, accessed online via proquest] /Wyo-MB

The desirability of shifting to certain inexhaustible or renewable energy sources is obvious. What is not so widely recognized, however, is that these sources too have their costs - in terms of installation, collection, maintenance, and transmission - and that therefore none of them, despite whatever abundance may characterize their occurrence in nature, can offer unlimited accessibility for energy supply.10 Some of the alternative sources, such as hydrogen and biomass, themselves require significant if not prohibitive energy inputs. Biomass (burning biological materials as fuel) also threatens to reduce the land-area available for growing food. Hydrogen, for its part, carries the danger of leakage and of rising to the stratosphere, where it could destroy the ozone layer. Tapping geothermal energy can, in certain regions, risk provoking seismic disturbances; in addition, there may be high costs associated with the depth of requisite drilling, and the emerging heat may be dissipated in various ways. Wind energy, despite its clear positive potential, is limited by materials and space requirements, as well as by the irregularity of its source in many locations. Tidal power is more continuous than wind energy, but in addition to the high installation cost of its requisite barrages or underwater turbines, it poses - as do wind turbines - certain dangers for resident or migrant wildlife. Solar energy, finally, is extraordinarily promising in direct localized applications, but for power generation on a large scale, it would risk impinging on space required for other purposes. As for solar collectors situated in otherwise unused desert regions, their dust-free maintenance in such sites would require the long-distance trans-shipment of vast quantities of water. All these technologies, with the partial exception of biomass, avoid adding to the net concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The same might perhaps be said of nuclear power, provided that, as the more up-to-date versions promise, it does not entail further largescale mining and refinement of fissionable material. Nuclear power has other problematic implications, however, beyond its daunting startup costs in both time and money. Even if we were to suppose - as is further claimed - that the problem of waste has been minimized via repeated re-use (until there is hardly any radioactive material left) and that the dangers of a Chernobyl-type disaster or of vulnerability to military attack have been addressed by engineering improvements,11 there still remains the fact that nuclear power is linked to the potential for making bombs, and no disarmament process is underway. The imperialist governments will therefore not allow nuclear power to be distributed on a scale sufficient to match the potential global demand for it. The longer-term ecological and political desideratum would not be to undo such restrictions, but rather to impose them on the imperialist powers themselves, as part of a full-scale conversion process. The upshot of all these considerations is that the question of how to supply the world's currently growing energy demand without continuing recourse to carbon dioxide-producing fossil fuels - coal, oil, and natural gas - has not yet been solved. In view of the problems associated with all the alternative energy sources, a radical and comprehensive reconsideration of the demand side of this equation would seem to be called for. This is the essence of the socialist response: while encouraging the use of various safe-energy alternatives, it can accept the fact that these alternatives are ultimately limited in their total power-generating capacity, and therefore that the world's aggregate energy consumption will actually have to be reduced. Once this is understood, one can then focus on the interrelated issues of how to identify and prioritize real needs, and how to correspondingly reorganize society in such a way as to assure everyone's well-being. This is beyond the purview of capitalist thought, whatever its level of awareness of the environmental danger.

#### Second, the Impact—consumption focus is the only way to solve for overconsumption and misconsumption that threaten human survival

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

A strictly ecological interpretation takes consumption as perfectly ‘‘natural.’’ To survive, all organisms must consume— that is, degrade resources. This interpretation of a given consumption act is background consumption. It refers to the normal, biological functioning of all organisms, humans included. Every act of background consumption by an individual alters the environment, the total environmental impact being a function of aggregate consumption of the population. Individuals consume to meet a variety of needs, physical and psychological, both of which contribute to the ability of the individual to survive and reproduce. From this limited, asocial, nonethical interpretation of consumption, all consumption patterns and consequences are natural, including population explosions and crashes and irreversibilities caused by the expansion of one species at the expense of other species. If, however, the interpretation is modified to include human concern for population crashes, species extinctions, permanent diminution of ecosystem functioning, diminished reproductive and developmental potential of individuals, and other irreversible effects, then ‘‘problematic consumption’’ becomes relevant. Two interpretive layers are overconsumption and misconsumption. Overconsumption is the level or quality of consumption that undermines a species’ own life-support system and for which individuals and collectivities have choices in their consuming patterns. Overconsumption is an aggregate-level concept. With instances of overconsumption, individual behavior may be perfectly sensible, conforming either to the evolutionary dictates of fitness or to the economically productive dictates of rational decision making. Collective, social behavior may appear sensible, too, as when increased consumption is needed in an advanced industrial economy to stimulate productive capacity and compete in international markets. But eventually the collective outcome from overconsuming is catastrophe for the population or the species. From a thermodynamic and ecological perspective, this is the problem of excessive throughput. 21 The population or species has commanded more of the regenerative capacity of natural resources and more of the assimilative capacity of waste sinks than the relevant ecosystems can support. And it is an ethical problem because it inheres only in populations or species that can reflect on their collective existence. What is more, for humans it becomes a political problem when the trends are toward collapse, power differences influence impacts, and those impacts generate conflict. The second interpretive layer within problematic consumption is misconsumption, which concerns individual behavior. The problem here is that the individual consumes in a way that undermines his or her own well-being even if there are no aggregate effects on the population or species. Put differently, the long-term effect of an individual’s consumption pattern is either suboptimal or a net loss to that individual. It may or may not, however, undermine collective survival. Such consumption can occur along several dimensions.

#### Third is the alt, rejection of the 1ac’s production focus in favor of a consumption based approach to energy resources.

#### And, A Consumption based approach is necessary to solve—must flip the production angle on its head--

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

If the production angle is inherently unecological, if it naturally overwhelms feedback that would otherwise reveal long-term net harm, then the consumption angle, if it has analytic and policy utility, ought to do just the opposite. It should direct analytic attention to what is lost, to what risks are incurred when, in this example, the harvest rate exceeds the regenerative rate of the forest ecosystem. Following the framework outlined above, I begin the consumption angle within the productionconsumption, supply-demand dichotomy, then shift to material activity up and down the chain of resource-use decisions. Within the production-consumption dichotomy, the first observation is that the production-oriented measures do not solve the problem of overharvesting. They mitigate the damage or extend the time until the forest is completely cut over. When resource-use decisions are largely governed by agents and managers and consumers highly removed from the forest itself, the problem is not inefficiencies or lack of political will or greed. The problem is not inefficient use of logs and lumber or the political difficulties of creating parks and buffer strips. Indeed, the problem is not the intricacies of meeting ever-increasing demand, satisfying customers, stockholders, and workers. Rather, the problem is the demand itself, the array of signals and incentives coming from actors highly distanced from ecological constraint. 27 A consumption perspective therefore asks about the nature of the demand, what is otherwise forbidden territory in the production angle where consumers are sovereign. The consumption angle asks whether the increasing demand is simply a matter of a growing population in need, say, of shelter; whether the price paid by buyers reflect full costs, social and ecological (however measured); whether consumption is facilitated, maybe subsidized, by low-cost transportation infrastructure or easy credit; 28 whether the benefits of new products are highlighted while the drawbacks are shaded; whether retailers launched a new line of luxury furniture or builders doubled the average house size (yet again). It asks whether consumers have the option of choosing less wood-intensive means of meeting the same needs. What is more, the consumption angle raises questions of nonpurchase. Is some segment of the population forgoing purchase of the product and, if so, is it because of income, availability, information, or alternative means of meeting the same needs? In other words, is nonpurchase a meaningful option and, if so, does the increasing demand truly reflect a net social-welfare gain, the implicit assumption in the production angle? Shifting to consumption as ‘‘using up,’’ a comprehensive analysis would examine each decision node from initial extraction to ultimate use and disposal. Here I focus on processing and initial extraction. From the production angle, a mill owner ‘‘produces’’ lumber from logs. Equally logically, yet from the consumption angle, the mill owner consumes logs from the timber owner’s forest. That is, what is used up is a log and its alternative uses. The log is irretrievably converted to one item— lumber— never to be used for veneer or paper or larger-dimension lumber. Applying the same logic to the timber owner and the forest, what is used up, it would appear at first glance, is trees. Each tree cut is irreversibly removed, its ability to photosynthesize and provide habitat for other plants and animals, completely eliminated. But at some rate and extent of harvest, more than single trees’ capacity to put on cellulose is consumed. Each tree constitutes a node in a complex system. As some trees fall to the ax (or to wind or insects), the system, being adaptive and resilient, adjusts. But as more trees fall, a threshold is passed and the integrity of the system is compromised. At this level of harvest, the system itself and all the species it entails and ecosystem services it provides are, indeed, consumed— that is, used up. Efficient production, erosion control, and preserves (unless on a system scale) do nothing to alter this ultimate effect of ever-increasing harvest. They may postpone the threshold or soften its impact, but the forest ecosystem is still consumed. From this analytic perspective, all decision makers along the chain from extraction to end use are ‘‘consumers.’’ As such, they and policy makers and citizens who condition their choices logically must ask what is ‘‘used up,’’ what services are put at risk, what features of the primary resource— the forest ecosystem (not the trees)—are being eliminated. Moreover, to ask these questions is unavoidably to ask about long-term effects. If the ecosystem is degraded, will there always be another? Do the benefits accrued by each actor along the material chain accumulate so as to unambiguously override the risk or loss of the ecosystem (especially if such a judgment is made in an open, well-informed forum rather than in the market)? Are future generations likely to recognize and accept the value of the trade-off: more human capital (lumber and furniture and their associated technologies) for less natural capital? These are questions of long-term sustainable resource use, not environmental improvement. They take high-integrity ecosystems as given, indeed necessary, not the social organization for resource use and economic expansion that happens to be hegemonic at this historical juncture. But I should stress that these questions derive logically from the consumption angle, not from the arbitrary or ideologically derived positions of those who ‘‘value nature’’ or who profess concern for future generations. These questions come from turning the dominant perspective on its head and asking not what goods are produced (and presuming that all such goods consumed are ‘‘good’’), but what services, what forms of social and natural capital, are consumed. Just as the production angle presumes goods are good and more goods are better, in the consumption angle, life-support systems are presumed fragile and critical irreversibilities possible. ‘‘Cautious consuming’’ is not only prudent but rational. In addition, not only do these questions derive logically from the consumption angle, whether emphasizing the demand side or viewing all economic activity as consuming, the perspective itself is at least as logical as the production angle. In fact, although the production angle may be the most logical in an ‘‘empty-world,’’ frontier economy, in a ‘‘full world,’’ in an ecologically constrained economy, the consumption angle can be judged more logical. It does, after all, draw attention to ecosystem functioning as an integral part of the analysis, not as an addon, not as an ‘‘externality,’’ the prevailing approach in the production angle.

### CP- 1NC Text

#### Text:

#### The fifty United States state governments and relevant United States territories should adopt federal standards for cause of action on radiation doses and nuclear waste standards. (Solves Jose and Garza ’07 and Harvey ’11)

#### The fifty United States state governments and relevant United States territories should not preclude the construction or operation of a nuclear power plant with a Nuclear Regulatory Commission approved license for construction or operating a nuclear power plant. (Solves Garvey 11)

#### States leadership on nuclear power production solves

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

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

### 1NC: Elections

#### Don’t buy statistical noise- Obama will win even post-debate slide

Silver Oct. 8th

[Nate Silver, political analyst, Amid Volatile Polling, Keep an Eye on Election Fundamentals, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/08/after-conventions-follow-the-bouncing-poll-numbers/>, uwyo//amp]

By the weekend, however — after the release of a favorable jobs report last Friday — Mr. Romney’s bounce seemed to be receding some. Tracking polls released on Monday by Gallup and Rasmussen Reports actually showed a shift back toward Mr. Obama, although another poll by Pew Research showed Mr. Romney with a four-point lead among likely voters. Polling data is often very noisy, and not all polls use equally rigorous methodology. But the polls, as a whole, remain consistent with the idea that they may end up settling where they were before the conventions, with Mr. Obama ahead by about two points. Such an outcome would be in line with what history and the fundamentals of the economy would lead you to expect.

#### Biden consolidated the working class white vote-Romney and Ryan can’t relate

Church Oct. 12th

[Glenn Church, contributor, October 12th, 2012, Joe Biden Rode His Working Class Background in the Debate, <http://foolocracy.com/2012/10/joe-biden-rode-his-working-class-background-in-the-debate/>, uwyo///amp]

Joe Biden spoke about the middle class 24 times in the VP debate. That is because the Vice President is about as middle class as a vice president can be. That helps explain why Biden came across as a blue-collar worker from a Scranton mill. During the debate, he looked like the guy who would come into a bar from a hard day’s work and let everyone know what he thinks. If you disagreed with him, then you might need to step outside into the alley for an attitude adjustment. The exact people whom Obama has difficulty relating to, white working-class males, are the very people that Biden relates to. Biden speaks their language. He understands their problems. Neither Obama, Romney nor Ryan bring that personal connection. Ryan, who showed off his knowledge and qualifications strongly, looked like the junior partner in a law firm. He was competent and decisive, but he isn’t going to relate to working-class voters like Biden. Will any of this change the way people vote? Probably not many. But it will buy a week for the Obama/Biden campaign. Biden may have bought a second look for Obama from working and middle class voters. What Obama does with it will have to wait until the next presidential debate.

#### Blue collar, working class whites will decide the election due to their swing state locations- Obama will alienate them and send them to Romney should he reject traditional FF expansion

Mead 2012

[Walter Russell Mead, James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine, and is recognized as one of the country's leading students of American foreign policy. June 6, 2012, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/>, Uwyo//amp]

Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “brown jobs” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election. Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign. As the FT reports: “Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio,” he said. Republicans, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . . Mr Romney has said he will approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work. As we’ve mentioned before, energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector. From a political perspective, Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.

**Romney election causes Iran strikes. Approach to Iran is the biggest contrast in Obama and Romney foreign policy – Obama will continue to push sanctions and negotiation while Romney will bow to Israeli desires to attack and pursue a bombastic foreign policy.**

**Daily KOs**, Editorial, “The Daily Kos, President Obama Versus Romney on Iran”, 4/16/**2012** <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>

To me, however **the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran.** Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, **we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come.** (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "**The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process**," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia. "But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. **Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent** a needless **war.** You can be sure that Mitt **Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”.** As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. **Bottom line, if** somehow **the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a** more than likely **bombardment of Iran. If** the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and **they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.**

#### That leads to a global nuclear holocaust which draws in Russia and China AND leads to the detonation of CBW’s

**Morgan 09**

[Dennis Ray Morgan, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies- South Korea, 10 July 2009, World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race, Futures 41 (2009) 683–693, uwyo//amp]

**Given the present day predicament regarding Iran’s attempt to become a nuclear power, particular attention should be given to one of Moore’s scenarios depicting nuclear war that begins through an attack on Iran’s supposed nuclear facilities**. According to Seymour Hersh [12] **the nuclear option against Iran has, in fact, been discussed** by sources in the Pentagon as a viable option. As Hersh reports, **according to a former intelligence officer, the lack of ‘‘reliable intelligence leaves military planners, given the goal of totally destroying the sites, little choice but to consider the use of tactical nuclear weapons. ‘Every other option, in the view of the nuclear weaponeers, would leave a gap,’** the former senior intelligence official said. ‘Decisive is the key word of the Air Force’s planning. **It’s a tough decision. But we made it in Japan**.’’ [12].10 The official continues to explain **how White House and Pentagon officials are considering the nuclear option for Iran, ‘‘Nuclear planners go through extensive training** and learn the technical details of damage and fallout - we’re talking about mushroom clouds, radiation, mass casualties, and contamination over years. This is not an underground nuclear test, where all you see is the earth raised a little bit. **These politicians don’t have a clue, and whenever anybody tries to get it out – remove the nuclear option – they’re shouted down’’** [12]. Understandably, some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not comfortable about consideration of the nuclear option in a first strike, and some officers have even discussed resigning. Hersh quotes the former intelligence officer as saying, ‘‘Late this winter, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sought to remove the nuclear option from the evolving war plans for Iran - without success. The White House said, ‘Why are you challenging this? The option came from you’’’ [12]. **This scenario has gained even more plausibility since a January 2007 Sunday Times report [13] of an Israeli intelligence leak that Israel was considering a strike against Iran, using low-yield bunker busting nukes to destroy Iran’s supposedly secret underground nuclear facilities. In Moore’s scenario, non-nuclear neighboring countries would then respond with conventional rockets and chemical, biological and radiological weapons. Israel then would retaliate with nuclear strikes on several countries, including a pre-emptive strike against Pakistan, who then retaliates with an attack not only on Israel but pre-emptively striking India as well. Israel then initiates the ‘‘Samson option’’ with attacks on other Muslim countries, Russia, and possibly the ‘‘anti-Semitic’’ cities of Europe. At that point, all-out nuclear war ensues as the U.S. retaliates with nuclear attacks on Russia and possibly on China** as well.11 Out of the four interrelated factors that could precipitate a nuclear strike and subsequent escalation into nuclear war, probably the accidental factor is one that deserves particular attention since its likelihood is much greater than commonly perceived. In an article, ‘‘20 Mishaps that Might Have Started a Nuclear War,’’ Phillips [14] cites the historical record to illustrate how an accident, misinterpretation,or false alarm could ignite a nuclear war. Most of these incidents occurred during a time of intense tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the Cuban Missile Crisis, but other mishaps occurred during other times, with the most recent one in 1995. Close inspection of each of these incidents reveals how likely it is that an ‘‘accident’’ or misinterpretation of phenomena or data (‘‘glitch’’) can lead to nuclear confrontation and war. In his overall analysis, Phillips writes: The probability of actual progression to nuclear war on any one of the occasions listed may have been small, due to planned ‘‘failsafe’’ features in the warning and launch systems, and to responsible action by those in the chain of command when the failsafe features had failed. However, the accumulation of small probabilities of disaster from a long sequence of risks adds up to serious danger. There is no way of telling what the actual level of risk was in these mishaps but if the chance of disaster in every one of the 20 incidents had been only 1 in 100, it is a mathematical fact that the chance of surviving all 20 would have been 82%, i.e. about the same as the chance of surviving a single pull of the trigger at Russian roulette played with a 6- shooter. With a similar series of mishaps on the Soviet side: another pull of the trigger. If the risk in some of the events had been as high as 1 in 10, then the chance of surviving just seven such events would have been less than 50:50. [14]12 **Aggression in the Middle East along with the willingness to use low-yield ‘‘bunker busting’’ nukes by the U.S. only increases the likelihood of nuclear war and catastrophe in the future. White House and Pentagon policy-makers are seriously considering the use of strategic nuclear weapons against Iran**. As Ryan McMaken explains, **someone at the Pentagon who had . . .not yet completed the transformation into a complete sociopath leaked the ‘Nuclear Posture Review’ which outlined plans for a nuclear ‘end game’ with Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria, none of which possess nuclear weapons. The report also outlined plans to let the missiles fly on Russia and China** as well, even though virtually everyone on the face of the Earth thought we had actually normalized relations with them. **It turns out, much to the surprise of the Chinese and the Russians, that they are still potential enemies in a nuclear holocaust.**

#### NRC actions generate controversy- always linked to safety and waste fears

Garvey 11

[Todd Garvey, Legislative Attorney, State Authority to Regulate Nuclear Power: Federal Preemption Under the Atomic, CRS Reports, Energy Act September 6, 2011]

Recent events, however, have the potential to slow the current growth period. Most importantly, the earthquake and tsunami that caused significant damage to the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant in Japan have heightened nuclear safety concerns in the United States.2 In addition, congressional and media focus on the federal government’s failure to develop a disposal solution for the nation’s growing stockpile of nuclear waste;3 reports of radioactive tritium leaks from nuclear reactors in various states;4 and a threat to a federal nuclear facility in New Mexico due to wildfires5 have all reinforced the health and safety concerns associated with nuclear power.6 Also, significant controversy has surrounded the NRC, the independent regulatory commission charged with ensuring the safety of nuclear power in the United States, relating to the Commission’s role in determining whether to license the proposed Yucca Mountain nuclear waste facility.7 These various forces have culminated in increased concern over the safety of nuclear power generally— all during a period in which operating licenses for 18 reactors will expire by 2020 if not renewed.

## Case

### Preemption

#### NRC already has authority to preempt any law that inhibits the construction or operation of nuclear power plants

Garvey, 2011

[Todd, Legislative attorney reporting for congressional research service, “State Authority to Regulate Nuclear Power: Federal Preemption Under the Atomic Energy Act.” 9-6-11, Online, https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=20&cad=rja&ved=0CFUQFjAJOAo&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.hsdl.org%2F%3Fview%26did%3D718958&ei=nm1mUJ\_EEaapiALH9IC4Bw&usg=AFQjCNFgzlXBq8\_XGgKmLPjt6bvCSyc0TQ] /Wyo-MB

The Court then employed Congress’s intended division of authority to determine the preemptive scope of the AEA. In doing so the Court established two instances in which state law was preempted. First, almost in passing, the Court noted that any state statute which sought to regulate the “construction and operation” of a nuclear power plant, even if enacted out of nonsafety concerns,” would “directly conflict with the NRC’s exclusive authority over plant construction and operation.”44 Thus, any state law seeking to regulate the “construction or operation” of a nuclear power plant would be preempted, either as in “conflict” with federal law, or as within a field exclusively occupied by the NRC. Without elaborating, the Court concluded that the California statute did not attempt to regulate the “construction or operation” of a nuclear reactor.

#### No nuke renaissance—natural gas is too cheap

Hiltzik, 2011

[Michael, LA times, “A nuclear renaissance in U.S. was unlikely even before Japan disaster.” 3-23-11, Online, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/23/business/la-fi-hiltzik-20110323] /Wyo-MB

To all those who may be concerned that the catastrophic events at Japan's Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant will derail the heralded renaissance of nuclear power in the U.S., you can relax.¶ The reason is simple: There is no renaissance.¶ Not even Exelon Corp., the nation's biggest nuclear generation company, has been holding its breath for a surge in orders or appreciable increase in new generating capacity. The reason has little to do with an unreasoning public's fear of nuclear meltdowns and radiation poisoning, and almost everything to do with pure economics. As John Rowe, Exelon's chairman and chief executive, told an audience at a Washington think tank two weeks ago, you can build a new natural gas plant for 40% less than a new nuclear plant, and the price of its fuel is at rock bottom.¶ "Natural gas is queen," he says. (To be fair, Exelon also makes a lot of money from gas.)

#### NRC lax enforcement will elevate nuclear costs because it will create massive compliance costs

Lochbaum 8

[David, Union of Concerned Scientists, “Fixing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission”, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/fixing-the-nuclear-regulatory-commission]

NRC's inadequate enforcement has caused significant safety and economic problems. In its September 2006 report, "Walking a Nuclear Tightrope: Unlearned Lessons of Year-plus Reactor Outages," UCS described the 36 times since 1966 that U.S. nuclear power reactors remained shut down a year or longer to restore safety levels eroded by accumulated violations. In these cases, it took an army of workers more than a year, and cost an average of nearly $1.7 billion, to bring the reactor back into compliance. Inadequate enforcement by the NRC allowed safety levels to erode over several years, resulting in unnecessarily higher risk to the surrounding communities during those years and higher cost to the owners.

#### [2.] Federalism causes economic growth – US, Europe, and China prove. This answers their China competition argument and is more qualified

Qian & Weingast, 97- Assistant Professor of Economics, and Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution at Stanford University (YINGYI QIAN and BARRY WEINGAST, “Federalism as a Commitment to Preserving Market Incentives”, Journal of Economic Perspectives, Fall, http://www-siepr.stanford.edu/workp/swp97042.pdf)

Studies of federalism typically illustrate their principles using the state governments of the United States or the national and supranational governments of Europe. In addition to drawing on those cases, we believe that modern China provides a striking example of the economic benefits of federalism. China has emphasized economic reform through devolution of authority from the central to local governments, in contrast to the more centralized reform in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Along several critical dimensions, China’s central government has explicitly limited its information as a way of credibly committing the center not to repeat the pernicious behavior of the Mao era. For example, the central government allows local governments to maintain various "extra-budget" and "off-budget" accounts. Limited knowledge about these budgets commits the central government not to tax them, which in turn encourages local governments to generate prosperity and revenue. The central government also issues large quantities of cash, facilitating cash transactions which are far less prone to state predation. Also, the state permits private savings accounts with state banks under false names, and thus credibly commits not to confiscate bank deposits for a particular person. Of course, the central government can still confiscate a portion of all deposits by taxation or inflation, but the political costs would be high. Although not completely binding its own hands, the central government’s devolution of information and authority makes it harder to use those hands.

#### [1.] Manufacturing Industries are doing well now—key driver of GDP growth, added 17% of net jobs in the US and increased construction

Vavra, 8-21 (post date)

[Bob, Editor at Plant Engineering, “Kurek: It’s A Pivotal Time For Manufacturing,” Plant Engineering, August 21, 2012, <http://www.plantengineering.com/single-article/kurek-its-a-pivotal-time-for-manufacturing/62d3b081a9ef1ae68369c0001472e4ee.html>, //uwyo-baj {Karen Kurek, The National Manufacturing And Distribution Practice Leader With McGladrey LLP.}]

CFE: Assess the state of U.S. manufacturing, both in this country and as it compares with the rest of the world. Kurek: In our survey of manufacturers and distributors earlier this year, the number of thriving and growing companies almost doubled in 2011 compared to the 2010 figures. Some industry sectors — notably automotive and industrial equipment —gained new life after being hit particularly hard by an uncommonly weak economy. From this perspective, it seemed as if the industry could be on the cusp of a true renaissance and leading the economic recovery. In fact, despite a slow economic recovery in the U.S. overall, manufacturing has been a key driver of GPD growth for the past 18 to 24 months. Particularly in states such as Indiana and Oregon, the economic influence of the industry is strong. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, year-to-date the manufacturing sector has contributed 17% of all net job creation in the economy. And the Census Bureau noted a strong rise in durable goods orders and, year-over-year, manufacturing construction is up nearly 27%.

#### **[2.] Alt causes to manufacturing collapse**

Plastics Today, 12

[“Four long-term issues that could sink U.S. manufacturing,” Plastics Today, August 21, 2012, <http://www.plasticstoday.com/articles/four-long-term-issues-could-sink-us-manufacturing-082120123>, //uwyo-baj]

U.S. manufacturing is growing stronger but that expansion is in spite of four direct challenges to continued relevance in the global market: growing inadequacy of its infrastructure; a lack of qualified factory workers; a tax and regulatory regime that generally does not provide incentives for expansion projects; and the lack of a long-term national industrial policy. Those key findings from a gathering of industry, labor, government, and academia at the U.S. Manufacturing Competitiveness Initiative: Dialogue on Next Generation Supply Networks and Logistics, held in February at the Georgia Tech Global Learning Center in Atlanta.

#### Economic collapse does not cause war—their historical arguments are wrong

Ferguson 6

(Niall, MA, D.Phil., is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University. He is a resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He is also a Senior Reseach Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct)

**Nor can economic crises explain** the **bloodshed**. What may be **the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to** the rise of **fascism and** the outbreak of **World War II. But** that simple story leaves too much out. **Nazi Germany started the war** in Europe **only after its economy** had **recovered. Not all** the **countries affected by the** Great **Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars** of aggression. In fact, **no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible** for the century as a whole. **Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.**

#### The economy is resilient

Lambro 8

- chief political correspondent of The Washington Times (7/28/08, Donald Lambro, The Washington Times, "Always darkest before dawn", lexis)

**The doom-and-gloomers are still with us, of course, and they will go to their graves forecasting that life as we know it is coming to an end and that we are in for years of economic depression and recession**. Last week, the New York Times ran a Page One story maintaining that Americans were saving less than ever, and that their debt burden had risen by an average of $117,951 per household. And the London Telegraph says there are even harder times ahead, comparing today's economy to the Great Depression of the 1930s. Wall Street economist David Malpass thinks **that kind of fearmongering is filled with manipulated statistics that ignore long-term wealth creation in our country, as well as globally**. Increasingly, **people are investing "for the long run** - for capital gains (not counted in savings) rather than current income - in preparation for retirement," he told his clients last week. **Instead of a coming recession, "we think the U.S. is in gradual recovery after a sharp** two-quarter **slowdown, with** consumer **resilience more likely than the decades-old expectation** of a consumer slump," Mr. Malpass said. "**Fed data shows clearly that** household **savings** of all types - liquid, financial and tangible - **are** still **close to** the **record levels** set in September. IMF data shows U.S. households holding more net financial savings than the rest of the world combined. **Consumption** **has** repeatedly **outperformed expectations in recent quarters** and year," he said. **The American economy has been pounded by a lot of factors**, including the housing collapse (a needed correction to bring home prices down to earth), the mortgage scandal and the meteoric rise in oil and gas prices. **But this $14 trillion economy**, though slowing down, **continues to grow** by about 1 percent on an annualized basis, confounding the pessimists who said we were plunging into a recession, defined by negative growth over two quarters. That has not happened - yet. Call me a cockeyed optimist, but I do not think we are heading into a recession. On the contrary, I'm more bullish than ever on our economy's long-term prospects.

#### No war/collapse – globalization checks

Zakaria 9

- Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability: Why terrorism and economic turmoil won't keep the world down for long” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.print.html>)

**Political and economic stability have each reinforced the other**. And the third **force that has underpinned the resilience of the global system is technological connectivity. Globalization has always existed in a sense in the modern world, but until recently its contours were mostly limited to trade**: countries made goods and sold them abroad. Today the information revolution has created a much more deeply connected global system. Managers in Arkansas can work with suppliers in Beijing on a real-time basis. The production of almost every complex manufactured product now involves input from a dozen countries in a tight global supply chain. And the consequences of connectivity go well beyond economics. Women in rural India have learned through satellite television about the independence of women in more modern countries. Citizens in Iran have used cell phones and the Internet to connect to their well-wishers beyond their borders. Globalization today is fundamentally about knowledge being dispersed across our world. This **diffusion of knowledge may actually be the most important reason for the stability of the current system. The majority of the world's nations have learned some basic lessons about political well-being and wealth creation. They have taken advantage of the opportunities provided by peace, low inflation, and technology to plug in to the global system**. And they have seen the indisputable results. **Despite all the turmoil of the past year, it's important to remember that more people have been lifted out of poverty over the last two decades than in the preceding 10**. Clear-thinking citizens around the world are determined not to lose these gains by falling for some ideological chimera, or searching for a worker's utopia. They are even cautious about the appeals of hypernationalism and war. Most have been there, done that. And they know the price. In fact, **the most remarkable development in the last few years has been the way China, India, Brazil, and other emerging markets have managed their affairs prudently, taming growth by keeping interest rates up and restricting credit in the middle of the bubble—just as an economics textbook (and common sense) would advise**. Instead it was the advanced industrial world, which had always lectured everyone else about good political and economic management, that handled its affairs poorly, fueling bubble after bubble, being undisciplined in the boom, and now suffering most during the bust. The data reflect this new reality. By 2014 the debt of the rich countries in the G20 will be 120 percent of GDP, three times the level of debt in the big emerging-market countries. The students of the global system are now doing better than their teachers

### Warming 1NC – AT: Warming Advantage

#### No impact on warming.

#### 1st, Nuke Power doesn’t solve warming:

#### A. Nuke power doesn’t meaningfully solve emissions—way too long timeframe, and high carbon abatement costs make it a bad option

Sokolski, 2010

[Henry, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, "The high and hidden costs of nuclear power." Policy Review 162 (2010): 53+. Academic OneFile. Web. 5 June 2012] /Wyo-MB

Another assertion nuclear power supporters frequently make is that once carbon is no longer free, their zero carbon emission power plants will be the clear, clean-energy victor. Yet nuclear power may already have priced itself out of the running in any carbon abatement competition. Factoring in industry construction, operation, and decommissioning costs, the total cost of abating one ton of carbon by substituting a new nuclear power plant for a modern coal-fired generator has been pegged by nuclear power critics at $120 or more. (3) This figure, which includes the costs of public subsidies, assumes fairly low capital construction costs (roughly one half of the industry's latest high-end cost projections). If one uses high-end projections, the cost for each ton of carbon abated approaches $200. Certainly there are much cheaper and quicker ways to reduce carbon emissions (see Figure 2). Just how rapidly nuclear power can abate carbon emissions is also a significant issue. Certainly, if one is interested in abating carbon in the quickest, least expensive fashion, building expensive nuclear plants that take up to a decade to bring on line will not be an appealing option. That's why in North and South America and the Middle East, the building of natural gas burning generators is currently an attractive, near-term option. Advanced gas-fired power plants can halve carbon emissions as compared to coal-fired plants, can serve as base or peak power generators, and can be brought on line in 18 to 30 months rather than the years upon years needed to build large reactors. Advanced gas-fired generator construction costs, moreover, are a fraction of those projected for nuclear power. (5)

#### B. Cant solve emissions that cause warming—multiple reasons

Totty, 2008

[Michael, WSJ, “The case for and against nuclear power.” 6-30-2008, Online, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121432182593500119.html] /Wyo-MB

Nuclear power isn't a solution to global warming. Rather, global warming is just a convenient rationale for an obsolete energy source that makes no sense when compared to the alternatives.¶ Sure, nuclear power generates lots of electricity while producing virtually no carbon dioxide. But it still faces the same problems that have stymied the development of new nuclear plants for the past 20 years -- exorbitant costs, the risks of an accident or terrorist attack, the threat of proliferation and the challenge of disposing of nuclear waste.¶ The cost issue alone will mean that few if any new nuclear power stations will get built in the next few years, at least in the U.S., and any that do will require expensive taxpayer subsidies. Instead of subsidizing the development of new plants that have all these other problems, the U.S. would be better off investing in other ways to meet growing energy demands and reduce carbon-dioxide emissions.¶ In fact, the sheer number of nuclear plants needed to make a major dent in greenhouse emissions means the industry hasn't a prayer of turning nuclear power into the solution to global warming. One study from last year determined that to make a significant contribution toward stabilizing atmospheric carbon dioxide, about 21 new 1,000-megawatt plants would have to be built each year for the next 50 years, including those needed to replace existing reactors, all of which are expected to be retired by 2050. That's considerably more than the most ambitious industry growth projections.

#### 2nd, Nuke Power causes warming:

#### A. Nuke power contributes to warming from the release of energy

Skorodin, 2010

[Morton, Contributor to global research, “Nuclear Energy Causes Global Warming.” 7-23-10, Online, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=20231] /Wyo-MB

Once you release all that energy from Uranium, as in a nuclear reactor, it is here forever, except for some fraction that radiates out into outer space as “long-wave radiation.” The rest goes into the air, waterways, glaciers, dirt and rocks as waste heat, also called thermal [heat] pollution, increasing the temperature, thereby bringing about global warming.¶ ¶ Is nuclear the only the only source of energy that releases waste heat?¶ ¶ No. Coal, oil and natural gas [hydrocarbons, so-called “fossil fuels”] also release waste heat when burned.¶ ¶ Why is this fact not included in the title of this article?¶ ¶ Because many people already know that use of hydrocarbons causes global warming. Also, many believe that nuclear power does not cause global warming and that it may actually solve the global warming problem. Nothing could be further from the truth, because it produces heat and, therefore, thermal pollution.

#### Historic warming trends occurred without CO2 emissions- roman era proves

Waugh ‘12

[Rob, Columnist Archive for MailOnline, “Tree-rings prove climate was WARMER in Roman and Medieval times than it is now - and world has been cooling for 2,000 years”, 11.7.12., Mail Online, <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2171973/Tree-ring-study-proves-climate-WARMER-Roman-Medieval-times-modern-industrial-age.html>> //wyo-hdm]

Rings in fossilised pine trees have proven that the world was much warmer than previously thought - and the earth has been slowly COOLING for 2,000 years. Measurements stretching back to 138BC prove that the Earth is slowly cooling due to changes in the distance between the Earth and the sun. The finding may force scientists to rethink current theories of the impact of global warming. It is the first time that researchers have been able to accurately measure trends in global temperature over the last two millennia. Over that time, the world has been getting cooler - and previous estimates, used as the basis for current climate science, are wrong. Their findings demonstrate that this trend involves a cooling of -0.3°C per millennium due to gradual changes to the position of the sun and an increase in the distance between the Earth and the sun. ‘This figure we calculated may not seem particularly significant,’ says Esper, ‘however, it is also not negligible when compared to global warming, which up to now has been less than 1°C. 'Our results suggest that the large-scale climate reconstruction shown by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) likely underestimate this long-term cooling trend over the past few millennia.’ The finding was based on semi-fossilised tree rings found in Finnish lapland. Professor Dr. Jan Esper's group at the Institute of Geography at JGU used tree-ring density measurements from sub-fossil pine trees originating from Finnish Lapland to produce a reconstruction reaching back to 138 BC. In so doing, the researchers have been able for the first time to precisely demonstrate that the long-term trend over the past two millennia has been towards climatic cooling. ‘We found that previous estimates of historical temperatures during the Roman era and the Middle Ages were too low,’ says Esper. ‘Such findings are also significant with regard to climate policy, as they will influence the way today's climate changes are seen in context of historical warm periods.’ The annual growth rings in trees are the most important witnesses over the past 1,000 to 2,000 years as they indicate how warm and cool past climate conditions were.

#### BAD DATA HAS EXAGGERATED RATE—WILL BE SLOW

MATTHEWS (Heartland Institute) 4/1/01

[Robert, Environmental and Climate News, <http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=1137>]

Fresh doubt has been cast on evidence for global warming following the discovery that a key method of measuring temperature change has exaggerated the warming rate by almost 40 percent. Studies of temperature records dating back more than a century have seemed to indicate a rise in global temperature of around 0.5C, with much of it occurring since the late 1970s. This has led many scientists to conclude global warming is under way, with the finger of blame usually pointed at man-made emissions of such greenhouse gases as carbon dioxide. Now an international team of scientists, including researchers from the Met Office in Bracknell, Berkshire, United Kingdom, has found serious discrepancies in the temperature measurements, suggesting that the amount of global warming is much less than previously believed.

# 2nc

### 2NC Impact Calculus – Magnitude

#### Extend Morgan 2009 – US and Israeli strikes are likely to use nuclear bunker busters because of unreliable intelligence causing global nuclear holocaust.

#### The impact is extinction – 3 scenarios [1.] Causes US-China-Russia nuclear war.

#### [2.] Middle East CBW conflict – causes extinction

Ochs 2

Richard, June 9, pg. <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>.

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### [3.] Causes India-Pakistan conflict – that causes extinction

Fai 7/8/01 (Ghulam Nabi; Executive director - Kashmiri American Council) Washington Times l/n wbw

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. **The most dangerous place on the planet is** Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and **sandwiched between nuclear -capable India and Pakistan**. **It has ignited two wars** between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, **and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe**. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. **The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries**. **Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles**. **Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations**. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

#### US strike on Iran causes extinction

Hirsch 6

Jorge, Professor of Physics at the University of California San Diego, 2006“America and Iran: At the Brink of the Abyss”, Feb 20, <http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8577>.

The U.S. has just declared that it will defend Israel militarily against Iran if needed. Presumably this includes a scenario where Israel would initiate hostilities by unprovoked bombing of Iranian facilities, as it did with Iraq's Osirak, and Iran would respond with missiles targeting Israel. The U.S. intervention is likely to be further bombing of Iran's facilities, including underground installations that can only be destroyed with low-yield nuclear bunker-busters. Such nuclear weapons may cause low casualties, perhaps only in the hundreds [.pdf], but the nuclear threshold will have been crossed. Iran's reaction to a U.S. attack with nuclear weapons, no matter how small, cannot be predicted with certainty. U.S. planners may hope that it will deter Iran from responding, thus saving lives. However, just as the U.S. forces in Iraq were not greeted with flowers, it is likely that such an attack would provoke a violent reaction from Iran and lead to the severe escalation of hostilities, which in turn would lead to the use of larger nuclear weapons by the U.S. and potential casualties in the hundreds of thousands. Witness the current uproar over cartoons and try to imagine the resulting upheaval in the Muslim world after the U.S. nukes Iran. - The Military's Moral Dilemma - Men and women in the military forces, including civilian employees, may be facing a difficult moral choice at this very moment and in the coming weeks, akin to the moral choices faced by Colin Powell and Dan Ellsberg. The paths these two men followed were radically different. Colin Powell was an American hero, widely respected and admired at the time he was appointed secretary of state in 2001. In February 2003, he chose to follow orders despite his own serious misgivings, and delivered the pivotal UN address that paved the way for the U.S. invasion of Iraq the following month. Today, most Americans believe the Iraq invasion was wrong, and Colin Powell is disgraced, his future destroyed, and his great past achievements forgotten. Daniel Ellsberg, a military analyst, played a significant role in ending the Vietnam War by leaking the Pentagon Papers. He knew that he would face prosecution for breaking the law, but was convinced it was the correct moral choice. His courageous and principled action earned him respect and gratitude. The Navy has just reminded [.pdf] its members and civilian employees what the consequences are of violating provisions concerning the release of information about the nuclear capabilities of U.S. forces. Why right now, for the first time in 12 years? Because it is well aware of moral choices that its members may face, and it hopes to deter certain actions. But courageous men and women are not easily deterred. To disobey orders and laws and to leak information are difficult actions that entail risks. Still, many principled individuals have done it in the past and will continue to do it in the future ( see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].) Conscientious objection to the threat and use of nuclear weapons is a moral choice. Once the American public becomes fully aware that military action against Iran will include the planned use of nuclear weapons, public support for military action will quickly disappear. Anything could get the ball rolling. A great catastrophe will have been averted. Even U.S. military law recognizes that there is no requirement to obey orders that are unlawful. The use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country can be argued to be in violation of international law, the principle of just war, the principle of proportionality, common standards of morality ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]), and customs that make up the law of armed conflict. Even if the nuclear weapons used are small, because they are likely to cause escalation of the conflict they violate the principle of proportionality and will cause unnecessary suffering. The Nuremberg Tribunal, which the United States helped to create, established that "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." To follow orders or to disobey orders, to keep information secret or to leak it, are choices for each individual to make – extremely difficult choices that have consequences. But not choosing is not an option. - America's Collective Responsibility - Blaming the administration or the military for crossing the nuclear threshold is easy, but responsibility will be shared by all Americans. All Americans knew, or should have known, that using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country like Iran was a possibility given the Bush administration's new policies. All Americans could have voiced their opposition to these policies and demand that they be reversed. The media will carry a heavy burden of responsibility. The mainstream media could have effectively raised public awareness of the possibility that the U.S. would use nuclear weapons against Iran. So far, they have chosen to almost completely hide the issue, which is being increasingly addressed in non-mainstream media. Members of Congress could have raised the question forcefully, calling for public hearings, demanding public discussion of the administration's plans, and passing new laws or resolutions. So far they have failed to do so and are derelict in their responsibility to their constituents. Letters to the president from some in Congress [1], [2] are a start, but are not likely to elicit a meaningful response or a change in plans and are a far cry from forceful action. Scientific organizations and organizations dealing with arms control and nuclear weapons could have warned of the dangers associated with the Iran situation. So far, they have not done so ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). Scientists and engineers responsible for the development of nuclear weapons could have voiced concern [.pdf] when the new U.S. nuclear weapons policies became known, policies that directly involve the fruits of their labor. Their voices have not been heard. Those who contribute their labor to the scientific and technical infrastructure that makes nuclear weapons and their means of delivery possible bear a particularly heavy burden of moral responsibility. Their voices have barely been heard. - The Nuclear Abyss - The United States is preparing to enter a new era: an era in which it will enforce nuclear nonproliferation by the threat and use of nuclear weapons. The use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran will usher in a new world order. The ultimate goal is that no nation other than the U.S. should have a nuclear weapons arsenal. A telltale sign that this is the plan is the recent change in the stated mission of Los Alamos National Laboratory, where nuclear weapons are developed. The mission of LANL used to be described officially as "Los Alamos National Laboratory's central mission is to reduce the global nuclear danger" [1] [.pdf], [2] [.pdf], [3] [.pdf]. That will sound ridiculous once the U.S. starts throwing mini-nukes around. In anticipation of it, the Los Alamos mission statement has been recently changed to "prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to protect our homeland from terrorist attack." That is the present and future role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, to be achieved through threat (deterrence) and use of nuclear weapons. References to the old mission are nowhere to be found in the current Los Alamos documents, indicating that the change was deliberate and thorough. It is not impossible that the U.S. will succeed in its goal. But it is utterly improbable. This is a big world. Once the U.S. crosses the nuclear threshold against a non-nuclear country, many more countries will strive to acquire nuclear weapons, and many will succeed. The nuclear abyss may turn out to be a steep precipice or a gentle slope. Either way, it will be a one-way downhill slide toward a bottomless pit. We will have entered a path of no return, leading in a few months or a few decades to global nuclear war and unimaginable destruction. But there are still choices to be made. Up to the moment the first U.S. nuclear bomb explodes, the fall into the abyss can be averted by choices made by each and every one of us. We may never know which choices prevented it if it doesn't happen. But if we make the wrong choices, we will know what they were. And so will future generations, even in a world where wars are fought with sticks and stones.

#### War with Iran cements fears of pre-emptions – forces Russia and China conflict

AP 2012

[Associated Press, January 23, 2012, EU adopts Iran oil embargo; China, Russia worried over US war threats, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/europe/EU-adopts-Iran-oil-embargo-China-Russia-worried-over-US-war-threats/articleshow/11602863.cms>, uwyo//amp]

A leading state-run Chinese daily warned on Monday that Moscow and Beijing were seriously concerned over US attempts to go to war with Iran, IANS reported from Beijing. After Iraq and Afghanistan, the US "is preparing for a potential confrontation with Iran, and appears confident of another successful air strike. "Such a demonstration of armed might makes powers like Russia and China increasingly nervous," the commentary in the English language Global Times said. It said that "mainstream forces in Washington are trying to sell a ludicrous standpoint to the American people: that it is worthwhile to bear financial costs and even lose some lives to confront lurking dangers to US security in the Middle East. "This is not a rational analysis, but rather a pious belief in US politics. With an appetite for national security causes, the US becomes increasingly meticulous in eliminating potential challenges." The daily, which reflects the thinking in Chinese leadership, warned that by stirring up other powers' sense of insecurity, the US was actually undermining its own interests. "If the West slides into a war with Iran, the damages will not be any lower than the potential threat of Iran's nuclear power. "Perhaps the US is used to resorting to war to solve geopolitical problems," it said. "Many worry that such a mentality will sooner or later lead to a US clash with Russia and China." For Beijing and Moscow alike, it said, relations with the US had been stressful. In both countries, an increasing number of people now advocate a Moscow-Beijing alliance, Global Times said. "The two do have countermeasures against the US, and they are capable of deterring US allies," it added. "If they are really determined to join hands, the balance of power on many world issues will begin to shift."

#### Romney will rollback EPA regulation of greenhouse gas emissions and refuse to take action on climate change

Murdock 2012

[Deroy Murdock, National Review Online Contributing Editor, Jan 20, 2012, Romney: Hot and Cold on Global Warming ,, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/288664/romney-hot-and-cold-global-warming-deroy-murdock#uwyo//amp]

Willard Mitt Romney these days could not be more explicit about abandoning President Obama’s carbon dioxide restrictions. “Irresponsibly,” Romney wrote in an August 28 op-ed for the Foster’s Daily Democrat in New Hampshire, “the EPA declared carbon dioxide, the same carbon dioxide that humans exhale, to be a ‘pollutant’ that poses risks to human health.” He also observed: “Congress had the good sense not to compound our economic challenges by imposing cap-and-trade’s extraordinary costs on the American people.” Romney’s website offers this carbon-friendly promise: “Mitt Romney will eliminate the regulations promulgated in pursuit of the Obama administration’s costly and ineffective anti-carbon agenda.”

[\_\_] Strikes turn economy advantage

[A.] Straights of Hormuz

The Iran Project, group of interested former officials of the US government and professionals in US national security, includes folks like Richard Armitage, Zbigniew Brezezinski, and Paul Volker, “Weighing the Benefits and Costs of Military Action Against Iran”, Wilson Center, 9/11/2012

Among the potential costs discussed in this paper are the following: • Direct Iranian retaliation against the U.S. While some argue that Iran might hold back using force in order to avoid provoking a larger scale conflict, we believe that Iran would retaliate, costing American lives; damaging U.S. facilities in the region; and affecting U.S. interests in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Gulf, and elsewhere. Iran would draw on its extensive conventional rocket capability and IRGC anti-ship missiles, small submarines, fast attack boats, and mine warfare in the Gulf. Iran might attempt to close the Strait of Hormuz, which could rattle global markets and cause a significant spike in oil prices (as well as blocking the main artery for export of Iran’s own oil). • Iranian strikes against Israel. Iran would hold Israel partly responsible for any attacks, whether or not Israeli forces participated in military action. While Israel’s anti-missile and civilian defense programs are strong, sustained air strikes by Iran would result in casualties and damage to facilities, perhaps including the Israeli nuclear complex at Dimona. • Indirect retaliation by Iran. Attacks by well-armed proxies such as Hezbollah or Shiite militant groups in Iraq, as well as by Iran’s covert forces and the IRGC Qods Force, could be even more damaging to U.S. and Israeli interests than direct Iranian retaliation. Such indirect retaliation could include the use of missiles and rockets by proxies as well as terrorist attacks and covert action, such as sabotage and assassination. If Hezbollah were to make heavy use of the missiles and rockets it has deployed in southern Lebanon, that could expand the conflict, possibly leading to a regional war in the Levant.

[B.] Oil prices

The Iran Project, group of interested former officials of the US government and professionals in US national security, includes folks like Richard Armitage, Zbigniew Brezezinski, and Paul Volker, “Weighing the Benefits and Costs of Military Action Against Iran”, Wilson Center, 9/11/2012

• Global political and economic instability, including disruptions in energy supply and security. A U.S. and/or Israeli attack on Iran could introduce destabilizing political and economic forces in a region already experiencing major transformations. In addition to costing the U.S. economy hundreds of billions of dollars yearly, a sustained conflict would boost the price of oil and further disrupt an already fragile world economy.

#### -State of the Union and its in the party platform

Jordan **Weissmann**, “The Democrats' Single Least Credible Idea: An 'All of the Above' Energy Plan”, The Atlantic, **September** 2012

**Ever since his last State of the Union** address, President **Obama has** relied on four short words **to describe his administration's energy policy: "all of the above."** Should we rely on fossil fuels or renewables? Yes, says the White House. **That sentiment is** now **enshrined in the Democratic party platform that was officially adopted** in Charlotte Monday night. "We can move towards a sustainable energy-independent future if we harness all of America's great natural resources," the [document states](http://assets.dstatic.org/dnc-platform/2012-National-Platform.pdf). "That means **an all-of-the-above approach** to developing America's many energy resources, **including wind, solar, biofuels, geothermal, hydropower, nuclear, oil, clean coal, and natural gas**."

#### Strikes fail—three reasons

Fuhrmann and Kreps 12 (1-31, Matthew Fuhrmann is an assistant professor of political science at Texas A&M University, and Sarah Kreps is an assistant professor of government at Cornell University, “Column: Why attacking Iran won't stop the nukes”, *USA Today*, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-01-30/iran-nuclear-program-attack-preemptive-military/52891714/1>)

•First, the targets have often possessed a small and geographically concentrated nuclear program. Attacks against Germany during World War II, Iraq in 1981 and Syria in 2007 were successful, in part, because attacks were able to essentially eliminate the target's capacity to produce fissile material (weapons-grade highly enriched uranium or plutonium) by destroying one critical facility.¶ Iran's nuclear program, which dates to the 1950s, however, is relatively advanced and highly diffuse. A number of facilities would need to be destroyed to significantly curtail Iran's weapons program. At a minimum, the attacker — presumably the United States or Israel — would need to destroy the two known uranium enrichment facilities at Natanz and Qom. The target list would also probably include the heavy water production facility at Arak, the uranium conversion center at Isfahan, Iran's one operational nuclear power plant at Bushehr and its medical research reactor located outside Tehran.¶ The U.S. military has the capability to destroy these facilities. Yet the likelihood of operational success declines as the number of facilities that need to be destroyed increases.¶ •Second, the fairly advanced state of Iran's nuclear program also raises the likelihood that it has clandestine facilities that neither Israel nor the U.S. knows about. Advocates of attacking Iran suggest that this is unlikely, but history tells a different story.¶ Indeed, the track record of identifying all nuclear facilities in states of concern is far from perfect. During the Persian Gulf War, for example, the U.S. heavily bombed Iraqi nuclear installations, but some important facilities — including a centrifuge plant at Al Rashidiya — remained unscathed because their existence was unknown to the U.S. and its allies.¶ Iran is almost certainly aware that an attack against its nuclear facilities is possible, especially given that its nuclear program was targeted during the Iran-Iraq War of the 1980s. Why, then, should policymakers have confidence that Iran has not built secret nuclear facilities or taken other countermeasures to protect itself?¶ •Third, even if we assume that the U.S. could locate and destroy all of Iran's facilities, Tehran already possesses the knowledge required to produce enriched uranium — a critical ingredient for nuclear weapons. Any facilities that were destroyed could be rebuilt relatively quickly.

#### Strikes won’t stop proliferation – merely a set back and can’t kill intellectual power

RT, “Ian strike must be bigger than Afghan/Iraqi ops combined – report” 9/13/2012

Only a US operation bigger than the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan combined can stop Iran from its alleged pursuit of a nuclear bomb, a new military report said. Such action, however, risks igniting all-out war in the Middle East. Amid escalating rhetoric from Israel and the US over military action against Iran, more than 30 former US diplomats, retired admirals and generals have assembled a report on the consequences of military action against Tehran. The study will be released on Thursday. The AP received an advance copy of the document, set to be released on Thursday, and reported that the analysis assessed the risks of a possible invasion of Iran, but provided no overall conclusion or recommended course of action. Retired Army Lt. Gen. Frank Kearney, who endorsed the report, claimed that it was intended to “stimulate thinking in the US about the objectives of a military attack on Iran beyond the obvious goal of hitting key components of Iran's nuclear program.” The report said that a US military attack would harm the current regime’s political standing and damage its ability to launch counterattacks, but Tehran would almost certainly retaliate, “directly and through surrogates, in ways that risked igniting all-out war in the Middle East.” US strikes could destroy Iran's most important nuclear facilities and damage its military forces but would only delay – not fully stop – the Islamic republic's alleged pursuit of a nuclear weapon. "Clearly there is some [US] ability to do destruction, which will cause some delay, but what occurs after that?" Kearney said. “You can't kill intellectual power." In assessing the costs and benefits of a possible strike, the review said that Iran could be stopped only by a military invasion and occupation “more taxing than the Iraq and Afghanistan wars combined.” "Given Iran's large size and population, and the strength of Iranian nationalism, we estimate that the occupation of Iran would require a commitment of resources and personnel greater than what the US has expended over the past 10 years in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars combined," the report said. In the wake of recent anti-US protests across the Middle East, including violent clashes in Egypt and Yemen, the document also warned that such a strike “would add to a perception of the US as anti-Muslim – a perception linked to the US-led invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan and hardened by Internet-based video excerpts of an anti-Muslim film that may have fueled Tuesday's deadly attack on a US diplomatic office in Libya.”

### 2NC – AT: Strikes Good – Iranian Proliferation

#### [\_\_] They have to spot us a war to even get an internal link to solving this impact – means we control timeframe calculus. Any risk of strikes escalating, proliferation not being so bad, or strikes failing to prevent proliferation means you vote negative.

#### [\_\_] Strikes make proliferation inevitable – undermines potential for political settlement and makes the process more opaque

The Iran Project, group of interested former officials of the US government and professionals in US national security, includes folks like Richard Armitage, Zbigniew Brezezinski, and Paul Volker, “Weighing the Benefits and Costs of Military Action Against Iran”, Wilson Center, 9/11/2012

• A potential breakdown of hard-won global solidarity against Iran’s nuclear program. We believe that if Iran’s nuclear program is attacked by the U.S. or Israel in the absence of an international mandate or a multinational coalition, support for maintaining sanctions against Iran could be substantially weakened. Weapons sales to Iran that are now prohibited by sanctions could resume, as might the sale of materials that could be used for making a nuclear weapon. • Increased likelihood of Iran becoming a nuclear state. While it is not impossible that aerial attacks could drive Iran to the negotiating table, we believe that military action probably would reduce the possibility of reaching a more permanent political resolution of concerns about Iran’s nuclear program. In fact, we believe that a U.S. attack on Iran would increase Iran’s motivation to build a bomb, because 1) the Iranian leadership would become more convinced than ever that regime change is the goal of U.S. policy, and 2) building a bomb would be seen as a way to inhibit future attacks and redress the humiliation of being attacked. Iran could also withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and end all cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), leaving the international community with greatly reduced knowledge of Iran’s nuclear program.

#### [\_\_] Pre-emptive strikes undermine international pressure that is having an effect on curbing Tehran’s proliferation

David Gardner, Daily Mail reporter, “It's too late to stop Iran's nuclear programme: U.S. military chief says Israeli strike would NOT crush Tehran's ambitions”, *Daily Mail*, 8/31/2012. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2196366/Irans-nuclear-programme-unstoppable-U-S-military-chief-says-Israeli-strike-NOT-crush-Tehrans-ambitions.html)

An Israeli strike would come too late to crush Iran’s nuclear programme, according to America’s top military chief.¶ General Martin Dempsey said such an attack would ‘clearly delay but probably not destroy’ Tehran’s nuclear ambitions.¶ Speaking from London, where he was with a U.S. delegation visiting the Paralympic Games, it was the strongest comment yet from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff distancing America from a possible unilateral attack by Israel.¶ Israel is believed to be planning a military strike ahead of November's Presidential elections.¶ Barack Obama would be under pressure to support the attack - even though military chiefs are against it - for fear of alienating Jewish voters in key swing states such as Florida.¶ Emphasizing Washington’s position, General Dempsey - America's most senior general - added: 'I don’t want to be complicit if they (Israel) decide to do it.’¶ And he said there was a worry that the international coalition putting pressure on Tehran ‘could be undone if Iran was attacked prematurely.’¶ He insisted that sanctions were having an effect and should be given a reasonable chance of succeeding.

#### If there was clear evidence the US could build multilateral support for striking Iran – solves long term costs to US interests

The Iran Project, group of interested former officials of the US government and professionals in US national security, includes folks like Richard Armitage, Zbigniew Brezezinski, and Paul Volker, “Weighing the Benefits and Costs of Military Action Against Iran”, Wilson Center, 9/11/2012

Some of these costs would be mitigated if a U.S. strike were to occur in response to Iranian actions that clearly revealed an intention to develop a nuclear weapon. Such actions might include the expulsion of IAEA inspectors and withdrawal from the NPT, or the launch of a crash program to raise existing supplies of low- and medium-enriched uranium to a weapons-grade level of enrichment. Given the time required for Iran to progress from the decision to weaponize to possession of a reliable, deliverable weapon, the United States would have an opportunity to develop international support for multilateral action against Iran, including further sanctions, additional negotiations, and the use of military force. While the costs associated with Iranian retaliation would not significantly be altered if other nations approved or joined in a U.S. military strike, the longer-term costs to U.S. interests would be somewhat lessened.

#### Strikes kill diplomacy which is key to lasting solution

Luers & Pickering 2011

[William H. Luers, Thomas R. Pickering, former American ambassadors and Carnegie Corporation grantee/trustee, December 30, 2011, Military action isn’t the only solution to Iran, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/military-action-isnt-the-only-solution-to-iran/2011/12/29/gIQA69sNRP_story.html>, uwyo//amp]

We and our colleagues in the Iran Project — an initiative of ours that has suggested diplomatic strategies and encouraged direct U.S.-Iran discussions for nearly a decade — have for three years proposed ways to contain Iran’s nuclear program, wall it off from developing weapons and engage Iran in a dialogue on other regional issues. It is not too late. History teaches that engagement and diplomacy pay dividends that military threats do not. Deployment of military force can bring the immediate illusion of “success” but always results in unforeseen consequences and collateral damage that complicate further the achievement of America’s main objectives. Deploying diplomats with a strategy while maintaining some pressure on Iran will lower Tehran’s urgency to build a bomb and reduce the danger of conflict. The slow, elusive diplomatic process to achieve U.S. objectives does not provide the sound-bite satisfaction of military threats or action. Multiple, creative efforts to engage Iran’s leaders and provide a dignified exit from the corner in which the world community has placed them could achieve more durable solutions at a far lower cost. It is a lesson that those urging military action against Iran have failed to learn. Clearly, the Iraq war did not build “the defenses of peace” in their minds. And such efforts must truly fail before more forceful action is made in a genuinely multilateral action, endorsed by the U.N. Security Council. Acheson, that brilliant strategist and close friend of Archi­bald MacLeish, criticized advocates of “massive retaliation” in the 1950s. It would be mad, he said, to “embrace disaster in order to escape anxiety.” Greater knowledge and closer contact with an enemy reduce anxiety and reveal surer ways to avoid disaster.

#### [\_\_] Iranian nuclearization might prevent war – wouldn’t use them and deters Israeli military adventurism

Patrick Seale, commentator and author of several books on Middle East affairs, “Uzi Arad – Israel’s Super-Hawk”, GulfNews, 9/14/2012

Men such as Arad and Netanyahu do not, even for a moment, think that Iran’s leaders are mad or suicidal. They are well aware that if Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons, it would never launch them against Israel ‑ and risk immediate national annihilation. Atomic bombs are weapons of defence, not offence. They provide a deterrent capability to the country possessing them ‑ that is to say they serve to deter a hostile nuclear power from launching an attack. No nuclear power, for example, would consider attacking nuclear-armed North Korea. Israel does not want Iran, or any other state in the Greater Middle East, to acquire a deterrent capability in the form of nuclear weapons, since this would restrict its own ability to attack its neighbours at will. If Iran or an Arab state had a nuclear capability, Israel would not have attacked Lebanon in 2006, Syria in 2007 and Gaza in 2008.

#### -Obama is pushing all of the above and friendly to FF now

Eric **Lipton and** Clifford **Krauss** Washington and Houston reporting, “Fossil Fuel Industry Ads Dominate TV Campaign”, New York Times, **9/13**/2012

But [climate change legislation](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/climate-and-energy-legislation/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier&pagewanted=all) died in Congress, Republicans gained a majority in the House, and pocketbook issues like the price of gasoline began dominating public discussion. **After imposing a yearlong oil and gas drilling moratorium** in the Gulf of Mexico in response to the disastrous BP spill in 2010, President **Obama recast himself as favoring an “all of the above” energy strategy, allowing** the **industry to drill offshore** as deep as ever **and** moving **to open up new regions** like Alaska’s Arctic waters. The shift left many fossil fuel critics disillusioned and unwilling to do much to support the president. “It’s hard to think of any environmental activist who is enthused about anything Obama does these days,” said Brendan Cummings, senior counsel for the [Center for Biological Diversity](http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/index.html), which challenges the industry on drilling plans. “**Obama’s explicit embrace of fossil fuels** and implicit embrace of all the environmental degradation that entails **are** almost **indistinguishable from the policies of the Bush administration.”**

#### The election is a 4 point race-something could still turn the tide

Lux Sept. 26

[Mike Lux, Partner of Democracy Partners, September 26, 2012, Winning the Election -- And a Successful Second Term, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mike-lux/democrat-house-campaigns_b_1916069.html?utm_hp_ref=elections-2012>, uwyo//amp]

I have been in politics way too long to take anything for granted in this presidential race, and I am way too superstitious to assume a victory no matter what. The strongly anti-Obama vote remains at a rock solid 45 percent no matter what ridiculous things Romney says or does, and there will be a few percent undecided right to the end, which means Romney will hang relatively close through the last weeks of this race. By everything I can tell, including both public and private polls I have seen, this is a 4 point race, and that is still close. World events, a weak Obama debate performance or some other kind of mistake, or any number of other things might still put Romney even closer before it is done.

#### A majority of Americans reject expansion of nuclear power

GMU 2012

[George Mason University Center fo Climate Change Communication, Yale Project on Climate Change Communication, March 2012, Climate Change in the American Mind:

Public Support for Climate & Energy Policies

in March 2012, <http://environment.yale.edu/climate/files/Policy-Support-March-2012.pdf>, uwyo//amp]

• Likely due to the Fukushima nuclear accident, support for building more nuclear power plants

has fallen dramatically – from 61 percent who supported it in 2008 to just 42 percent now.

Among registered voters, 37 percent of Democrats, 48 percent of Independents, and 53 percent

of Republicans support this policy.

#### Americans on either side of the political aisle oppose nuclear power expansion in the U.S.

Holyk and Langer 2011

[Gregory Holyk and Gary Langer, ABC News analysts, April 20, 2011, Nuclear Power: Opposition Spikes After Japan Earthquake, <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/nuclear-power-opposition-grows-japan-earthquake-abc-news/story?id=13412262>, uwyo//amp]

Americans by a 2-1 margin oppose building more nuclear power plants in the United States, an 11-point spike in opposition from a few years ago. In the aftermath of Japan's nuclear plant crisis, 64 percent in this ABC News/Washington Post poll oppose new nuclear plant construction, while 33 percent support it. "Strong" opposition now far outstrips strong support, 47-20 percent. Opposition is up from 53 percent in a 2008 poll, and strong opposition is up even more, by 24 points. Charts and Questionnaire The results reflect the significant challenges facing the nuclear power industry, which had been reaching for greater acceptance on the basis of factors including high oil prices, environmental concerns prompted by the Gulf oil spill a year ago and efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Opposition is not merely a not-in-my-back-yard phenomenon. The survey, conducted for ABC News by Langer Research Associates, finds that 67 percent of Americans oppose construction of a nuclear plant within 50 miles of their home -- not significantly different than the number who oppose it regardless of location. Resistance is bipartisan, with majorities of Democrats, Republicans and independents alike opposed to new nuclear plant construction. Still, there are differences among groups; opposition is higher among Democrats (75 percent, vs. 59 percent of Republicans and independents combined), women (73 percent, vs. 53 percent of men) and liberals (74 percent, vs. 60 percent of moderates and conservatives).
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#### Still links to federal government action disads.

#### [ ] Federal action stifles state action in anticipation

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publlius, 2011

The limited scope and uncertain future of new federal climate policy initiatives thus far under contested federalism underscored the reality that much of the American approach to climate policy will in all likelihood continue to be state- and regionally-centered in the coming years. After the surge of sub-federal policy development in the period of state domination, states began to slow their efforts, in large part due to anticipated federal action on a large scale. The collapse of Congressional deliberation on major legislation returned much of the lead in climate governance to states. This raised significant questions of implementation, including a series of major challenges and opportunities.

#### Overlap leads to policy failure

Rivlin, 12

(Sr. Fellow-Economic Studies at Brookings & Founding Director of CBO, 6/12, “Rethinking Federalism for More Effective Governance” http://publius.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/06/12/publius.pjs028.full?keytype=ref&ijkey=j9keOPmOHj0c2xV)

A bolder approach would be for the federal government to cede some major functions to the states and concentrate on carrying out its remaining national responsibilities more effectively. The case for dividing the governmental job rests partly on efficiency—**lowering the administrative cost of federal state overlap and interaction**. It also rests on the perception that the United States is an extremely diverse country and that many governmental services should be tailored to local conditions. Whether the service is education or housing or transportation, residents of inner city Philadelphia have different needs than those of rural Kansas or coastal Alaska. Governments closer to the scene are better able to assess the needs of citizens and design programs to meet them. It is easier for citizens at the state and local level to be actively involved in what their government does and call officials to account for their performance.

#### States incentives/regulations solve nuclear power – solves signals to financial community

NEI, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Policies That Support New Nuclear Power Plant Development”, October 2009

State Policies Several states have passed legislation or implemented regulations, or both, to support construction of new nuclear power plants.  These policies range from property tax incentives to pre-determination of rate-making principles for a project before construction begins. The policies that help most with financing new plants in regulated states are those that: Require the state public utility commission to determine if a proposed plant is prudent before construction begins and approve costs periodically during construction, thereby guaranteeing these capital costs will be added to the rate base when the plant comes online. Allow the carrying cost of construction work in progress (CWIP)—or the financing cost associated with construction—to be passed on to ratepayers during construction. Allowing CWIP reduces the cost ratepayers will pay for power from the plant when it goes into commercial operation. Some unregulated states assist with financing for unregulated plants by allowing pre-negotiated, long-term power purchase agreements (PPA). PPAs guarantee the project will have a source of cash flow (and cost recovery) once it is operational. State-level policies send positive signals to the financial community, helping companies finance projects reasonably, and, thereby, keeping the cost of electricity for consumers lower.

#### States action causes federal adoption means we solve 100% of case and don’t link to federal action key solvency deficits

#### -- Vertical policy diffusion – prefer this evidence it is specific to incentives and energy policy

Roberta Mann, Professor and Dean’s Distinguished Faculty Fellow, University of Oregon School of Law, “BUSINESS LAW FORUM TAXATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAX POLICIES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE: COORDINATION OR CROSS-PURPOSE?”, Lewis and Clark Law Review, Summer 2011. 15 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 369

Several groups of researchers have examined the potential interactions between federal and state climate policies. n54 Andrew Aulisi [\*377] and other researchers from the World Resources Institute examined case studies to determine when leading state policies would "vertically diffuse" and be adopted by the national government. n55 The most significant factors for successful vertical policy diffusion were the push for diffusion by state champions, policy learning by example and innovation, and the spillover effect. n56 State officials may press for federal adoption of their policies because those policies may fail without expansion to the national level, due to "competition with other states with conflicting policies or weaker commitments to the policy goal." n57 State policies may demonstrate that a policy can be implemented and be effective. The spillover effect is "the extent to which the perceived benefits and costs of state policies cross over state lines to other states" or the nation. n58 The results of vertical diffusion may be full or partial preemption of the issue by the federal government, issuance of grants or incentives by the federal government to the states to perpetuate the activity, or federal mandates, with or without funding. n59 The researchers concluded that the RGGI cap-and-trade program contained all the significant vertical diffusion factors, including the somewhat less significant factor of business support for federal action. n60 The researchers predicted that the federal government is "likely to use partial preemption to respond to the RGGI ... standards." n61 The House-passed climate change bill (ACES) would have fully preempted existing regional cap-and-trade programs. n62 The choice of full preemption in the legislation may have been driven by the concerns of business constituents. Business interests have considerable influence on policymaking in the United States. n63 Business support for federal action is motivated by the desire for uniform standards, which enables businesses to avoid a patchwork of varying state rules that would increase compliance costs and create competitive advantages. n64

#### They say environment but

#### States key to solve energy policy and environment.

NEI, Nuclear Energy Institute, “The Trickle-Up Effect: States Put Singular Stamp on Energy Policy—With National Implications” 2008

Spurred by federal legislation and public concern about energy costs, electricity supply and environmental issues, the pace of state and local government activity on energy policy in general—and nuclear power in particular—has skyrocketed in the past few years. Energy, environmental and economic concerns are coalescing, and states are taking action. “For most people, the federal government seems too removed from their daily lives,” said Del. Sally Jameson (D), a member of the Maryland House of Delegates since 2003. Her district straddles the nation’s capital and Calvert County, Md., home to Constellation Energy’s Calvert Cliffs nuclear plant. “Most people look to the state for policy. They know us one-on-one and state policy directly affects their lives.  “The federal government is so huge that they believe they will get lost in it. At the state level,” she noted, “their voices are heard.”