# Case

### Deployable Soon

#### We could commercialize SMR’s within 5 years

Freed 10

Josh Freed, Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Elizabeth Horwitz, Policy Advisor at Third Way’s Clean Energy Program, Jeremy Ershow, Third Way Clean Energy Program, Sept 2010, Thinking Small On Nuclear Power, http://content.thirdway.org/publications/340/Third\_Way\_Idea\_Brief\_-\_Thinking\_Small\_On\_Nuclear\_Power.pdf

Several U.S. companies are in the advanced stages of developing small reactors that adapt existing technology to produce smaller amounts of baseload electricity.15 These technologies are nearly ready for deployment. Final decisions about design, siting, and regulatory approval could be made within the next five years.16 The federal government can take several steps to help make this possible. First, economic barriers to entry must be lowered. For first movers, costs of licensing, design and regulatory approval will be comparable to those of the larger reactors because existing regulations have not yet been tailored to suit new designs. As the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) gains expertise in evaluating SMRs, and as economies of scale develop, these costs will decrease. Until this happens, the Department of Energy’s new cost-sharing program for near-term licensing and deployment of light water SMRs will help reduce some of the financial impact.17[i] The NRC also needs to continue its commitment to allocate sufficient resources and build the expertise necessary to evaluate and license SMRs in a timely fashion. The Department of Energy (DOE) and Department of Defense (DOD) can also prime the market pump by serving as a buyer of first-of-a-kind technologies. This could include deploying SMRs on DOE-owned sites, many of which are already zoned to support nuclear power plants,18 and appropriate DOD facilities in the United States. DOD, the largest single energy consumer in the U.S., comprises 78% of federal energy use, and is the most significant energy consumer in several metropolitan areas.19 DOE should also work closely with the private sector to develop standardized designs, with the goal of achieving demonstration and licensing within a decade.20 The potential market for SMRs is global. As we note in “Getting Our Share of Clean Energy Trade,” whichever country emerges as the market leader could dominate a good part of the $6 trillion global energy market.21 The U.S. could seize that mantle and all the jobs and exports that come with it. American reactors could be deployed within a decade domestically22 and go global soon after.

#### Current SMR technology is well established- Navy ships

Freed 10

(Josh, Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Elizabeth Horwitz is a Policy Advisor at Third Way’s Clean Energy ¶ Program, Jeremy Ershow was formerly a Policy ¶ Advisor at Third Way, “Thinking Small On Nuclear Power” <http://content.thirdway.org/publications/340/Third_Way_Idea_Brief_-_Thinking_Small_On_Nuclear_Power.pdf>, SEH)

The light water technology that current SMRs use is well-established; ¶ American manufacturers have designed and built small, light water reactors for ¶ 60 years to fuel the Navy’s carriers and submarines.¶ 29¶ While advanced reactor ¶ technology is further off, innovation is necessary to complete the transition to ¶ clean energy. Advanced reactor technologies are promising technologies that ¶ we need to invest in today

### AT Waste Confidence

#### Waste confidence won’t impact licensing

**NYT**, 8/9/**’12**

(<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/08/09/an-uncertain-phase-for-nuclear-power-licenses/>)

But as with many disputes in the nuclear industry, it’s complicated. **The reactors**, it turns out, **do not need a license renewal to keep running.**

The commission has a “timely renewal doctrine,” not unlike what some other federal agencies practice, that allows the status quo to remain while the agency deliberates. “If you are already in the queue, when you cross the end of your license and renewal is under consideration, you can continue operating,’’ said Eliot Brenner, a spokesman. The plant’s operator, Entergy, had to apply for a renewal five years before the license was due to expire, and did so in 2007.

Utilities applying for licenses for other plants will have to wait, although **no groundbreakings were likely in the near future anyway.** Two twin-unit plants in the South, Vogtle 3 and 4 in Georgia and Summer 2 and 3 in South Carolina, already have combined construction and operating licenses. A spokesman for the commission said that **the moratorium order was silent on those licenses**, so those reactors could proceed. Vogtle 3 and Summer 2 are both scheduled to begin commercial operation in 2016.

### DoD Fast Tracked

#### DOD avoids NRC regulatory hurdles

Butler ‘11

(LtCol Butler is currently assigned to Headquarters, North American Air Defense Command-U.S. Northern Command/J594 (Strategy, Policy, and Plans Directorate), Security Cooperation ntegration Branch. This article was his Chase Prize Essay Contest entry. “Why the Marine Corps should lead the environmental and energy way forward and how to do it” March 18, 2011 accessed online September 15, 2012 at <http://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/not-green-enough>)

Fifth, the cumbersome, bureaucratic certification process of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), often enough to scare away potential entrepreneurs and investors, is not necessarily a roadblock to success. The NRC is “responsible for licensing and regulating the operation of commercial nuclear power plants in the United States.” Military installations offer unique platforms that could likely bypass an extended certification process. With established expertise and a long safety record in nuclear reactor certification, operations, training, and maintenance, the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program comprises the civilian and military personnel who:¶ . . . design, build, operate, maintain, and manage the nuclear-powered ships and the many facilities that support the U.S. nuclear-powered naval fleet.”34¶ Bypassing the NRC and initiating SMR experimentation under ADM Hyman Rickover’s legacy umbrella of naval reactors could shorten the process to a reasonable level for Marine and naval installations.35¶ ¶ Finally, Marine Corps-SMR technology opens the pathway for related endeavors and synergetic undertakings. The Army has several smart and influential individuals poised to partner in nuclear energy endeavors, and our naval brethren enjoy a long history of nuclear reactor expertise. Partnerships and enhanced use leases to support SMR deployments should be leveraged.36 As the collective military expertise in SMR technology grows, additional capabilities, such as expeditionary and vehicular power sources, could be explored. And related technologies, such as hybrid/electric vehicle power storage and recharging facilities and water desalination plants, could collocate with nuclear plants on installations to both use the energy.37

# Reg Neg

#### The cp kills investor certainty – can’t create gen iv tech, and doesn’t promote innovation

Cary Coglianese (Associate Professor of Public Policy, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Chair of the¶ Regulatory Policy Program, Center for Business and Government; and Affiliated Scholar, Harvard Law School) 2001 “Assessing The Advocacy Of Negotiated Rulemaking:¶ A Response To Philip Harter” <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/m-rcbg/research/c.coglianese_new.york_assessing.advocacy.pdf>

In addition to giving priority to tractable issues, negotiated rulemaking may encourage imprecision or ambiguity.273 Since it is usually easier to achieve consensus at higher levels of abstraction, the potential always exists that negotiators will adopt abstract or vague language.274 As¶ Neil Kerwin has observed, when an agency commits itself to obtaining consensus, that is, “to¶ producing a rule with which everyone with a recognized interest can agree, the only way to break certain deadlocks is to produce a rule that ignores unresolved (or unresolvable) issues or deals with¶ them through vague language whose meaning will be disputed during the implementation¶ process.”275 Adopting vague language may Negotiated rulemaking’s emphasis on unanimity also makes it more likely that the final¶ outcome will succumb to the lowest-common-denominator problem. The outcome that is minimally¶ acceptable to all the members of a negotiated rulemaking committee will not necessarily be optimal¶ or effective in terms of achieving social goals. A recent study of negotiated rulemaking conducted¶ by Charles Caldart and Nicholas Ashford shows that in industries that are not likely to innovate in¶ the absence of strong governmental regulation, the lowest-common-denominator problem keeps negotiated rules from promoting the technological innovation needed to improve environmental and¶ safety performance.276 They conclude that because industry representatives in these types of¶ industries will be reluctant to agree to regulations that would compel firms to make dramaticinvestments in new technologies, “negotiated rulemaking’s focus on consensus can effectively¶ remove the potential to spur innovation.”277

#### Certainty is essential – only effective method of catalyzing investment

Trembath, 11

[2/4/11, [Nuclear Power and the Future of Post-Partisan Energy Policy](http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/), Alex Trembath is a policy associate in the Energy and Climate Program at Breakthrough. He is the lead or co-author of several Breakthrough publications, including the 2012 report "Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence" and "Where the Shale Gas Revolution Came From." Alex is a graduate of University of California at Berkeley, <http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/>]

If there is one field of the energy sector for which certainty of **political will and** government policy is essential**,** it is nuclear power**.** High up front costs for the **private** industry**,** extreme regulatory oversightand public wariness necessitate a committed government partner for private firms investing in nuclear technology**. In a new** [**report**](http://www.thirdway.org/publications/370) **on the potential for a “nuclear renaissance,” Third Way references the failed cap-and-trade bill, delaying tactics in the House vis-a-vis EPA regulations on CO₂, and the recent election results to emphasize the difficult current political environment for advancing new nuclear policy.** The report**, “The Future of Nuclear Energy,”** makes the case for **political** certainty**: “**It is difficult for energy producers **and users** to estimate the **relative** price for nuclear**-generated** energy compared to fossil fuel alternatives **(e.g. natural gas)–**anessential consideration in making the major capital investment decision necessary for new energy production that will be in place for **decades.”** Are our politicians willing to match the level of certainty that the nuclear industry demands**? Lacking a suitable price on carbon that may have been achieved by a cap-and-trade bill removes one primary policy instrument for making nuclear power more cost-competitive with fossil fuels. The impetus on Congress, therefore, will be to shift from demand-side “pull” energy policies (that increase demand for clean tech by raising the price of dirty energy) to** [**supply-side “push” policies**](http://leadenergy.org/2010/09/supply-demand-energy-innovation/)**, or industrial and innovation policies. Fortunately, there are signals from political and thought leaders that a package of policies may emerge to incentivize alternative energy sources that include nuclear power. One place to start is the recently deceased American Power Act, addressed above, authored originally by Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman. Before its final and disappointing incarnation, the bill** [**included**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/12/american-power-act-photos_n_573643.html#s90041&title=undefined) **provisions to increase loan guarantees for nuclear power plant construction in addition to other tax incentives. Loan guarantees are probably the most important method of government involvement in new plant construction, given the high capital costs of development. One wonders what the fate of the bill, or a less ambitious set of its provisions, would have been had Republican Senator Graham not abdicated and removed any hope of Republican co-sponsorship. But that was last year. The changing of the guard in Congress makes this a whole different game, and the once feasible support for nuclear technology on either side of the aisle must be reevaluated. A New York Times** [**piece**](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/business/energy-environment/17NUCLEAR.html) **in the aftermath of the elections forecast a difficult road ahead for nuclear energy policy, but did note Republican support for programs like a waste disposal site and loan guarantees. Republican support for nuclear energy has roots in the most significant recent energy legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which passed provisions for nuclear power with wide bipartisan support. Reaching out to Republicans on policies they have supported in the past should be a goal of Democrats who wish to form a foundational debate on moving the policy forward. There are also signals that key Republicans, notably** [**Lindsey Graham**](http://washingtonindependent.com/99171/graham-circulating-clean-energy-standard) **and** [**Richard Lugar**](http://www.plattsenergyweektv.com/story.aspx?storyid=132784&catid=293)**, would throw their support behind a clean energy standard that includes nuclear and CCS. Republicans in Congress will find intellectual support from a group that AEL’s Teryn Norris coined** [**“innovation hawks,”**](http://leadenergy.org/2011/01/the-rise-of-innovation-hawks/) **among them Steven Hayward, David Brooks and George Will. Will has been** [**particularly outspoken**](http://www.newsweek.com/2010/04/08/this-nuclear-option-is-nuclear.html) **in support of nuclear energy, writing in 2010 that “it is a travesty that the nation that first harnessed nuclear energy has neglected it so long because fads about supposed ‘green energy’ and superstitions about nuclear power’s dangers.” The extreme reluctance of Republicans to cooperate with Democrats over the last two years is only the first step, as any legislation will have to overcome Democrats’ traditional opposition to nuclear energy. However, here again there is reason for optimism. Barbara Boxer and John Kerry bucked their party’s long-time aversion to nuclear in a precursor bill to APA, and Kerry continued working on the issue during 2010. Jeff Bingaman, in a speech earlier this week, reversed his position on the issue by calling for the inclusion of nuclear energy provisions in a clean energy standard. The Huffington Post** [**reports**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/01/sen-jeff-bingaman-backs-n_n_816864.html) **that “the White House reached out to his committee [Senate Energy] to help develop the clean energy plan through legislation.” This development in itself potentially mitigates two of the largest obstacle standing in the way of progress on comprehensive energy legislation: lack of a bill, and lack of high profile sponsors. Democrats can also direct** [**Section 48C**](http://leadenergy.org/2010/12/clean-energy-financing-first-steps-towards-post-partisan-effort/#more-3320) **of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 towards nuclear technology, which provides a tax credit for companies that engage in clean tech manufacturing. Democrats should not give up on their policy goals simply because they no longer enjoy broad majorities in both Houses, and Republicans should not spend all their time holding symbolic repeal votes on the Obama Administration’s accomplishments. The lame-duck votes in December on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the tax cut deal and START indicate that at least a few Republicans are willing to work together with Democrats in a divided Congress, and that is precisely what nuclear energy needs moving forward. It will require an agressive push from the White House, and a concerted effort from both parties’ leadership, but the road for forging bipartisan legislation is not an impassable one.** The politician with **perhaps** the **single** greatest leverage over the future of nuclear energy is **President** Obama**, and his rhetoric matches the challenge posed by our aging and poisonous energy infrastructure. “This is our generation’s Sputnik moment,” announced Obama recently. Echoing the calls of presidents past, the President used his** [**State of the Union**](http://www.slate.com/id/2281847/) **podium to signal a newly invigorated industrialism in the United States. He advocated broadly for renewed investment in infrastructure, education, and technological innovation. And he did so in a room with many more members of the opposition party than at any point during the first half of his term.** The eagerness of the President tocombine **left and right** agendas can **hopefully** match the hyper-partisan bitterness **that dominates our political culture,** and nuclear power maybe one sector of our economy to benefit from his political leadership**.**

#### The CP’s ‘citizen involvement’ ensures agency backlash – causes delays and hampers implementation

Sean Nolan (Associate Professor of Law and Dispute Resolution Program Director. Vermont Law School) 2011 Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines

“Citizen involvement” as a label has different meanings depending¶ on who is using it and the context in which it is used. In¶ the context of the minimal governmental procedures that are required¶ to make a legally defensible decision, it means notice and¶ comment and possibly a public hearing. However, in the context of¶ decision-making intended to fully incorporate a range of concerns,¶ “citizen involvement” refers to a more inclusive, transparent and¶ responsive process. Many agencies resist more robust levels of citizen¶ involvement at the policy development stage, preferring to rely¶ on the minimal processes with which they are familiar.¶ Resistance to this level of citizen involvement is endemic and¶ springs from beliefs (and experiences) that engaging citizens takes¶ too long, is too costly, and results in sub-optimal solutions.17 The¶ assumption is that a more streamlined decision-making process,¶ guided and informed by knowledgeable bureaucrats, will produce better and timelier results.18 Adherents to minimal citizen involvement¶ in decision-making view the citizens as uninformed and parochial¶ and involving them will only give strength to Not-in-My-¶ Back-Yard (“NIMBY”) sentiment.19 Simply dismissing citizen opposition¶ as self-interested, NIMBY whiners ignore the two realities¶ addressed in this Article: (1) that many facility proposals subject to¶ citizen opposition will impose significant, uncompensated burdens¶ on communities; and (2) that successful citizen involvement is¶ more than a statement of principle—it must be implemented following¶ the best practices of consensus building and collaboration.20

#### Perm Do the Counterplan

#### Resolved means to deliberate.

Merriam Webster 9 [http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolved]

# Main Entry: 1re·solve # Pronunciation: \ri-ˈzälv, -ˈzȯlv also -ˈzäv or -ˈzȯv\ # Function: verb # Inflected Form(s): resolved; re·solv·ing 1 : to become separated into component parts; also : to become reduced by dissolving or analysis 2 : to form a resolution : determine 3 : consult, deliberate

#### Should means achieving the objectives of a presumptively mandatory requirement.

GAO 8 [Government Accounting Office, Exposure Draft of Proposed Changes to the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, http://www.gao.gov/govaud/cl\_iia080331.pdf]

The second sentence of the “must” definition used in the exposure draft instructions is more aligned with the definition of “should” as used by other standards setters, including GAO. The definition of “should” as used by GAO, which is intended to be consistent with the definition used by the AICPA and the PCAOB, indicates a presumptively mandatory requirement and contains the following language: “…in rare circumstances, auditors and audit organizations may depart from a presumptively mandatory requirement provided they document their justification for the departure and how the alternative procedures performed in the circumstances were sufficient to achieve the objectives of the presumptively mandatory requirement.”  We suggest that the IIA move the second sentence of the “must” definition to the “should” definition. The definition of “must” needs to be clear that “must” indicates an unconditional requirement and that another procedure cannot substitute for a “must.” Also, we suggest adding language to the definition of “should” to indicate that substituting another procedure for a “should” requirement is allowed only if the auditors document their justification for the departure from the “should” and how the alternative procedures performed in the circumstances were sufficient to achieve the objectives of the “should” requirement. The IIA should review every “must” requirement in the Standards to determine whether there are acceptable alternatives to the procedure; if so, “should” is the appropriate word.

#### Substantially means to a large degree.

**Words & Phrases 2** (Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “Substantially,” Volume 40B, p. 324-330 October 2002, Thomson West)

N.D.Ill. 2002. Under ADA, “substantially” in phrase substantially limits, means considerable, or to a large degree.

#### Condition CP Bad

1. Fairness- Steals 9 minutes of aff offense and forces us to debate against ourselves having to say plan hurts the environment
2. Ground- gives uniqueness to an large number of unpredictable disads and allows jacking of best 2AC arguments
3. Time skew- answering one hit wonder skews 2AC necessitating rejecting the team
4. Ignore their offense- Their counterplan interpretations are self serving and judge bias is too far on states counterplans- Literature exists tons of things tangential to the topic, PICs out of topic words justify the The PIC, and they could run it as a disad

# Politics

**No recession impact**

**Coleman ‘3**

(Glenn, writer for Money Magazine, CNN, “Peter Lynch: Why he's buying now,” 1-24, http://money.cnn.com/2003/01/23/funds/lynch/)

Recessions are scary things, and the obvious worries about jobs and bonuses and bills and bankruptcies-- the background noise that keeps you awake at night, Lynch calls it--often mute an important fact: **The U.S. economy has seen 10 recessions since 1945, and it has emerged from nine of them stronger than before**. Of course, it's not a fact yet that we'll pull ourselves No. 10 in better shape.

### High Skilled Inevitable

#### High Skilled Expansion inevitable

Oppenheimer 2-7

Andres is a Columnist for the Miami Herald, “Immigration and the Global Race for Talent,” <http://www.thestate.com/2013/02/07/2618543/commentary-immigration-and-the.html#.URQfuqXAez5>

Under a bipartisan bill led by Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, and known as the Immigration Innovation Act, the United States would eliminate restrictions on visas for workers with graduate degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics from qualified U.S. universities, and would almost double existing quotas for other highly-skilled private sector workers.¶ The bill, which may become part of Obama’s comprehensive immigration reform plan, is very likely to pass, congressional sources say.¶ While Democrats and Republicans are still arguing over other parts of Obama’s immigration plan, which would give a path to legal status for up to 11 million undocumented residents, both parties agree on the need to dramatically increase the number of visas for foreign scientists to help make the U.S. economy more competitive.¶ “This is a big, big step forwards,” says Vivek Wadhwa, a well-known innovation guru with Singularity University and author of The Immigrant Exodus, a book arguing that the United States is falling behind in innovation because of its failure to retain the scientists who graduate from its universities.¶ Right now, most U.S. visas are given based on family ties, rather than on professional skills. Only 7 percent of U.S. visas are given to foreigners based on their skills, compared with 25 percent in Canada, 42 percent in Australia, 58 percent in Britain, 80 percent in Switzerland and 81 percent in South Korea, according to a recent study by the Partnership for a New American Economy.¶ Under the Hatch bill, the number of highly-skilled foreigners admitted into the United States could double to 280,000 from the current 140,000 a year, according to Wadhwa.¶ “The race for skilled immigrants is intensifying in today’s knowledge-based economy,” Wadhwa told me. “In the past, it was all about manufacturing, and you needed workers. Now, it’s all about technology and innovation, and you need skilled scientists and engineers.”

### Flooding the Zone Solves

#### Flooding the zone with legislation now- that’s key

Todd et al 2-5

Chuck is an NBC News’ Chief Political Correspondent, “Flooding the Zone,” <http://firstread.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/02/05/16852487-first-thoughts-flooding-the-zone>

\*\*\* Flooding the zone: Exactly one week away from President Obama’s State of the Union address, the White House has spent the early days of the second term flooding the zone with its legislative agenda. Last week, the president delivered his big immigration speech in Las Vegas. Yesterday, he spoke about gun violence in Minnesota. Today, he’s meeting at the White House with progressive, labor, and business leaders to discuss immigration reform and the budget situation. What’s going on here: The Obama White House wants to overload Washington’s political circuits in an effort to see what it can get through Congress -- without letting Congress define what issues get addressed. After all, Republicans want to solely talk about the budget before the March budget showdown (see yesterday’s multiple coordinated responses by House Republicans on the White House’s announcement it would be late with its budget). Yet by flooding the zone, Team Obama -- with the bully pulpit and the State of the Union at its disposal -- wants to widen the political dialogue beyond that one issue. This “flooding the zone” concept is how the Obama White House operated in the first six months of the first term, and it’s where he got most of his legislative achievements. When the White House got bogged down on ONE issue (health care, debt ceiling, etc), officials determined they lost some of their political capital.

### Obama Capital Fails

#### Obama capital fails- style and circumstance

Cost 2-9

Dr. Jay has a Ph. D in Political Science from Deleware and is a staff writer at the Weekly Standard, “Obama the Bargainer,” <http://www.weeklystandard.com/print/articles/obama-bargainer_699205.html>

The recent inaugural festivities would have seemed more than a little strange to the Framers of the Constitution, had they been on hand to see the show. After all, here was their “republic” unified in celebration of vast executive powers being vested in a single human being. Did they not wage a bloody war to overcome such 17th-century notions?¶ And yet, the republic bequeathed by the likes of Madison and Jefferson prizes the inaugural ceremony. It is the most important rite in what Gene Healy of the Cato Institute calls “the cult of the presidency,” which is a decidedly bipartisan affair. Liberals celebrated Obama’s power, conservatives bemoaned it, but all acknowledged it.¶ What then is this power, exactly? The answer is scarcely to be found in the Constitution itself. Article II is shorter than your average newspaper column and spends most of its time reviewing the complicated procedures by which the chief executive is to be selected.¶ The presidency has come to mean much more than the measly powers granted its occupant by the Constitution; the job of the modern president is to fill the spaces left between the various articles and sections and clauses of the founding document. What our system disperses among branches, states, localities, parties, and interest groups, the president brings together, coordinating their efforts for the national good.¶ This is a virtually impossible task, for the formal powers of the president do not meet the informal expectations we the people have set for him. As Harry Truman predicted in the summer of 1952, when it was clear that Dwight Eisenhower would succeed him, “He’ll sit here and he’ll say ‘Do this! Do that!’ And nothing will happen. Poor Ike—it won’t be a bit like the Army. He’ll find it very frustrating.”¶ As usual, the ornery Missouri-farmer-turned-haberdasher hit the nail on the head. Commands simply won’t cut it, for many of the people whom the president would command need not heed him. Members of Congress, judges, cabinet department heads, even leaders of the military have their own mandates that do not require ironclad fealty to the president.¶ Instead, a president succeeds by persuading others to do what he wants. As presidential adviser Richard Neustadt once put it, the job of the president¶ is to induce them to believe that what he wants of them is what their own appraisal of their own responsibilities requires them to do in their interest, not his. Because men may differ in their views on public policy, because differences in outlook stem from differences in duty—duty to one’s office, one’s constituents, oneself—that task is bound to be more like collective bargaining than like a reasoned argument among philosopher kings.¶ Thus, with the festivities finished and the glow of the inauguration fading, it is fair to ask: Just how powerful will President Obama be in his second term? In other words, how successful will he be at persuading the diverse agents of our government to do what he wants them to do?¶ If the lessons of his first term guide our expectations for the second, then the most likely answer is: not very.¶ At first blush, this assertion might sound absurd. A weak President Obama? Proof of the contrary is in the pudding: The massive stimulus, the health care bill, and financial reform were all epic in their scope and ambition. Surely both left and right agree—whether they celebrate or bemoan the fact—that Obama is a very strong, liberal president.¶ But presidential power—the ability to persuade—has many sources, some external, some internal. The external sources are all reducible to “the political context.” How many seats does the president’s party control in Congress? What is the status of the opposition party? What was the relative strength of the president and his party in the last election? What is his job approval rating? And so on. All of these factors set the boundaries for how easily the president can persuade others.¶ In 2009 and 2010, President Obama enjoyed a very favorable political context. Today, the political context is more favorable to him than it was in 2011, but markedly diminished from the heady days of 2009. So, for instance, President Obama can call for action on “climate change” until he is blue (or, perhaps, green) in the face, but the political environment—including arguably the most conservative House of Representatives since the 1920s—means he lacks the power to make it happen.¶ The internal sources of strength are the president’s political skills, which he deploys in particular circumstances. So the question becomes: How good is he at persuading others, given the political context? If political context is the science of presidential power, quantifiable in electoral results and congressional voting scores, persuasive skill is the art. Here, we must put down the American Political Science Review and pick up Machiavelli’s Prince. As for President Obama’s first term, no other incoming president in recent history had such a surplus of political capital and misused it so terribly. The reason? He lacks important skills that are integral in the exercise of presidential power.¶ ¶ All presidents are unique, each possessing or lacking skills useful to a chief executive. Obama is notable in that he has mastered some vital skills better than any recent predecessor, but he exhibits virtually no facility with others. His strengths have been enumerated extensively by a fawning press corps. His favorable coverage is due not only to the media’s ideological commitment to his policy goals, but also to his natural gifts. He awes the press, and many other groups in society, by his very presence. Moreover, he knows he has this power over them. This ability, more than any other, made him president and remains his single greatest source of power.¶ Yet though he affects some people intensely, he himself seems largely unaffected by others. This helps explain why he has used his speaking ability so unevenly: He is wont to misread people, and therefore situations. His Tucson speech, for instance, after the shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, was a political stroke of genius. He intuited what the moment called for and delivered it perfectly. By contrast, his 2009 speech to the International Olympic Committee pitching Chicago was a waste of time and made him look small. Similarly, he has time and again left business leaders feeling nonplussed, inviting them to the White House mainly to serve as window dressing for another teleprompter performance. ¶ It is on Capitol Hill that Obama seems most out of touch with his audience. In particular, he does not understand what the key players in Congress expect, yet he is convinced he knows them better than they know themselves. What’s more, he gives little and inconsistent guidance as to what he expects from them. That goes for both Republicans and Democrats.¶ For Republicans, the warning signs appeared early, on the stimulus bill passed in the president’s first month in office. Obama and his team were supremely confident that they could get a $900 billion package through Congress with solid Republican support, so much so that when House minority whip Eric Cantor warned that they would receive no backing from House Republicans, they told him not to embarrass himself with such an absurd prediction.¶ Team Obama failed to anticipate how turned off the congressional GOP would be by the spending side of the package: Democratic appropriators were unloading a wish list that had accumulated during more than a decade of Republican governance. The White House also thought the Republicans would be attracted to the tax cuts that constituted roughly one-third of the package. But the White House did not understand how Republicans view taxes—specifically, the difference between tax credits, which the stimulus favored heavily, and rate cuts, which Republicans prefer. None of this should have come as a surprise to anyone who had done any homework on the congressional GOP. After all, Republicans killed a 1993 stimulus bill that was qualitatively similar, but less than a tenth the size of the 2009 package.¶ What did Team Obama surmise when its predictions fell flat? It certainly did not take time to gauge the congressional GOP more carefully, to build a more nuanced picture of Republicans’ motives and expectations. Instead, it adopted the cartoonish caricature one finds in a Paul Krugman column: Republicans are contemptible knaves, willing to let the economy go down the drain to embarrass the president.¶ The stimulus also featured another theme of presidential-congressional relations under Obama: mixed messages from the White House. Early in the negotiations over the bill, President Obama told House minority leader John Boehner and Cantor that he was interested in their ideas. He did not want to play partisan games; he just wanted to jump-start the economy. Yet when Cantor presented the president a list of suggestions, Obama brought the dialogue to an icy conclusion by infamously declaring, “I won, so I think I trump you on that.” During the deliberations on the bill, the president’s chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, was known to respond to other GOP suggestions by shouting, “We have the votes. F— ’em!”¶ ¶ For the first two years of Obama’s tenure, congressional Republicans did not register with the White House at all. Contact was so sparse that when the GOP took control of the House of Representatives, the White House did not even have Boehner’s cell phone number so the president could place a congratulatory call.¶ The case of Michigan Republican Dave Camp is illustrative. According to Bob Woodward in The Price of Politics,¶ The administration’s approach to Congress was different from what he was used to. He had first come to Washington as a congressional staffer during the Reagan administration. Reagan had deployed administration liaisons all over Congress. Camp could remember Reagan getting on the phone with a lowly freshman congressman to discuss legislation. .  .  . During Obama’s first two years in office, Camp was the ranking Republican on the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee. He was one of the more politically moderate House Republicans. Yet the administration’s Hill staff didn’t even seem to know who he was. He never saw them.¶ During the debt ceiling battle of 2011, the president again exhibited cluelessness about the motivations of congressional Republicans. Precious time during the month of July was wasted as Obama insisted again and again on decoupling the Bush-era tax cuts, making permanent the cuts for those making under $250,000, and letting the cuts in the high-end rates expire. His argument was that the congressional GOP could avoid the wrath of Grover Norquist because it would not actually have to vote to increase taxes. It seemed never to cross his mind that tax rate increases such as he was proposing were anathema to congressional Republicans.¶ The bigger problem during the debt ceiling fight, and probably the biggest contributor to the near-default of the country that summer, was Obama’s failure to heed Boehner’s warning that $800 billion in additional tax revenue was his “red line,” above which he could not go. The justification for that figure was that it was all that could be squeezed out of tax reform (and even that was optimistic according to many analysts); beyond that, tax rates would have to be raised in order to bring in more revenue. In late July, after Boehner had made a “grand bargain” offer that included $800 billion in new revenue, Obama asked for another $400 billion. Memories diverge on exactly who said what—Boehner is convinced Obama said he had to have the extra money, while Obama believes he only suggested it. This ambiguity might have been avoided if Obama had not made the rookie mistake of making such a big request over the phone instead of in person. And, anyway, he should have known not to ask, given Boehner’s previous warnings about his red line. Unsurprisingly, the deal blew up shortly afterwards.¶ It boils down to the difference between listening and waiting to talk. With congressional Republicans, Obama always seems to do the latter. So, once again, he was left disappointed, and once again he assumed the worst of his negotiating partners. He surmised that there were simply too many extreme Tea Party Republicans who were prepared to breach the debt ceiling, and that Boehner lacked control of his caucus. Again, a basic understanding of Republican history would have corrected this notion. Like Newt Gingrich and Denny Hastert before him, Boehner is responsible to a majority of the Republican caucus, which for generations has opposed the kinds of rate increases that $1.2 trillion in new revenue would have required.¶ Not only did Obama fail to listen during the debt ceiling struggle, he consistently sent the other side mixed messages. A case in point: Obama’s demagogic April 2011 speech blasted Paul Ryan’s budget as “leaving seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry” and abandoning “the fundamental commitment this country has kept for generations.” In private, however, Obama had praised Ryan for offering a serious proposal and emphasized that both sides had to avoid scaring the elderly for political points. Worse, he had held a bipartisan summit that very day to encourage the two sides to come together on a plan.¶ ¶ ¶ Obama’s problems communicating with Congress are not limited to the right side of the aisle. Although Democrats need not worry about White House demagoguery or fret that Obama fails to understand their concerns, he has nevertheless done a poor job of engaging them in dialogue. In particular, the White House has often cut congressional Democrats out of the loop, inhibiting interbranch coordination and angering leaders by what they feel is trampling on their institutional rights.¶ Indeed, the president’s signature achievement—Obamacare—almost did not happen because of this. The process by which the health care bill was written was chaotic, to say the least. At one point five bills were circulating on Capitol Hill, three in the House and two in the Senate. Each differed, sometimes dramatically, in how to expand coverage and how to pay for it. And yet the White House did virtually nothing in 2009 to coordinate these efforts.¶ In fact, White House aides privately thought the final House bill was a liberal fantasy, and they had worked out a deal with medical providers that did not include the so-called public option. Yet the president never came out against that proposal, or any other, for that matter. After multiple calls over the summer of 2009 for President Obama to set some ground rules on what he expected, he gave a speech in early September that, though his aides promised specificity, was once again vague.¶ Finally, in early January, when the two chambers had passed their bills and it came time to work out the finer points, President Obama actually stormed out of a meeting after Nancy Pelosi tartly expressed her frustration with his lack of leadership. It was left to Emanuel to finish the negotiations. Worse, the needless delays due to the lack of presidential leadership sapped public support for the reform effort, led to Scott Brown’s victory in the Senate race in Massachusetts that January, and eventually forced Democrats to pass a gratuitously slipshod and ill-conceived bill that otherwise never would have become law.¶ After the 2010 midterms, House Democrats lost their majority, but not all of their clout. It would have been virtually impossible for Boehner to pass a compromise debt ceiling plan through the House in 2011 without at least some Democratic support, so it was appropriate for Pelosi and her leadership team to be kept in the loop. For a while, they were, but as Boehner and Obama approached a grand bargain, House Democrats were excluded.¶ Amazingly, so was Harry Reid. Any deal would obviously have to bear the imprimatur of the Senate majority leader, yet he was cut out of the final talks. It was only after the New York Times scooped the Boehner-Obama grand bargain that the White House brought Senate Democrats into the loop. Unsurprisingly, they were apoplectic, believing that the deal extracted too little from the congressional GOP, and feeling that they had been ignored. In fact, it was the outrage of the Senate Democrats that prompted the White House to go back to Boehner at the last minute to ask for more tax revenue, scuttling the big deal once and for all.¶ All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure.¶ There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill.¶ In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president’s job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: ¶ ¶ The reason people put me in this office is people felt that I had connected our current predicaments with the broader arc of American history and where we might go as a diverse and forward-looking nation. And that narrative thread we just lost, in the day-to-day problem solving that was going on. .  .  . What the president can do, that nobody else can do, is tell a story to the American people about where we are and where we need to go.¶ While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices.¶ The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one “actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood.” President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one “in the arena.”¶ What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi’s power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side.¶ But little such progress will be due to President Obama. It is highly unlikely that he will act as the collective bargainer Neustadt envisioned. He will not be the one to help hammer out policy differences between Senate Democrats and House Republicans, such as illegal immigrants’ status under Obamacare, or help the appropriators find the money needed for enforcement, or create a political space where both parties can declare victory.¶ Sure enough, last week’s campaign-style speech in Las Vegas on immigration reform was classic Obama. Not only did it do nothing to advance the ball on the sensitive negotiations in Congress, but the president demanded immediate amnesty, something to which Republicans will never agree. He also said he would “insist” that Congress vote on his proposal if it did not act in a timely fashion.¶ That captures Obama’s problem in a nutshell. “Insisting” that Congress do something is a good way to make sure nothing happens. Instead, as Harry Truman once said, the president must spend his time “flattering, kissing, and kicking people to get them to do what they are supposed to do anyway.” Barack Obama does not do this. He thinks it beneath him. After four years in office, he still fails to grasp the essence of modern presidential power.

#### Economic decline does not cause shooting wars

Miller 2k

(Morris, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### Plan popular in Congress- Only 1 vote against it and both parties cosponsor

Pendidikan ‘11

Cinta writes for the Love and Like Education Blog, “Sanders is the Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research,” <http://loveandlikeeducation.blogspot.com/2011/08/bernie-sanders-and-small-modular.html>

Sanders is Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research¶ Bernie Sanders and Small Modular Reactors¶ Senator Bernie Sanders often speaks about his opposition to Vermont Yankee as having something to do with the age of the plant, the fact it is owned by Entergy, or his "state's rights" stance about regulating nuclear power plants.¶ Recently, however, Sanders made it clear that he is against nuclear power in any form and is proud of that opinion. On Senator Sanders website, he featured the fact that he was the only vote against "a pair of measures that would promote the development of small modular reactors."¶ One of these measures was the Nuclear Power Act S512. This act would authorize the Secretary of Energy to start a cost-shared program for development of small modular reactors (SMRs).¶ This act had strong bi-partisan support, being sponsored by 3 Republican and 4 Democratic Senators. The act requires research and development funds for SMRs. The Act is still in process, and does not have a firm dollar amount attached, but the dollar amount is likely to be small (in government terms, at least.). Current estimates are $100 million per fiscal year for four years, starting next year.¶ The act also requires that industry cost-share the expense. If industry doesn't think it is worth spending money on the research, the research will not receive government funding either.¶ As a background to the probable cost of this Act, we should note that President Obama requested $4.8 billion dollars for Department of Energy research, of which $3.2 billion is allocated for renewable energy and energy efficiency research. (This number has changed with the debt deal, but new numbers are not available at this time.)¶ Small Modular Reactors for The Future¶ Sander's opposition to this Nuclear Power Act will hurt America's chances to develop an important new exportable technology. Outside of Europe, the nuclear renaissance remains in full swing, with reactors being ordered and built in Arabia, China, India and Southeast Asia. Developing a strong set of SMR designs would be America's best chance to re-entering the world market for nuclear power.¶ SMRs are modular (assembled in a factory and delivered to the site), small (50 to 225 MW) and have many safety features, such as passive cooling. SMRs are expected to have a huge international market. They suitable for many places that do not have the population density or money for the current crop of huge reactors (1200 MW, built on site at great expense). SMRs would make nuclear power affordable and salable many places.¶ Westinghouse and Babcock & Wilcox have invested significant amounts of their own money in developing these products. The NRC is also active in assessing preliminary designs. At another Senate committee meeting on SMRs, Commissioner Magwood of the NRC said that he does not expect decisions made by the NRC to be the critical factor in the success or failure of SMRs. Magwood noted that SMRs have passive safety features and large water inventories; these would be considered during license review.¶ America Fallen Behind¶ America has fallen far behind the rest of the world in most nuclear technologies. Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) and Boiling Water Reactors (BWRs) were developed in this country. They are being sold all over the world, but not by United States companies. We're out of the running. Other countries licensed and improved our original technologies. Companies from France, Korea, Russia and China compete to build large reactors in China, Arabia, and Southeast Asia.¶ Three American companies have put millions of dollars into the development of SMRs: Westinghouse, Babcock & Wilcox, and NuScale (a small start-up). Many people in the nuclear industry feel that the race to develop the first successful SMR is a truly high-stakes race, being fought at the level of nationwide efforts. Luckily, SMR development has bi-partisan support, and Mr. Sanders was alone in his opposition to supporting American industry efforts to develop these plants.¶ Should Government Be Involved?¶ Of course, one can make a case that the government should get out of the energy research business altogether. If Senator Sanders wished to save tax dollars by cutting all energy-research programs, he might have a valid case. However, if the government does plan to spend money on energy research, cost-sharing with industry on a new nuclear technology is certainly a far better use of funds than many of the projects in the swollen DOE renewable budget.

#### Winners win - even controversial policies boost Obama’s capital

Singer 9 (Juris Doctorate candidate at Berkeley Law, Jonathon, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital,” 3/3/2009, <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>)

Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. "What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result.

### Plan Pop

#### Plan popular in Congress- Only 1 vote against it and both parties cosponsor

Pendidikan ‘11

Cinta writes for the Love and Like Education Blog, “Sanders is the Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research,” <http://loveandlikeeducation.blogspot.com/2011/08/bernie-sanders-and-small-modular.html>

Sanders is Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research¶ Bernie Sanders and Small Modular Reactors¶ Senator Bernie Sanders often speaks about his opposition to Vermont Yankee as having something to do with the age of the plant, the fact it is owned by Entergy, or his "state's rights" stance about regulating nuclear power plants.¶ Recently, however, Sanders made it clear that he is against nuclear power in any form and is proud of that opinion. On Senator Sanders website, he featured the fact that he was the only vote against "a pair of measures that would promote the development of small modular reactors."¶ One of these measures was the Nuclear Power Act S512. This act would authorize the Secretary of Energy to start a cost-shared program for development of small modular reactors (SMRs).¶ This act had strong bi-partisan support, being sponsored by 3 Republican and 4 Democratic Senators. The act requires research and development funds for SMRs. The Act is still in process, and does not have a firm dollar amount attached, but the dollar amount is likely to be small (in government terms, at least.). Current estimates are $100 million per fiscal year for four years, starting next year.¶ The act also requires that industry cost-share the expense. If industry doesn't think it is worth spending money on the research, the research will not receive government funding either.¶ As a background to the probable cost of this Act, we should note that President Obama requested $4.8 billion dollars for Department of Energy research, of which $3.2 billion is allocated for renewable energy and energy efficiency research. (This number has changed with the debt deal, but new numbers are not available at this time.)¶ Small Modular Reactors for The Future¶ Sander's opposition to this Nuclear Power Act will hurt America's chances to develop an important new exportable technology. Outside of Europe, the nuclear renaissance remains in full swing, with reactors being ordered and built in Arabia, China, India and Southeast Asia. Developing a strong set of SMR designs would be America's best chance to re-entering the world market for nuclear power.¶ SMRs are modular (assembled in a factory and delivered to the site), small (50 to 225 MW) and have many safety features, such as passive cooling. SMRs are expected to have a huge international market. They suitable for many places that do not have the population density or money for the current crop of huge reactors (1200 MW, built on site at great expense). SMRs would make nuclear power affordable and salable many places.¶ Westinghouse and Babcock & Wilcox have invested significant amounts of their own money in developing these products. The NRC is also active in assessing preliminary designs. At another Senate committee meeting on SMRs, Commissioner Magwood of the NRC said that he does not expect decisions made by the NRC to be the critical factor in the success or failure of SMRs. Magwood noted that SMRs have passive safety features and large water inventories; these would be considered during license review.¶ America Fallen Behind¶ America has fallen far behind the rest of the world in most nuclear technologies. Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) and Boiling Water Reactors (BWRs) were developed in this country. They are being sold all over the world, but not by United States companies. We're out of the running. Other countries licensed and improved our original technologies. Companies from France, Korea, Russia and China compete to build large reactors in China, Arabia, and Southeast Asia.¶ Three American companies have put millions of dollars into the development of SMRs: Westinghouse, Babcock & Wilcox, and NuScale (a small start-up). Many people in the nuclear industry feel that the race to develop the first successful SMR is a truly high-stakes race, being fought at the level of nationwide efforts. Luckily, SMR development has bi-partisan support, and Mr. Sanders was alone in his opposition to supporting American industry efforts to develop these plants.¶ Should Government Be Involved?¶ Of course, one can make a case that the government should get out of the energy research business altogether. If Senator Sanders wished to save tax dollars by cutting all energy-research programs, he might have a valid case. However, if the government does plan to spend money on energy research, cost-sharing with industry on a new nuclear technology is certainly a far better use of funds than many of the projects in the swollen DOE renewable budget.

# Alt energy

### 2AC- Renewables DA

#### Fossil fuels dominate for at least 2 decades

Liu & Liang 1-1

Hengwei and Dapeng are at the School of Management at the Harbin Institute of Technology, “A Review of Clean Energy Innovation and Technology Transfer in China,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, Volume 18 Pages 486-498

Global energy will remain dominated by fossil fuels in the coming decades, with a majority of the energy-demand growth in developing countries. According to the International Energy Agency (IEA)'s New Policies Scenario, which assumes that recent government commitments are implemented in a cautious manner, global primary energy demand will increase by one-third between 2010 and 2035, with 90% of the growth in non-Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. The share of fossil fuels in global primary energy consumption falls from around 81% today to 75% in 2035. Renewables increase from 13% of the mix today to 18% in 2035.

¶

#### Plan displaces fossil fuels

Loudermilk ‘11

(Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375>)

Pursuing a carbon-free world Realistically speaking, a world without nuclear power is not a world full of increased renewable usage, but rather, of fossil fuels instead. The 2007 Japanese Kashiwazaki-Kariwa nuclear outage is an excellent example of this, as is Germany’s post-Fukushima decision to shutter its nuclear plants, which, despite immense development of renewable options, will result in a heavier reliance on coal-based power as its reactors are retired, leading to a 4% increase in annual carbon emissions. On the global level, without nuclear power, carbon dioxide emissions from electricity generation would rise nearly 20% from nine to eleven billion tons per year. When examined in conjunction with the fact that an estimated 300,000 people per year die as a result of energy-based pollutants, the appeal of nuclear power expansion grows further.¶ As the world copes simultaneously with burgeoning power demand and the need for clean energy, nuclear power remains the one consistently viable option on the table. With this in mind, it becomes even more imperative to make nuclear energy as safe as possible, as quickly as possible—a capacity which SMRs can fill with their high degree of safety and security. Additionally, due to their modular nature, SMRs can be quickly constructed and deployed widely. While this is not to say that small reactors should supplant large ones, the US would benefit from diversification and expansion of the nation’s nuclear energy portfolio.

#### SMRs key to renewables penetration

Loudermilk ‘11

(Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375>)

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

#### Renewables fail

Forsberg ‘11

(Charles Forsberg, executive director of the MIT Nuclear Fuel Cycle Study in the Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering at MIT and former Corporate Fellow at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, October 6, 2011, “What alternatives to nuclear energy?,” Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/roundtables/nuclear-energy-different-other-energy-sources#rt8801>)

For those opposed to nuclear energy, the belief is that there are alternative energy sources -- a faith in alternatives, ironically, as strong as some of the early advocates for nuclear power in the 1950s. But no such options exist in a world that will soon have 10 billion people (see Forsberg, "Mutually Assured Energy Independence"). That fundamental reality dictates the need for nuclear energy.¶ Climate change, fossil fuels, and famine. We have fossil fuels; however, the burning of fossil fuels releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere with the potential for large changes in (1) climate and (2) pH (acidity) of water and soil. Both threaten agricultural productivity, because the changing climate moves agriculture to less productive soils. A consistent climate is critical in the formation of fertile soils -- a several-thousand-year process. Climate change also may entail rebuilding much of man’s infrastructure, which is designed for specific climate and sea-level conditions. Betting on fossil fuels is a high-risk strategy for world agriculture and food supplies. While carbon dioxide sequestration will work in a few locations, it's unlikely to be a universal solution.¶ Renewables: latitude counts. We live on a globe circling the sun that creates seasons. That reality means that renewable systems must address how to store energy on a daily, weekly, and seasonal basis. It also drives the design of future energy systems.¶ At MIT, we examined electricity-storage requirements for California assuming three energy futures: (1) all electricity produced by nuclear reactors operating at constant output, (2) all electricity produced by wind assuming California wind conditions and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) wind model, and (3) all electricity produced by solar using the NREL solar-trough model that includes limited energy storage. Table 1 shows the fraction of electricity that has to go into storage at times of excess electricity production to provide electricity when demand exceeds supply.¶ The hourly storage requirements were determined by using the hourly demand curves for electricity and the hourly electricity outputs of solar or wind or nuclear in California. The weekly storage requirements assumed that smart grids, pumped storage, and other technologies could result in each week having a uniform electricity demand, but different weeks have different electricity demands. It is thus a measure of the seasonal storage requirements that needs to be identified, assuming different energy sources with seasonal storage requirements measured in 10s to 100s of gigawatts per year depending upon the electricity prod uction technology.¶ Two-thirds of our electricity is base-load electricity; base-load nuclear energy has low electricity storage requirements. The storage requirements for solar and wind, however, are higher. In fact, the situation is even worse than indicated in Table 1, because the calculations assumed perfect storage systems. Real seasonal storage systems have just 50 percent efficiency but may ultimately increase to 70 percent. In other words, serious wind and solar energy initiatives require massive seasonal storage systems.¶ There are seasonal energy storage technologies being developed, such as nuclear-geothermal gigawatts per year and hydrogen systems. In a nuclear-geothermal energy storage system at times of low electricity demand, nuclear energy is used to heat a 500-meter cube of rock a kilometer or more underground to create an artificial geothermal heat source for peak power production. However, there is no way to insulate rock a kilometer underground. The heat losses are only a few percent on a large system but prohibitive in smaller systems -- that is, it is a technology that only couples to large-scale nuclear energy.¶ The potentially viable seasonal electricity storage technologies (including hydrogen) either couple to nuclear plants or involve synergistic combinations of nuclear and renewables -- but viable storage technologies do not couple efficiently to wind and solar. Renewable advocates point to Denmark and Germany -- countries whose wind systems depend upon Scandinavian hydro. However, there is not enough hydro worldwide to make a serious dent in the storage challenge. An all-renewables world will remain unaffordable -- even if the cost of renewables drop because of the larger challenge of energy storage to match production with demand.¶ Conclusions. Our energy challenge requires nuclear and renewables -- technologies that are complementary in many applications. Energy is over 10 percent of the global GNP, so economics matters because mankind needs more than energy to prosper. The risks of nuclear energy are small compared with the alternatives of oil wars, climate change, or unaffordable energy.

#### No impact and long timeframe

Mendelsohn 9,

(Robert O. the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of¶ Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and¶ Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/¶ gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006.) Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b) crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20-30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people. (Dasgupta et al. 2009) Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and wellbeing may be at risk (Stern 2006). These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the Case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. the net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed

### SMRs Key to Grid

#### Only smr’s solve the grid – renewables fail

Barton 11

Charles Barton 11, founder of the Nuclear Green Revolution blog, MA in philosophy, “Future storm damage to the grid may carry unacceptable costs”, April 30, <http://nucleargreen.blogspot.com/2011_04_01_archive.html>

Amory Lovins has long argued that the traditional grid is vulnerable to this sort of damage. Lovins proposed a paradigm shift from centralized to distributed generation and from fossil fuels and nuclear power to renewable based micro-generation. Critics have pointed to flaws in Lovins model. Renewable generation systems are unreliable and their output varies from locality to locality, as well as from day to day, and hour to hour. In order to bring greater stability and predictability to the grid, electrical engineers have proposed expanding the electrical transmission system with thousands of new miles of transmission cables to be added to bring electricity from high wind and high sunshine areas, to consumers. This would lead, if anything, to greater grid vulnerability to storm damage in a high renewable penetration situation. Thus Lovins renewables/distributed generation model breaks down in the face of renewables limitations. Renewables penetration, will increase the distance between electrical generation facilities and customer homes and businesses, increasing the grid vulnerable to large scale damage, rather than enhancing reliability. Unfortunately Lovins failed to note that the distributed generation model actually worked much better with small nuclear power plants than with renewable generated electricity. Small nuclear plants could be located much closer to customer's homes, decreasing the probability of storm damage to transmission lines. At the very worst, small NPPs would stop the slide toward increased grid expansion. Small reactors have been proposed as electrical sources for isolated communities that are too remote for grid hookups. If the cost of small reactors can be lowered sufficiently it might be possible for many and perhaps even most communities to unhook from the grid while maintaining a reliable electrical supply. It is likely that electrical power will play an even more central role in a post-carbon energy era. Increased electrical dependency requires increased electrical reliability, and grid vulnerabilities limit electrical reliability. Storm damage can disrupt electrical service for days and even weeks. In a future, electricity dependent economy, grid damage can actually impede storm recovery efforts, making large scale grid damage semi-self perpetuating. Such grid unreliability becomes a threat to public health and safety. Thus grid reliability will be a more pressing future issue, than it has been. It is clear that renewable energy sources will worsen grid reliability, Some renewable advocates have suggested that the so called "smart grid" will prevent grid outages. Yet the grid will never be smart enough to repair its own damaged power lines. In addition the "smart grid" will be venerable to hackers, and would be a handy target to statures. A smart grid would be an easy target for a Stuxnet type virus attack. Not only does the "smart grid" not solve the problem posed by grid vulnerability to storm damage, but efficiency, another energy approach thought to be a panacea for electrical supply problems would be equally useless. Thus, decentralized electrical generation through the use of small nuclear power plants offers real potential for increasing electrical reliability, but successful use of renewable electrical generation approaches may worsen rather than improved grid reliability.