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#### Focus on energy production produces chronic failure. Energy becomes an end-in-itself with no social or ethical guidance.

Byrne and Toly 6—\*John Byrne, Director Center for Energy and Environmental Policy & Public Policy at Delaware and \*\*Noah Toly, Research Associate Center for Energy and Environmental Policy [*Transforming Power* eds. Byrne, Toly, & Glover p. 20-21] **[Gender paraphrased]**

The Technique of Modern Energy Governance While moderns usually declare strong preferences for democratic governance, their preoccupation with technique and efficiency may preclude the achievement of such ambitions, or require changes in the meaning of democracy that are so extensive as to raise doubts about its coherence. A veneration of technical monuments typifies both conventional and sustainable energy strategies and reflects a shared belief in technological advance as commensurate with, and even a cause of, contemporary social progress. The modern proclivity to search for human destiny in the march of scientific discovery has led some to warn of a technological politics (Ellul, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c; Winner, 1977, 1986) in which social values are sublimated by the objective norms of technical success (e.g., the celebration of efficiency in all things). In this politics, technology and its use become the end of society and members have the responsibility, as rational beings, to learn from the technical milieu what should be valorized. An encroaching autonomy of technique (Ellul, 1964: 133- 146) replaces critical thinking about modern life with an awed sense and acceptance of its inevitable reality. From dreams of endless energy provided by Green Fossil Fuels and Giant Power, to the utopian promises of Big Wind and Small-Is-Beautiful Solar, technical excellence powers modernist energy transitions. Refinement of technical accomplishments and/or technological revolutions are conceived to drive social transformation, despite the unending inequality that has accompanied two centuries of modern energy's social project. As one observer has noted (Roszak, 1972: 479), the "great paradox of the technological mystique [is] its remarkable ability to grow strong by chronic failure. While the treachery of our technology may provide many occasions for disenchantment, the sum total of failures has the effect of increasing dependence on technical expertise." Even the vanguard of a sustainable energy transition seems swayed by the magnetism of technical acumen, leading to the result that enthusiast and critic alike embrace a strain of technological politics. Necessarily, the elevation of technique in both strategies to authoritative status vests political power in experts most familiar with energy technologies and systems. Such a governance structure derives from the democratic-authoritarian bargain described by Mumford ( 1964). Governance "by the people" consists of authorizing qualified experts to assist political leaders in finding the efficient, modern solution. In the narratives of both conventional and sustainable energy, citizens are empowered to consume the products of the energy regime while largely divesting themselves of authority to govern its operations. Indeed, systems of the sort envisioned by advocates of conventional and sustainable strategies are not governable in a democratic manner. Mumford suggests ( 1964: I) that the classical idea of democracy includes "a group of related ideas and practices ... [including] communal self-government ... unimpeded access to the common store of knowledge, protection against arbitrary external controls, and a sense of moral responsibility for behavior that affects the whole community." Modern conventional and sustainable energy strategies invest in external controls, authorize abstract, depersonalized interactions of suppliers and demanders, and celebrate economic growth and technical excellence without end. Their social consequences are relegated in both paradigms to the status of problems-to-be-solved, rather than being recognized as the emblems of modernist politics. As a result, modernist democratic practice becomes imbued with an authoritarian quality, which "deliberately eliminates the whole human personality, ignores the historic process, [and] overplays the role of abstract intelligence, and makes control over physical nature, ultimately control over [hu]man[ity] himself, the chief purpose of existence" (Mumford, 1964: 5). Meaningful democratic governance is willingly sacrificed for an energy transition that is regarded as scientifically and technologically unassailable.

#### Critique is a prior question—starting with incentives dodges issues of social and environmental sustainability.

Byrne and Toly 6—\*John Byrne, Director Center for Energy and Environmental Policy & Public Policy at Delaware and \*\*Noah Toly, Research Associate Center for Energy and Environmental Policy [*Transforming Power* eds. Byrne, Toly, & Glover p. 22-24]

Transition without Change: A Failing Discourse After more than thirty years of contested discourse, the major 'energy futures' under consideration appear committed to the prevailing systems of governance and political economy that animate late modernity. The new technologies-conventional or sustainable-that will govern the energy sector and accumulate capital mjght be described as centaurian technics21 in which the crude efficiency of the fossil energy era is bestowed a new sheen by high . technologies and modernized ecosystems: capitalism without smoky cities, contaminated industrial landscapes, or an excessively carbonized atmosphere. Emerging energy solutions are poised to realize a postmodern transition (Roosevelt, 2002), but their shared commitment to capitalist political economy and the democratic-authoritarian bargain lend credence to Jameson's assessment (1991) of postmodernism as the "cultural logic of late capitalism." Differences in ecological commitments between conventional and sustainable energy strategies still demarcate a battleground that, we agree, is important-even fundamental. But so also are the common aspirations of the two camps. Each sublimates social considerations in favor of a politics of more-is-better, and each regards the advance of energy capitalism with a sense of inevitability and triumph. Conventional and sustainable energy visions equally presume that a social order governed by a 'democratic' ideal of cornucopia, marked by economic plenty, and delivered by technological marvels will eventually lance the wounds of poverty and inequality and start the healing process. Consequently, silence on questions of governance and social justice is studiously observed by both·proposals. Likewise, both agree to, or demur on, the question of capitalism's sustainability.22 Nothing is said on these questions because, apparently, nothing needs to be. If the above assessment of the contemporary energy discourse is correct, then the enterprise is not at a crossroad; rather, it has reached a point of acquiescence to things as they are. Building an inquiry into energy as a social project will require the recovery of a critical voice that can interrogate, rather than concede, the discourse's current moorings in technological politics and capitalist political economy. A fertile direction in this regard is to investigate an energy-society order in which energy systems evolve in response to social values and goals, and not simply according to the dictates of technique, prices, or capital. Initial interest in renewable energy by the sustainability camp no doubt emanated, at least in part, from the fact that its fuel price is non-existent and that capitalization of systems to collect renewable sources need not involve the extravagant, convoluted corporate forms that manage the conventional energy regime. But forgotten, or misunderstood, in the attraction of renewable energy have been the social origins of such emergent possibilities. Communities exist today who address energy needs outside the global marketplace: they are often rural in character and organize energy services that are immune to oil price spikes and do not require water heated to between 550Q and 900Q Fahrenheit (300Q and 500Q Celsius) (the typical temperatures in nuclear reactors). No energy bills are sent or paid and governance of the serving infrastructure is based on local (rather than distantly developed professional) knowledge. Needless to say, sustainability is embodied in the lifeworld of these communities, unlike the modern strategy that hopes to design sustainability into its technology and economics so as not to seriously change its otherwise unsustainable way of life . Predictably, modern society will underscore its wealth and technical acumen as evidence of its superiority over alternatives. But smugness cannot overcome the fact that energy-society relations are evident in which the bribe of democratic-authoritarianism and the unsustainability of energy capitalism are successfully declined. In L 928, Mahatma Gandhi (cited in Gandhi, 1965: 52) explained why the democratic-authoritarian bargain and Western capitalism should be rejected: God forbid that India should ever take to industrialization after the manner of the West. The economic imperialism of a single tiny island kingdom (England) is today keeping the world in chains. If an entire nation of 300 million took to similar economic exploitation, it would strip the world bare like locusts. Unless the capitalists of India help to avert that tragedy by becoming trustees of the welfare of the masses and by devoting their talents not to amassing wealth for themselves but to the service of the masses in an altruistic spirit, they will end either by destroying the masses or being destroyed by them. As Gandhi's remark reveals, social inequality resides not in access to electric light and other accoutrements of modernity, but in a world order that places efficiency and wealth above life-affirming ways of life. This is our social problem, our energy problem, our ecological problem, and, generally, our political-economic problem. The challenge of a social inquiry into energy-society relations awaits.
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#### Financial incentives are rebates, grants, loans, Tax Incentives, green building incentives, and industrial recruitment. Distinct from Community Investment & Rules & regulations

#### The aff isn’t an example of a topical incentive

Gouchoe 2k—North Carolina State University, National Renewable Energy Laboratory [Susan, December 2000, Local Government and Community Programs and Incentives for Renewable Energy— National Report, http://seg.fsu.edu/Library/casestudy%20of%20incentives.pdf]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents a summary of the renewable energy programs and incentives of 45¶ communities in 23 states as collected and catalogued by the Interstate Renewable Energy¶ Council’s (IREC) Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy (DSIRE) project. Also included are summaries of state initiatives that impact implementation of renewable energy¶ technologies on the local level. Programs and incentives in this report include:

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT & AWARENESS PROGRAMS

v Renewable Energy Projects

v Education & Assistance

v Green Pricing Programs

v Green Power Purchasing

FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

v Rebates, Grants, & Loans

v Tax Incentives

v Green Building Incentives

v Industrial Recruitment

RULES, REGULATIONS & POLICIES

v Solar & Wind Access

v Net Metering

v Construction & Design

v Contractor Licensing

v Equipment Certification

v Public Benefits Funds

v Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards

v Disclosure & Certification

Established in 1995, DSIRE is an ongoing project to summarize incentives, programs, and¶ policies for renewable energy. The project is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy’s¶ Office of Power Technologies and is managed by the North Carolina Solar Center. DSIRE on¶ Line makes the DSIRE database accessible via the web at:¶ http://www.ncsc.ncsu.edu/dsire.htm. The website is updated daily and includes search¶ capabilities for all incentives. In addition to state and local programs, the website features¶ utility programs and a searchable bibliography.

#### VOTE NEGATIVE

#### PREDICTABLE LIMITS—the word incentives in the resolution is modified by financial to make it manageable. Going beyond makes the topic unpredictable.

#### GROUND—financial incentives insure the aff has links to market disads and counterplans which are the only core negative ground across bi-directional energies. Holding the line key
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#### India is poised to become a nuclear exporter due to lack of US competition in the small reactor market. The plan reverses this. Exports are key to Indian nuclear industry.

CSIS 10 [“India’s Nuclear Push” http://csis.org/blog/india%E2%80%99s-nuclear-push]

**“**In India's statement to the 54th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna, Indian Atomic Energy Commission chairman Srikumar Banerjee said that Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd (NPCIL) is ‘ready to offer Indian PHWRs of 220 MWe or 540 MWe for export’”**. ¶** It’s happening– second-tier nuclear suppliers from China, South Korea, and now India are waking up to the opportunities that may emerge from intensified interest in nuclear power. India is entering the nuclear supply business at a time when new nuclear states are looking for alternatives to the huge, expensive reactors sold by the French, Russians, Japanese, Canadians, and Americans. ¶ ¶ Last year, Korea won the plum contract in the Middle East – a $20 billion agreement to build 4 nuclear power reactors in the United Arab Emirates. The UAE plans to construct a total of 10 reactors, using one contractor. China, while busily constructing nuclear power plants at home, will build a few new reactors in Pakistan and reportedly is interested in Turkish and Arab state plans to import. India will be next off the starting block of this export race.¶ ¶ There’s no way to predict how price-competitive India’s export reactors will be. NPCIL is a public enterprise under the control of the government’s Department of Atomic Energy. One of the suggested virtues of the U.S.-India nuclear deal was that the Indian nuclear sector would be forced to clean up its act as foreign competition grew in India.One way for the NPCIL to become more self-sustaining is through exports. ¶ **¶** What will motivate nuclear power newcomers to buy Indian, Korean or Chinese? First, the reactor vendors from the advanced nuclear states are in disarray. AREVA has its much-publicized cost overruns in Olkiluoto; Japanese vendors do not have an export history; and Russian reactors were previously sold only in the Eastern bloc countries or allies. Russia will expand from reactors in India and Iran to potential contracts with Turkey and Vietnam.¶ ¶ China, South Korea and Indiaallhave smaller reactors to offer**.** In the United States, while there is interest in small modular reactors, there aren’t any licensed**.** These smaller reactors are more likely to fit the needs of states that are new to nuclear power. Not only do they lack the billions of dollars it takes to build large 1000MWe-1600MWe reactors, but they also lack the extensive transmission grids to accommodate large, centralized electricity generators.

#### Indian nuclear industry is essential to indian growth

World Nuclear News 9 [http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/NN-Indian\_joint\_venture\_to\_produce\_forgings-301109.html]

India will have a world-class heavy forging facility for future nuclear power plants after a joint venture by Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd (NPCIL) and Larsen & Toubro (L&T).

NPCIL-LandT¶ The signing of the joint venture agreement in Mumbai¶ The joint venture will construct a new facility at L&T's existing manufacturing site in Hazira, Surat, Gujarat state, which will have a dedicated steel melt shop producing ingots of up to 600 tonnes, as well as a heavy forge shop equipped with a forging press that will be amongst the largest in the world. The facility will supply finished forgings for nuclear reactors, pressurizers and steam generators, and also heavy forgings for critical equipment in the hydrocarbon sector and for thermal power plants. The coastal location of the Hazira plant will also facilitate multi-modal transportation and export of parts produced at the joint venture facility.¶ In a joint statement, the companies said: "The new fully integrated facility ... would significantly augment India's capabilities in manufacturing critical components for the nuclear power industry." They added, "Indigenous manufacture of forgings will close a critical cap in Indian industry's capability to produce equipment for nuclear, thermal power and hydrocarbon plants. It will enable a significant reduction in cycle times."¶ ¶ Anil Kakodkar, secretary of the Department of Atomic Energy and chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, commented: "The establishment of JV between NPCIL and L&T reflects our vision of steady progress for growth of nuclear power in the country in a self reliant manner." He added, "The facility would contribute in closing the gap in the supply chain for nuclear power reactors, a wide spectrum of installations for nuclear fuel cycle and other infrastructure applications, like hydrocarbon and power."¶ ¶ L&T chairman and managing director A M Naik added, "This JV will place India amongst the few countries in the world capable of producing nuclear grade heavy forgings. When combined with the established facilities in Hazira, this venture will form part of a fully integrated high technology manufacturing complex." He noted that L&T has previously provided NPCIL with nuclear power plant systems and equipment and that the new joint venture "will add a new dimension to our long standing relationship."¶ ¶ According to a Bloomberg report, the new plant will start in 2011, while exports are set to begin by 2013.¶ ¶ L&T is India's biggest engineering and construction company and makes reactor pressure vessels for the country's pressurized heavy water reactors (PHWRs), fast breeder reactor and steam generators. It has been involved in supply of equipment, systems and services for nearly all the PHWRs that have been indigenously built, including the manufacture of calandrias, end-shields, steam generators, primary heat transport system and heat exchangers.¶ ¶ The company signed four agreements with foreign nuclear power reactor vendors in early 2009. The first, with Westinghouse, sets up L&T to produce component modules for the Westinghouse AP1000 reactor. The second agreement was with Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd "to develop a competitive cost/scope model for the ACR-1000." In April, L&T signed an agreement with Russia's AtomStroyExport primarily focused on components for the next four VVER reactors at Kudankulam, but extending beyond that to other Russian VVER plants in India and internationally. In May, it signed an agreement with GE-Hitachi to produce major components for ABWRs - the two companies hope to utilize indigenous Indian capabilities for the complete construction of nuclear power plants including the supply of reactor equipment and systems, valves, electrical and instrumentation products for ABWR plants to be built in India.

#### Indian Growth Prevents indo-pak war

Kapur 8 [Associate Professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the U.S. Naval Post-graduate School and a Faculty Affiliate at Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation (Paul, Ten Years of Instability in a Nuclear South Asia, International Security, Volume 33, Number 2, Fall 2008]

The Indians, for their part, have pursued improved relations with Pakistan for two principal reasons, neither of which stems from nuclear deterrence. First, India's main national priority has become continued economic growth, which Indian leaders believe is essential if the country is to reduce poverty, shed its "third-world" status, and join the first rank of nations.[54](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.2.kapur.html" \l "f54) Greater prosperity, in turn, has led to rising economic aspirations among the Indian electorate. Indians increasingly expect, as Chengappa puts it, "better jobs, the American dream." Therefore the government seeks "to focus on growth and to keep the peace," rather than squander resources on continued Indo-Pakistani conflict.[55](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.2.kapur.html" \l "f55)
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**Congress will avoid the fiscal cliff now.**

**Postal 11/8**/12 Veteran reporter covering Washington, D.C. and federal insurance regulation

(Arthur Postal, Credit Union Times, Dealmakers at Work on Fiscal Cliff, <http://www.cutimes.com/2012/11/08/dealmakers-at-work-on-fiscal-cliff?ref=hp>)

Washington is again focusing on the so-called “fiscal cliff” now that the election is out of the way, and there is **strong evidence** of a “grand bargain” being agreed to by **Congress** and the **White House** by year-end in order to avert a dramatic impact on the economy.

President Obama signaled support for a compromise in accepting Mitt Romney’s concession early Wednesday, and on Wednesday, both Senate and House leaders made statements implying that talks are underway.

The issue boils down to the fact that, barring action, $668 billion in total spending cuts and tax increases will take effect Jan. 1, constituting 4% of total gross domestic product.

Also critical is that estate-tax policy will revert to 2001 levels if there is no action. If Congress fails to act, 14.7 million U.S. households would have a potential estate tax liability, according to LIMRA.

The **consensus** of congressional staffers is that there will be a one-year deal to avoid the huge year-end impact.

The sources say that this deal would include an agreed-upon deficit reduction number, including an agreement for tax reform that brings in revenues.

**Nuclear fuels held back because other energies will fight**

**ADAMS 7 – 24 – 12 Pro-nuclear advocate with small nuclear plant operating and design experience. Former submarine Engineer Officer. Founder, Adams Atomic Engines, Inc** [Rod Adams, The Atomic Show #185 – Is Thorium Superior to Uranium?, <http://atomicinsights.com/2012/07/the-atomic-show-185-is-thorium-superior-to-uranium.html>]

On July 23, 2012, busy schedules aligned and I had the chance to talk with Richard Martin, the author of SuperFuel: Thorium, the Green Energy Source for the Future and Kirk Sorensen, the co-founder and chief technology officer of Flibe Energy, a start-up company formed to “develop small modular reactors based on liquid-fluoride thorium reactor (LFTR) technology.” Kirk is also the founder of Energy from Thorium.

Thought I did not think of phrasing it in this manner until I sat down to post the show, the initial question we discussed was “is thorium superior to uranium”? Even if Martin and Sorensen were able to win that argument, the more important question was determining whether the answer matters as much as the fact that both uranium and thorium (and their periodic table neighbor, plutonium) are atomic fission fuels that have serious advantages over combustion fuels in terms of energy density, total energy value and ability to produce power without pollution.

We talked quite a bit about my solidifying theory that a major part of the long running battle against using any of the three available nuclear fission fuels has derived from the fact that the current kings of the energy hill do not want either one to **take their market share away**. As is often the case, my discussion opponents initially labeled my theory as a crackpot conspiracy theory; I stubbornly continued explaining that pointing to a business strategy that includes efforts to “raise the barriers of entry” for formidable competitors should not be dismissed.

It is not a conspiracy theory to point out the enormous amount of capital that is invested in the global effort to locate, extract, transport, refine, distribute and market coal, natural gas and oil. It is not a conspiracy theory to point out that politicians and the advertiser supported media have numerous reasons to help their friends continue to capture trillions of dollars worth of revenue each year from suppling industrial society with the fuels that keep it running at prices that are far higher than they would be if there were amply supplies of nuclear fission based machines being allowed to operate on a remotely level playing field.

**Capital is key.**

**Kalab 11/8**/12 Shorenstein Center's Founding Director, Edward R. Murrow Professor of Press and Public Policy at Harvard, Scholar in Foreign Policy – Brookings

(Marvin, An Overture to Romney, <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/up-front/posts/2012/11/08-romney-kalb>)

Conservative critics, gloomy after their candidate’s defeat, argue that President Obama, despite his impressive win in a struggling economy, has no mandate. **That is nonsense.** The president has a mandate, or, what former President George W. Bush referred to as “political capital,” to lead the way toward a political reconciliation over the nation’s impending fiscal cliff negotiations—and to do so now, while the glow of his victory still glitters in the political sunrise. **No one else can lead**, and no one else should lead.

In a way unique to Oval Office occupants, who have run their last political campaign, freshly liberated from normal political constraints, President Obama can now embark on this urgent task by dramatically widening the circle of his inner cabinet and inviting prominent Republicans to join it and, in this way, help him reach an unprecedented bipartisan compromise in the best interests of the country. One such Republican is Mitt Romney, the man he just beat. Though technically the head of his party, Romney is now a man without a job but a man who was, only a few days ago, close to being President-elect. Why not appoint Romney to replace Tim Geithner as Secretary of the Treasury?

This is not so wild an idea, though I can imagine, as you can, the obvious pitfalls. He has major disagreements with the president on economic policy, and he may yet dream about another run for the top job. In addition, Obama may already have promised the job to someone else.

But, if words still have meaning, and if the president remains fixed on striking a major deal before dreaded sequestration sinks its claws into the American economy, Obama is now in a position to make a bold move. The stage, in fact, is set.

**The impact is global econ collapse.**

**Mandel 12** Syracuse Business News Examiner

(Harold, Fitch says fiscal cliff could set off global recession, <http://www.examiner.com/article/fitch-says-fiscal-cliff-could-set-off-global-recession>)

Money News has reported on September 27, 2012: "Fitch: US Fiscal Cliff Could Trigger Global Recession, Halve World Growth." Fitch Ratings said on Thursday that the unprecedented belt-tightening, which is known as the fiscal cliff that hangs over the United States could, at the very least, cut world growth in half in 2013. Fitch also said that the fiscal cliff could push the United States and possibly the world into recession.

The ratings agency stated, "The U.S. fiscal cliff represents the single biggest near-term threat to a global economic recovery." Fitch has gone on to warn, “A U.S. fiscal shock would be exported to the rest of the world via a sharply weaker U.S. dollar and asset prices, lower U.S. price and wage inflation and heightened risk of deflation, and the impact on commodity prices.” In the meantime leading U.S. executives have less confidence in the business outlook now than at any time in the past three years, with a primary reason being fear of gridlock in Washington over the fiscal deficit and tax policy. And so unless the fiscal cliff is confronted and avoided this could be bad news for everyone.

**Nuclear war.**

**Kemp 10** Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

(Geoffrey Kemp, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4)

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “**failed states**.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in **Pakistan** and its takeover by Muslim **extremists**, who then take possession of a large number of **nuclear weapons**. The danger of war between **India and Pakistan** increases significantly. **Iran**, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances **nuclear proliferation** in the **Middle East**, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear **terrorism** increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population.

**Sequestration destroys the US military.**

**Hunter 9/30**/12 U.S. Representative from Alaska

(Duncan, “SEQUESTRATION SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE,” 2012, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/sep/30/tp-sequestration-sends-wrong-message-to-us/?page=1#article>)

Over the next 10 years, because of sequestration, the Pentagon will be forced to absorb $500 billion in budget cuts that will strike at the heart of America’s military. Making this even more dangerous is the fact that the legislation triggering sequestration, the Budget Control Act, also imposed an additional $450 billion in defense budget cuts for a total of nearly $1 trillion of reductions over the next decade. The next 10 years are sure to be no different from the last. In the Middle East, **Iran** is desperately searching to fill a regional power vacuum and enhance its weapons program, while threatening to **close the Strait of Hormuz** and targeting Israel with unapologetic provocation. Meanwhile, the United States still has an obligation to Iraq. There is a necessity for diplomatic support and engagement, even though the ground combat mission is over. **Africa** is also experiencing power struggles of its own. The situations in Libya and Egypt are evolving, while Yemen and Somalia are acting as staging grounds for **al-Qaeda.** There is also the threat of Somali pirates in international waters. Multiple high-profile hostage situations and combat rescues show just how serious of a threat that rogue bands of pirates are to naval and commercial shipping lanes. There is also the threat of **North Korea** with its aggressive pursuit of advanced aerial weaponry, **Russia** with its focus on arms modernization, and China with its large-scale and rapid military buildup. **China’s** display of hostility toward **Taiwan** — a friend and ally of the United States — also shows no sign of diminishing. With all of this, more than 70,000 American troops are in Afghanistan, facing down a dangerous enemy. For the United States and other nations, interest in Afghanistan and the region will continue long after the last of the coalition ground forces leave and the next phase of the mission begins. Ignoring America’s obligation as a world leader and the patchwork of threats that exist today won’t eliminate the risk posed by an Iran that one day acquires nuclear weapons or a North Korea that eventually acquires effective strike capability. More likely, these and other threats will develop more quickly and efficiently, putting the **global interests** of the U.S. directly in the cross hairs. Through a robust national defense, the United States has always sent a clear message around the world that American intentions are good and we stand by our allies. The strength of the U.S. military has **dissuaded conflict** and suggested to adversaries that challenging freedom is a losing proposition. It was this deterrent, in fact, that won the Cold War and turned the U.S. military into the world’s most effective fighting force. **Sequestration would change all of this**, for the worse. In the words of Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, sequestration is a “nutty formula, and it’s goofy to begin with, and it’s not something, frankly, that anybody responsible ought to put into effect.” He also said sequestration is the equivalent of “**shooting ourselves in the head**.” Tough words, but Secretary Panetta is right. Sequestration would produce the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest Navy since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in Air Force history. Ironically, the president’s defense policy shift to the Pacific increases reliance on the Navy, but with the smallest fleet in nearly a century, controlling the oceans and projecting force will become an even more difficult and selective process, requiring prioritization that would create vulnerabilities elsewhere. Resetting America’s armed forces after a decade-plus of combat action is another necessity that cannot be overlooked. There is also a guarantee of pink slips throughout the uniformed services and every industry that directly supports the U.S. military. In San Diego, the military sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs, and billions of dollars in economic productivity. San Diego — even for all of its strategic value — is not immune to job loss and other economic impacts accompanying deep budget cuts. Sequestration is a term Americans should get to know and understand, because it will have real and lasting consequences if left unchecked. The upside is that the risks and dangers can be avoided as long as Congress and the president act in the coming months. The clock is ticking to stave off sequestration — a move that would signal to our friends and enemies alike that we uphold our promises and stand ready to defend our interests against any threat.
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#### Text: The United States federal government should obtain, through alternative financing, electricity from small modular reactors that designate military installations in the United States as priority users.

#### For is a term of exclusion

Cline, 39 – Judge for the US Customs Court (AMERICAN COLORTYPE CO. v. UNITED STATES C. D. 107, 2 Cust. Ct. 132; 1939 Cust. Ct. LEXIS 35)

The provision under which the plaintiff claims in this case is paragraph 1807 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which is substantially the same as paragraph 1704 of the act of 1922 except that it contains additional exceptions, [\*\*6] namely, "drawing" and "sketch" and articles "for industrial use." The pertinent parts of the paragraph read as follows:

PAR. 1807. Original paintings in oil, \* \* \*; and the words "painting," "drawing," "sketch," "sculpture," and "statuary" as used in this paragraph shall not be understood to include any articles of utility or for industrial use \* \* \*. [Italics ours.]

While the court held in Progressive Fine Arts Co. v. United States, supra, that the words "articles of utility" in paragraph 1704 of the act of 1922 did not cover paintings which were not originally designed for utilitarian purposes, even though they were used for such purposes after importation, there is still involved herein the question of whether Congress intended that the new words in paragraph 1807 of the Tariff Act of 1930 "for industrial use" should have the same meaning as that held to apply to the words "articles of utility" in the previous act or should be considered as having a different meaning.

In the case of United States v. Irving Massin & Bros., 16 Ct. Cust. App. 19, T. D. 42714, in considering whether the words "such" and "similar" in section 402 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1922 [\*\*7] referred to the same or different merchandise, the court said at page 24:

\* \* \* If the word "similar" means no more than the word "such," then there is no reason for it being used in the statute. To so construe it, is to lose sight entirely of the ordinary meaning of the word and to adopt a construction based upon the theory that Congress has employed useless and unnecessary language in drafting this act, which, under ordinary circumstances, we may not do. United States v. Post Fish Co., 13 Ct. Cust. App. 155, T. D. 41022. "Similar" merchandise must be construed as different from "such" merchandise in order to give this statute full effect. \* \* \*

The same reasons used by the appellate court may be adopted in construing the language of the statute herein involved. If the words "for industrial use" mean no more than the words "articles of utility," there could be no reason for inserting the additional words "for industrial use" in the paragraph. Therefore, it must be held that the [\*135] new language "for industrial use" was intended to have a different meaning from the words "articles of utility," as construed in the case of Progressive Fine Arts Co. v. United States, [\*\*8]

supra.

Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "industrial" as follows:

Industrial. 1. Relating to industry or labor as an economic factor, or to a branch or the branches of industry; of the nature of, or constituting, an industry or industries \* \* \* .

The transferring of the scenes on an oil painting to a printed copy is a branch of industry under the definition above quoted.

Some of the meanings of the preposition "for" signify intent, as shown by the following definition in the same dictionary:

For. 2. Indicating the end with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done; as: a. As a preparation for; with the object of; in order to be, become, or act as; conducive to. \* \* \*.

d. Intending, or in order, to go to or in the direction of.

Therefore, the words "articles for industrial use" in paragraph 1807 imply that Congress intended to exclude from that provision articles either purchased or imported with the intention to use the same in industry for manufacturing purposes. The record in this case establishes that the paintings were purchased and imported with intent to reproduce printed copies thereof for industrial use, and that they were [\*\*9] so used after importation.

#### Priority user status solves all grid-dependence issues while allowing excess energy to be sold back into the grid.

Marcus King, LaVar Huntzinger, and Thoi Nguyen, March 2011. CNA Environment and Energy Team, Resource Analysis Division. “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations,” <http://www.cna.org/research/2011/feasibility-nuclear-power-us-military>.

There are several alternatives for the customer base served by a DoD nuclear power plant. The plant could be built for:

• DoD as the exclusive user

• Commercial users, but with DoD a priority user

• Commercial users, including DoD

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

#### Exclusive access deals would cause community backlash against the DOD.

Commander Herbert E. Carmen, Christine Parthemore, and Will Rogers, April 2010. USN, Senior Military Fellow at the Center for a New American Security; Bacevich Fellow at the Center for a New American Security; and Research Assistant at the Center for a New American Security. “Broadening Horizons: Climate Change and the U.S. Armed Forces,” Center for a New American Security, http://www.cnas.org/node/4374.

The question of whether or not to locate nuclear reactors on domestic DOD installations has been raised for years, and the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act required DOD to assess the feasibility, costs and benefits of going this route. The need to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, and recent debates over “islanding” energy systems and integrating smart grid technolo- gies for energy and cyber security reasons, have all created a new sense of urgency for definitive answers to this pressing policy question.¶ The concept of energy islanding is enjoying increased attention today, and several Army, Navy and Air Force officials we spoke with explicitly stated that small nuclear reactors could help DOD to create islanding capabilities. The February 2008 Defense Science Board report “More Fight – Less Fuel” states that “The Task Force recommends DoD pursue the concept of ‘islanding,’ which would isolate critical loads, and selectively entire installations, from the¶ grid and make them self-sufficient.”14 Likewise, in response to a question about islanding for DOD bases, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations & Environment Dr. Dorothy Robyn stated in February 2010 that the source of electricity generation could be important to meeting the goals of islanding: “Is the backup diesel capability, or whatever that we now have, sufficient? Do we need to do more than that? And renewable can be helpful, nuclear could be very helpful, I don’t see renewable and nuclear as either or, it could be both.”15¶ If improving energy security includes all stra- tegic assets, personnel and logistics involved with a given base’s activities, then the definition of islanding would similarly need to expand to include parts of the greater community around the base, for example nearby ports. There is also a **concern over negative public image that could stem from military bases having vast energy resources while the surrounding communities experience** disruptions and other **problems**. This speaks to the idea that promoting nuclear energy for the purpose of creating islanding capabilities for bases would require careful definition of the goals of this approach and intricate planning.

#### Community relations key to prevent encroachment --- undermines training and readiness.

Amanda Boccuti, Lauren Faul, and Lauren Gray, 5/21/2012. Analyst for Marstel-Day, LLC, providing analysis and GIS support for U.S. Marine Corps projects; analyst for Marstel-Day, LLC, specializing in Strategic Communications. Her primary responsibilities entail the development of engagement plans for the U.S. Marine Corps which will provide them a framework to sustain the missions through community outreach and engagement; and researcher at Marstel-Day, LLC, offering research and analysis of environmental issues for encroachment control plans and communications, outreach and engagement strategies for the U.S. Marine Corps. “Establishing Creative Strategies for Effective Engagement Between Military Installations & Communities,” Engaging Cities, http://engagingcities.com/article/establishing-creative-strategies-effective-engagement-between-military-installations-communi.

Throughout the Nation’s history, military installations and ranges were historically established in undeveloped areas, except for those forts located to defend cities. Local communities developed near the installations for safety and economic reasons resulting in the installation being the up-to-that-point rural community’s primary economic engine. Routine communication between the installations and local communities were minimal because the installation was self-supporting and not subject to local laws and regulations. Communications were primarily social. Starting in the post-World War II era and accelerating as the 20th Century came to a close, installation-adjacent communities increased in both density and size – becoming less rural, more suburban or urban, and more economically diverse.¶ Military missions continue to evolve, incorporating new weapon platforms and training over larger areas and at all hours of the day and night. These changes in both surrounding communities and the installation missions have often lead to competing interests with respect to the economy, natural resource management, and land use. Military installations and local communities must, therefore, focus communication efforts on building partnerships to find mutually acceptable paths forward for resolving their competing interests. **Developing collaborative relationships is imperative to turning otherwise conflicting interests into opportunities for mutually beneficial solutions**. The nature of those interactions is defined by issue type, installation and community rapport, and available communication channels.¶ The four military services (i.e., Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force) have service-specific community engagement programs to develop partnerships; all four, however, conduct information sharing through the Public Affairs Office (PAO), which handles media and public relations. Three of the services – the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force – have established encroachment management policies that outline service responsibilities to establish, maintain, and **sustain community relationships in order to reduce encroachment effects**. This responsibility is usually assigned to a Community Plans and Liaison Office (CPLO) or an equivalent community planner. The CPLO and PAO work with their installation Commander to act as the military’s voice and point of engagement in the community through consistent messaging, establishing an installation presence in community forums, and planning community-engagement events and processes.¶ Though Department of Defense (DoD) mechanisms exist to develop community partnerships, mediating the different interests and priorities among military installations and their surrounding communities is a complex, nuanced process usually exercised by the services, through their installation leadership. Siting of renewable energy projects, environmental stewardship responsibilities, noise from training events, and other policy- and planning-related matters invoke difficult questions, such as: how can an installation and its surrounding communities concurrently pursue goals and development **in a way that lead to mutual gain**, obtaining threshold requirements and fair compromise? Finding interest nexuses and fostering an open, strong relationship in which those nexuses can be explored is key.

#### Readiness key to deter conflict.

[Jack Spencer](http://www.heritage.org/About/Staff/JackSpencer_old.cfm), 9/15/2000. Policy Analyst for Defense and National Security in the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies at The Heritage Foundation. “The Facts About Military Readiness,” Heritage Foundation Backgrounder, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2000/09/bg1394-the-facts-about-military-readiness.

Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

### 1NC—Solvency

#### NRC restrictions are the single biggest roadblock for SMRs—delays, lack of human and technical capacity, and zoning restrictions.

Nick Cunningham, October 2012. Policy Analyst for Energy and Climate at the American Security Project. “Small Modular Reactors: A Possible Path Forward for Nuclear Power,” American Security Project, <http://americansecurityproject.org/ASP%20Reports/Ref%200087%20-%20Small%20Modular%20Reactors.pdf>.

The most difficult challenge currently facing SMRs is the institutional barriers. Currently, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has not certified a single SMR design. Despite the variety of SMR designs from several nuclear vendors, the NRC has lacked sufficient human and technical capacity to license small modular reactors in the past.33 Even as policymakers have expressed greater interest in SMRs in recent years, the licensing process for a new design takes several years at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars.34¶ Also, many regulations create a difficult environment for small reactors and favor large reactors. For example, the NRC requires 10 mile emergency planning zones around nuclear power plants,¶ making it difficult to site a small reactor near urban centers where it could be used for energy applications other than centralized electricity generation.35¶ SMRs will need to overcome this long history of institutional bias towards large reactors. As the most prominent licensing body for the nuclear industry worldwide, the NRC to a certain degree, shapes the global future for nuclear power. If the NRC does not lead on small modular reactors, it may be an uphill battle for the SMR industry.

#### NRC restrictions overwhelm government financial incentives.

Jim Hopf, 10/25/2011. Senior nuclear engineer with more than 20 years of experience in shielding and criticality analysis and design for spent fuel dry storage and transportation systems. “[Roadblock in Congress for SMR Development](http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2011/10/25/congress-smr/),” ANS Nuclear Café, http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2011/10/25/congress-smr/.

As many have observed, the main barrier to the deployment of SMRs may not be a lack of government financial or R&D support, but instead the enormous amount of time and money required to get new reactor designs licensed by the NRC. Reactor licensing processes have been taking many years and costing more than a $100 million dollars. Even approving an exact copy of an already-licensed reactor design (for a new site) is projected to take more than two years.¶ Even SMRs that deploy conventional light-water technology (such as NuScale or mPower) can expect a long (~ 5 year) licensing process (starting in late 2012 or 2013). For non-conventional technologies like Hyperion, who knows how long it will take? The NRC has stated that non-conventional SMRs like Hyperion are not on its priority list right now, and that it will only consider such an application when a serious customer has been found (thus setting up a chicken-egg problem).¶ Other issues that may hold back SMRs include security and emergency planning/evacuation requirements, and per-reactor NRC fees. If the NRC is not willing to consider the SMRs’ lower potential radioactivity release, as well as the lower probability of such release, in setting these requirements, as well as scaling fees with reactor capacity, it may destroy SMRs’ economic viability.¶

### 1NC—DoD Advantage [Gtown]

#### US decline will not spark wars.

MacDonald & Parent 11—Professor of Political Science at Williams College & Professor of Political Science at University of Miami [Paul K. MacDonald & Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Spring 2011), pp. 7–44]

Our findings are directly relevant to what appears to be an impending great power transition between China and the United States. Estimates of economic performance vary, but most observers expect Chinese GDP to surpass U.S. GDP sometime in the next decade or two. 91 This prospect has generated considerable concern. Many scholars foresee major conflict during a Sino-U.S. ordinal transition. Echoing Gilpin and Copeland, John Mearsheimer sees the crux of the issue as irreconcilable goals: China wants to be America’s superior and the United States wants no peer competitors. In his words, “[N]o amount of goodwill can ameliorate the intense security competition that sets in when an aspiring hegemon appears in Eurasia.” 92

Contrary to these predictions, our analysis suggests some grounds for optimism. Based on the historical track record of great powers facing acute relative decline, the United States should be able to retrench in the coming decades. In the next few years, the United States is ripe to overhaul its military, shift burdens to its allies, and work to decrease costly international commitments. It is likely to initiate and become embroiled in fewer militarized disputes than the average great power and to settle these disputes more amicably. Some might view this prospect with apprehension, fearing the steady erosion of U.S. credibility. Yet our analysis suggests that retrenchment need not signal weakness. Holding on to exposed and expensive commitments simply for the sake of one’s reputation is a greater geopolitical gamble than withdrawing to cheaper, more defensible frontiers.

Some observers might dispute our conclusions, arguing that hegemonic transitions are more conflict prone than other moments of acute relative decline. We counter that there are deductive and empirical reasons to doubt this argument. Theoretically, hegemonic powers should actually find it easier to manage acute relative decline. Fallen hegemons still have formidable capability, which threatens grave harm to any state that tries to cross them. Further, they are no longer the top target for balancing coalitions, and recovering hegemons may be influential because they can play a pivotal role in alliance formation. In addition, hegemonic powers, almost by definition, possess more extensive overseas commitments; they should be able to more readily identify and eliminate extraneous burdens without exposing vulnerabilities or exciting domestic populations.

We believe the empirical record supports these conclusions. In particular, periods of hegemonic transition do not appear more conflict prone than those of acute decline. The last reversal at the pinnacle of power was the AngloAmerican transition, which took place around 1872 and was resolved without armed confrontation. The tenor of that transition may have been influenced by a number of factors: both states were democratic maritime empires, the United States was slowly emerging from the Civil War, and Great Britain could likely coast on a large lead in domestic capital stock. Although China and the United States differ in regime type, similar factors may work to cushion the impending Sino-American transition. Both are large, relatively secure continental great powers, a fact that mitigates potential geopolitical competition. 93 China faces a variety of domestic political challenges, including strains among rival regions, which may complicate its ability to sustain its economic performance or engage in foreign policy adventurism. 94

Most important, the United States is not in free fall. Extrapolating the data into the future, we anticipate the United States will experience a “moderate” decline, losing from 2 to 4 percent of its share of great power GDP in the five years after being surpassed by China sometime in the next decade or two. 95 Given the relatively gradual rate of U.S. decline relative to China, the incentives for either side to run risks by courting conflict are minimal. The United States would still possess upwards of a third of the share of great power GDP, and would have little to gain from provoking a crisis over a peripheral issue. Conversely, China has few incentives to exploit U.S. weakness. 96 Given the importance of the U.S. market to the Chinese economy, in addition to the critical role played by the dollar as a global reserve currency, it is unclear how Beijing could hope to consolidate or expand its increasingly advantageous position through direct confrontation. In short, the United States should be able to reduce its foreign policy commitments in East Asia in the coming decades without inviting Chinese expansionism. Indeed, there is evidence that a policy of retrenchment could reap potential benefits. The drawdown and repositioning of U.S. troops in South Korea, for example, rather than fostering instability, has resulted in an improvement in the occasionally strained relationship between Washington and Seoul. 97 U.S. moderation on Taiwan, rather than encouraging hard-liners in Beijing, resulted in an improvement in cross-strait relations and reassured U.S. allies that Washington would not inadvertently drag them into a Sino-U.S. conflict. 98 Moreover, Washington’s support for the development of multilateral security institutions, rather than harming bilateral alliances, could work to enhance U.S. prestige while embedding China within a more transparent regional order. 99 A policy of gradual retrenchment need not undermine the credibility of U.S. alliance commitments or unleash destabilizing regional security dilemmas. Indeed, even if Beijing harbored revisionist intent, it is unclear that China will have the force projection capabilities necessary to take and hold additional territory. 100 By incrementally shifting burdens to regional allies and multilateral institutions, the United States can strengthen the credibility of its core commitments while accommodating the interests of a rising China. Not least among the benefits of retrenchment is that it helps alleviate an unsustainable financial position. Immense forward deployments will only exacerbate U.S. grand strategic problems and risk unnecessary clashes. 101

#### Reactors are still in the research stage—they are decades away from being deployable.

Anderson 10—Senior Engineer in the Integrated Applications Office @ National Renewable Energy Laboratory [Kate Anderson “SMALL NUCLEAR REACTORS,” White Paper, February 1, 2010]

Despite these benefits, small reactors have many challenges to overcome. A few designs are in the engineering phase and could be commercialized within a decade, but most designs are still in the research stage, and will require extensive engineering and demonstration before they are ready to be commercialized. The unique design features that make small reactors appealing, like passive safety systems and integral designs, require non-traditional components that will need to be fully developed, tested, and demonstrated. Additional developments in instrumentation and control will be needed for most small reactor designs. Designs that depart from the traditional light water reactortechnology may required significant material and fuel qualification as well, which could take 10-12 years or more.9 pg. 3-4

#### The system is robust—they have learned from past experiences.

Cauley 11—President and Chief Executive Officer North American Electric Reliability Corporation [Gerry Cauley, “HEADLINE: ELECTRIC GRID AND INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY,” Committee on House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, CQ Congressional Testimony, May 31, 2011 Tuesday]

The electricity being used in this room right now is generated and transmitted in real time over a complex series of lines and stations from as far away as Ontario or Tennessee. As complex as it is, few machines are as robust as the bulk power system. Decades of experience with hurricanes, ice storms and other natural disasters, as well as mechanical breakdowns, vandalism and sabotage, have taught the electric industry how to build strong and reliable networks that generally withstand all but the worst natural and physical disasters while supporting affordable electric service. The knowledge that disturbances on the grid can impact operations thousands of miles away has influenced the electric industry culture of reliability, affecting how it plans, operates and protects the bulk power system.

#### No impact to sabotage

Newitz 10 [ANNALEE NEWITZ, The US electrical grid is too crappy to be vulnerable to terrorist attack, say physicists,” IO9, October 13, 2010 8:30 AM, pg. http://io9.com/5662593/the-us-electrical-grid-is-too-crappy-to-be-vulnerable-to-terrorist-attack-say-physicists]

Last year, network theorists published some papers suggesting that terrorists could take down the entire US electrical grid by attacking a small, remote power station. But new research shows that network theory models, which great for analyzing many complex systems, don't work for patchwork systems like the US electrical grid. Basically, the grid was set up so haphazardly that you'd have to take out a major node before you'd affect the entire thing. (Want to see a map of the US electrical grid? Check out this one on NPR.)

Science Daily sums up:

[The] electric grid is probably more secure that many people realize — because it is so unpredictable. This, of course, makes it hard to improve its reliability (in another line of research, [study co-author Paul] Hines has explored why the rate of blackouts in the United States hasn't improved in decades), but the up-side of this fact is that it would be hard for a terrorist to bring large parts of the grid down by attacking just one small part.

The researchers based their conclusions on real-world data from the power grid in the eastern U.S.

#### No lash-out—their evidence is about Cold War doctrine

### 1NC—Water

#### Alt cause—export regulations

Platts, 10/1/2012. “Export reform needed to increase US nuclear market share: NEI,” http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/ElectricPower/6666149.

Export controls on technology related to nuclear power should be reformed to allow US companies to capture a larger share of growing international markets, the Nuclear Energy Institute said Monday. The US Department of Commerce estimates the world market for nuclear power technology, fuel and related services and equipment at "upwards of" $750 billion over the next 10 years, Richard Myers, vice president for policy development, planning and supplier programs at NEI, said at a press conference Monday in Washington to release a report the US nuclear power industry commissioned on the topic. "It is a myth that the US nuclear supply chain has disappeared," Myers said. Most manufacturing of large "heavy metal" components for nuclear power plants, such as reactor vessels, is now done in Asia, but many US firms manufacture "precision components" for the nuclear industry and would stand to benefit from increased ability to compete with other countries, Myers said. US licensing and regulatory reviews of nuclear exports, however, are "unduly burdensome," have confusing "layers of jurisdiction" shared by at least four federal agencies, and typically take at least a year to complete, "months longer" than reviews in other exporter countries, he said. As a result, the US export control regime is "far more complex and more difficult to navigate ... than comparable regimes in other nations," Myers said. The report prepared by the law firm Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman for NEI said that "US agencies should be able to increase the efficiency of their license processing through stronger executive branch procedures. By signaling to potential customers that US exports may be licensed on a schedule comparable to those of foreign export control regimes, such an improvement could significantly 'level the playing field' for US exporters in the near term." Many such reforms can be accomplished "administratively," without the need for legislation, James Glasgow, a partner at Pillsbury who specializes in nuclear export law, said during the press conference. The US Department of Energy is currently amending some of its export regulations, known as the Part 810 rule, and reforming that rule could provide significant opportunities to US exporters, Glasgow said. Unfortunately, some of DOE's proposed revisions to the rule go in the wrong direction, adding regulatory requirements and hurdles, Myers said. Some potential customers for US nuclear exports see DOE's Part 810 review as "the choke point" for an order, and "sometimes that's an evaluation criterion" for deciding whether to buy from a US firm, Glasgow said. In such situations, delay in the review can be "the functional equivalence of denial" of permission for the export because the buyer looks elsewhere, he said.

\*\*\*Burdensome U.S. export regulations are the critical obstacle to nuclear leadership—the U.S. actually still has the supply chain, but massive delays in processing push countries away from the U.S.

#### No water wars AND no impact to water scarcity

Allouche 11—Jeremy Allouche, research Fellow, water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, former professor—MIT, PhD in International Relations from the Graduate Institute of International Studies [“The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” *Food Policy*, Volume 36, Supplement 1, January 2011, Pages S3–S8, Science Direct]

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable.

Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations

In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level.

In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action.

The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems.

None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18).

As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 ( [FAO, 1978] and [FAO, 1984]).

The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example [Allouche, 2005], [Allouche, 2007] and [Rouyer, 2000]). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians ( [Dinar and Dinar, 2005] and [Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006]).

In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable.

The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict ( [Brauch, 2002] and [Pervis and Busby, 2004]). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and [Kevane and Gray, 2008]).

#### Aff can’t solve—Indian dams makes war and collapse inevitable.

### AT: Central Asia War

#### Their Central Asia scenario is mind-numbingly stupid ---

#### Tajikistan is landlocked --- what fucking salt water are they going to desalinate?

#### Your internal link evidence concedes the problem is not “water shortages”—it’s that Tajikistan needs to use rivers to produce hydropower, which upsets water flows for Uzbek agriculture.

#### Blank’s best escalation warrant is about Nagorno-Karabakh causing Turkey/Russia conflict and NATO draw in. He mentions Central Asia, but Tajikistan and Uzbekistan are not the source of NATO/Russia proxy conflict.

#### No Central Asia war --- the West frequently misrepresents the region as a source of great power conflict with little real knowledge. Proven by this advantage.

John Heathershaw and Nick Megoran, 6/16/2011. Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Exeter, working on the politics of aid and conflict resolution in Central Asia; and political geography lecturer at Newcastle Univerity, in the school of Geography, Politics and Sociology. “Central Asia: the discourse of danger,” http://www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/john-heathershaw-nick-megoran/central-asia-discourse-of-danger.

Question: What do a recently-released International Crisis Group report (‘Tajikistan: the changing insurgent threats’) and the latest Red River computer game (‘Operation Flashpoint’) have in common? Answer: They both feature Islamist insurgents infiltrating Tajikistan and posing a threat to Western security//

. In fact such portrayals of Central Asia are commonplace in the West, from popular culture to the quasi-academic work of policy analysts. In research conducted since the 1990s, we have charted how UK and US representations of Central Asia routinely present it as especially dangerous, fusing the traditional insecurities of the Orient to dysfunctional post-Soviet authoritarianism. This has elicited a small debate on the margins of Central Asian studies about the significance of the discourse of danger. In response, we wrote a paper on the subject that was presented at Chatham House and recently published in the journal International Affairs (‘Contesting danger: a new agenda for policy and scholarship on Central Asia’), outlining three features of the Western discourse of danger on Central Asia. By ‘Western discourse of danger on Central Asia’ we mean how Western policy, popular and even academic accounts identify Central Asia as obscure, ethnically and politically fractious, essentially Oriental and—for these reasons—dangerous. Typically, Central Asia is spuriously identified as a source of a considerable Islamic terrorist threat as in the recent International Crisis Group report on Tajikistan. It can also mean that ethnic conflict is misread and great power conflict is assumed where in fact it may not exist. Why does the overlap between popular culture and policy analysis matter? The link we make between computer games and policy reports may seem trite. Surely these are incommensurable genres of discourse for quite diverse audiences and with wholly different intentions? Surely one is primarily for the entertainment of adolescent males, and the other seeks serious understanding in order to change policy? We should not be too quick to dismiss the effect of popular culture on policy making. Many of the Western military misadventures which have been undertaken since the end of the Cold War may have been made more likely by the feeling of interconnectedness generated by new technologies and cultural forms such as the internet. The portrayal of the military and intelligence services in the era of the ‘war on terror’ are often critical, but most ascribe to governments an ability to get things done which far exceeds what is practically possible in a globalised world. There are three reasons why popular culture matters in policymaking, and which justify the making of links between forms of representations from quite different genres. Firstly, there is the basic point that in Western democracies government are more or less responsive to public opinion. If citizens feel Afghanistan is an essentially dangerous place then they are more likely to accept the problematic argument of their governments that threats to the West will continue to come from that country unless we offer military support to a government we have placed in power. On the other hand, public interest in Central Asia is so limited that few votes are cast and few letters are sent to MPs on the basis of concern about the region. Public opinion only indirectly affects foreign policy and we should not overstate the link between the two. In many respects it is the effect of popular culture on those that do research and make decisions, in governments and non-governmental organisations, that is most significant. Secondly, the dearth of knowledge on the region amongst so-called experts means that popular culture and quasi-academic studies have greater significance. Misguided applications of the ‘great game’ or the idea of Muslim radicalisation are frequently left unchallenged. Moreover, even powerful Western governments have relatively few people with knowledge of the region and its languages. Area studies has been in decline for decades and nowhere is the phenomenon more acute than Central Asia where there was very little knowledge of the region even during the Cold War when funding was poured into the development of Sovietology. Finally, and most importantly, knowledge is produced interpretatively. This means that where ideas about the region emerge that associate it with conflict, Islamism and great power conflict they are often difficult to shift even when academic knowledge seems to refute these claims.

## \*\*\* 2NC

### 2NC T—No Purchase O/V

#### Broadly defining incentives makes more than 40 mechanisms topical.

Moran 86—non-resident fellow at the Center for Global Development and holds the Marcus Wallenberg Chair at the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University(Theodore, Investing in Development: New Roles for Private Capital?, p. 29—googlebooks)

Guisinger finds that if “incentives” are broadly defined to include tariffs and trade controls along with tax holidays, subsidized loans, cash grants, and other fiscal measures, they comprise more than forty separate kinds of measures. Moreover, the author emphasizes, the value of an incentive package is just one of several means that governments use to lure foreign investors. Other methods—for example, promotional activities (advertising, representative offices) and subsidized government services—also influence investors’ location decisions. The author points out that empirical research so far has been unable to distinguish the relative importance of fundamental economic factors and of government policies in decisions concerning the location of foreign investment—let alone to determine the effectiveness of individual government instruments.

### AT: Webb

#### Webb includes PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS because in Canada they often are given with a condition to do something else. That makes them a financial incentive. NOT the procurement, but the EXTERNAL MOTIVATION. Plus, its Canadian

Webb 93—lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)—italics in the original

At the same time, Canadian governments make use of many financial incentives to encourage private sector compliance with public policies. As used here, incentives qualify as examples of the State's "fingers." Contrary to the impression given by the strong-thumbs-no-fingers aphorism, the position taken here is that in fact there are many fingers being used by the federal government, but often they operate outside of the glare of public scrutiny and effective control. Fingers can be less clumsy than thumbs, and are capable of probing where thumbs cannot go -- for example, the federal government can 8 and has created many incentive programs which directly affect matters of provincial legislative jurisdiction9 whereas it can only establish traditional regulatory regimes in relation to federal legislative heads of power.10 Incentives often take the form of funds which have "strings attached" -- for example, in the case of certain incentive programs involving contributions11 for economic development, and procurement contracts 12 it is not uncommon to find stipulations that recipients establish employment equity plans, or meet environmental requirements.13 Certainly, incentives have been used in Canada to achieve policy objectives where it is difficult to imagine coercive sanctions being employed: for example, threats of fines or imprisonment to achieve research and development, to increase the birth rate, to stimulate the Canadian art and film sector, or mining exploration might raise hackles, yet each of these contexts attracts financial incentives.14 Moreover, just as the fingers work well in tandem with thumbs, so too it is not uncommon to find financial incentives used in conjunction with coercive instruments. For example, there are incentives to abate pollution or to hire disadvantaged groups, offered at the same time as traditional pollution control and anti-discrimination regimes are in place.15

### DSIRE Prodict

#### Our definition comes from Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency—prefer that—it’s the most up to date & comprehensive source for incentives information.

Gouchoe 2k—North Carolina State University, National Renewable Energy Laboratory [Susan, December 2000, Local Government and Community Programs and Incentives for Renewable Energy— National Report, http://seg.fsu.edu/Library/casestudy%20of%20incentives.pdf]

DSIRE Project Overview

The Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy (DSIRE) serves as the nation’s most¶ comprehensive source of information on the status of programs and incentives for renewable¶ energy. The database tracks these programs at the state, utility, local, and community level.¶ Established in 1995, DSIRE is an ongoing project of the Interstate Renewable Energy Council¶ (IREC) and is managed by the North Carolina Solar Center with funding from the U.S.¶ Department of Energy’s Office of Power Technologies.

The first three phases of the DSIRE project—surveys of state financial incentives, state¶ regulatory policies, and utility programs and incentives—have been completed. Information¶ from these databases has been published in three previous reports:

National Summary Report on State Financial Incentives for Renewable Energy (1997);

National Summary Report on State Programs and Regulatory Policies for Renewable Energy

(1998); and

National Summary Report on Utility Programs and Incentives for Renewable Energy (1999).¶ These reports summarize incentives, programs, and policies that promote active and passive¶ solar, photovoltaics, wind, biomass, alternative fuels, geothermal, hydropower, and waste¶ energy sources. Given the rapidly changing status of state activities, an updated report—¶ National Summary Report on State Financial and Regulatory Incentives for Renewable¶ Energy—has been produced concurrently with this report on local initiatives.¶ While reports serve as a snapshot of the status of incentives and programs, constant revisions¶ and additions to the database maintain DSIRE’s role as the most up-to-date, national¶ clearinghouse of information on incentives and programs for renewable energy. Through¶ DSIRE on Line, the DSIRE database is accessible via the web at:¶ http://www.ncsc.ncsu.edu/dsire.htm. In 2001, federal incentives will be added to the database,¶ thereby providing a complete and comprehensive database of renewable energy incentives at¶ all levels—national, state, and local.

IREC is a nonprofit consortium of state and local government renewable energy officials and¶ is uniquely situated to oversee the effort to compile information on state, local, and utility¶ incentives. IREC ensures that all information products produced are disseminated widely to¶ federal, state and local agencies, federal laboratories, and other appropriate audiences.¶ The primary subcontractor to IREC for the DSIRE project is the North Carolina Solar Center.¶ Established in 1988, the Solar Center is located in the College of Engineering at North¶ Carolina State University in Raleigh, NC and is sponsored by the State Energy Office in the¶ North Carolina Department of Administration. The Solar Center conducts programs in four¶ areas: policy analysis, research and commercialization, technical assistance and training, and¶ education and outreach.

### AT: DOD Exempt

#### AND—DOD won’t choose to exempt themselves—it would force them to accept liability when they don’t have sufficient personnel or expertise to regulate nuclear power.

Marcus King, LaVar Huntzinger, and Thoi Nguyen, March 2011. CNA Environment and Energy Team, Resource Analysis Division. “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations,” <http://www.cna.org/research/2011/feasibility-nuclear-power-us-military>.

The most basic licensing issue relates to whether NRC will have jurisdiction over potential nuclear reactor sites or whether DoD could be self-regulating. Our conversations with NRC indicate it is the only possible licensing authority for reactors that supply power to the com- mercial grid. However, DOE and DoD are authorized to regulate mission critical nuclear facilities under Section 91b of the Atomic Energy Act. There is some historical precedent for DoD exercising this authority. For example, the Army Nuclear Program was granted exception under this rule with regard to the reactor that operated aboard the Sturgis barge in the 1960s and 1970s [44].¶ It seems unlikely that DoD would pursue exemption under Section 91b in the future.10 Regulating power plants is a function that lies beyond DoD's core mission. The Department and the military ser- vices are unlikely to have personnel with sufficient expertise to act as regulators for nuclear power plants, and it could take considerable time and resources to develop such expertise. Without NRC oversight DoD would bear all associated risks.

### 2NC—No Transition Impact

#### The only comprehensive study proves no transition impact.

MacDonald & Parent 11—Professor of Political Science at Williams College & Professor of Political Science at University of Miami [Paul K. MacDonald & Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Spring 2011), pp. 7–44]

In this article, we question the logic and evidence of the retrenchment pessimists. To date there has been neither a comprehensive study of great power retrenchment nor a study that lays out the case for retrenchment as a practical or probable policy. This article fills these gaps by systematically examining the relationship between acute relative decline and the responses of great powers. We examine eighteen cases of acute relative decline since 1870 and advance three main arguments.

First, we challenge the retrenchment pessimists’ claim that domestic or international constraints inhibit the ability of declining great powers to retrench. In fact, when states fall in the hierarchy of great powers, peaceful retrenchment is the most common response, even over short time spans. Based on the empirical record, we find that great powers retrenched in no less than eleven and no more than fifteen of the eighteen cases, a range of 61–83 percent. When international conditions demand it, states renounce risky ties, increase reliance on allies or adversaries, draw down their military obligations, and impose adjustments on domestic populations.

Second, we find that the magnitude of relative decline helps explain the extent of great power retrenchment. Following the dictates of neorealist theory, great powers retrench for the same reason they expand: the rigors of great power politics compel them to do so.12 Retrenchment is by no means easy, but necessity is the mother of invention, and declining great powers face powerful incentives to contract their interests in a prompt and proportionate manner. Knowing only a state’s rate of relative economic decline explains its corresponding degree of retrenchment in as much as 61 percent of the cases we examined.

Third, we argue that the rate of decline helps explain what forms great power retrenchment will take. How fast great powers fall contributes to whether these retrenching states will internally reform, seek new allies or rely more heavily on old ones, and make diplomatic overtures to enemies. Further, our analysis suggests that great powers facing acute decline are less likely to initiate or escalate militarized interstate disputes. Faced with diminishing resources, great powers moderate their foreign policy ambitions and offer concessions in areas of lesser strategic value. Contrary to the pessimistic conclusions of critics, retrenchment neither requires aggression nor invites predation. Great powers are able to rebalance their commitments through compromise, rather than conflict. In these ways, states respond to penury the same way they do to plenty: they seek to adopt policies that maximize security given available means. Far from being a hazardous policy, retrenchment can be successful. States that retrench often regain their position in the hierarchy of great powers. Of the fifteen great powers that adopted retrenchment in response to acute relative decline, 40 percent managed to recover their ordinal rank. In contrast, none of the declining powers that failed to retrench recovered their relative position. Pg. 9-10

#### No risk of conflict—discards paranoid threat predictions.

Bandow 11—Doug Bandow, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, former special assistant to Ronald Reagan, author of *Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire* (Xulon) [January 31, 2011, “Solving the Debt Crisis: A Military Budget for a Republic,” http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=12746]

More than two decades after the Cold War dramatically ended, the U.S. maintains a Cold War military. America has a couple score allies, dozens of security commitments, hundreds of overseas bases, and hundreds of thousands of troops overseas. Yet international hegemonic communism has disappeared, the Soviet Union has collapsed, Maoist China has been transformed, and pro-communist Third World dictatorships have been discarded in history's dustbin. The European Union has a larger economy and population than America does. Japan spent decades with the world's second largest economy. South Korea has 40 times the GDP and twice the population of North Korea. As Colin Powell exclaimed in 1991, "I'm running out of demons. I'm running out of enemies. I'm down to Castro and Kim Il-sung." Yet America accounts for roughly half of the globe's military outlays. In real terms the U.S. government spends more on the military today than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War. It is difficult for even a paranoid to concoct a traditional threat to the American homeland. Terrorism is no replacement for the threat of nuclear holocaust. Commentator Philip Klein worries about "gutting" the military and argued that military cuts at the end of the Cold War "came back to haunt us when Sept. 11 happened." Yet the reductions, which still left America by far the world's most dominant power, neither allowed the attacks nor prevented Washington from responding with two wars. And responding with two wars turned out to be a catastrophic mistake. Evil terrorism is a threat, but existential threat it is not. Moreover, the best response is not invasions and occupations — as the U.S. has learned at high cost in both Afghanistan and Iraq. Rather, the most effective tools are improved intelligence, Special Forces, international cooperation, and restrained intervention. Attempts at nation-building are perhaps even more misguided than subsidizing wealthy industrialized states. America's record isn't pretty. The U.S. wasn't able to anoint its preferred Somali warlord as leader of that fractured nation. Washington's allies in the still unofficial and unstable nation of Kosovo committed grievous crimes against Serb, Roma, and other minorities. Haiti remains a failed state after constant U.S. intervention. The invasion of Iraq unleashed mass violence, destroyed the indigenous Christian community, and empowered Iran; despite elections, a liberal society remains unlikely. After nine years most Afghans dislike and distrust the corrupt government created by the U.S. and sustained only by allied arms. The last resort of those who want America to do everything everywhere is to claim that the world will collapse into various circles of fiery hell without a ubiquitous and vast U.S. military presence. Yet there is no reason to believe that scores of wars are waiting to break out. And America's prosperous and populous allies are capable of promoting peace and stability in their own regions. Indeed, U.S. security guarantees are profoundly dangerous. Intended to deter by making American involvement automatic, they ensure American participation if deterrence fails. Moreover, Washington's defense promises discourage friendly states from defending themselves while encouraging them to take more provocative positions against their potential adversaries. Yet analysts keep coming up with bizarre new duties for the U.S. government. John Guardiano, for one, thinks it is America's responsibility to prepare "to occupy and rebuild North Korea when it implodes." Actually, that should be South Korea's job.

### They Cite: Kagan & O’Hanlon

#### Kagan and O’Hanlon’s methodology should be rejected—they’re just neocon hacks that recycle the same tired war propaganda.

Justin Raimondo, Editorial Director of *Antiwar.com*, contributing editor for *The American Conservative*, senior fellow at the Randolph Bourne Institute, Adjunct Scholar with the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2007 (“Invade Pakistan?,” *AntiWar.com*, November 22nd, Available Online at http://original.antiwar.com/justin/2007/11/21/invade-pakistan/, Accessed 09-07-2010)

That’s the hallmark of the Kagan-O’Hanlon method, which is also the methodology of the neoconservatives, whose arguments they synopsize and sell to policymakers as products of the "bipartisan center": conflating wildly disparate elements and somehow always linking them all to al-Qaeda. That has been the modus operandi of the War Party from the very beginning of this increasingly ugly episode in American history. Iraq was said to be in cahoots with Osama. Then it was Iran, according to such impeccable sources as Michael Ledeen. As I’ve remarked before, they don’t even have to produce fresh war propaganda: all they have to do is substitute Pakistan or Iran where it used to say Iraq, and they have a pro-war talking point, good as new.

### Ext Anderson—NRC

#### The best case scenario puts deployment 15 years away and new tech always takes longer.

Anderson 10—Senior Engineer in the Integrated Applications Office @ National Renewable Energy Laboratory [Kate Anderson “SMALL NUCLEAR REACTORS,” White Paper, February 1, 2010]

While a few experimental prototypes have been built, commercialization of small nuclear reactors is still at least 5-10 years away. None of the designs under development have been certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The design certification process for traditional light water reactors typically takes 2-3 years, with an additional 2 years or longer for site licensing to build and operate the reactor. Certifications for designs using new technologies are expected to take longer.13 The NRC estimated in 2008 that it would take 5 years to develop necessary analytical tools, data, regulatory guides, and standard review plans for confirmatory safety analyses and license review, and another 4-5 years to conduct the licensing review for new technologies.14

In a 2001 report, DOE estimated the cost of electricity for a generic 50 MWe small reactor would be 5.4-10.7 cents/kWh, and 10.4-24.3 cents/kWh for a 10 MWe reactor.

15 Capital cost estimates range from $1000-$4000/kW. At these prices small nuclear reactors would provide power at rates competitive with fossil fuel and renewable energy generation technologies.

Small nuclear reactors are not a currently available energy generation technology. Many factors related to the technology, regulatory process, cost, and safety are still being developed and will contribute to their future commercial viability. The following DOE national laboratories are conducting research on small nuclear reactors. Pg. 4-5

#### They can’t solve for NRC fees.

Andres & Breetz 11—Professor of national Security Strategy @ National War College & Doctoral candidate in Political Science @ Massachusetts institute of technology [Richard B. Andres (Senior fellow and energy and environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic research @ National Defense University) & Hanna L. Breetz,“Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications,” Strategic Forum, February 2011]

Furthermore, the regulatory timeline and costs for licensing are also sources of financial uncertainty. NRC licensing processes have historically evolved around LWRs, and although NRC officials have begun dialogue on licensing for small reactors, they have estimated in the past that it could take a decade to develop new regulatory guides and licensing reviews. 25 The NRC fee structure is also a barrier for small reactors. Under current regulations, the annual fee to operate each licensed nuclear reactor is $4.5 million—a prohibitive cost for many small reactor developers and users. The NRC is considering a variable fee structure based on reactor output, but it has deferred any actions or decisions until a licensing application is submitted. 26 pg. 7

### Ext Cauley—99% reliable

#### The grid is 99.999% reliable.

Joskow 11—Professor of Economics @ MIT [Paul L. Joskow, “Creating a Smarter U.S. Electricity Grid,” October 2011, MIT CEEPR: A Joint Center of the Department of Economics, MIT Energy Initiative and MIT Sloan School of Management, CEEPR WP 2011-021]

Despite this complex operational management structure, the U.S. transmission system is presently very reliable. While good comprehensive numbers are not available, it is extremely rare that retail consumers lose power because of failures of equipment or ¶ operating errors on the high voltage transmission system. EPRI (2011a, p.2.1) estimates ¶ that U.S. power systems achieve 99.999% reliability at the high voltage (bulk) ¶ transmission network level and that over 90% of the outages experienced by retail ¶ customers are due to failures on the distribution system, not the transmission system (EPRI (2011a, p. 6.1). However, when a rare major failure does occur on the high voltage transmission network, as with the 2003 Midwest-Northeast blackout when 50 million customers were affected with outages that lasted up to a couple of days, the associated costs can be quite high. Pg. 18

#### The grid is resilient—smart grids solve the 1% risk of the advantage.

Magnuson 12—Colonel in the United States Marine Corps [Colonel Brian L. Magnuson, “DoD Installation Energy Security: Evolving to a Smart Grid,” Strategy Research Project, 20-03-2012]

The electrical grid of today is extremely complex and resilient, operating without ¶ fault better than 99% of the time. But as demand continues to grow, efficiencies need to ¶ be found in all aspects of the electrical system: production, transmission, distribution, ¶ system operations, and consumption. Early efficiencies included awareness programs ¶ like Con Edison’s “Save a Watt” program.¶ 29¶ The program educates consumers and ¶ encourages them to think about what electricity they use, when they use it, and how ¶ they can reduce their overall consumption by investing in home insulation or lower ¶ voltage light bulbs. These awareness initiatives address the demand side of the ¶ problem. Legislative initiatives, like EISA2007, requiring more efficient appliances like ¶ air conditioners and refrigerators also helped slow the pace of demand.¶ 30¶ Over time, the ¶ efficiency gains from these initiatives plateaued requiring additional measures to ensure ¶ sustained levels of electric reliability across the grid. The next step in evolving the ¶ electrical grid was the concept of the smart grid.

EISA2007 established a federal policy to modernize the electric utility ¶ transmission and distribution system to maintain reliability and infrastructure protection through the development of the “smart grid.”¶ 31¶ The term “smart grid” refers to a ¶ distribution system that allows for the flow of information from a customer’s meter in two¶ directions: both inside the house to thermostats, appliances, and other devices, and ¶ from the house back to the utility.¶ 32¶ The same concept applies to industrial and ¶ commercial consumer markets. Furthermore, the smart grid includes a variety of ¶ operational and energy measures including smart meters, smart appliances, renewable ¶ energy resources, and energy efficiency resources.¶ 33¶ One goal of the smart grid is to ¶ use advanced, information-based technologies to increase power grid efficiency, reliability, and flexibility, and reduce the rate at which additional electric utility ¶ infrastructure needs to be built. At the consumer end, the smart grid will allow ¶ appliances to be turned off or down, or operations delayed during periods of high ¶ electrical demand, or high electrical cost. This smart grid capability is known as ¶ demand response.¶ 34¶ For example, a major department store chain in the Northeast ¶ outfitted all its stores with smart meters. When the balancing authority sees electrical ¶ demand nearing supply, it signals, perhaps through a curtailment service provider, for¶ each building to institute barely perceptible changes in lighting and air conditioning¶ temperatures to reduce the aggregate demand on the electrical system.¶ 35¶ This negative ¶ generation, or negawatt, allows the electricity to be sent elsewhere.¶ 36¶ Similar ¶ efficiencies can be gained through smart grid technology innovations at the distribution, ¶ transmission, and production levels. Having broadly defined what the smart grid is, now ¶ let’s take a look at some of the components of smart grid.

#### Early warning allows for preventive action.

Vittal 10—Chair Professor of Electrical Engineering @ Arizona State University [Vijay Vittal (Director of the Power Systems Engineering Research Center;, “The Impact of Renewable Resources on the Performance and Reliability of the Electricity Grid,” The Bridge, Volume 40, Number 1, Spring 2010]

The electric power grid is becoming an increasingly automated network and is expected to have increased¶ functionality, higher efficiency, more programmability, and more flexibility. A variety of communication¶ networks are interconnected to the electric grid for sensing, monitoring, and control. These communication networks are closely associated with the supervisory control¶ and data acquisition (SCADA) systems in the network.

The data provided by the SCADA systems are used¶ in the energy-management systems (EMS) for a wide¶ range of systems-operation functions and real-time control¶ of the power grid. The SCADA network and EMS¶ are the main factors in the operation of the system under normal and emergency conditions. Any disturbance or¶ dislocation in the network is sensed primarily by observations¶ and analysis of the behavior of the system based on data obtained by the SCADA network.

The present method of securing the electric grid is real-time monitoring of the electrical behavior and performance of transmission lines. Wide area monitoring system (WAMS) technologies are key to increasing access to available maximum capacity of the transmission lines. WAMS provide real-time monitoring, which enables grid operators to determine precisely the operating¶ margins of transmission lines while maintaining stability limits.

One WAMS technology that is increasingly being used is phasor measurement units (PMUs) (Phadke and Thorp, 2008), which are GPS-enabled sensors that take accurate measurements of grid conditions at strategic¶ points in fine-grain time intervals (e.g., microseconds). GPS—time-stamped measurements (e.g., voltage and phase angle)—from multiple PMUs are gathered through a real-time communication network and used to conduct online security assessments of the grid. The PMU-based WAMS technologies, which effectively monitor the dynamic state of the grid, including voltage and angular stability and thermal limits, provide early warnings to network operators of imminent failures, stress, or potential instability, thus enabling them to take preventive action. Pg. 10

### Ext Newitz—No sabotage

#### Their internal link is based on flawed topological models—No risk of sabotage

Page 10 [Lewis Page, “Power grid scare stories a 'bunch of hooey',” The Register, 13th October 2010, http://www.theregister.co.uk/2010/10/13/leccy\_grid\_strike\_hooey/]

There have been a lot of scare stories in the media about electrical power grids in recent times, suggesting that it would be a simple matter to bring down a national transmission system by way of a minor cyber attack or physical sabotage—thereby bringing that nation's infrastructure to a grinding halt.

There's just one problem with that idea: it's "a bunch of hooey," according to power-engineering boffin Seth Blumsack.

Blumsack and his colleagues were moved to look into the matter of deliberate power-grid crashing after recent papers and studies in hefty journals—including some briefed to US politicians—painted a grim picture earlier this year. The perception was that making a targeted strike on a relatively minor electrical installation such as a neighbourhood substation (by bomb, arson or electronic/network sabotage) could easily bring down the whole grid to which it was attached.

According to Blumsack and his fellow 'leccy boffins Eduardo Cotilla-Sanchez and Ed Hines, the alarmist analyses are based on a particular type of mathematical modelling of power grids—so-called "topological" models.

"Some modellers have gotten so fascinated with these abstract networks that they've ignored the physics of how things actually work," Hines says.

"This can lead you grossly astray."

Blumsack, Hines and Cotilla-Sanchez decided to contrast the performance of a topological model with one based on actual physics—specifically on Ohm's and Kirchoff's Laws governing the flow of electricity in the real world. They tried out both kinds of model on an accurate representation of the North American Eastern Interconnect, the largest and one of the most trouble-prone portions of the US grid, using real-world data from a test case generated in 2005.

The three engineers say that the physics-driven model was much closer to reality, and that this verifies what physics models show. The results showed that in fact it is major grid components through which a lot of power flows—big generating stations and massive transformers—which are the main points of vulnerability, not the minor installations scattered across the country.

It isn't so much that a minor event on a minor line or installation can't crash the network: such things do happen. But in general there have to be huge numbers of such minor events before one of them happens to hit the miracle weak point and bring everything down. It would be an impossible task for terrorists or other malefactors to know in advance just where and when a minor pinprick could cause massive effects.

"Our system is quite robust to small things failing," says Hines.

Hitting a bigger installation or link, which would generally be better secured and more resilient, would be much more likely to work. Even then a well-resourced terror or sabotage unit with the ability to knock out bigger grid components would struggle to take down the whole thing as it is still very difficult to know exactly where and when to strike.

"It takes an incredible amount of information," says Hines, "to really figure out how to make the grid fail."

### 2NC—No Water Wars

#### Water wars are a myth—overwhelming empirical evidence

Weinthal and Vengosh 11—\*Erika Weinthal is Associate Professor of Environmental Policy at the Nicholas School of the Environment at Duke University and \*\*Avner Vengosh is a Professor of Geochemistry and Water Quality and chair of the Water and Air Resources program at the Nicholas School of Environment in Duke University [ed. Richard Parker, Marni Sommer, “Water and Conflict,” ch. 26, *Routledge Handbook of Global Public Health*, Taylor & Francis, Feb 1, 2011]

By the end of the twentieth century, it was thus widely assumed that water scarcity would be a driver of conflict between nation states, especially in the arid regions of MENA. World leaders such as former UN secretary-general, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, famously warned, ‘the next war in the Middle East will he fought over water, not politics' (Vesilind 1993: 53). The Economist, furthermore, predicted in 1999 that '[w]ith 3.5 billion people affected by water shortages by 2050, conditions are ripe for a century of water conflicts.’ The empirical evidence, however, has yet to support such prophecies. Rather, when it comes to water resources at the interstate level, cooperation is much more ubiquitous. The historical record shows that states rarely if ever go to war over water; in parsing more than 1,800 state-to-state water interactions in trans-boundary basins between 1946 and 1999, Wolf et al. (2003) demonstrated that none have led to formal war. Yet such encouraging findings should not obscure the fact that the ‘[MENA] region has a striking absence of inclusive and comprehensive international water agreements on its most significant trans-boundary water courses’ (World Bank 2007: 80). The Nile River Basin, which is shared by ten countries and inhabited by approximately 150 million people, for example, has a long history of tension (e.g. Egypt-Sudan conflicts in the l950s). In spite of current progress with the Nile Basin Initiative (World Bank 2007: 83), Egypt—the dominant downstream riparian (i.e. water user along the river)—continues to appropriate more than 90 per cent of the Nile River.

With the maturation of the field of water conflict and cooperation, the notion of impending water wars has come to be better understood as a ‘myth’ rather than a ‘reality’ (Bencala and Dabelko 2008). This is not to say that tensions do not exist among states regarding their shared and limited water resources, but rather there is a growing realisation that the source of conflict is emanating from disagreements within a country due to a lethal combination of population growth, unsustainable water withdrawals, lack of adequate water management, weak institutions, and pressure for economic development (e.g. see Wolf 2007). The Pacific Institute's Water Conflict Chronology indicates that between 2000 and 2009, most occurrences of water conflict were at the sub-national level, of which nearly half were development disputes. Examples in 2009 include hundreds of Mumbai residents in India protesting water cuts that resulted in one person being killed and dozens injured, and violent clashes in Ethiopia over access to water in the Somali border region.

### No Water Wars—AT: Nile

#### Cultural norms ensure Nile countries cooperate instead of fighting over water.

The New Courier 3 [Barry James, October, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\_ID=14364&URL\_DO=DO\_TOPIC&URL\_SECTION=201.html]

As the example of the Nile basin illustrates, the tendency among nations has been to seek means of co-operating rather than fighting over water. Sharp and often historically irreconcilable differences divide many of the countries sharing 261 river basins around the world. But “the number of cases where there has been co-operation related to water is much greater than the number of cases where there was conflict related to water,” says Léna Salamé of UNESCO’s World Water Assessment Programme. “I think human-kind has come to respect water as something culturally very important,” says Joaquim von Braun, director-general of the International Food Policy Research Institute in Washington. “The poisoned well is something that is perceived as disgusting in any society and there is a lot of tradition and culture against taking away someone else’s source of water, especially in water-scarce regions.” In fact, Aaron Wolf and Sandra Postel, two American academics who have studied this issue in great detail, have found only one outright war over water in the past 4,500 years. That was between two city states, Lagash and Umma, in the region now called southern Iraq. There have been many skirmishes and conflicts in which water was a factor, but the authors have identified more than 3,600 water treaties signed in the past 12 centuries, many of which have survived wars over other issues.

### Indo-pak

#### Aff can’t solve—Indian dams makes war and collapse inevitable.

Daly 12—John C.K. Daly is the chief analyst at the energy news site Oilprice.com. Dr. Daly received his Ph.D. in 1986 from the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London [April 13, 2012, “Troubled Waters: Has The India-Pakistan Water Conflict Reached A Boiling Point?” http://www.economywatch.com/economy-business-and-finance-news/has-the-india-pakistan-water-conflict-reached-a-boiling-point.13-04.html]

In an editorial entitled “War With India Inevitable” published in Lahore's ‘The Nation’ on Sunday, the newspaper's Editor-in-Chief and Nazaria-i-Pakistan Trust Chairman, Majid Nizami, asked his fellow citizens to prepare for a war with India over water issues.

Nizami also told those attending the "Pakistan-India relations: Our rulers’ new wishes" session at Aiwan-e-Karkunan Tehrik-e-Pakistan, that, "Indian hostilities and conspiracies against the country will never end until she is taught a lesson."

While The Nation – a conservative daily that is part of the Nawa-i-Waqt publishing group – may have a circulation of just 20,000 readers, its close ties to Pakistan's highest military circles mean that Nizami's comments should hardly be rejected out of hand.

Tellingly, Nizami's audience at the session also included some high ranking Pakistani officials, including Nazaria-i-Pakistan Vice Chairman Dr Rafique Ahmed; Pakistan Movement Workers-Trust Chairman, retired Colonel Jamshed Ahmed Tareen; former Foreign Secretary Shamshad Ahmed Khan; Jamiat Ulema-e-Pakistan Secretary General Qari Zawar Bahadur; retired Air Marshall Khurished Anwar Mirza; retired Brigadier Hamid Saeed Akhtar and Jamaat-e-Islami Lahore Chief Ameer-ul-Azeem, among others.

At the heart of the issue are Pakistan's concerns over India's ongoing construction of two hydroelectric dams on the upper reaches of the Indus River. The Indus, which begins in Indian-controlled Kashmir and flows through both India and Pakistan, is Pakistan's primary freshwater source, on which 90 percent of its agriculture depends.

The 45-megawatt, 190-feet tall Nimoo-Bazgo concrete dam and the 44-megawatt Chutak hydroelectric power project, Islamabad believes, will reduce the Indus River's flow towards Pakistan, and are capable of storing up to 4.23 billion cubic feet of water, which will violate the terms of the bilateral 1960 Indus Water Treaty.

“Already the Indus is experiencing water flows that are down 30 percent from its normal levels. According to a number of Pakistani agriculture and water experts, the nation is heading towards a massive water shortage in the next couple of years due to insufficient water management practices and storage capacity, which will be exacerbated by the twin Indian hydroelectric projects.”

So, if push comes to shove, who's got Pakistan's back? China.

During the Boao Forum for Asia held in China's southern Hainan Island on 1 April, Pakistan and China agreed to support each other "in all circumstances" and vowed to uphold their sovereignty and territorial integrity at all costs.

Pakistani Prime Minister Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani told Chinese Executive Vice Premier Li Keqiang: "China's friend is our friend, and China's enemy is ours," adding that Pakistan considers China's security as its own security and supports China's position on Taiwan, Tibet and Xinjiang.

Li replied that China would support Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity in every situation, telling Gilani: "No matter what changes take place at international level, we will uphold Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity."

It might be noted here that in October 1962, coinciding with the Cuban missile crisis, India and China fought a brief but bitter war along their disputed Himalayan border. Fifty years later, China and India have yet to resolve their border issues over Kashmir; and China continues to claim most of India's Arunachal Pradesh territory to the base of the Himalayas in the absence of any definitive treaty delineating the border.

Kashmir today also remains the site of the world's largest and most militarized territorial dispute with portions under the de facto administration of China (Aksai Chin), India (Jammu and Kashmir), and Pakistan (Azad Kashmir and Northern Areas).

No guesses therefore as to whom Beijing might back should Pakistani-Indian tensions continue to rise.

Accordingly, the only way to keep the peace may be, as to paraphrase Ronald Reagan in Berlin: "Prime Minister Singh, tear down those dams!" Just don't bet on it.

### AT: Central Asia War

#### [Tajikistan all in on hydropower --- political pressure means they can’t back down.]

Alexander Sodiqov, 11/22/2011. PhD student at the University of Toronto’s Department of Political Science. Central Asia Editor for [Global Voices](http://globalvoicesonline.org/). “Rogun Dam at key juncture,” Jamestown Foundation, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Central_Asia/MK22Ag01.html>.

In deciding when and whether to start diverting the Vakhsh River, President Emomali Rahmon will have to find a proper balance between domestic and foreign pressures. Within Tajikistan, there is not only overwhelming support for the construction of the Rogun Dam, but strong public pressure to start the construction as soon as possible. Most Tajiks view the dam as a way out of the energy shortages that have plagued the country for most of the past decade. The country's aging hydropower plants generate enough electricity in warmer seasons to meet domestic needs. In winter, however, energy demands peak while water levels in rivers fall, leading to energy deficits—currently standing at about 2 billion kWh per year. As a result, authorities resort to rolling blackouts from the late fall to early spring, leaving most of the country with only two to four hours of electricity per day. Power outages are expected to be particularly pronounced this year. Scarce precipitations last winter and an unusually dry and cold spring kept reservoirs behind Tajikistan's major hydropower dams half empty for most of the year. As a result, the authorities began rationing electricity supply to the population this year one month earlier than in recent years. Confronted by growing public anger over the chronic energy shortages, President Rahmon has made the development of Tajikistan's energy sector the main focus of his government. The 3,600 megawatt Rogun Dam project, which was designed by Soviet engineers in the 1970s, has been elevated to the status of a "national" project in Tajikistan. Unable to secure external investment for the 335-meter dam, which is estimated to cost up to US$3.6 billion, the Tajik government has financed the initial phases of the project from state budget funds. The country spent $420 million in 2009-2011, and is planning to spend another $223 million on the project next year. The major opposition to the project has come from Tajikistan's downstream neighbor, Uzbekistan. Tashkent fears that the reservoir behind the Rogun Dam will require increased water withdrawals from the Vakhsh River, thus affecting the flow of water that Uzbekistan needs to irrigate its cotton fields. The Uzbek authorities have also claimed that the giant power station will have adverse environmental impacts. Ironically, Uzbekistan's fierce opposition to the Rogun project has helped to turn it into a symbol of national pride for most Tajiks, who now see Tashkent's objections as an additional motivation///

for the completion of the dam. In an attempt to overcome Tashkent's opposition and persuade international financial institutions to fund the Rogun projects, Dushanbe requested the World Bank to conduct two independent studies assessing the dam's economic feasibility and its potential social and environmental impact. The results of these studies will be available in the summer of 2012. Pending these results, the World Bank has requested that the Tajik government suspend the construction of the dam and the resettlement of people from the dam's projected flooding zone. A similar message was recently delivered by US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. On October 22, speaking at a meeting in Dushanbe, Clinton insisted that Tajikistan should not build the dam before the findings of the World Bank-commissioned studies become available. She also announced that if these studies advise against the project, Tajikistan should look for alternative ways of producing electricity. The diversion of the Vakhsh River at this point would draw international condemnation of the Tajik government. Therefore, it is likely that President Rahmon will decide to postpone the diversion until after the results of the feasibility studies become available. It is highly improbable, however, that any findings from these studies can persuade Tajikistan to abandon the cherished project.

## \*\*\* 1NR

### 2NC—OV

**The timeframe is a matter of weeks.**

**Craig 9/24/**12 Fox News Business Writer

(Victoria, “Fiscal Pitfalls Hinge on Gridlocked Congress” <http://www.foxbusiness.com/government/2012/09/20/fiscal-pitfalls-hinge-on-gridlocked-congress/>)

A fix for the national economy is not as simple as just passing a budget, or reducing government spending. And the risk is potential to seriously destabilize an economy that is already at a tipping point. If more than one credit ratings service decides to downgrade its outlook on the U.S., it not only spells trouble for lawmakers, but financial markets as well. In its report, Moody’s warns what follows multiple downgrades would be a very different scene than when S&P took action. That’s because money-markets funds and other investment tools hold only the highest quality bonds. But the report adds, “Even without any action by the ratings agencies, a failure to make progress toward fiscal sustainability would signal that policymakers will not act until the budget is out of control and the nation is in a serious financial crisis.” Holtz Eakin takes that one step further, describing what the bigger picture would look like in the absence of some kind of Congressional action. “It would be an unambiguously bad event in the financial markets,” Holtz-Eakin said. “We’ve seen turbulence in the past and Main Street’s unimmune. We’d have bad equity market performance, bond yields would go up, credit channels would be depressed. It would send us into another recession.” Still, no matter how you slice it, it seems the future of the economy all comes down to politics.

**That makes the AFF irrelevant.**

**Means 10/25/**12 Businessman, Former assistant to Vice President Nelson Rockefeller, Former economist at the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare (Grady, “US economy on schedule to crash March 2014.” The Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/oct/25/us-economy-on-schedule-to-crash-march-2014/>)

Those wild and crazy Mayans put down their marker that the end of the world would occur on Dec. 21, 2012 — about two months from now. There is, of course, some small chance that they might be right. On the other hand, there is a very large probability that the real end of the world will occur around March 4, 2014.

The doomsday clock will ring then because the U.S. economy may fully crash around that date, which will, in turn, bring down all world economies and all hope of any recovery for the foreseeable future — certainly over the course of most of our lifetimes. Interest rates will skyrocket, businesses will fail, unemployment will go to record levels, material and food shortages will be rampant, and there could be major social unrest. Any wishful thinking that America is in a “recovery” and that “things are getting better” is an illusion.

The problem is not Medicare, which won’t quit on us for another six or seven years. Nor is it Social Security, which will not be fully bankrupt for another 15 years or so. The crisis is much more immediate and much more serious.

The central problem is that America is the bank of the world. What this means, simply, is that the dollar is the world’s currency (often termed the “reserve currency”). Throughout the world, nearly all traded goods, oil, major commodities, real estate, etc., are denominated in dollars. The world needs dollars, and the U.S. provides them and provides confidence that the dollar is the “safest” currency in the world. Countries get dollars by trading with us on attractive terms, which enables Americans to live very well. Countries support this system and cover their risk by investing in dollars through T-bill auctions and other mechanisms, which enables us to run budget deficits — up to a point.

The central issue is confidence in America, and the world is losing confidence quickly. At a certain point, soon, the United States will reach a level of deficit spending and debt at which the countries of the world will lose faith in America and begin to withdraw their investments. Many leading economists and bankers think another trillion dollars or so may do it. A run on the bank will start suddenly, build quickly and snowball.

At that point, we will need to finance our own deficit, and we will not be able to do so. We will raise bond rates to re-attract foreign investment, interest rates will go up, and businesses will fail. Unemployment will skyrocket. **The rest of the world will fully crash along with us**. Europe will continue to decline, and the euro will not replace the dollar. Russia will see a collapse in oil prices as market demand softens, and Russia will collapse along with it. China will find nowhere to export and also will collapse. The Russian and Chinese governments, which see all this coming and have been stockpiling gold to hedge against such a dollar collapse, will find that you cannot eat gold. There will be uprisings — think of the streets in Spain and Greece today — everywhere. Technological advances that traditionally drive productivity increases and economic growth will not be able to keep up with this collapse.

When might this all happen? Paul Volker indicates we might face a mess like this in the next year and a half. David Walker, former U.S. comptroller, i.e., the former chief accountant of the U.S. government, has suggested similar time frames for economic catastrophe. Most agree that the **budget sequestration** approach **won’t work** from either economic or political perspectives, and mindless across-the-board cuts in spending will only exacerbate a mess. The Federal Reserve’s third round of quantitative easing, in which we print money to buy our own bonds in order to goose economic and employment numbers, means we are floating our own debt, a good formula for sudden hyperinflation.

**Halts SMR construction.**

**Carbon Control News 8**

(October 10th, 2008)

For instance, the nuclear industry's hope for renaissance in the face of looming greenhouse gas regulations could be one the first causalities of the economic crisis. The nation's first application for the construction of a new nuclear reactor in over three decades, submitted by Maryland-based Constellation Energy, has already been delayed in part due to the company's financial ties to the now-bankrupt Lehman Brothers investment firm

### 2NC—Hegemony

**Most qualified evidence.**

**BPC 12** Bipartisan Policy Center's Task Force on Defense Budget and Strategy. Co-Chairs: Senator Pete Domenici, Former Chairman of the U.S. Senate Budget Committee and Senior Fellow at the BPC, Secretary Dan Glickman, Former U.S. Agricultural Secretary and Former Chairman of the U.S. House Select Intelligence Committee and Senior Fellow at the BPC, and General James Jones, Former National Security Advisor and Former Commander of U.S. European Command and Senior Fellow at the BPC. Members: Dr. Graham Allison, Director of the Belfer Center at Harvard, Ross Perot, General Peter Chiarelli, Former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Major General Arnold Punaro, Senior Fellow of the Defense Business Board and Former Staff Director of the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, Admiral Greg Johnson, Former Commander of U.S. Naval Forces in Europe, Dr. Abram Shulsky, Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute, General George Joulwan, Former Commander of U.S. European Command, General Charles Wald, Former Deputy Commander of U.S. European Command, Read Admiral David Mercer, Former Commander of Navy Region Europe, Dr. Dov Zakheim, Former Under Secretary of Defense, and Dr. Michael O'Hanlon, Senior Fellow at the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution. "Indefensible: The Sequester’s Mechanics and Adverse Effects on National and Economic Security," June, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/6-7-12%20FINAL%20Sequester%20White%20Paper.pdf

Note: Charts omitted

The FY 2013 sequester will replace the ability of elected leaders to set defense policy with a procedure that will indiscriminately cut 15 percent from defense programs. Indeed, at a time when the military is reorienting its missions to new strategic priorities and seeking to modernize its forces as two major land wars wind down, these across-the-board cuts will make it significantly more difficult to ensure **readiness**, procure **new weapons** systems, and invest in **new tech**nology to meet **emerging threats.** ¶ The president is charged with defining the threats that the United States is likely to confront and a strategic vision for how to avoid or defeat them. The Pentagon contributes to formulating that strategy, and is responsible for ensuring that our forces are prepared and have the necessary equipment to enact it. Through the authorization and appropriations processes, lawmakers are able to modify that blueprint to best serve the security interests of the nation. But on January 2, 2013, the views of the president, Pentagon, and Congress will matter little. ¶ The sequester will deprive all three of these stakeholders of their power to shape the country’s defense policy. Instead, a mechanism that uniformly slashes 15 percent from most defense budget accounts will take the place of the best judgments of our elected representatives and their appointed officials about what is needed to keep us safe. ¶ Such cuts, blind to strategic priorities, will leave the U.S. military unable to implement effectively **any credible national security strategy** – whether President Obama’s or any other one – because arbitrary reductions will have taken the place of deliberative planning. Cuts made in this fashion will eliminate almost all of DoD’s discretion to preserve funding for the most important and efficient national security missions and capabilities. ¶ As an example, consider the administration’s Strategic Guidance issued in January 2012 and the capabilities that the Pentagon has deemed necessary. This new strategy highlights that “U.S. economic and security interests are inextricably linked to developments in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia,” 17 and therefore, “we will of necessity rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region.” Accomplishing this, according to the Pentagon, will require the military to shift toward a leaner, more agile force – one that can effectively project its power across the vast distances of the Pacific Ocean. Accordingly, military planners have identified the need for greater investment in technologically-superior air-, sea- and cyber-power at the cost of heavy ground forces. Additionally, after 10 years of war, military leaders have made it clear that our troops need to recover and aging equipment needs to be repaired. ¶ The Pentagon’s budget request for FY 2013 reflects these priorities – increasing funding for weapons platforms that support power projection and other missions critical to the new strategy, and cutting money for programs that military leaders no longer have deemed to be as critical. As Secretary Panetta told an Asian security conference on June 2, 2012: ¶ We are investing specifically in those kinds of capabilities – such as an advanced fifth-generation fighter, an enhanced Virginia-class submarine, new electronic warfare and communications capabilities, and improved precision weapons – that will provide our forces with freedom of maneuver in areas in which our access and freedom of action may be threatened. We recognize the challenges of operating over the Pacific’s vast distances. That is why we are investing in new aerial-refueling tankers, a new bomber, and advanced maritime patrol and anti-submarine warfare aircraft. 18 ¶ DoD’s budget request strives to meet the demands of the president’s new defense strategy while roughly abiding by the original BCA cap levels for defense spending, lowering the base defense budget by about $5 billion compared to FY 2012, but without accounting for the sequester’s further automatic cuts. ¶ Our analysis, however, indicates that the sequester will greatly constrain the Pentagon’s ability to execute any of these strategic shifts in its procurement, planning, and training. Without meaningful reforms, inefficiencies in the defense budget are already eroding funds needed to train, equip, and deploy our forces. Now, the combination of continued FY 2012 funding, which does not reflect the president’s new strategic priorities, and the indiscriminate 15 percent sequester cut mean that funds available to DoD on January 2, 2013, will differ greatly from those it requested. Indeed, some priority projects might receive as much as 75 percent less funding than the Pentagon determined was needed for FY 2013. Conversely, weapons systems for which DoD has requested reduced funding because of their lower priority in light of the new strategy could receive as much as nine times more funding than requested. ¶ More specifically, our calculations indicate that refurbishment of the nearly 25-year-old USS Abraham Lincoln aircraft carrier, development and purchases of a new aerial refueling tanker, and funding for resetting and retraining troops could be cut by 72, 57, and 42 percent, respectively, relative to the Pentagon’s FY 2013 request. Additionally, funding could fall roughly $1.7 billion short of the nearly $4 billion requested by DoD and Homeland Security for investments in the personnel, technology, and infrastructure needed to protect our sensitive computer networks by developing offensive cyber capabilities. Simultaneously, funding for Heavy Tactical Vehicles, the M-1 Abrams tank, and Stryker armored vehicles – all ground vehicles that serve little purpose in the Asia-Pacific region – could be increased by 934, 442, and 107 percent, respectively, over the Pentagon’s request for FY 2013. ¶ Thus, the sequester will leave military leaders with some combination of three options, each of which will increase risks and costs: ¶ • Indefinitely delay implementation of the new strategy, and accept the strategic risks that would flow from not moving to address the threats identified in the Strategic Guidance. ¶ • Attempt to pursue the new strategy with fewer of the new capabilities and weapons platforms than the Pentagon has deemed necessary, and accept the operational risks that come from not having enough of the right tools for the job and lower force readiness. ¶ • Make do with the older weapons systems that DoD already possesses, and accept the tactical and safety risks of using outdated technology that does not fulfill the requirements of current missions, and is also more likely to fail. ¶ The first two options cause contract delays, reductions, and renegotiations, contributing to increases in per-unit costs. The last option will result in increased maintenance costs, as antiquated planes, ships, and helicopters are pushed beyond their expected service lives. Either way, the military eventually will need some of the weapons that the sequester will keep us from purchasing today. Indeed, nearly one-quarter of our ships failed inspection last year. The average age of our fighter jets is 22 years, our bombers 35 years, and our aerial refueling tankers 47 years. The longer we put off modernizing our armed forces, the greater the risk to our troops and the greater the eventual procurement costs will be, defeating the very logic of deficit reduction. ¶ Meanwhile, although China’s military power is still inferior to that of the United States, Beijing’s actions – and fear of its intentions – have already led many regional countries to look to the United States for **security guarantees** and cooperation. If U.S. commitment to these alliances is perceived to be weakening, or our ability to defend them waning, our partners could feel pressured to accommodate China’s growing ambitions. ¶ At a time when the military is reconstituting itself as two major land wars wind down, being called upon to reorient its missions to new strategic priorities and seeking to modernize its forces, across-the-board cuts will make it significantly more difficult to properly ensure readiness, procure new weapons systems, and invest in new technology to meet emerging threats. As a result, the U.S. military will be left in a holding pattern, trying to make do with yesterday’s military to fight tomorrow’s wars.

### 2NC—Economy

**Best economists.**

**Schoen 11/7**/12 Commentator at NBC News

Obama victory clouded by looming fiscal battle with, http://www.nbcnews.com/business/economywatch/obama-victory-clouded-looming-fiscal-battle-congress-1C6892841

Congratulations, President Barack Obama. Now, you have just 49 days to resolve a $600 billion fiscal crisis that could push the economy back into recession.

The slow, steady improvement in the economy that helped Obama defeat Republican nominee Mitt Romney Tuesday is in peril if he can’t quickly forge agreement with a still-divided Congress on a new budget that delays steep tax increases and deep spending cuts.

The so-called “fiscal cliff” – set to take effect Jan.1 – is a **doomsday budget package** Congress enacted in 2011 to try to force compromise on a series of bitterly divisive policy choices. **Economists** and **politicians**, including Federal Reserve Chairman Ben **Bernanke**, have warned it would almost **certainly wipe out any progress** the White House has made in reviving the economy and creating jobs.

Recent reports have shown the economy picking up strength. Growth in U.S. gross domestic product, though still sluggish, picked up to a 2.0 percent annual pace in the third quarter from a 1.3 percent rate in the second. After a pause this spring, the pace of hiring picked up this summer, with employers now adding some 175,000 new jobs a month to payrolls. Consumers are spending more on big-ticket items, like cars and appliances.

A prolonged budget impasse would **reverse those gains**. The hit to consumer spending from higher taxes, along with the loss of government spending, would knock 3 to 4 percent from GDP, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

"If we go back into recession, we will likely **pull the global economy with us**," said Ameriprise Financial economist Russell Price. "The longer a (budget) deal takes, the longer the economy suffers. It’s just that simple."

**Causes US credit downgrades.**

**LA Times 11/7**/12 Los Angeles Times

(Fitch Ratings warns of U.S. credit downgrade from fiscal cliff, <http://www.latimes.com/business/money/la-fi-mo-fitch-credit-rating-fiscal-cliff-obama-20121107,0,6939564.story>)

Fitch Ratings said that there would be "no fiscal honeymoon" for President Obama, warning early Wednesday that the U.S. probably would lose its **AAA credit** rating if the White House and Congress don't address looming tax increases, spending cuts and the fast-approaching debt ceiling.

"The economic policy challenge facing the president is to put in place a credible deficit-reduction plan necessary to underpin economic recovery and confidence in the full faith and credit of the U.S.," said Fitch, one of the three major credit rating companies.

The expiration of the George W. Bush-era tax cuts and the start of automatic spending cuts to reduce the deficit -- a combination known as the fiscal cliff -- will take place Jan. 1. **Most economists** believe it will trigger another recession.

In addition, the government will hit its $16.4-trillion debt limit near the end of the year. Treasury officials said they can take steps to allow continued borrowing, but the nation would face a possible default early in 2013 if the limit isn't increased.

Obama and members of Congress have pledged to try to agree on a broad deficit-reduction plan to avoid the impact of the fiscal cliff, and such a deal most likely would include an increase in the debt limit.

But Tuesday's election sent mixed messages from the electorate. Obama was reelected on a platform of higher taxes for wealthy Americans. Republicans retained the majority in the House, running on a pledge of no tax increases.

**Fitch** said failure to come to a bipartisan agreement endangered the nation's credit rating. After the bitter fight over raising the debt limit in the summer of 2011, Standard & Poor's downgraded the U.S. rating to AA+ from AAA.

Fitch and Moody's Investor Services did not follow suit.

But **Moody's** warned in September that failure to reach a deficit-reduction deal probably would lead it to downgrade the U.S. rating. And Fitch echoed that Wednesday.

"Avoiding the fiscal cliff and a timely increase in the debt ceiling would support the economic recovery and send a positive signal that agreement can be reached on a credible plan to reduce the federal budget deficit and stabilize federal debt over the medium term, consistent with the U.S. retaining its 'AAA' status," Fitch said.

### 2NC—Europe

**Fiscal cliff collapses the Euro-Zone**

**Dadush 11/7**/12 Served as the World Bank's Director of International Trade and Before that as Director of Economic Policy.

U.S. fiscal cliff risks dragging global economy into darkness, http://edition.cnn.com/2012/11/07/business/opinion-dadush-obama-economy/index.html

Fiscal cliff awaits Obama and the world

If the U.S. falls off this fiscal cliff into recession, the outlook for the **world economy**, already gloomy, will darken further.

The task of **keeping the euro-zone afloat**, amid scared investors and depression-level unemployment in Spain and Greece, will become even harder.

The risk of a renewed global banking crisis triggered by sovereign defaults in Europe would escalate sharply. Nor could the U.S. or Europe deploy the policy arsenal they possessed in 2008 to right the ship -- their fiscal and monetary bullets have been spent.

Confronted with this dire alternative, Obama will have to compromise by accepting a program of long-term cuts in social programs while Republicans accept phased tax increases -- both departing from their diametrically opposed electoral platforms.

As a minimum, this compromise will include a claw back of the payroll tax reduction, and of extended unemployment benefits as well as some expenditure cuts, adding up to 1% to 2% of U.S. GDP in 2013.

**Partial collapse triggers war, collapses the EU.**

**Scott 12** Professor of international financial systems @ Harvard Law School

(Hal S. Scott (Director of the Committee on Capital Markets Regulation), “The Global (Not Euro-Zone) Crisis,” New York Times, August 15, 2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9nonqa2)

The euro-zone crisis has striking parallels with our experience in **two world wars**, when the United States mistakenly calculated that Europe could solve its own foreign policy problems and that Americans were immune from the consequences of the Continent’s failure to do so.

Europe’s failure **twice plunged the world into war**. In today’s globalized economic world, Europe’s failure to resolve its financial crisis could plunge the world into economic chaos. This is a global crisis — not a euro-zone crisis — and we must take international action to deal with it. , “

One **fundamental parallel** with the two world wars is the tension between Germany and other European states. While successfully integrated into Europe, Germany remains the Continent’s most powerful economic force, with higher productivity and economic growth rates and lower inflation than the other major European countries, including France, Italy, Spain and Britain. In the periods leading up to the world wars, Germany’s neighbors rightly feared and deeply resented German military power. Today, they fear German economic power even while they plead with Germany to come to their aid.

Germany can only go so far in bailing out Europe. The cost of recapitalizing European banks (despite overly optimistic stress tests), including those in Germany, is estimated to be €420 billion under an adverse scenario, just for non-performing loans. The cost of marking down — let alone writing off — sovereign debt would be much greater. As of last November, 20 of the largest banks in the European Union carried $4.2 trillion in PIIGS (Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Spain) sovereign debt, about seven times the amount of their $620 billion in equity.

The amount of potential budget support for countries with unsustainable debt is also substantial, up to €1.4 trillion for 2012 and 2013, excluding any support for Greece. This does not count losses of the European Central Bank from its operations to bring down the yield on new sovereign debt issuance.

Bailing out Europe is beyond the practical capacity of Germany, whose G.D.P. is approximately €2.6 trillion, a level that is far from assured as Europe crumbles around it.

Just as importantly, Germany faces severe political constraints on rescuing Europe. The German government is fortunate that the pro-European Social Democrat opposition party has not attacked its economic support for Europe. But Chancellor Angela Merkel faces deep divisions within her own party, fueled by the constant negative drumbeat of the Bundesbank. If Germany does too much for Europe it could sink Merkel. If Germany does too little for Europe, it could cause **deep resentment** from those it refused to help.

Too big a reparation burden on Germany after World War I contributed to the rise of the Nazis; in contrast, after World War II, we used the international approach of the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe. Instead of placing another impossible burden on Germany, we must again take international action.

Various solutions to Europe’s problems that do not depend entirely on Germany are being considered in Europe while the rest of the world gives counsel from the sidelines, but these proposed solutions are insufficient and uncertain. Debt can be restructured, as with Greece, but this makes future borrowing more expensive, negatively impacts bank capital and risks contagion. Moreover, this does not address the root cause of the crisis — uncompetitive economies and overspending. Banks can raise some additional capital, but not nearly enough. Austerity measures are politically difficult to sustain and, for those who believe in stimulus, counter-productive for economic growth.

The European Central Bank can finance countries unable to borrow at affordable rates but this raises the specter of inflation and increases the debt burden of the sovereigns they are financing.

The option of using exchange-rate adjustment, by abandoning the euro straightjacket of immutable fixed exchange rates, is beset by operational problems. The effective re-denomination of debt and temporary capital controls would require international approval.

More fundamentally, it is feared that **even a partial euro-zone breakup** could be the start of the end of the European Union, a **major step backward** from decades of integration.

**Extinction.**

**Bruton 1** Former Irish Prime Minister

(John, Report before the Joint Committee on European Affairs, Parliament of Ireland, October, http://www.irlgov.ie/committees-02/c-europeanaffairs/future/page1.htm)

2.5 As the Laeken Declaration put it, "Europe needs to shoulder its responsibilities in the governance of globalisation" adding that Europe must exercise its power in order "to set globalisation within a moral framework, in other words to anchor it in solidarity and sustainable development". 2.6 Only a strong European Union is big enough to create a space, and a stable set of rules, within which all Europeans can live securely, move freely, and provide for themselves, for their families and for their old age. Individual states are too small to do that on their own. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with the globalized **human diseases**, such as AIDS and tuberculosis. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with **globalized criminal conspiracies**, like the Mafia, that threaten the security of all Europeans. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with globalized **environmental threats**, such as global warming, which threaten our continent and generations of its future inhabitants. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with globalized **economic forces**, which could spread recession from one country to another and destroy millions of jobs. Only a strong European Union is big enough to regulate, in the interests of society as a whole, the activities of profit seeking private corporations, some of which now have more spending power than many individual states. 2.7 These tasks are too large for individual states.

### AT: DOD

**The DOD does not shield.**

**NYT 12** The New York Times

(Military Spending on Biofuels Draws Fire, 8/27, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/28/business/military-spending-on-biofuels-draws-fire.html?_r=1>)

The still-experimental fuels are also expensive — about $27 a gallon for the fuel used in the demonstration, compared with about $3.50 a gallon for conventional military fuels.

And that has made them a flash point in a larger political battle over government financing for new energy technologies.

“You’re not the secretary of energy,” Representative Randy Forbes, a Republican from Virginia, told Mr. Mabus as he criticized the biofuels program at a hearing in February. “You’re the secretary of the Navy.”

The House, controlled by Republicans, has already approved measures that would all but kill Pentagon spending on purchasing or investing in biofuels. A committee in the Senate, led by Democrats, has voted to save the program. The fight will heat up again when Congress takes up the Defense Department’s budget again in the fall.

The naval demonstration — known as the Great Green Fleet — was part of a $510 million three-year, multiagency program to help the military develop alternatives to conventional fuel. It is a drop in the ocean of the Pentagon’s nearly $650 billion annual budget.

But with the Defense Department facing $259 billion in budget cuts over the next five years, some lawmakers argue that the military should not be spending millions on developing new fuel markets when it is buying less equipment and considering cutting salaries.

This phase of the military’s exploration of alternative fuels began under President George W. Bush and grew out of a task force that Donald Rumsfeld, then the secretary of defense, convened in 2006 to explore ways to reduce dependence on petroleum. If the military had less need to transport and protect fuel coming from the Middle East, the thinking went, the fighting forces could become more flexible and efficient, with fewer lives put at risk.

In addition to biofuels, early efforts included developing liquid fuels from coal and natural gas for the Air Force, the largest energy user of the armed services. But the gas and coal fuels would not meet cost or environmental requirements, officials said. The Defense Department focused on advanced biofuels, which are generally made from plant and animal feedstocks that don’t compete with food uses, which is a concern with common renewable fuels like the corn-based ethanol used in cars.

The federal Renewable Fuel Standard, which sets targets for renewable fuel production and requires a certain amount to be blended into conventional gasoline and diesel, has been the main catalyst for the growth of several companies exploring new technologies.

Investors, however, have been leery of the enormous amounts of cash it can take to bring the fuels from the lab to the gas tank. Industry officials say that having a large, steady customer like the military could attract other investors to help finance large refineries that would bring costs down through economies of scale. Military officials say that their purchases of small amounts for testing has already helped reduce the cost. In 2009, the Pentagon spent roughly $424 a gallon on algae oil from Solazyme.

“Finding a user like the military can rapidly help to scale technologies that then are used in the civilian marketplace — it becomes a catalyst,” said Bob Johnsen, chief executive of Primus Green Energy, which is developing fuels from biomass and natural gas. “If the military becomes a buyer, that becomes a means by which the production facilities can be financed.”

The Defense Department is always vulnerable to charges of overspending — remember the $7,600 coffee maker? — but military leaders argue that what they are putting into biofuels is a blip given the potential benefits of reducing their need for Middle Eastern oil, with all its volatilities.

“Our primary rationale is not economic,” said Sharon E. Burke, assistant secretary of defense for operational energy plans and programs. “Our job is to defend the country.”

She said biofuel spending was just 7 percent of the $1.6 billion budget the military was requesting for efforts to improve energy usage in field operations in the next fiscal year. Most of the measures are aimed at reducing the need for fuel in the first place, including using diesel electricity generators more efficiently, putting greener engines into vehicles and aircraft, and using hybrid solar generators and batteries in the field.

The Defense Department is also running several demonstration projects on its bases, testing ways to produce and distribute electricity better. And the Army recently put out a request for proposals for $7 billion in renewable energy projects, part of reaching its goal of getting a gigawatt of its electricity — enough to power roughly 250,000 American homes — from renewable sources by 2025.

In Congress, there is little apparent opposition to the overall military push toward renewable power generation or energy efficiency.

But the biofuel program has struck a nerve among Republicans who, ever since the government’s failed investment in the solar panel maker Solyndra, **have been wasting few opportunities to hammer their message that the government should not risk taxpayer money to bolster favored technologies.**

Representative Mike Conaway, a Texas Republican who introduced House legislation that would limit biofuel purchasing and production and has been critical of the Great Green Fleet, said Democrats were using the military to pursue an environmental agenda. “We just want to require the Department of Defense to do exactly what every other American does when they buy fuel: they try to get the best price they can,” he said.

### 2NC—UQ Wall

**Framing issue --- PC is key --- that's Kateb. More evidence.**

**Rowland 11/7**/12 Writer at the Boston Globe

(Christopher and Scott Helman, Economy kept Obama afloat, blocked Romney win, Boston Globe, <http://bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2012/11/07/economy-kept-obama-afloat-blocked-romney-win/GGjoaHhlk06KobPutBJoSP/story.html>)

Next up for Obama is proving to those voters that he can achieve results. That remains an exceedingly difficult task in a deeply divided capital, with Republicans retaining control of the House on Tuesday and Democrats staying in charge in the Senate. Latinos who voted for Obama in large numbers Tuesday will demand that he seriously pursue immigration reform. Hurricane Sandy’s devastating effects in New York and New Jersey have renewed calls to address climate change.

Most immediately, the president and Congress will have to deal with the looming “fiscal cliff’’ — a set of automatic budget cuts that were put in place by Washington leaders to extract themselves from the 2011 debt-ceiling standoff, combined with the expiration of the George W. Bush-era tax cuts.

Economists warn that the nation will slide into another recession if the president and Congress do not come up with a plan to avoid the sudden shock to the economy that would result. How these fiscal talks proceed will depend on how much political capital Obama is perceived to have gained in the election. He was narrowly winning the popular vote as the ballots were tallied into Wednesday. If Republicans see political danger in continuing to dig in their heels, will they be more willing to negotiate a tax overhaul that includes higher taxes for the wealthy?

**Obama has enough now.**

**Cohen 11/7**/12 Formerly the executive editor of The American Prospect, Cohn is currently a senior editor at The New Republic magazine

(Jonathan Cohn, Yes, Obama Won a Mandate, <http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/109818/obama-wins-four-more-years-mandate-agenda-validation-obamacare>)

But what about the next four years? Doesn’t Obama still need a governing plan? Sure. And if Obama has been relatively silent lately on some urgent issues—chief among them, climate change—he’s been quite clear when it comes to economic policy. He’s produced plans for strengthening the recovery. He’s laid out principles for reducing the deficit: Relatively modest reductions in spending coupled with higher taxes on the wealthy. And with the coming debate over the spending sequester and expiration of the Bush tax cuts, both set for January 2013, Obama will get a chance to apply those principles.

The stakes in this fight are large: Depending on the terms, they will define the scope of the federal government for at least a generation to come. And, unlike in recent fiscal debates, **Obama should have leverage**—more, perhaps, than at any time since the earliest days of his presidency. He can hold out in the debate over the sequester and Bush tax cuts, because the default action—doing nothing—is far worse for Republicans than it is for him. And with the newly elected Tammy Baldwin and Elizabeth Warren joining the reelected Sherrod Brown and Sheldon Whitehouse in the Senate, Obama should have a more unified and incrementally more liberal congressional party behind him. (Hopefully they will push Obama, even as they get his back.)

**It will pass ---**

**Momentum.**

**WSJ 11/9**/12 (Pressure Rises on Fiscal Crisis; White House, Lawmakers Try to Push Ahead Amid New Warnings Over Inaction, Paletta, Damian; Lee, Carol E; Bendavid, Naftali. Wall Street Journal (Online) [New York, N.Y] 09 Nov 2012: n/a)

Since Mr. Obama's election victory, White House and congressional leaders of both parties have taken a more conciliatory stance. That has stirred hopes of a bipartisan deficit-reduction deal among some--and agitated people in both parties who object to any compromise calling for higher tax revenues on one hand, and cuts to government entitlement programs on the other.

"Personally, I think the conditions are **exactly perfect** for us to move ahead with this **right now**," said Sen. Bob Corker (R., Tenn.), who won re-election Tuesday. "It is going to take the president being committed to doing this and sitting down and rolling up his sleeves and making it happen."

House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio in a conference call Wednesday told fellow Republicans to avoid drawing lines in the sand. "We don't want to box ourselves in, and we don't want to box the White House out," he said, according to someone familiar with the call.

**The GOP will budge.**

**Corbin 11/8**/12 On Wall Street Staff Writer

**(**Kenneth Corbin, Fiscal Cliff Looms Large in 'Mother of All Lame-Duck Sessions' in Congress, http://www.onwallstreet.com/news/Fiscal-Cliff-Looms-Large-in-Mother-of-All-Lame-Duck-Sessions-in-Congress-2681772-1.html)

\*Andrew Friedman, principal at the policy-analysis shop Washington Update

Friedman, too, expects that the parties will be able to reach some sort of a deal, at least in the short term. He anticipates that Republicans will eventually give ground on the tax issue, taking the president's advisors at their word that Obama would veto any deficit plan that does not include higher taxes for the top earners.

But the threshold might move, he said, suggesting that instead of the $250,000 mark the president has proposed, they might find a compromise by allowing taxes to increase only for those earning $1 million or more.

"I think on balance we probably will avoid it," Friedman said. "I think the Republicans will ultimately agree to perhaps raise taxes above a certain income level, maybe $1 million, and keep taxes low on everyone else."

He pointed to comments that House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) made on Wednesday that held the door open to increasing revenues as part of a deficit-reduction plan, though Boehner qualified his remarks, saying, "We're willing to accept new revenue, under the right conditions." He called for an overhaul of the tax code patterned after the 1986 Tax Reform Act that would cut "special-interest loopholes and deductions" to create a "fairer, simpler, cleaner tax code."

**Boehner optimistic.**

**Davis 11/8**/12 USA Today Washington Bureau

(Susan Davis, Boehner sees short-term budget fix, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2012/11/08/boehner-outlines-session/1691661/>)

Boehner is proposing what he calls a short-term "bridge" that would extend all of the tax rates for one year and buy more time to overhaul the federal tax code. Boehner says that would increase revenue by closing tax loopholes, not by raising the rates individuals pay on their wages.

"There's a lot of ways you could do this that would allow the Congress to fix our tax code next year, look at real spending cuts and entitlement reforms that would produce what the president's called for — a balanced approach," he said.

No deal, Senate Democrats say. Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., outlined an opposing view: Democrats want an agreement to extend the Bush-era cuts on everyone except the top earners, and they want it done in the next 53 days. "Waiting for a month, six weeks, six months, that's not gonna solve the problem. We know what needs to be done," Reid said.

Boehner said his rank-and-file views heading over the cliff as "unacceptable," but he acknowledged there is no clear path forward for compromise. He was **optimistic** that a deal would be reached between himself, Reid and President Obama.

"I have no doubts that they're as interested in doing the will of the American people as I am," he said.

Obama is scheduled to make a statement about the fiscal situation at the White House Friday afternoon.

Boehner pledged to work with Obama to find consensus but offered a critical assessment of his re-election victory speech. "It sounded pretty good, but you know, I remember that speech from four years ago, and that sounded real good, too," he said. "I don't mean to seem harsh, but actions speak louder than words."

### 2NC—Punt it

**Political insiders.**

**RAJU 11 – 7 – 12 Politico Staff** [Manu Raju, Harry Reid agenda: Filibuster crackdown, tax increases, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1112/83514.html>]

Sen. Harry Reid embraced his role as a more empowered Senate majority leader Wednesday, calling for a major fiscal deal in the lame duck session while vowing a new push on immigration reform and an overhaul of filibuster rules in the new Congress.

He also promised not to “mess with Social Security” as negotiations begin on fiscal reform.

Speaking at a packed news conference on Capitol Hill, Reid laid out an ambitious agenda for 2013 after his party’s surprisingly decisive Senate victories and President Barack Obama’s reelection bid, saying the public gave Democrats a new mandate to raise taxes on wealthy families as part of a major year-end fiscal deal. While Reid said he’s not going to “draw lines in the sand” ahead of the year-end fiscal cliff, he insisted on higher revenues.

**Reid has good reason to feel ambitious**. After a year of gloomy predictions for Democratic Senate candidates, the party may increase it’s majority from 53 seats to 55 seats — a stunning accomplishment considering how many of Reid’s colleagues were considered vulnerable.

“The president campaigned around the country saying, ‘We know what the problems are with this fiscal problem. We just need some revenue,’” Reid said. “That was the issue. The mandate was look at all the exit polls, look at all the polling, the vast majority of the American people, rich, poor, everybody agrees that the rich — richest of the rich have to help a little bit.”

With Washington facing potentially devastating tax hikes and spending cuts in less than two months, **Reid said he was not in favor of punting** until the next Congress by passing a short-term extension.

“I’m not for kicking the can down the road,” said Reid, who spoke with Obama Tuesday night. “I think **we’ve done that far too much**. I think we know what the issue is. We need to solve that issue. Waiting for a month, six weeks, six months, that’s not gonna solve the problem. We know what needs to be done. I think that we should just roll up our sleeves and get it done.”

House Speaker John Boehner, whom Reid spoke with Wednesday morning, has said tax hikes on the rich would not pass his chamber. But Reid said the burden was on the GOP to cut a deal.

“Well, the Republicans have to make the choice. We’re willing to work something out. We’re willing to work it out sooner rather than later. I don’t know how they think they benefit by waiting until sequestration [automatic defense cuts] kicks in,” he said.

### AT: Thumpers

**Negotiations are already happening.**

**Politico 11/8**/12 Washington Staff

(Behind Boehner's new tone, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1112/83608.html>)

Since Boehner gave the speech, Rep. Kevin McCarthy and his whip operation have called more than 120 House Republicans to gauge their reaction. By week’s end, they’ll have reached out to the entire House Republican Conference. When they return, McCarthy will meet with small groups of Republicans to feel them out for opposition.

At the staff level, the talks have **actually begun**. Boehner’s policy director, Brett Loper, has met informally with the Obama administration. Top aides to Boehner and Reid have also quietly huddled.

Inside Boehner’s operation, planning for these talks began in September on the second floor of the Capitol.

Boehner chief of staff Mike Sommers, Loper and Dave Schnittger — a Boehner hand from the Ohio Republican’s early days in D.C. — took to the famous “Board of Education” room to begin planning for two scenarios: a Romney win and an Obama victory.

**It's the immediate focus.**

**Reuters 11/7**/12

(As Fiscal Cliff fast approaches, Obama reaches out to Romney to help break Congress gridlock, <http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/11/07/as-fiscal-cliff-fast-approaches-obama-reaches-out-to-romney-to-help-break-congress-gridlock/>)

The **immediate focus** for Obama and U.S. lawmakers will be to deal with the “fiscal cliff,” a mix of tax increases and spending cuts due to extract some $600 billion from the economy at the end of the year barring a deal with Congress. Economists warn it could push the United States back into recession.

House Majority Leader John Boehner moved swiftly on the fiscal cliff issue, saying he would issue a statement on it on Wednesday, citing “the need for both parties to find common ground and take steps together to help our economy grow and create jobs, which is critical to solving our debt.”

Concern about U.S. fiscal problems after Obama’s re-election contributed to a decline in global financial markets. World shares turned lower and Wall Street stocks, which had been expected to rise on relief over the clear election outcome, opened lower partly due to fears over economic weakness in Europe.

### AT: No Capital

**Has the capital.**

**WSJ 11 – 9 – 12** [The President's Cliff Walk; Boehner offers a fiscal olive branch to the White House. Anonymous. Wall Street Journal (Online) [New York, N.Y] 09 Nov 2012: n/a.]

There's little doubt that Mr. Obama has the political whip hand for the moment. The tax increases and defense spending cuts will automatically take effect if Congress and the President fail to act. Mr. Obama could bludgeon Republicans to accept a deal on his terms, then if they balk simply pocket the tax increases as a revenue windfall, while blaming Republicans if there's a recession.

What that strategy won't do is solve the real problems he's inheriting from his own first term. The deficit is growing by $1 trillion a year and another U.S. credit-rating downgrade beckons as entitlement spending escalates. Above all, the economy is growing too slowly to raise incomes or raise enough revenue for the government.

The question is whether Mr. Obama wants to solve these problems--or continue demonizing Republicans while getting nothing done.

### 2NC—Link Debate

**Picking nuclear as a winner costs PC**

**Nelson 9/24** E&E reporters [Gabriel Nelson and Hannah Northey, NUCLEAR ENERGY: DOE funding for small reactors languishes as parties clash on debt, <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3?page_type=print>]

That the grants haven't been given out during a taut campaign season, even as President Obama announces agency actions ranging from trade cases to creating new national monuments to make the case for his re-election, may be a sign that the reactors are ensnared in a broader feud over energy spending.

Grant recipients would develop reactor designs with an eye toward eventually turning those into pilot projects -- and the loan guarantees that these first-of-a-kind nuclear plants are using today to get financing **would be blocked under the "No More Solyndras" bill** that passed the House last week (Greenwire, Sept. 14).

Congress has given the grant program $67 million for fiscal 2012, shy of the amount that would be needed annually to reach full funding. If the "sequester" kicks in at year's end and slashes DOE funding or the balance of power changes in Washington, the amount of money available could dwindle yet again.

Even the staunchest supporters of the federal nuclear program are acknowledging it is a tough time to promise a $452 million check.

Former Sen. Pete Domenici, a New Mexico Republican who pushed for new reactors as chairman of both the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, said during a brief interview Tuesday that well-designed loan guarantees won't cost too much because they get repaid over time. The cost could be borne by a "tiny little tax" on the nuclear industry, he said.

But when it comes to straight-up spending, like the grants that would support getting these cutting-edge reactors ready for their first demonstrations, the solution may not be so clear. While some Republicans remain staunch supporters of funding for the nuclear power industry, there are others who label the government subsidies as a waste of taxpayer dollars.

"It's awful hard, with the needs that are out there and the debt that haunts us, to figure out how you're going to establish priorities," said Domenici, who has advocated for the deployment of new nuclear reactors as a fellow at the Bipartisan Policy Center. "I can't stand here and tell you that I know how to do that."

**True of the lame duck.**

**AP 10/1**/12 Associated Press via the Australian

(Investors eye the 'fiscal cliff' as Barack Obama's poll numbers improve, <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/in-depth/us-election/investors-eye-the-fiscal-cliff-as-barack-obamas-poll-numbers-improve/story-fn95xh4y-1226485913043>)

What many in the market worry about isn't that high earners may pay more in taxes if Mr Obama wins. They worry that federal spending cuts and tax hikes scheduled for 2013 will kick in on January 1 and start pulling the country into another recession. The higher taxes and lower spending would total $600 billion. They take effect automatically unless Congress and the White House reach a deal before then.

If he's re-elected, Mr Obama will still face a House of Representatives controlled by Republicans the rest of the year. And the new Congress that takes office in January may have a Republican House, too. Investors says that's likely to set up a budget battle similar to August of last year, which ended with the country losing its top credit rating and panicked investors fleeing the stock market.

"**If you have any kind of gridlock, you run the risk of inaction**," says Tom Simons, a market economist at the investment bank Jefferies. "This is a situation where inaction is the worst outcome."

Mr Obama and others like former President Bill Clinton have expressed the belief that House Republicans could be more cooperative once the election is over.

"They'll be faced with determining whether we get a recession or not," says Jeff Kleintop, chief market strategist at LPL Financial.

Most on Wall Street think Congress and Mr Obama would eventually manage to at least postpone some of impending tax and spending changes before this year is out.

The Congressional Budget Office recently laid out the grim consequences of such an event - often compared to dropping off a "fiscal cliff." Starting January 1, tax cuts signed by President George W. Bush expire as do Mr Obama's cuts to payroll taxes. Federal spending on defence and other domestic programs will drop, while emergency unemployment benefits run out.

The combined effect off all these changes would shrink the economy nearly 3 per cent at an annual rate in the first half of next year, the CBO estimates, and push unemployment up to 9.1 per cent by the fall. The unemployment rate was 8.1 per cent in August. Recent surveys of businesses suggest the threat is already weighing on the minds of executives when they're making hiring and spending plans.

For the world's biggest money managers, the fiscal cliff now ranks as the greatest hazard to the global economy, according to Bank of America's most recent fund manager survey. It topped the European debt crisis, a collapse in Chinese real estate and even a war between Israel and Iran.

The danger looms so large to most investors that they believe Washington will find a way to escape it.

"Ultimately, I think a deal gets done, but it's just a question of how long it takes to get there," Mr Kleintop says. "By no means is it going to be an easy process. Gridlock means there's a greater chance that this drags on into next year."

Analysts at investment firms have kept a close eye on polling numbers and especially on the Intrade, an online marketplace where members can trade predictions on events like elections. Polls show voters leaning toward Mr Obama in key swing states. On Intrade, the odds have swung strongly in Mr Obama's direction, jumping to a 76 per cent chance of re-election, up from 51 per cent at the start of September.

Intrade markets put the chance that Republicans will retain control the House at 74 per cent.

If these forecasts prove right, the balance of power in Washington would remain the same. Democrats keep the White House and a slim majority in the Senate, and Republicans keep the House.

What troubles investors is that the same elected officials who fought over raising the debt ceiling last year could be taking up the same task again while debating how best to manoeuvre around the fiscal cliff. Treasury officials have estimated that Congress won't have to raise the debt limit until January.

Expect to see a replay of the debt-ceiling fight, says Ian Lyngen, a senior government bond strategist at CRT Capital. Except that this time what's at stake is the country's borrowing limit and a recession.

"I'm sure it's going to go just like it did last time - very messy," Mr Lyngen says.

In one dizzying stretch that August, the Dow Jones industrial average dropped 2,000 points in three weeks.

"And don't forget," Mr Lyngen adds, "that ultimately got resolved."

The widespread belief on Wall Street is that Congress and Mr Obama will start negotiations over raising the debt limit and pushing back the fiscal cliff when they return in late November - the so-called lame-duck session, because newly elected members of Congress will not have taken their seats.

Twists in the talks will likely rattle markets as the new year approaches. But if stocks do fall sharply, investors expect that would push Republicans and Democrats to reach a deal.

"Ugly negotiations in the lame-duck session could really throw the market for a loop," says Mr Kleintop. "It could be a painful process for investors."

### AT: PC Irrelevant

**Political scientists and experts agree it’s relevant.**

**Beckman 10** Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine

(Matthew N., 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 50)

However, many **close observers** of the presidential–congressional relationship have long cited pre-voting bargaining across Pennsylvania Avenue as being **substantively important**. For example, discussing President Eisenhower’s legislative record in 1953, CQ staffers issued a caveat they have often repeated in the years since:¶ The President’s leadership often was tested beyond the glare spotlighting roll calls. . . . Negotiations off the floor and action in committee sometimes are as important as the recorded votes. (CQ Almanac 1953, 77)¶ **Many a political scientist has agreed**. Charles Jones (1994), for one, wrote, “However they are interpreted, roll call votes cannot be more than they are: one form of floor action on legislation. If analysts insist on scoring the president, concentrating on this stage of lawmaking can provide no more than a partial tally” (195). And Jon Bond and Richard Fleisher (1990) note that even if they ultimately are reflected in roll-call votes, “many important decisions in Congress are made in places other than floor votes and recorded by means other than roll calls . . . ” (68).