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#### Pursuit of hegemony’s locked-in

Zach Dorfman 12, assistant editor of Ethics and International Affairs, the journal of the Carnegie Council, and co-editor of the Montreal Review, “What We Talk About When We Talk About Isolationism”, May 18, <http://dissentmagazine.org/online.php?id=605>

The rise of China notwithstanding, the United States remains the world’s sole superpower. Its military (and, to a considerable extent, political) hegemony extends not just over North America or even the Western hemisphere, but also Europe, large swaths of Asia, and Africa. Its interests are global; nothing is outside its potential sphere of influence. There are an estimated 660 to 900 American military bases in roughly forty countries worldwide, although figures on the matter are notoriously difficult to ascertain, largely because of subterfuge on the part of the military. According to official data there are active-duty U.S. military personnel in 148 countries, or over 75 percent of the world’s states. The United States checks Russian power in Europe and Chinese power in South Korea and Japan and Iranian power in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Turkey. In order to maintain a frigid peace between Israel and Egypt, the American government hands the former $2.7 billion in military aid every year, and the latter $1.3 billion. It also gives Pakistan more than $400 million dollars in military aid annually (not including counterinsurgency operations, which would drive the total far higher), Jordan roughly $200 million, and Colombia over $55 million. U.S. long-term military commitments are also manifold. It is one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, the only institution legally permitted to sanction the use of force to combat “threats to international peace and security.” In 1949 the United States helped found NATO, the first peacetime military alliance extending beyond North and South America in U.S. history, which now has twenty-eight member states. The United States also has a trilateral defense treaty with Australia and New Zealand, and bilateral mutual defense treaties with Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, and South Korea. It is this sort of reach that led Madeleine Albright to call the United States the sole “indispensible power” on the world stage. The idea that global military dominance and political hegemony is in the U.S. national interest—and the world’s interest—is generally taken for granted domestically. Opposition to it is limited to the libertarian Right and anti-imperialist Left, both groups on the margins of mainstream political discourse. Today, American supremacy is assumed rather than argued for: in an age of tremendous political division, it is a bipartisan first principle of foreign policy, a presupposition. In this area at least, one wishes for a little less agreement. In Promise and Peril: America at the Dawn of a Global Age, Christopher McKnight Nichols provides an erudite account of a period before such a consensus existed, when ideas about America’s role on the world stage were fundamentally contested. As this year’s presidential election approaches, each side will portray the difference between the candidates’ positions on foreign policy as immense. Revisiting Promise and Peril shows us just how narrow the American worldview has become, and how our public discourse has become narrower still. Nichols focuses on the years between 1890 and 1940, during America’s initial ascent as a global power. He gives special attention to the formative debates surrounding the Spanish-American War, U.S. entry into the First World War, and potential U.S. membership in the League of Nations—debates that were constitutive of larger battles over the nature of American society and its fragile political institutions and freedoms. During this period, foreign and domestic policy were often linked as part of a cohesive political vision for the country. Nichols illustrates this through intellectual profiles of some of the period’s most influential figures, including senators Henry Cabot Lodge and William Borah, socialist leader Eugene Debs, philosopher and psychologist William James, journalist Randolph Bourne, and the peace activist Emily Balch. Each of them interpreted isolationism and internationalism in distinct ways, sometimes deploying the concepts more for rhetorical purposes than as cornerstones of a particular worldview. Today, isolationism is often portrayed as intellectually bankrupt, a redoubt for idealists, nationalists, xenophobes, and fools. Yet the term now used as a political epithet has deep roots in American political culture. Isolationist principles can be traced back to George Washington’s farewell address, during which he urged his countrymen to steer clear of “foreign entanglements” while actively seeking nonbinding commercial ties. (Whether economic commitments do in fact entail political commitments is another matter.) Thomas Jefferson echoed this sentiment when he urged for “commerce with all nations, [and] alliance with none.” Even the Monroe Doctrine, in which the United States declared itself the regional hegemon and demanded noninterference from European states in the Western hemisphere, was often viewed as a means of isolating the United States from Europe and its messy alliance system. In Nichols’s telling, however, modern isolationism was born from the debates surrounding the Spanish-American War and the U.S. annexation of the Philippines. Here isolationism began to take on a much more explicitly anti-imperialist bent. Progressive isolationists such as William James found U.S. policy in the Philippines—which it had “liberated” from Spanish rule just to fight a bloody counterinsurgency against Philippine nationalists—anathema to American democratic traditions and ideas about national self-determination. As Promise and Peril shows, however, “cosmopolitan isolationists” like James never called for “cultural, economic, or complete political separation from the rest of the world.” Rather, they wanted the United States to engage with other nations peacefully and without pretensions of domination. They saw the United States as a potential force for good in the world, but they also placed great value on neutrality and non-entanglement, and wanted America to focus on creating a more just domestic order. James’s anti-imperialism was directly related to his fear of the effects of “bigness.” He argued forcefully against all concentrations of power, especially those between business, political, and military interests. He knew that such vested interests would grow larger and more difficult to control if America became an overseas empire. Others, such as “isolationist imperialist” Henry Cabot Lodge, the powerful senator from Massachusetts, argued that fighting the Spanish-American War and annexing the Philippines were isolationist actions to their core. First, banishing the Spanish from the Caribbean comported with the Monroe Doctrine; second, adding colonies such as the Philippines would lead to greater economic growth without exposing the United States to the vicissitudes of outside trade. Prior to the Spanish-American War, many feared that the American economy’s rapid growth would lead to a surplus of domestic goods and cause an economic disaster. New markets needed to be opened, and the best way to do so was to dominate a given market—that is, a country—politically. Lodge’s defense of this “large policy” was public and, by today’s standards, quite bald. Other proponents of this policy included Teddy Roosevelt (who also believed that war was good for the national character) and a significant portion of the business class. For Lodge and Roosevelt, “isolationism” meant what is commonly referred to today as “unilateralism”: the ability for the United States to do what it wants, when it wants. Other “isolationists” espoused principles that we would today call internationalist. Randolph Bourne, a precocious journalist working for the New Republic, passionately opposed American entry into the First World War, much to the detriment of his writing career. He argued that hypernationalism would cause lasting damage to the American social fabric. He was especially repulsed by wartime campaigns to Americanize immigrants. Bourne instead envisioned a “transnational America”: a place that, because of its distinct cultural and political traditions and ethnic diversity, could become an example to the rest of the world. Its respect for plurality at home could influence other countries by example, but also by allowing it to mediate international disputes without becoming a party to them. Bourne wanted an America fully engaged with the world, but not embroiled in military conflicts or alliances. This was also the case for William Borah, the progressive Republican senator from Idaho. Borah was an agrarian populist and something of a Jeffersonian: he believed axiomatically in local democracy and rejected many forms of federal encroachment. He was opposed to extensive immigration, but not “anti-immigrant.” Borah thought that America was strengthened by its complex ethnic makeup and that an imbalance tilted toward one group or another would have deleterious effects. But it is his famously isolationist foreign policy views for which Borah is best known. As Nichols writes: He was consistent in an anti-imperialist stance against U.S. domination abroad; yet he was ambivalent in cases involving what he saw as involving obvious national interest….He also without fail argued that any open-ended military alliances were to be avoided at all costs, while arguing that to minimize war abroad as well as conflict at home should always be a top priority for American politicians. Borah thus cautiously supported entry into the First World War on national interest grounds, but also led a group of senators known as “the irreconcilables” in their successful effort to prevent U.S. entry into the League of Nations. His paramount concern was the collective security agreement in the organization’s charter: he would not assent to a treaty that stipulated that the United States would be obligated to intervene in wars between distant powers where the country had no serious interest at stake. Borah possessed an alternative vision for a more just and pacific international order. Less than a decade after he helped scuttle American accession to the League, he helped pass the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) in a nearly unanimous Senate vote. More than sixty states eventually became party to the pact, which outlawed war between its signatories and required them to settle their disputes through peaceful means. Today, realists sneer at the idealism of Kellogg-Briand, but the Senate was aware of the pact’s limitations and carved out clear exceptions for cases of national defense. Some supporters believed that, if nothing else, the law would help strengthen an emerging international norm against war. (Given what followed, this seems like a sad exercise in wish-fulfillment.) Unlike the League of Nations charter, the treaty faced almost no opposition from the isolationist bloc in the Senate, since it did not require the United States to enter into a collective security agreement or abrogate its sovereignty. This was a kind of internationalism Borah and his irreconcilables could proudly support. The United States today looks very different from the country in which Borah, let alone William James, lived, both domestically (where political and civil freedoms have been extended to women, African Americans, and gays and lesbians) and internationally (with its leading role in many global institutions). But different strains of isolationism persist. Newt Gingrich has argued for a policy of total “energy independence” (in other words, domestic drilling) while fulminating against President Obama for “bowing” to the Saudi king. While recently driving through an agricultural region of rural Colorado, I saw a giant roadside billboard calling for American withdrawal from the UN. Yet in the last decade, the Republican Party, with the partial exception of its Ron Paul/libertarian faction, has veered into such a belligerent unilateralism that its graybeards—one of whom, Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana, just lost a primary to a far-right challenger partly because of his reasonableness on foreign affairs—were barely able to ensure Senate ratification of a key nuclear arms reduction treaty with Russia. Many of these same people desire a unilateral war with Iran. And it isn’t just Republicans. Drone attacks have intensified in Yemen, Pakistan, and elsewhere under the Obama administration. Massive troop deployments continue unabated. We spend over $600 billion dollars a year on our military budget; the next largest is China’s, at “only” around $100 billion. Administrations come and go, but the national security state appears here to stay.

## TO DA

#### No risk of Asia war – Peaceful China and multilateral institutions

Bitzinger and Desker, 9

[Richard, Senior Fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Barry, Dean of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Director of the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, “ Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival | vol. 50 no. 6 | December 2008–January 2009

 The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnational terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely. This is not to say that the region will not undergo significant changes. The rise of China constitutes perhaps the most significant challenge to regional security and stability – and, from Washington’s vantage point, to American hegemony in the Asia-Pacific. The United States increasingly sees China as its key peer challenger in Asia: China was singled out in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review as having, among the ‘major and emerging powers … the greatest potential to compete militarily with the United States’.1 Although the United States has been the hegemon in the Asia-Pacific since the end of the Second World War, it will probably not remain so over the next 25 years. A rising China will present a critical foreign-policy challenge, in some ways more difficult than that posed by the Soviet Union during the Cold War.2 While the Soviet Union was a political and strategic competitor, China will be a formidable political, strategic and economic competitor. This development will lead to profound changes in the strategic environment of the Asia-Pacific. Still, the rise of China does not automatically mean that conflict is more likely; the emergence of a more assertive China does not mean a more aggressive China. While Beijing is increasingly prone to push its own agenda, defend its interests, engage in more nationalistic – even chauvinistic – behaviour (witness the Olympic torch counter-protests), and seek to displace the United States as the regional hegemon, this does not necessarily translate into an expansionist or warlike China. If anything, Beijing appears content to press its claims peacefully (if forcefully) through existing avenues and institutions of international relations, particularly by co-opting these to meet its own purposes. This ‘soft power’ process can be described as an emerging ‘Beijing Consensus’ in regional international affairs. Moreover, when the Chinese military build-up is examined closely, it is clear that the country’s war machine, while certainly worth taking seriously, is not quite as threatening as some might argue.

#### No up-front appropriations

**DOE 11**,

 “Funding Federal Energy and Water Projects”, July, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/52085.pdf>

On-site renewable PPAs allow Federal agencies to fund on-site renewable energy projects with no upfront capital costs incurred. A developer installs a renewable energy system on agency property under an agreement that the agency will purchase the power generated by the system. The agency pays for the system through these power purchase payments over the life of the contract. After installation, the developer owns, operates, and maintains the system for the life of the contract. The PPA price is typically determined through a competitive procurement process.

#### Massive military renewables program now

Colman ‘12

Zack Colman, The Hill, 8/7/12, White House to seek $7B in green energy contracts for military, thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/242593-army-announces-renewable-energy-contracts-as-white-house-continues-green-push

The White House announced Tuesday it is inviting contract proposals from green energy firms to boost the Army’s use of renewable energy. The administration is making **$7 billion available** for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to spend on locally-generated biomass, geothermal, solar or wind energy for up to 30 years. The move is part of a broader White House-led push to green the armed forces, **over GOP opposition**, **which claims the efforts are a waste of taxpayer dollars**. The Defense Department has set ambitious targets, aiming for renewable sources to account for 25 percent of its energy by 2025, with the Army working toward getting 1 gigawatt of power from green sources by that year. Heather Zichal, the White House deputy assistant for energy and climate change, praised the DOD’s “extraordinary work” to promote renewable energy usage, in a media call on Tuesday. She said alternative energy will reduce costs and enhance national security. Republicans, however, have pressed the White House and military to abandon some alternative energy programs. They say the efforts cost too much with budget sequestration threatening to slash the defense budget by $492 billion over 10 years. Zichal, though, said **the president was fully behind the push** and believed the military’s turn toward alternative energy was “operationally necessary, financially prudent and mission critical.” She also lauded the Navy’s July demonstration of its “Great Green Fleet” aircraft carrier strike group. That Pacific Rim exercise tested a fuel that combined a $26-per-gallon biofuel with conventional petroleum. On Monday, the Army, along with the Interior Department, announced it would integrate green energy electricity sources such as wind and solar at military installations. Interior and the Army said those power generators would keep the lights on should the commercial electric grid fail. **The military-centric announcements are** one **part of a larger White House renewable energy blitz** this week. Earlier Tuesday, the administration revealed it would fast-track seven solar and wind electricity projects on federal lands and also held a news conference celebrating the completion of the first wind farm on federal lands in Nevada.

#### Alt causes—

#### Cost inflation

Murdock 12

Clark Murdock, CSIS Defense and National Security Group Senior Adviser, 1/10/12, Weaker Defense Dollars, www.defensenews.com/article/20120610/DEFFEAT05/306100005/Weaker-Defense-Dollars

The White House and Capitol Hill have spent months publicly battling over the size of defense cuts, while the Defense Department faces a far greater threat from within: the prospect of not only fewer defense dollars but also **weaker defense dollars**. Most of the current commentary inside the Capital Beltway is focused on the $500 billion in sequestration cuts that could emerge in January, **but it is the escalating cost of continuing to do business that has sapped the defense dollar’s purchasing power**. The deepest level of cuts being envisioned, the dreaded sequester, only goes half as far as has been seen in every previous drawdown this century, including a drop of 43 percent after the Korean War, 33 percent after the Vietnam War and 36 percent following the Cold War. Nonetheless, senior Pentagon officials have stridently opposed these cuts, invoking epithets ranging from “mindless” and “devastating” to “catastrophic.” This reaction is likely due to the fact that the defense budget is being hollowed out by internal cost inflation. The defense budget is $300 billion larger than it was in 2001, and yet there are fewer dollars available today for buying weapons and fielding new capabilities. Indeed, increasing personnel, operations and acquisition costs have combined to form a three-headed monster that is eating away at the foundation of U.S. military superiority. **Personnel and operating costs** have always made up the largest portion of the budget, but they have recently **ballooned to 70 percent of the total budget and are squeezing out** the **accounts that pay for new hardware and** the **development of** the **next generation of systems**. If personnel costs are allowed to continue to grow at their current rate, they will, as Todd Harrison of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments has observed, “consume the entire defense budget by FY2039.”

#### Sequestration

Murdock 12

Clark Murdock, CSIS defense and national security group senior adviser, May 2012, Planning for a Deep Defense: Drawdown—Part I, http://csis.org/files/publication/120522\_DD\_Interim\_Report.pdf

Although some are still in denial about the imposition of the bipartisan BCA cuts,28 the post- 9/11 drawdown will both be deeper and steeper than DoD (and its supporters) clearly hope. As discussed in Appendix B, the sequester cuts alone would reduce the defense budget by another 9 percent. Although gaming the post-November 2012 "Taxmageddon" scenario -- the end of CY2012 brings an end to the Bush tax cuts and the Obama payroll tax cut, in addition to triggering the budget deficit reduction sequester mechanism -- has become a cottage industry in Washington, the likelihood that DoD will escape further reductions seems quite small. Preventing the imposition of sequester or, more likely, lifting the sequester once it's triggered will require a "grand bargain" deal on deficit reduction that consists of entitlement cuts and tax increases (sometimes called revenue enhancements). The defense budget, which constitutes 54 percent of discretionary spending, will be part of the solution, given Democratic aversion to entitlement cuts and Republican antipathy to tax increases. Optimistic (from DoD's perspective) scenarios are for a total drawdown of $800-900B, which would be a 15-17 percent cut from the FY 2012 FYDP. Pessimistic (again from DoD's perspective) estimates run from a $1.5T decrease (28 percent) and above. This author's best guess -- $1.2-1.5T (23-28 percent) depending on how Republicans and Democrats fare in the presidential and congressional races. If President Obama wins re-election, the Democrats retain control of the Senate, and the GOP loses strength in the House, DoD is likely to take a bigger hit ($1.5T). If Republicans take the presidency and control both houses of Congress, they might prefer to exempt DoD altogether from the contraction in government spending (see footnote 28 and statements by candidate Mitt Romney), but Democratic strength in Senate (and their likely ability to prevent cloture by denying the GOP 60-vote margins) will, in the author’s view, keep DoD at the drawdown table.

## 2AC CP—AT ARPA-E

#### DOD is key—

#### Usable tech—non-military first mover status means the reactors aren’t usable for military bases—that’s Andres and Breetz

#### Market size—investors need a large market to guarantee a return on investment—only the DOD allows for successful commercialization—that’s Marqueese

#### And implementation – licensing and dual use tech make DoD a natural fit

Hayward et al 10

Steven Hayward, AEI Resident Scholar, Mark Muro, Brookings Institute Metropolitan Policy Program, Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger, Breakthrough institute cofounders, October 2010, Post-Partisan Power, thebreakthrough.org/blog/Post-Partisan Power.pdf

In addition to reforming energy deployment subsidies and launching a new competitive deployment strategy, the nation should once again leverage the power of federal procurement to establish demanding requirements to drive innovation and improvement in new energy technologies. The DOD has a long track record of using the power of procurement to successfully drive the commercialization and improvement of new technologies, many of which later spun off into broader commercial adoption. In contrast, the DOE has no way to either procure or use energy technologies at commercial scale. The DOD should help fill this void, once again using procurement to advance a range of potential dual-use energy innovations. The Pentagon’s 2010 “Quadrennial Defense Review” prioritizes expanded DOD involvement in energy innovation—and with good reason.69 The U.S. military today uses more oil than Sweden and more electricity than Denmark. Every $10 increase in the price of oil costs the DOD more than $1 billion dollars, sapping money that should be used to equip our troops for critical missions at home and abroad.70 With fuel convoys costing both lives and money every day in Iraq and Afghanistan, questions of energy are understandably high on the list of Pentagon priorities, and a growing community of national security experts, including both active and retired generals and flag officers, has identified the development of new energy alternatives that can both reduce America’s exposure to volatile oil markets and enhance military operational capabilities as key to securing the nation’s defense.71 Congress should provide new funds necessary to secure America’s energy future and national defense, providing up to $5 billion annually (as needed) to support DOD efforts to procure, demonstrate, test, validate, and improve a suite of cutting-edge energy technologies with potential to enhance American energy security or improve the strategic and tactical capabilities of the American armed forces. Energy technologies with clear dual-use commercial and military potential well suited to DOD procurement could include: advanced biofuels, including aviation fuels; advanced solar thermal and photovoltaic power technologies; improved batteries; electric vehicles; and new, modular nuclear reactors (discussed in greater detail below). As discussed above, DOD should work closely with ARPA-E and other research initiatives in both DOD and DOE to ensure a steady flow of energy innovation geared towards military needs. Procurement contracts should require continued innovation and cost improvements from supplying firms and should be competitively awarded. New efforts should be pursued to ensure that innovative firms both large and small can participate in procurement contracts and the military can benefit from the best American innovations, no matter where they arise.72 Embrace the Potential of Nuclear — But Pursue a Portfolio A new generation of smaller, innovative nuclear reactors holds great promise in providing affordable, reliable, zero-carbon power and heat to utilities of all sizes, industrial facilities, and military bases. For decades, small reactors between one-tenth to one-twentieth the size of existing commercial nuclear plants have powered U.S. aircraft carriers and submarine fleets. New modular commercial reactor designs based on the same reliable technology are smaller, safer, and less expensive than older designs and have the potential to be affordably mass-manufactured. Such technologies also offer the possibility of greater applicability globally and could potentially represent a new high-value, export-oriented manufacturing industry for the U.S. economy. A new generation of more advanced designs may hold even greater promise for the future.73 Modular reactor designs should receive priority attention from the Departments of Energy and Defense, who can each work to research advanced reactor technologies, license and approve new commercial modular reactor designs, and procure and demonstrate small modular reactors at DOE nuclear facilities and DOD military bases.

#### DoD won’t procure

Bonvillian and Van Atta 12

William B. Bonvillian, Director of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Washington DC Office, and Richard Van Atta, Senior Research Analyst at the Institute for Defense Analyses, former Department of Defense Special Assistant for Dual Use Technology Policy and Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Dual Use and Commercial Programs, March 2012, Energy Innovation at the Department of Defense: Assessing the Opportunities, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/library/report/energy-innovation-department-defense-assessing-opportunities

The Remaining Technology Implementation Challenge for DARPA and ARPA-E Both DARPA and ARPA-E face a profound challenge in technology implementation. For DARPA, the Cold War era of major defense acquisition budgets is long gone, and defense “recapitalization”— replacement of the existing generation of aircraft, ships, and land vehicles with new defense platforms—is evolving at a glacial pace. Finding homes for its evolving technologies, therefore, has increasingly become a difficult task for DARPA. Because technology transition was once a relatively straightforward task for DARPA, it has not yet fully faced up to the implications of how complex it has now become. ARPA-E faces a technology transfer problem of the first magnitude: the U.S. has a very limited history of moving technology advances into and transforming CELS, including in energy. Although ARPA-E faces a long list of challenges, the problem of technology implementation is perhaps the most profound. This is because of the difficulty new energy technologies face, not only with the problem of the Valley of Death in moving from research to late-stage development, but the problem endemic to CELS of market launch—implementing technology at scale. ARPA-E has worked imaginatively to structure new elements into its model to address this problem. The models of the Strategic Environmental R&D Program (SERDP) and Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP) from DoD, where the R&D entity directly hands off to the test bed, provides an interesting new model in the energy area for ARPA-E to consider as it focuses on technology implementation. Collaboration with these programs, which ARPA-E is actively working on, may provide a crucial new tool set. ARPA-E is not alone in facing this implementation problem; the applied agencies at DOE, led by EERE, face a similar problem, and the SERDP/ESTCP combined model of R&D-test bed-deployment offers an interesting new approach. DARPA, too, despite remarkable past successes, is not immune, as suggested above, from the implementation problem, which appears to be growing. It, too, might learn lessons and make further uses of the SERDP/ESTCP approach. In summary, implementation presents a major challenge for both agencies. DARPA needs to consider its existing portfolio of implementation support, and consider better connection to available tools (such as Mantech and the Defense Production Act, for example) for its manufacturing initiatives. ARPA-E has worked imaginatively on its implementation capabilities, but the com- plexity of its task requires it to consider additional mechanisms.

#### Can’t commercialize

Bonvillian and Van Atta 12

William B. Bonvillian, Director of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Washington DC Office, and Richard Van Atta, Senior Research Analyst at the Institute for Defense Analyses, former Department of Defense Special Assistant for Dual Use Technology Policy and Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Dual Use and Commercial Programs, March 2012, Energy Innovation at the Department of Defense: Assessing the Opportunities, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/library/report/energy-innovation-department-defense-assessing-opportunities

Role as first adopter/initial-market creator. DARPA has frequently undertaken a technology insertion role; in coordination with other parts of DoD it has been able to create initial markets for its new technologies, allowing the Department to serve as first technology adopter. **DOE offers no comparable first market for ARPA-E technologies**. Given DoD’s interest in energy technology advances, it could serve as an initial market. ARPA-E will need to develop further strategies to find first adopters and initial markets, because the lack of track records of costs and efficiencies constitutes a serious barrier to commercializing and scaling new energy technologies.

#### DoD already established its recommendations for SMR adoption

King 11

Marcus King, Ph.D., Center for Naval Analyses Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy TeamLaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, March 2011, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S.Military Installations, www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear Power on Military Installations D0023932 A5.pdf

Recognizing nuclear power as a potential benefit to Department of Defense (DoD) facilities, Congress directed the DoD, in section 2845 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) of 2010, to “conduct a study to assess the feasibility of developing nuclear power plants on military installations” [12]. Specifically, the study is to consider the following topics: • Options for construction and operation • Cost estimates and the potential for life-cycle cost savings • Potential energy security advantages • Additional infrastructure costs • Effect on the quality of life of military personnel • Regulatory, state, and local concerns • Effect on operations on military installations • Potential environmental liabilities • Factors that may impact safe colocation of nuclear power plants on military installations • Other factors that bear on the feasibility of developing nuclear power plants on military installations. To meet this requirement, the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, DUSD(I&E), asked CNA to conduct this feasibility study. The CNA effort was directed by a steering group consisting of representatives from DUSD (I&E), each of the military departments, DOE, NRC, and DOE Labs. This report documents our analysis and findings.

#### AND—It recommended against being an early adopter—proves the CP can’t establish a bureaucratic consensus for the plan

King 11

Marcus King, Ph.D., Center for Naval Analyses Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy TeamLaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, March 2011, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S.Military Installations, www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear Power on Military Installations D0023932 A5.pdf

The most significant risk for SMR power plants is associated with being an early adoptor of new technology. From a DoD perspective, economic feasibility depends on negotiating arrangements for the project that ensure DoD is not responsible for FOAK expenses. Having contractor owners and operators would reduce operating risks associated with being an early adoptor. If partners can’t be found who are willing to bear the FOAK and early adoptor risks then DoD should not undertake such a project. The recent MOU between DOE and DoD identifies a framework for cooperation and partnership for sharing risks associated with this type of project.

## Microgrid CP

Doesn’t solve Alaska—magnuson—regulatory confusion specifically means roll out impossible

#### Doesn’t solve regulatory confusion or cyberdefense

Daniel Sater 11, Research Fellow at Global Green USA’s Security and Sustainability Office, “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions”, August, <http://globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf>

Cybersecurity remains one of the leading challenges impeding the development of a smart grid. In January 2011, the GAO published a report on the progress being made on cybersecurity as it related to smart grids71. Unfortunately, the report did not specifically address microgrids. The GAO found six challenges, however, to the development of a smart grid. The DOD is nonetheless well suited to handle the challenges listed by the GAO and the confinement of microgrids to military installations should mitigate many cybersecurity risks. The challenges listed by the GAO and the advantages of military microgrids for cybersecurity appear below. Challenge 1: Aspects of the regulatory environment may make it difficult to ensure smart grid systems’ cybersecurity. The federal government and state governments regulate electricity production and distribution. Having multiple entities produce regulations can lead to conflicting rules and thus confusion. Microgrids on military installations should avoid many of the regulatory issues the GAO found with the smart grid. The confinement of microgrids to military bases means that only the DOD will have regulatory control over them. There is precedent for states to exempt military installations from state regulations. According to a different GAO report, states often excluded military installations from their renewable energy-production goals.72 Furthermore, it is unlikely that any state government would want to get into the politically untenable battle with the Pentagon over issuing competing regulations governing military bases. Challenge 2: Utilities are focusing on regulatory compliance instead of comprehensive security. Microgrid cybersecurity will benefit from having the same entity, the DOD, issue the microgrid regulations and own the microgrids. Utilities have little incentive to invest in security measures past the bare minimum necessary for regulatory compliance. However, unlike a utility, the DOD will suffer in the event of a cybersecurity failure and thus has incentives to pursue comprehensive security. Challenge 3: The electric industry does not have an effective mechanism for sharing information on cybersecurity. Different utility companies across different states do not have a central authority analogous to that which military bases have in the Pentagon. Though there will certainly be bureaucracy, the DOD has more capacity to share information about cybersecurity and cyber-attacks than utilities. Challenge 4: Consumers are not adequately informed about the benefits, costs, and risks associated with smart grid systems. The DOD can take steps to inform all of its employees about microgrids in ways that may not be available to utilities to inform their customers. The DOD could require short classes on the benefits and risks of microgrids for all its employees and more rigorous education for its base commanders and others making decisions about grid implementation. A utility company cannot require its customers to take a class. A utility’s best option for educating its customers would be to send out information packets with monthly bills and hope that consumers read them. Challenge 5: There is a lack of security features being built into certain smart grid systems. Given the importance of the DOD’s mission and the potentially catastrophic repercussions of lax cybersecurity, the Pentagon will not take the security of its microgrids lightly, especially with the recent publication of the “Department of Defense Strategy for Operating in Cyberspace.”73 Challenge 6: The electricity industry does not have metrics for evaluating cybersecurity. The lack of evaluation metrics is a serious problem, but the DOD could instruct USCYBERCOM to create a specific set of metrics for microgrid development.

#### Plan spills over to space nuclear power.

David 12

(Leonard, has been reporting on the space industry for more than five decades. He is a winner of last year's National Space Club Press Award and a past editor-in-chief of the National Space Society's Ad Astra and Space World magazines. He has written for SPACE.com since 1999, “ Air Force Eyes Nuclear Reactors, Beamed Power for Spacecraft” 22 February 2012, http://www.space.com/14643-air-force-space-nuclear-reactors-power-beaming.html)

Work on small modular nuclear reactors on Earth is highlighted in the Air Force report: "While the implementation of such a technology should be weighed heavily against potential catastrophic outcomes, many **investments into small modular reactors can be leveraged for space-based systems**. As these nuclear power plants decrease in size, their utility on board space-based assets increases."

The report explains that the Air Force space systems portfolio should consider piloting small modular nuclear systems, a view previously recommended by the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board.

#### That’s key to permanent off-earth settlements.

ScienceDaily ‘9

(“'Trash Can' Nuclear Reactors Could Power Human Outpost On Moon Or Mars,” <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/10/091004020806.htm>, AM)

Three recent tests at different NASA centers and a national lab have successfully demonstrated key technologies required for compact fission-based nuclear power plants for human settlements on other worlds. NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., offers a one-of-a-kind test facility which, without using nuclear materials, enables engineers to simulate the nuclear power process of heat transfer from a reactor to a power converter. "The recent tests bear out that Fission surface power system could be an important source of energy for exploration on the moon and Mars," said Mike Houts, project manager for nuclear systems at Marshall. "This power system could provide an abundant source of reliable, cost-effective energy and may be used anywhere on the lunar surface." For this particular test series, the Marshall reactor simulator was linked to a Stirling engine, developed by NASA’s Glenn Research Center in Cleveland. The Stirling engine, named for 19th-century industrialist and inventor Robert Stirling, converts heat into electricity. The Marshall reactor simulator included a specialized pump, provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, and a coolant loop filled with a mixture of sodium and potassium. The coolant loop provided heat to the Stirling engine at conditions very similar to an actual fission-based surface power system. The joint testing helped resolve potential integration issues and provided information and experience needed to reduce technology risks associated with this system concept. The testing of the Stirling engine with the Marshall reactor simulator may well be a key factor in demonstrating the readiness of fission surface power technology, and could provide NASA with an efficient and robust system to produce power in the harsh environment on the moon and Mars. NASA's current plan for human space exploration is to return astronauts to the moon by 2020 on expeditions that could lead to a permanent outpost for exploring the lunar surface and testing technologies that could aid a manned mission to Mars. The space agency has been studying the feasibility of using nuclear fission power generators to support future moon bases. Engineers performed tests in recent weeks as part of a joint effort by NASA and the Department of Energy. Nuclear fission power plants work by splitting the nuclei of atoms in a sustainable, controllable reaction that releases heat, which can then be funneled through a power converter to transfer that energy into usable electricity. "A small fission-based nuclear reactor coupled with a Stirling engine could provide up to 40 kilowatts of usable energy, enough to support a moon base or Mars outpost," said Houts. That's about the same amount of power needed to supply eight houses on Earth, NASA officials have said. The test series was conducted as part of the fission-based surface power project, within NASA's Exploration Technology Development Program, which is tasked with developing advanced technologies that will enable NASA to conduct future human exploration missions, while reducing mission risk and cost.

#### Colonization solves inevitable extinction.

Matheny ‘7

(Jason, PhD Student in School of Public Health @ Johns Hopkins, Risk Analysis: An International Journal, “Reducing the Risk of Human Extinction”, 27:5, Wiley InterScience)

As for astronomical risks, to escape our sun's death, humanity will eventually need to relocate. If we survive the next century, we are likely to build self-sufficient colonies in space. We would be motivated by self-interest to do so, as asteroids, moons, and planets have valuable resources to mine, and the technological requirements for colonization are not beyond imagination (Kargel, 1994; Lewis, 1996). Colonizing space sooner, rather than later, could reduce extinction risk (Gott, 1999; Hartmann, 1984; Leslie, 1999), as a species' survivability is closely related to the extent of its range (Hecht, 2006). Citing, in particular, the threat of new biological weapons, Stephen Hawking has said, "I don't think the human race will survive the next thousand years, unless we spread into space. There are too many accidents that can befall life on a single planet" (Highfield, 2001). Similarly, NASA Administrator, Michael Griffin (2006), recently remarked: "The history of life on Earth is the history of extinction events, and human expansion into the Solar System is, in the end, fundamentally about the survival of the species."

## 2AC Cliff—Wake

#### Decline doesn’t cause war

Morris Miller, Professor of Administration @ the University of Ottawa, ‘2K

(Interdisciplinary Science Review, v 25 n4 2000 p ingenta connect)

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

#### No impact uniqueness—stimulus package will end and government spending will decline—businesses are already reacting

Seeking Alpha 11/9/12

Investment News Site, “Even With A Fiscal Cliff Deal, Stocks And The U.S. Economy Will Unravel In 2013,” <http://seekingalpha.com/article/995621-even-with-a-fiscal-cliff-deal-stocks-and-the-u-s-economy-will-unravel-in-2013>, AM

Deal or no deal on the Fiscal Cliff, taxes are going higher, and the level of U.S. Government spending is going to dwindle because the nearly $1 trillion Obama stimulus package is done, and current levels of spending on defense, entitlements and other areas are also not sustainable and are poised for budget cuts. We will soon see the economic support that the Bush tax cuts, heavy government spending and the massive Obama stimulus plan provided as they evaporate and are replaced with higher tax rates and budget cuts. To get a sampling of what the combined impact of higher taxes and reduced government spending might feel like in 2013, all we have to do is take a look at Europe. Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece have all raised taxes and cut government spending in the past couple of years, and the resulting effects have been quite devastating. It did not take long for unemployment to spike and economic weakness to set in as consumers and businesses also cut spending. We are already seeing signs of this in the United States in advance of a potential Fiscal Cliff deal as corporations become more cautious, horde cash and reduce hiring. It also looks like U.S. consumers are becoming more cautious as even companies like McDonald's (MCD) see same store sales drop for the first time in 9 years. Industrial companies like Caterpillar (CAT) have also been signaling a slowdown as it recently reduced earnings guidance for the next couple of years. Stock market The stock market is starting to reflect the realities facing the United States. The Standard & Poors 500 Index (SPY) which trades for about 14 times earnings, has begun to trade lower and currently is just slightly above the 200-day moving average. I expect it to break below that key support level in the coming weeks and months which is likely to spur additional selling pressure. This country and its economy have been driven largely by borrowed money for many years, and that party is coming to an end. While the Obama stimulus plan and postponement of budget cuts has masked and delayed the real weakness in the economy for the past couple of years, that bandage is coming off soon and investors should consider getting very defensive in advance of 2013, when the effects of rising taxes and budget cuts will bear down hard on the economy. It's time to raise cash and avoid industrial stocks like Caterpillar and General Electric (GE), which are highly sensitive to the economic cycles.

#### Cliff negotiations collapse now:

#### Ideological lock-in

Cook, writer for the National Journal, 11/8/2012

(Nancy, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/to-avert-a-fiscal-cliff-catastrophe-someone-has-to-blink-20121108)

**The far more likely scenario** for both parties **is a swan dive over the fiscal cliff**. The election gave Obama some leverage, especially since the Democrats retained control of the Senate. But House Republicans also kept their majority. **Both parties view the status quo as an affirmation of their power**. “The president feels like his mandate from a slim margin of victory is to raise taxes,” says a Republican Senate aide privy to GOP discussions. “A razor-thin margin will not change the principles of the Republicans.” A plunge would follow weeks of behind-the-scenes negotiations, public political posturing, and pressure from outside groups—both political and business ones. And it would surely shake the nation’s confidence. But it might not be all bad. True, from an economic standpoint, it would turn deficit reduction into a de facto program of austerity, just as the unemployment rate is sinking and the economy is recovering. But from a purely political standpoint, the cliff dive would allow lawmakers to negotiate with a clean slate. **Neither party likes a recession** per se, **but they may both dislike one less than they dislike surrendering their entrenched tax positions**.

Fiat solves the link—plan passes instantaneously so it doesn’t require PC

#### Tea party blocks

Michael Mathes, AFP, 11/9/12, Tea Party still a force, despite some losses, www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5ghHKvO-nUR1ZzCDsfpdTFVr4I2FQ?docId=CNG.f123008f7575a156fb9c945fe5b10c48.6f1

Despite a handful of high-profile losses by Tea Party-backed candidates, the anti-tax, small-government movement solidified its imprint in the US Congress, with the bulk of its lawmakers re-elected. Some Democrats took Tuesday's election -- in which President Barack Obama defeated Republican Mitt Romney, increased his Senate majority and clawed back some seats in the House -- as a sign of diminished Tea Party stature two years after many candidates backed by the movement romped to victory in Congress. House Speaker John Boehner waved off potentially disruptive influences of the fiscally conservative movement in the House of Representatives as he braces for clutch negotiations with Democrats over looming challenges known as the "fiscal cliff." And he defended the group's goals as broadly consistent with those of Republicans of all stripes within the 435-member House. "All of us who were elected 2010 were supported by the Tea Party," he told ABC News on Thursday. "These are ordinary Americans who have taken a more active role in our government, they want solutions," Boehner declared, saying the Republican Party's leadership and members affiliated with the movement "all understand each other a lot better." But some experts and Tea Party leaders see a fresh clash brewing, even as the movement could be alienating voters in battlegrounds like Florida and red states like Missouri. "There will be something like a civil war within the Republican Party, with the extreme right of Tea Partyers and the Christian right on one side, and those who were formerly the GOP's mainstream on the other," Brigitte Nacos, a politics professor at Columbia University who tracks the movement, told AFP. "What is mostly at stake here is the future of the GOP" and its ability to win presidential elections and congressional majorities, she added. At least 51 of the 55 Tea Party members who ran for re-election on November 6 will return for the 113th Congress that begins in January, although there were some key defeats. Among them was Allen West, the outspoken former US Army officer and Tea Party hero for his fiery small-government stance, who recently caught criticism when he branded 80 Democrats as "members of the Communist Party." West is seeking a recount in his Florida district and has not conceded. Representative Joe Walsh also went down. And in two crucial US Senate races, Tea Party-backed candidates Todd Akin and Richard Mourdock both slumped to defeat, after each recently made comments about abortion that made them appear unsympathetic to rape victims. Some veteran conservative ideologues were re-elected to the House after tough races, notably Michele Bachmann, a founder of the Tea Party Caucus, who reportedly spent 12 times as much money as her Democratic rival but won her seat by just 3,000 votes. Jenny Beth Martin, founder of Tea Party Patriots, one of the first such groups in the nation, said that with the "catastrophic loss" of Republican establishment candidate Romney, the Tea Party is the "last best hope" for the country to adhere to its founding principles. "Our work begins again today," she said in a statement. "We will turn our attention back to Congress, to fight the battles that lie ahead including balancing the budget, repealing Obamacare, cutting the debt, holding the line on the debt ceiling, and the many other issues that will arise to threaten America." But Senator Charles Schumer, the number three Democrat in the Senate, described the Tea Party as on the "decline," with several of their candidates having to moderate their positions to win re-election after riding 2010's Tea Party wave. "Those Tea Party candidates who won, many of them ran away from the Tea Party platform," Schumer said at a Christian Science Monitor breakfast on Thursday. "They are a little bit chastened, the ones who've come back," he said, adding that their demands to repeal Obama's landmark health care law or not raise the debt ceiling will "play much less prominent" a role. Tea Party lawmakers are in no way backing off, said Jacqueline Bodnar of FreedomWorks, a grassroots group promoting fiscal conservatism. "If you look qualitatively, you're seeing much stronger fiscal conservatives who are fundamentally changing the composition of the House," Bodnar said, pointing to their focus on the very issues that make up the fiscal cliff challenges that lawmakers hope to settle in the coming months. "The debt ceiling increase was once standard protocol, and now it's a battle every single time."

Not an opp cost to the plan—a rational policymaker can pass the plan and continue negotiations on the cliff—

#### Obama PC on grand bargain negotiations fail

The Hotline, 9/10/12, Slow and Steady Wins the Race, Lexis

Gaps in Obama's leadership contributed to the collapse of a "grand bargain" on spending and debt last year. with Obama "failing to cultivate congressional relationships that may have helped him break through GOP opposition, author Bob Woodward told ABC. Woodward: "President Clinton, President Reagan. And if you look at them, you can criticize them for lots of things. They by and large worked their will. On this, President Obama did not. Now, some people are going to say he was fighting a brick wall, the Republicans in the House and the Republicans in Congress. Others will say it's the president's job to figure out how to tear down that brick wall. In this case, he did not." Asked if Obama "simply wasn't ready for the job of being president," Woodward responded: "I am not ducking this. I am weighing evidence, and there's evidence that he got on top a lot of things, he did a lot of things. And there's evidence that there are gaps. He did not fix this." Woodward places "particular blame for the failure to reach a deal" with Obama, "writing that the seeds of discord were planted early in his administration." Woodward: "There's this divided-man quality to President Obama always. Initially he meets with the congressional leaders, he says you know, 'We're going to be accommodating, we're going to listen, we're going to talk, we're going to compromise.' But then they -- Republicans ask some questions and challenge him a little bit and he says 'Look I won. I'm in charge here.' And the Republicans feel totally isolated and ostracized. And this was the beginning of a war" (Klein, ABC, 9/10).

#### Obama not key to the cliff

Warren, Chicago editor for the Daily Beast, 11/9/2012

(James, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/11/09/president-obama-s-hill-challenge-in-avoiding-fiscal-cliff.html)

Obama “has to change the way he operates,” argues Cook. “The White House motto seems to be ‘No New Friends,’” his allusion to the small and tight group of mostly Chicago chums with whom the president and Michelle Obama socialize.

But **even longtime Washington hands** are unclear how the system will resolve what a prominent Republican lobbyist calls a “**three-ring policy circus**” of huge automatic spending cuts due to kick in on Jan. 1; a decision on whether to extend Bush-era tax cuts; and a decision next year on raising the debt ceiling. A longer recession and higher unemployment could be in the offing if there’s no resolution.

**And it may be equally unclear whether a more overtly engaged Obama would alter the bargaining landscape**, **given underlying political frictions in both parties**—**and changes in the capital’s own political and social culture**.

#### No link

**Appelbaum 12**

Binyamin, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R&D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8, <http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say>

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said the Defense Department had been **more successful** than other federal agencies because it is the **main user of the innovations that it finances**. The Pentagon, which spends billions each year on weapons, equipment and technology, has an **unusually direct stake in the outcome** of its research and development projects.¶ "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes."¶ Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda **in controversial areas.** No matter which party is in power, the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy technology, for example, in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

#### Winners win

**Marshall and Prins ‘11**

(BRYAN W, Miami University and BRANDON C, University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy, “Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force”, Sept, Presidential Studies Quarterly 41, no. 3)

Presidents rely heavily on Congress in converting their political capital into real policy success. Policy success not only shapes the reelection prospects of presidents, but it also builds the president’s reputation for political effectiveness and fuels the prospect for subsequent gains in political capital (Light 1982). Moreover, the president’s legislative success in foreign policy is correlated with success on the domestic front. On this point, some have largely disavowed the two-presidencies distinction while others have even argued that foreign policy has become a mere extension of domestic policy (Fleisher et al. 2000; Oldfield and Wildavsky 1989) Presidents implicitly understand that there exists a linkage between their actions in one policy area and their ability to affect another. The use of force is no exception; in promoting and protecting U.S. interests abroad, presidential decisions are made with an eye toward managing political capital at home (Fordham 2002).

No link uniqueness—DOE loan guarantees for SMRS now—that’s DOD en blog

#### No impact—they’ll delay timelines

Schiff, president and chief global strategist of Euro Pacific Capital, 11/10/2011

(Peter, “Going Over The Fiscal Cliff Isn't The Problem, It's The Solution,” http://www.businessinsider.com/extend-and-pretend-2012-11)

If you recall, the cliff was created by a deal last year when Congress couldn't find ways to trim the deficit in exchange for raising the debt ceiling. When they failed to reach an agreement, Congress knew they had to raise the debt ceiling anyway. The resulting Budget Control Act of 2011, signed in August of that year, offered the pretense that they were dealing with our long-term fiscal crisis and not simply raising the debt ceiling with no strings attached. This was done not only to appease some House Republicans, who had threatened to vote against a debt ceiling increase, but to satisfy the bond rating agencies that had threatened (I would choose a different word or provide a source to back this up)a down-grade if Congress failed to act.

Now the focus turns to how Congress will dismantle the structure it created just 16 months ago. There can be **little doubt that they will** as economists are assuring politicians that driving over the fiscal cliff will immediately bring on a recession. The expiration of the Bush era tax cuts for all taxpayers will cost Americans an estimated $423 billion in 2013 alone. Hundreds of billions of across the board spending cuts, including the military, have been delineated. **No politician would allow that to happen**.

It is amazing that members of Congress can keep a straight face as they claim to want to address our long-term deficit problem while simultaneously working to avoid any substantive action. **No doubt an agreement will be reached that will replace the looming fiscal cliff with another one farther down the road** (which they can **easily dismantle** before we actually reach the precipice). Will the rating agencies buy this bill of goods a second time? If we lack the political courage to go over this fiscal cliff, why should anyone think we will be able to stomach going over the next one? Especially since each time we delay going over the cliff, we simply increase its future size, making it that much harder to actually go over it.

#### Multiple issues before the cliff

Geewax, 11/7

(NPR Correspondent, After Election, Congress Turns To 'Fiscal Cliff,' Other Money Issues

http://www.northcountrypublicradio.org/news/npr/164474557/after-election-congress-turns-to-fiscal-cliff-other-money-issues

Still, they must try to get something done. The soon-to-expire Congress is set to convene Nov. 13. Very likely, comprehensive solutions to fiscal-cliff problems will have to wait for the new Congress in January. But because so many deadlines will be hit before then, the lawmakers will need to pass measures to cope with a number of other crises, and then stall for time on the edge of the cliff. For example, Superstorm Sandy may force lawmakers to take quick action to shore up the Federal Emergency Management Agency, also known as FEMA. The agency could get overwhelmed by the cost of helping people whose homes have been destroyed by flooding. And then there's the cost of rebuilding public transit systems. A large, bipartisan group of congressmen signed a letter this week, asking House leaders to prepare to spend more money for cleaning up after the storm. They wrote that "as the full brunt of Hurricane Sandy is quantified, Congress must stand ready to provide the aid and assistance to the people and communities most devastated by this storm." And then there's the debt ceiling. Last week, the Treasury Department warned that the country probably will hit its $16.4 trillion borrowing limit by the end of the year. If the U.S. were to hit the ceiling and risk default on its debts, it could trigger a second downgrade of the U.S. government's credit rating and another rattling of global financial markets. Aside from FEMA and the debt ceiling, Congress must find ways to delay the fiscal-cliff cluster of changes. Take just this one: the alternative minimum tax — the AMT, an obscure tax rule — is about to sharply increase taxes for about 27 million households, according to the Congressional Research Service. Any couple with children and an annual income of more than $75,000 could be facing a federal tax bill that is thousands of dollars higher this year. Yes. Their taxes would shoot up for the 2012 tax year. Once the filing season begins in January, retroactive fixes to the AMT become much more difficult to implement, so Congress must act before New Year's Eve. When first created in 1969, the AMT was intended to ensure that wealthy people could not use deductions to escape paying all taxes. But the tax was not adjusted for inflation, and Congress has had to regularly apply a "patch" to ensure that the AMT didn't apply to average families. But because of political gridlock, Congress didn't pass a patch this year — and now the deadline is looming. So, you've got **FEMA, the debt ceiling and the AMT patch all demanding immediate action, even before turning to all of the other fiscal-cliff elements**.

#### No Link—Plan doesn’t require legislation, or focus from Obama and Congress—it’s a DOD contract

#### Bipart support

Christine Todd **Whitman 12**, CASEnergy Co-Chair, Former EPA Administrator and New Jersey Governor, “Nuclear Power Garners Bipartisan Support”, August 13, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php?rss=1&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+njgroup-energy+%28Energy+%26+Environment+Experts--Q+with+Answer+Previews%29#2237728>

The energy policy that I’ve seen garner consistent support from the left and the right over the years is also one with which I’m deeply familiar. This policy involves building a diverse portfolio of low-carbon energy sources, featuring a renewed investment in nuclear energy. And it’s not just policymakers from both sides of the aisle who support nuclear energy – it’s everyday energy consumers as well. According to a Gallup poll conducted in March of this year, nearly 60 percent of Americans support the use of nuclear energy to meet our nation’s electricity needs, and a majority support expanding America’s use of nuclear power. Next-generation nuclear energy projects are underway in Georgia, South Carolina and Tennessee, thanks in part to steady popular support, as well as support from President Obama, bipartisan congressional leaders and other policymakers at the federal and state levels. An additional 10 combined construction and operating licenses for 16 plants are under review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. This support is founded in the fact that nuclear energy, safely managed, provides an efficient, reliable source of energy. In fact, nuclear power is the only baseload source of carbon-free electricity. It provides nearly two-thirds of the nation’s low-carbon electricity, and will continue to be an important source of energy well into the future given the advent of innovative large and small reactor designs. The use of nuclear energy prevents more than 613 million metric tons of carbon dioxide every year – as much CO2 as is emitted by every passenger car in America. Bipartisan support for nuclear energy also stems from the boost that it provides to local job markets and to local and state economies. As nuclear energy expands and as more than half of the industry workforce approaches retirement, the industry offers growing opportunities for well-paying careers. The industry already supports more than 100,000 jobs, and the combination of retirements and the construction of new facilities could create as many as 25,000 new jobs in the near term. What’s more, the construction of a nuclear facility spurs the creation of other local jobs in industries ranging from manufacturing to hospitality. The industry generates between $40 and $50 billion in revenue and electricity sales, or some $470 million in total economic output and $40 million in labor wages at each U.S. facility every year. That’s a powerful economic engine and a positive impact that leaders are embracing. As America refocuses on cleaner energy policies that help boost our economy, nuclear power is becoming a clear and critical part of a secure, sustainable energy portfolio. We need electricity and we want clean air; with nuclear energy we can have both. It’s a source of power that leaders on both sides of the aisle can support.