### Warming

#### No solve warming

Michael A. Levi (David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment) August 20, 2012 “The Climate Change Limits of U.S. Natural Gas” http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/08/20/the-climate-change-limits-of-u-s-natural-gas/

The Associated Press reported last week that U.S. greenhouse gas emissions have dropped to a twenty-year low on the back of abundant natural gas. “The question,” it correctly observed, “is whether the shift is just one bright spot in a big, gloomy [climate change] picture, or a potentially larger trend.” I’ve argued repeatedly in the past that surging supplies of natural gas are good news for climate change. But there are important limits to what U.S. natural gas can do. This post is going to illustrate those with some simple numbers. Let’s start with a reference point. In 2009, in advance of the Copenhagen climate summit, the United States pledged to reduce (PDF) its greenhouse gas emissions to 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. It also repeatedly emphasized its intention to reduce those emissions to 30 and 42 percent below 2005 levels by 2025 and 2030 respectively. How far down that road could a shift from coal to gas get the United States? I’m going to focus on carbon dioxide emissions from energy. The EIA currently projects that U.S. emissions will be 5,429 million metric tons of carbon dioxide (MtCO2) by 2020, assuming that currently pending fuel economy rules for 2017-25 go ahead as planned. 1,787 MtCO2of that total would come from coal; 1,371 would come from natural gas. That already reflects a gradual substitution of gas for coal. But what would happen if natural gas completely replaced coal? Assume that the emissions from gas are about half those from coal. Then U.S. emissions would drop to 4,536 MtCO2. That’s 24 percent below 2005 levels. That leads to our first conclusion: substituting natural gas for coal has the theoretical potential to get us to our 2020 carbon goals. But, unless we deploy it with carbon capture and sequestration, it cannot get us to our 2025 or 2030 goals. (The 2025 and 2030 comparisons require a little bit of extra math that I won’t go through here.) One can push this a bit farther, supposing that natural gas completely replaced oil in residential, commercial, and industrial applications. Oil use in those three sectors is projected to generate 462 MtCO2 in 2020; replacing oil with natural gas could in principle reduce those emissions by somewhere around 150 MtCO2. That doesn’t change our bottom-line conclusions. But we’re not done. These figures are extreme limits that assume spectacular gains in natural gas use. Alas those gains aren’t practical. Focus on the coal-to-gas shift. I estimated that a complete replacement of coal with natural gas could slice 894 MtCO2 off of U.S. emissions. You need to burn about 18.2 Mcf (thousand cubic feet) of natural gas to generate a ton of greenhouse gas emissions. This implies that completely replacing U.S. coal with natural gas would require roughly 16 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of additional natural gas. That’s a 60 percent increment to projected natural gas supplies in 2020. Put another way, it’s more than double the amount of natural gas currently used in U.S. power plants. This is almost certainly not a practical addition to U.S. natural gas production. Perhaps a more reasonable (but still challenging) outer limit would see half of the U.S. coal use currently anticipated for 2020 replaced with natural gas. That would result in U.S. emissions 17 percent below 2005 levels, meeting the strict part of the Copenhagen commitment but leaving a big lift for other shifts to deliver on the follow-on targets. The bottom line? Natural gas can do a lot to bend the U.S. emissions curve over the coming years. In even the medium run, though, simply moving from coal to gas is not a substitute for broader policy, at least not if the United States wants to realize the sorts of emissions cuts that both Barack Obama and John McCain talked about only four years ago. Best to think of gas as a climate opportunity – to forestall construction of long-lived and highly polluting infrastructure, to make carbon capture and sequestration cheaper, to balance intermittent renewable sources – rather than as a solution in itself.

### 2AC Initial Funding T – Incentives

#### Initial funding is the primary way energy tech is supported

**CBO 12** [“Federal Financial Support for the Development and Production of Fuels and Energy Technologies”, Congressional Budget Office, Issue Brief 2012]

The Department of Energy was established in the late ¶ 1970s in response to a dramatic increase in oil prices. ¶ Throughout most of its history, DOE has supported ¶ energy technologies primarily by funding R&D and ¶ demonstration projects. DOE’s initial funding for energy ¶ technologies was aimed at creating new domestic sources ¶ of energy.

#### DOE support for energy tech is a financial incentive for energy production

**CBO 12** [“Federal Financial Support for the Development and Production of Fuels and Energy Technologies”, Congressional Budget Office, Issue Brief 2012]

In addition, the Department of Energy supports energy ¶ technologies by making direct investments (primarily for ¶ research and development) and by providing loans or ¶ loan guarantees. That support has varied over time, but, ¶ with the exception of the substantial funding provided in ¶ the 2009 economic stimulus legislation (the American ¶ Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, or ARRA), it ¶ has generally declined in recent years—from $10 billion ¶ (in 2011 dollars) in 1980 to $3.5 billion in 2011 and ¶ $3.4 billion in 2012. More than half of that support in ¶ both 2011 and 2012 was directed toward energy efficiency and renewable energy. ¶ DOE received roughly $10 billion in funding for its subsidized credit programs in 2009 but has received only ¶ limited additional subsidy funding for those programs ¶ since then: $170 million in 2011 and no new funding in ¶ either 2010 or 2012. Between 2009 and 2012, DOE ¶ provided an estimated $4.0 billion in subsidies for about ¶ $25 billion in loans, primarily to producers of advanced ¶ vehicles, generators of solar power, and manufacturers of ¶ solar equipment.¶ Without government intervention, households and businesses do not have a financial incentive to take into ¶ account the environmental damage or other costs to ¶ the nation associated with their choices about energy ¶ production and consumption.

#### The plan gets a class 103 license because it’s aimed at producing commercially viable energy

NRC, No Date [“PART 50—DOMESTIC LICENSING OF PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION FACILITIES

http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/part050/part050-0022.html]

A class 103 license will be issued, to an applicant who qualifies, for any one or more of the following: To transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, or use a production or utilization facility for industrial or commercial purposes; Provided, however, That in the case of a production or utilization facility which is useful in the conduct of research and development activities of the types specified in section 31 of the Act, such facility is deemed to be for industrial or commercial purposes if the facility is to be used so that more than 50 percent of the annual cost of owning and operating the facility is devoted to the production of materials, products, or energy for sale or commercial distribution, or to the sale of services, other than research and development or education or training.

#### And, incentives for energy production are the commercial transfer of resources linked to market expansion

EIA, 01 [United States Department of Energy Environmental Information Incentives, Mandates, and Government Programs for Promoting Renewable Energy, “Report Date: February 2001 Next Release Date: None Incentives, Mandates, and Government Programs for Promoting Renewable Energy by Mark Gielecki, Fred Mayes, and Lawrence Prete, [http//lobby.la.psu.edu/\_107th/128\_PURPA/Agency\_Activities/EIA/Incentive\_Mandates\_and\_Government.htm](http://lobby.la.psu.edu/_107th/128_PURPA/Agency_Activities/EIA/Incentive_Mandates_and_Government.htm)]

A financial incentive is defined in this report as providing one or more of the following benefits: A transfer of economic resources by the Government to the buyer or seller of a good or service that has the effect of reducing the price paid, or, increasing the price received, respectively; Reducing the cost of production of the good or service; or, Creating or expanding a market for producers.

#### And, counter interp applied r and d only – means no spinoff advantages

EIA 99 – Energy Information Administration / Federal Energy Market Interventions 1999: Primary Energy, "3. Federal Energy Research and Development", <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/servicerpt/subsidy/pdf/research.pdf>)

Research and Development Defined

Federal energy-related R&D can be described as falling into three classes: basic research, research that seeks to develop newenergy technologies**,** and research that seeks to improve existing technologies. • Basic Research. The potential beneficiaries of basic research could be considered to be the population of the United States or the world as a whole. Basic research includes research projects designed to pursue the advancement of scientific knowledge and the understanding of phenomena rather than specific applications. • Research To Develop New Technologies. The efforts in this context involve attempts to discover new scientific knowledge that can have commercial application. Although the end objective of the research is known, the research task is difficult and uncertain. • Research To Improve Existing Technologies. These efforts emphasize the use of scientific knowledge to design and test new processes that may have substantial technical and cost uncertainties. The immediate beneficiaries are generally well defined: current producers and consumers of particular fuels or operators, and customers of the technology being improved. Energy Research and Development as a Subsidy It is easier to measure energy R&D spending than to it characterize from a subsidy perspective. R&D spending is intended to create useful knowledge that benefits society. Thus, all Federal R&D spending could, in a general way, be considered a subsidy to knowledge; however, the extent to which specific R&D programs actually affect energy markets is more difficult to ascertain. The results of research are inherently uncertain. Many programs will advance knowledge across a range of energy and non-energy applications, rather than in the context of a particular fuel or form of consumption. Further, the knowledge obtained may be negative, in the sense that the research may only reveal technical or economic dead ends to be avoided in the future.42 Thus, only a portion of Federal energy R&D is likely to achieve results (in the form of changes in energy costs or consumption) that can be attributed specifically to a particular R&D program. Moreover, to the extent that there are attributable results, they are likely to be measurable only years after the funded research effort is initiated. Federal R&D is intended to support research that the private sector would not undertake. It is not supposed to substitute for private-sector R&D. However, the creation of a Government-funded R&D program could, under some circumstances, displace private-sector R&D. In that case, the Federal program would not produce anynet new knowledge but simplyreduce private costs. It is impossible, however, to know with certainty what private-sector firms would have done in the (hypothetical) absence of a Federal program. In general, the less “basic” the R&D program and the more focused on near-term commercialization, the greater the risk that the program will be a substitute for private-sector R&D. There are no means to determine conclusively whether or not particular Federal energy R&D projects are substitutes or complements for private-sector activities. Moreover, because research is risky, with failure an inherent part of the process, the effectiveness of Federal R&D cannot easily be assessed. This report makes no judgments on either of these issues. Rather, it surveys the current composition of Federal R&D spending and provides a degree of historical perspective on the changing composition of Federal energy R&D efforts. There is another issue that is specific to U.S. energy R&D programs: much U.S. energy R&D is aimed not at producing fuels per se but at developing fuel-consuming capital equipment (particularly power generation technologies). Such projects may be more properly viewed as a subsidy to capital equipment manufacturers than to fuel producers or consumers. Although, in principle, all successful power generation R&D benefits electricity consumers, the effects on fuel producers are more ambiguous. Because they are energy-saving technologies, the new technologies will only benefit producers if they help to expand the market for their fuel. Thus, if one seeks to understand the effects, rather than the intent, of R&D spending, the success of the programs must be evaluated, noting that expenditures will necessarily occur long before technology adoption, and considering the competitive consequences of any new technologies introduced. Finally, much of the expenditure that is formally defined as “energy research and development” in the U.S. Government’s budget accounts is not directly expended on energy research or development. Some of the funds are expended for environmental restoration and waste management for energy (particularly nuclear) research facilities, or on R&D on environmental restoration and waste management, or on overhead or difficult-to-allocate functions. Such spending may not have a material impact on current or future energy markets. Energy Research and Development Trends Table 8 allocates Federal energy R&D by energy type and function. Currently, nearly two-thirds of Federal energy R&D ($2.8 billion) is allocated to basic research. DOE’s largest single basic research program is the General Science Program, funded at $1.6 billion in fiscal year 1999. Basic research is difficult to characterize as an energy subsidy, however, because it cannot be allocated between energy and non-energy benefits, or among forms of energy. Therefore, the balance of this chapter focuses on applied energy R&D. Table 8 lists both “estimated” and “actual” research and development appropriations for fiscal year 1992. The estimated appropriations are drawn from the Department of Energy’s fiscal year 1993 budget proposal, prepared in early 1992, which showed appropriations by budget account for the previous fiscal year.43 The estimated appropriations were used in EIA’s 1992 subsidy report. The actual appropriations are drawn from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer’s Appropriation History Tables, prepared in early 1997, which show final appropriations by budget account. The differences between the two columns have multiple causes. The Department transfers (with the approval of Congress) unspent monies from one account to another. This may take place well after the end of a fiscal year if the Department has multi-year spending authority for a particular account. The largest difference between the two columns is due to a large reprogramming of funds for fusion research. There have also been several changes of classification. For example, the account “Biological and Environmental Research” has been transferred from “Environment, Safety, and Health” to “General Science.” In addition, minor errors in the original 1992 report have been corrected in the final appropriations column. For example, some of the expenditures on wind in the “Wind, Photovoltaic, and Other Solar” category were interchanged with biomass expenditures in the 1992 report. Applied R&D is aimed primarily at improving existing technology. Appropriations for applied energy R&D were about $1.5 billion in fiscal year 1999. Of that amount, more than half is allocated to nuclear activities. Within the range of nuclear projects, most of the money is spent on environmental management rather than R&D per se. For coal, the bulk of spending supports development of clean coal technologies. Solar, photovoltaic, and wind energy absorb the major share of renewable energy research funds ($134 million out of a total of $327 million). Expenditures shown as “unallocated” in Table 8 are administrative and miscellaneous programs associated with R&D. For example, unallocated expenditures for nuclear R&D ($143 million) in fiscal year 1999 include program termination costs and program direction. For renewable energy programs, they include program direction and funding for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory ($22 million in fiscal year 1999). The unallocated appropriation for basic energy research ($49.8 million in fiscal year 1999) funds personnel in a variety of research centers and provides support services and other related expenses. Figure 3 illustrates trends in Federal applied energy R&D appropriations from fiscal year 1978 through fiscal year 1998. There were sharp reductions in energy R&D appropriations during the early 1980s, followed by modest growth after 1992. R&D spending by fuel type is dominated by nuclear power R&D, although coal R&D appropriations were boosted in the late 1980s by the advent of the Clean Coal Technology Program, and renewable energy appropriations have risen somewhat since 1990. Federal R&D spending related to oil and gas is budgeted at $164 million in fiscal year 1999. Another recent trend in Federal R&D is a tendency for Congress to mandate research on particular projects. Title XIII of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 wrote much of DOE’s coal R&D program into law and added some new areas of research, mandating R&D on coal-fired diesel engines, nonfuel coal use, coalbed methane, metallurgical coal development, coal gasification, coal liquefaction, lowrank coal use, and magnetohydrodynamic power generation. There are similar detailed provisions throughout the law for research on other energy sources, including nuclear power, end use, and renewable energy. Nuclear Power Figure 4 Illustrates trends in DOE’s nuclear power R&D programs. DOE received an appropriation of $640 million for nuclear R&D in fiscal year 1999, but the majority of the funds ($466.6 million) are allocated to the cleanup of contaminated nuclear energy and research sites. About two-thirds of the cleanup funds are being used for site closures, and the balance is slated for site and project completion. Non-Defense Environmental Safety and Health A substantial portion of Government-funded nuclear R&D is for managing and addressing the environmental legacy resulting from nuclear energy and research activities. The goal is to clean up as many contaminated sites as possible by 2006. For fiscal year 1999, more than one-half of nondefense environmental, safety, and health funds are allocated for site closures. Improving Existing Power Plants and Enhancing Nuclear Power The Nuclear Energy Research Initiative provides funds for R&D at universities, national laboratories, and industry to advance nuclear power technology. It includes proliferation-resistant reactor and fuel technologies, highperformance, high-efficiency reactor technology, advanced nuclear fuels, and new technologies for the minimization and management of nuclear waste. The fiscal year 1999 appropriation for this program is $19 million, out of the $30 million for new or improved nuclear power plants.

#### Prefer it -

#### Over limiting – excluding new reactor type slays the most fertile source of aff ground – kills innovation which is key to creativity and education about the topic

#### Functional limits check topic explosion and guarantee ground

#### Predictability outweighs – our aff relies on the most precise vision of how nuclear power functions and is from the EIA and CBO which is most qualified and predictable for the aff

#### Reasonability –competing interps are bad and cause a race to the bottom that destroys substantive debate

### States 2AC

#### 50 state fiat is a voting issue – no decision makers controls state policy, kills logic which justifies infinite intrinsicness – no solvency advocate kills fairness and undermines core research skills – kills real world education

#### Perm do both – state action provides cover and acts like a mandate for Obama

#### Skin in the game – investors want to see federal government support for tech, so they’re convinced they won’t impose licensing restrictions – matching funds provide that – that’s 1AC Martin – more evidence

**Gale et al. ‘9** (FINANCING THE NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE: THE BENEFITS AND POTENTIAL PITFALLS OF FEDERAL & STATE GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES AND THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN CALIFORNIA Sony Ben-Moshe, Jason J. Crowell, Kelley M. Gale,\* Breton A. Peace, Brett P. Rosenblatt, and Kelly D. Thomason\*\* \* Kelley Michael Gale is the Finance Department Chair of Latham & Watkins‘ San Diego office and serves as global Co-Chair for the firm‘s Climate Change and Cleantech Practice Groups. He has thirty years of experience representing private and public sector clients in the development, regulation, and financing of alternative energy projects and capital intensive infrastructure projects. \*\* The co-authors are attorneys in the Project Finance Practice Group in the San Diego office of Latham & Watkins LLP. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not reflect the views of Latham & Watkins LLP or its clients. 498 ENERGY LAW JOURNAL [Vol. 30:497 2009

Similar to this political risk, **investors in new domestic nuclear reactors will likely face substantial regulatory and permitting risks, such as the risk of litigation** by residents or environmentalists desiring to thwart any large scale development of new reactors in the United States **and** the risk that **a** largely **untested** **regulatory approval process** may not operate as anticipated, and **those** challenges **can result in significant delays** in construction of a nuclear power project. Although they are different in kind, the substance of sovereign and other risks facing large overseas infrastructure projects is similar in the sense that worst case scenarios of delay or inability to make commercial use of the projects and the magnitude of the potential losses are roughly equivalent. As a risk mitigation measure in the case of financings for natural gas liquefaction facilities and other large overseas infrastructure projects, the Export-Import Bank of the United States may approve loan guarantees and offer credit enhancements and/or direct loans to support the sale of United States exports to emerging markets throughout the world. Its loan guarantees to support the construction of large overseas infrastructure projects increase the comfort of private institutional investors because these investors believe there is a substantially lower risk that an overseas political regime will change the rules in a manner adverse to creditors if the United States government is one of those creditors.34 In a similar fashion, regulatory risk insurance and loan guarantees provided by **the federal government should encourage** private financing of domestic nuclear power projects **because the government** providing the guarantees **also** **controls many of the risk factors which could give rise to regulatory delays** in commencing commercial operation of a new nuclear project. Further, in the nuclear power industry, **the federal government is reviewing** development **applications and reactor designs**, and is equipped with a **team of experts** in nuclear technologies, so that **if the federal government has skin in the game,** so to speak, **private lenders may take** additional **comfort** that **the government has performed a** certain level of **due diligence** **on a particular project and determined that there are no major flaws from its vantage point**. Section II.D.3 below discusses the risks covered by federally provided regulatory risk insurance and the ways in which it can be adapted to best encourage private sector financing for nuclear energy.

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

**Whitefield, 11** [5/4/11, STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ED WHITFIELD CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND POWER, “The Role of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in America’s Energy Future, http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/Media/file/Hearings/Energy/050411/Whitfield.pdf

While the NRC may not be the direct cause of this uncertainty – the Obama Administration’s policy is - the NRC’s actions will contribute to the uncertainty one way or another. Beyond open adjudicatory issues, the NRC has recently taken administrative action to close down its review of Yucca Mountain, which will deprive the public of the first independent government assessment of the merits of Yucca Mountain’s construction. That doesn’t bode well for a nuclear renaissance. On the front end of nuclear power development, I’m very interested to hear about whether the NRC can develop and provide more regulatory certainty in its licensing and re-licensing programs. As in other energy sectors, regulatory certainty, such as keeping to decision schedules, is essential for ensuring the investments necessary to develop nuclear energy. Additionally, I think it is worth reviewing the Commission’s organizational structure, and whether an agency rightly focused on safety is suitably structured to also facilitate the advancement of new nuclear generation. And connected with regulatory certainty, are clear and well developed safety engineering evaluations. As mentioned, the safety record of NRC is unparalleled. But recent events in Japan have raised questions in the public’s mind about how well the NRC does its job. We need to be confident the NRC is up to the task. I believe the agency is, but scrutiny is helpful to maintain the public trust. We do not want to overreact to events based on poor and faulty information or other political agendas. Nuclear power is critical to this nation. We should recognize its importance for a growing economy and not lose sight of the tremendous value a reliable, affordable power supply will mean for the future health and wealth of the United States.

#### DOE has statutory authority and only federal labs research and international coop

**MIT ‘10** [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap: Report to Congress”, April 2010, http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/nuclear-engineering/22-033-nuclear-systems-design-project-fall-2011/readings/MIT22\_033F11\_read\_core\_doe.pdf]

 In the United States, it is the responsibility of industry to design, construct, and operate commercial nuclear power plants. However, DOE has **statutory authority** under the Atomic Energy Act **to promote** and support **nuclear** energy **technologies** **for commercial applications**. In general, appropriate government roles include researching high-potential technologies beyond the investment horizon of industry **and** also **reducing the technical risks** of new technologies. In the case of new commercial reactor designs, potential areas of NE involvement could include: Enabling new technologies to be inserted into emerging and future designs by providing access to **unique laboratory resources for new technology development and**, where appropriate, **demonstration**. • Working through the laboratories and universities to provide unique expertise and facilities to industry for R&D in the areas of: o Innovative concepts and advanced technologies. o Fundamental phenomena and performance data. o Advanced modeling and simulation capabilities. APRIL 2010 22 34 NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ROADMAP o New technology testing and, if appropriate, demonstration. o Advanced manufacturing methods. Representative R&D activities that support each of the roles stated above are presented below. The level of DOE investment relative to industry investment will vary across the spectrum of these activities, with a generally increasing trend in DOE investment for longer-term activities. Finally, **there is potential to leverage** and **amplify** effective U.S. **R&D through collaborations with other nations through multilateral and bilateral agreements including the Generation IV International Forum**, which is investigating multiple advanced reactor concepts. DOE is also a participant in OECD/NEA and IAEA initiatives that bear directly on the development and deployment of new reactor systems.

#### States links to politics

Kiely ‘12 [[EUGENE KIELY](http://www.factcheck.org/author/eugene-kiely/), Washington assignment editor USA today, February 17, 2012 Factcheck.org “Did Obama ‘Approve’ Bridge Work for Chinese Firms?” http://www.factcheck.org/2012/02/did-obama-approve-bridge-work-for-chinese-firms/]

Who’s to blame, if that’s the right word, if the project ends up using manufactured steel from China? The National Steel Bridge Alliance blames the state railroad agency. The Alliance for American Manufacturing says the federal Buy American laws have been “weakened with loopholes and various exemptions that make it easier for bureaucrats to purchase foreign-made goods instead of those made in American factories with American workers.” So, how did **Obama get blamed** for the decisions by state agencies and for state projects that, in at least one case**, didn’t even use federal funds?** The answer is a textbook lesson in how **information gets distorted** when emails go viral. We looked at the nearly 100 emails we received on this subject and found that Obama wasn’t mentioned at all in the first few emails. Typical of the emails we received shortly after the ABC News report aired was this one from Oct. 11, 2011: “I just got an email regarding Diane Sawyer on ABC TV stating that U. S. Bridges and roads are being built by Chinese firms when the jobs should have gone to Americans. Could this possible be true?” The answer: Yes, it’s true. End of story, right? Wrong. Days later, emails started to appear in our inbox that claimed ABC News reported that Chinese firm were receiving stimulus funds to build U.S. bridges — even though the broadcast news story didn’t mention stimulus funds at all. (The report did include a clip of Obama delivering a speech on the need to rebuild America’s bridges and put Americans to work, but said nothing about the president’s $830 billion stimulus bill.) Still, we received emails such as this one on Nov. 4, 2011, that included this erroneous claim language: “Stimulus money meant to create U.S. jobs went to Chinese firms. Unbelievable….” **It didn’t take long for Obama to be blamed**. That same day — Nov. 4, 2011 — we received an email that made this leap to Obama: “SOME CHINESE COMPANIES WHO ARE BUILDING ‘OUR’ BRIDGES. (3000 JOBS LOST TO THE CHINESE FIRM)…..AND NOW OBAMA WANTS ‘MORE STIMULUS MONEY’…..THIS IS NUTS ! ! ! If this doesn’t make you furious nothing will….” This year, Obama’s name started to surface in the subject line of such critical emails — raising the attack on the president to yet another level and perhaps ensuring the email will be even more widely circulated. Since Jan. 17, we have gotten more than a dozen emails with the subject line, “ABC News on Obama/USA Infrastructure,” often preceded with the word “SHOCKING” in all caps. The emails increasingly contain harsh language about the president. Since Jan. 11, 23 emails carried this added bit of Obama-bashing: “I pray all the unemployed see this and cast their votes accordingly in 2012!” One of those emails — a more recent one from Feb. 8 — contained this additional line: “Tell me again how Obama’s looking out for blue collar guys**. He** cancels pipelines, and **lets Chinese contractors build our bridges…” And so it goes, on and on. All from a news report that blamed state officials — not Obama — for spending taxpayer money** on Chinese firms to build U.S. bridges.

#### Can’t solve nuclear leadership – not perceived

Fertel, 05 - Senior Vice President And Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute (Marvin, CQ Congressional Testimony, “NUCLEAR POWER'S PLACE IN A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY,” 4/28, lexis) //DH

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the federal government's nuclear energy programs, and to maintain America's leadership in nuclear technology development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation. Such efforts have provided a dramatic contribution to global security, as evidenced by the U.S.-Russian nonproliferation agreement to recycle weapons-grade material from Russia for use in American reactors. Currently, more than 50 percent of U.S. nuclear power plant fuel depends on converted Russian warhead material. Nowhere is continued congressional oversight more important than with DOE's program to manage the used nuclear fuel from our nuclear power plants. Continued progress toward a federal used nuclear fuel repository is necessary to support nuclear energy's vital role in a comprehensive national energy policy and to support the remediation of DOE defense sites. Since enactment of the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, DOE's federal repository program has repeatedly overcome challenges, and challenges remain before the Yucca Mountain facility can begin operation. But as we address these issues, it is important to keep the overall progress of the program in context. There is international scientific consensus that a deep geologic repository is the best solution for long-term disposition of used military and commercial nuclear power plant fuel and high-level radioactive byproducts. The Bush administration and Congress, with bipartisan support, affirmed the suitability of Yucca Mountain for a repository in 2002. Over the past three years, the Energy Department and its contractors have made considerable progress providing yet greater confirmation that this is the correct course of action and that Yucca Mountain is an appropriate site for a national repository. --During the past year, federal courts have rejected significant legal challenges by the state of Nevada and others to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the 2002 Yucca Mountain site suitability determination. These challenges questioned the constitutionality of the Yucca Mountain Development Act and DOE's repository system, which incorporates both natural and engineered barriers to contain radioactive material safely. In the coming year, Congress will play an essential role in keeping this program on schedule, by taking the steps necessary to provide increased funding for the project in fiscal 2006 and in future years. Meeting DOE's schedule for initial repository operation requires certainty in funding for the program. This is particularly critical in view of projected annual expenditures that will exceed $1 billion beginning in fiscal 2007. Meeting these budget requirements calls for a change in how Congress provides funds to the project from monies collected for the Nuclear Waste Fund. The history of Yucca Mountain funding is evidence that the current funding approach must be modified. Consumer fees (including interest) committed to the Nuclear Waste Fund since its f6rmation in 1983 total more than $24 billion. Consumers are projected to pay between $750 million to $800 million to the fund each year, based on electricity generated at the nation's 103 reactors. This is more than $2 million per day. Although about $8 billion has been used for the program, the balance in the fund is nearly $17 billion. In each of the past several years, there has been a gap between the annual fees paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants and disbursements from the fund for use by DOE at Yucca Mountain. Since the fund was first established, billions of dollars paid by consumers of electricity from nuclear power plants to the Nuclear Waste Fund-intended solely for the federal government's used fuel program-in effect have been used to decrease budget deficits or increase surpluses. The industry believes that Congress should change the funding mechanism for Yucca Mountain so that payments to the Nuclear Waste Fund can be used only for the project and be excluded from traditional congressional budget caps. Although the program should remain subject to congressional oversight, Yucca Mountain appropriations should not compete each year for funding with unrelated programs when Congress directed a dedicated funding stream for the project.¶ The industry also believes that it is appropriate and necessary to consider an alternative perspective on the Yucca Mountain project. This alternative would include an extended period for monitoring operation of the repository for up to 300 years after spent fuel is first placed underground. The industry believes that this approach would provide ongoing assurance and greater confidence that the repository is performing as designed, that public safety is assured, and that the environment is protected. It would also permit DOE to apply evolving innovative technologies at the repository. Through this approach, a scientific monitoring program would identify additional scientific information that can be used in repository performance models. The project then could update the models, and make modifications in design and operations as appropriate.¶ Congressional committees like this one can help ensure that DOE does not lose sight of its responsibility for used nuclear fuel management and disposal, as stated by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. The industry fully supports the fundamental need for a repository so that used nuclear fuel and the byproducts of the nation's nuclear weapons program are securely managed in an underground, specially designed facility. World-class science has demonstrated that Yucca Mountain is the best site for that facility. A public works project of this magnitude will inevitably face challenges. Yet, none is insurmountable. DOE and its contractors have made significant progress on the project and will continue to do so as the project enters the licensing phase. Congressional oversight also can play a key role in maintaining and encouraging the stability of the NRC's regulatory process. Such stability is essential for our 103 operating nuclear plants and equally critical in licensing new nuclear power plants. Congress played a key role several years ago in encouraging the NRC to move toward a new oversight process for the nation's nuclear plants, based on quantitative performance indicators and safety significance. Today's reactor oversight process is designed to focus industry and NRC resources on equipment, components and operational issues that have the greatest importance to, and impact on, safety. The NRC and the industry have worked hard to identify and implement realistic security requirements at nuclear power plants. In the three-and-a-half years since 9/11, the NRC has issued a series of requirements to increase security and enhance training for security programs. The industry complied-fully and rapidly.¶ In the days and months following Sept. 11, quick action was required. Orders that implemented needed changes quickly were necessary. Now, we should return to the orderly process of regulating through regulations.¶ The industry has spent more than $1 billion enhancing security since September 2001. We've identified and fixed vulnerabilities. Today, the industry is at the practical limit of what private industry can do to secure our facilities against the terrorist threat. NRC Chairman Nils Diaz and other commissioners have said that the industry has achieved just about everything that can be reasonably achieved by a civilian force.¶ The industry now needs a transition period to stabilize the new security requirements. We need time to incorporate these dramatic changes into our operations and emergency planning programs and to train our employees to the high standards of our industry-and to the appropriately high expectations of the NRC.¶ Both industry and the NRC need congressional oversight to support and encourage this kind of stability.¶ CONCLUSION¶ Electricity generated by America's nuclear power plants over the past half-century has played a key part in our nation's growth and prosperity. Nuclear power produces over 20 percent of the electricity used in the United States today without producing air pollution. As our energy demands continue to grow in years to come, nuclear power should play an even greater role in meeting our energy and environmental needs.¶ The nuclear energy industry is operating its reactors safely and efficiently. The industry is striving to produce more electricity from existing plants. The industry is also developing more efficient, next-generation reactors and exploring ways to build them more cost-effectively.¶ The public sector, including the oversight committees of the U.S. Congress, can help maintain the conditions that ensure Americans will continue to reap the benefits of our operating plants, and create the conditions that will spur investment in America's energy infrastructure, including new nuclear power plants.¶ One important step is passage of comprehensive energy legislation that recognizes nuclear energy's contributions to meeting our growing energy demands, ensuring our nation's energy security and protecting our environment. Equally important, however, is the need to ensure effective and efficient implementation of existing laws, like the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and to provide federal agencies with the resources and oversight necessary to discharge their statutory responsibilities in the most efficient way possible. The commercial nuclear power sector was born in the United States, and nations around the world continue to look to this nation for leadership in this technology and in the issues associated with nuclear power. Our ability to influence critical international policies in areas like nuclear nonproliferation, for example, depends on our ability to maintain a leadership role in prudent deployment, use and regulation of nuclear energy technologies here at home, in the United States, and on our ability to manage the technological and policy challenges-like waste management-that arise with all advanced technologies.

#### Federal investment key to successful demonstration and certainty

**Wallace ‘5** (President of Constellation Generation Group, Mike Wallace, CQ Congressional Testimony, “NUCLEAR POWER 2010 INITIATIVE,” 4/26, lexis)

The Department of Energy's Nuclear Power 2010 program is a necessary, but not sufficient, step toward new nuclear plant construction. We must address other challenges as well. Our industry is not yet at the point where we can announce specific decisions to build. We are not yet at the point where we can take a $1.5 billion to $2 billion investment decision to our boards of directors. We do yet not have fully certified designs that are competitive, for example. We do not know the licensing process will work as intended: That is why we are working systematically through the ESP and COL processes. We must identify and contain the risks to make sure that nothing untoward occurs after we start building. We cannot make a $1.5 $2 billion investment decision and end up spending twice that because the licensing process failed us. **The** **industry believes federal investment is necessary** and appropriate to offset some of the risks I've mentioned. We recommend that the federal government's investment include the incentives identified by the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board's Nuclear Energy Task Force in its recent report. That investment stimulus includes: 1. secured loans and loan guarantees; 2. transferable investment tax credits that can be taken as money is expended during construction; 3. transferable production tax credits; 4. accelerated depreciation. This portfolio of incentives is necessary because it's clear that no single financial incentive is appropriate for all companies, because of differences in company-specific business attributes or differences in the marketplace - namely, whether the markets they serve are open to competition or are in a regulated rate structure. The next nuclear plants might be built as unregulated merchant plants, or as regulated rate-base projects. The next nuclear plants could be built by single entities, or by consortia of companies. Business environment and project structure have a major impact on which financial incentives work best. Some companies prefer tax-related incentives. Others expect that construction loans or loan guarantees will enable them to finance the next nuclear plants. It is important to preserve both approaches. We must maintain as much flexibility as possible. It's important to understand why federal investment stimulus and investment protection is necessary and appropriate. Federal investment stimulus is necessary to offset the higher first-time costs associated with the first few nuclear plants built. Federal investment protection is necessary to manage and contain the one type of risk that we cannot manage, and that's the risk of some kind of regulatory failure (including court challenges) that delays construction or commercial operation. The new licensing process codified in the 1992 Energy Policy Act is conceptually sound. It allows for public participation in the process at the time when that participation is most effective - before designs and sites are approved and construction begins. The new process is designed to remove the uncertainties inherent in the Part 50 process that was used to license the nuclear plants operating today. In principle, the new licensing process is intended to reduce the risk of delay in construction and commercial operation and thus the risk of unanticipated cost increases. The goal is to **provide certainty** before companies begin construction and place significant investment at risk. In practice, **until the process is demonstrated, the industry and the financial community cannot be assured** that licensing will proceed in a disciplined manner, without unfounded intervention and delay. Only the successful licensing and commissioning of several new nuclear plants (such as proposed by the NuStart and Dominion-led consortia) can demonstrate that the licensing issues discussed above have been adequately resolved. Industry and investor concern over these potential regulatory impediments may require techniques like the standby default coverage and standby interest coverage contained in S. 887, introduced by Senators Hagel, Craig and others. Let me also be clear on two other important issues: 1. The industry is not seeking a totally risk-free business environment. It is seeking government assistance in containing those risks that are beyond the private sector's control. The goal is to ensure that the level of risk associated with the next nuclear plants built in the U.S. generally approaches what the electric industry would consider normal commercial risks. The industry is fully prepared to accept construction management risks and operational risks that are properly within the private sector's control. 2. The industry's financing challenges apply largely to the first few plants in any series of new nuclear reactors. As capital costs decline to the "nth-of-a-kind" range, as investors gain confidence that the licensing process operates as intended and does not represent a source of unpredictable risk, follow-on plants can be financed more conventionally, without the support necessary for the first few projects. **What is needed limited federal investment in a limited number of new plants** for a limited period of time to overcome the financial and economic hurdles facing the first few plants built. In summary, we believe the industry and the federal government should work together **to finance the first-of-a-kind design** and engineering work and to develop an integrated package of financial incentives to stimulate construction of new nuclear power plants. Any such package must address a number of factors, including the licensing/regulatory risks; the investment risks; and the other business issues that make it difficult for companies to undertake capital-intensive projects. Such a cooperative industry/government financing program is a necessary and appropriate investment in U.S. energy security.

### Politics

#### Individual members of the GOP have no incentive for compromise

Greg Sargent (writer for the Washington Post) February 4, 2013 “How House Republicans can kill immigration reform” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/02/04/how-house-republicans-can-kill-immigration-reform/

The problem is that many individual House Republicans don’t have incentives to back immigration reform, even if opposing it is bad for the GOP overall. Well over half of House Republicans represent districts that are over 80 percent white, and over 200 of them represent districts that backed Mitt Romney (who staked out a hard right “self deportation” position). What’s more, the average GOP district is only 11.5 percent Hispanic; by contrast, the average Dem district is twice that.

#### Gay rights disagreements derail legislation

Erin Kelley (writer for USA Today) February 8, 2013 “Gay rights becoming controversy in immigration reform” http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/02/08/gay-rights-immigration-reform/1903119/

President Obama and advocates want gay couples to receive equal treatment in any immigration reform law but Republicans and conservative religious groups say injecting the issue could derail a deal ¶ WASHINGTON -- Gay rights has emerged as an unexpected point of controversy in the congressional debate over immigration reform, prompting key Republicans to warn that it could derail efforts to reach a bipartisan compromise.¶ President Obama and some congressional Democrats are pushing for any immigration reform plan to include a provision to allow gay Americans to sponsor their immigrant partners for legal residency in the United States. That is a right currently enjoyed only by married heterosexual couples.¶ But Republican leaders on immigration reform say it's already going to be an uphill battle to convince their GOP colleagues to support a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million illegal immigrants living in the United States. Including a provision for gay partners will make reform legislation an even tougher sell, key senators said.¶ "I'm telling you now, if you load this (immigration reform legislation) up with social issues and things that are controversial, it will endanger the issue," Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., said at a forum this week sponsored by Politico.¶ Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., expressed similar concerns during an interview with the BuzzFeed online news site this week.¶ "I think if that issue (gay rights) becomes a central issue in the debate it's going to become harder to get it done because there will be strong feelings on both sides," Rubio said.

#### Plan popular

Jenkins-Smith et al 12

[Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, Carol L. Silva, Kerry G. Herron, Sarah R. Trousset, and Rob P. Rechard, “Enhancing the Acceptability and Credibility of a Repository for Spent Nuclear Fuel”, National Academy of Engineering of the National Academies, The Bridge on Managing Nuclear Waste, Summer 2012, Volume 42, Number 2, http://www.nae.edu/Publications/Bridge/59220/59232.aspx]

The effects of combining a repository with a reprocessing facility are shown in Table 2. Again, the changes in support are shown for those who initially opposed, were neutral, or supported each option. As with co-location of a repository with a national research laboratory, co-location of a repository with a reprocessing facility also increased support. Among those who either initially opposed the repository or were neutral, nearly half said the addition of the reprocessing capability would increase support for the repository. A smaller percentage said the combination would decrease support. Given the consistent and generally supportive attitudes of most Americans toward reprocessing (as discussed above), the increase in support for repositories co-located with reprocessing facilities is not surprising and could be helpful in informing policies. The implications are that public acceptance of an SNF repository is sensitive to the overall design attributes of the facility. If it is exclusively for disposal, the perceived risks and associated negative images tend to dominate perceptions (especially when SNF has been designated a “waste”). If the facility is more heterogeneous, that is, it includes design elements that address offsetting risk/benefits (such as a laboratory or reprocessing facility), thus attaching resource value to SNF, prospects for public acceptance improve.

#### Plan builds PC

Press Action 3/12/12 (“US Nuclear Industry Operates as if Fukushima Never Happened”) <http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/nuclearsubsidies03122012/>

Both Democrats and Republicans have had a long love affair with commercial nuclear power, and the relationship is showing no signs of losing steam. Since the 1950s, members of both parties have enthusiastically lavished electric utility companies with expensive gifts, ranging from subsidies to protection from liability for disasters to loan guarantees, all underwritten by U.S. taxpayers. The political calculus is simple: nuclear power enjoys unanimous support in Washington. Try to name one member of the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives who favors shutting down the nation’s 104 commercial nuclear reactors. Federal agencies, from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Department of Energy to the Nuclear Regulatory, have worked diligently through the years to promote nuclear power. At the state level, support for nuclear power also is extremely strong, although there are some politicians—albeit a tiny number—who have publicly called for the closure of certain nuclear plants. On the one-year anniversary of the start of the nuclear disaster at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant in Japan, one would assume a voice in official Washington would have emerged calling for an end to the nation’s experiment with nuclear power. In Germany, government officials made the decision to phase out nuclear power by 2022 in response to Fukushima. There’s no such sentiment among the ruling elite in the United States. Locating a member of Congress opposed to the continued operation of nuclear power plants is as hard as finding a lawmaker who favors breaking ties with Israel over its mistreatment of Palestinians for the last 60 years. In fact, it’s more than hard, it’s impossible. It’s very rare to find an issue where there is a noteworthy difference between Democrats and Republicans. When there are differences, they tend to be subtle, although party officials and the corporate media will attempt to sensationalize a slight difference to create an impression that the U.S. political system permits honest and real debate.

no push

#### Political capital is irrelevant and academically bankrupt – but winners win

Michael Hirsch (chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau) February 7, 2013 “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through.¶ Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years.¶ Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.¶ What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”¶ As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.¶ Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong

. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital

—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”¶ ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ¶ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?”¶ Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.)¶ And then there are the presidents who get the politics, and the issues, wrong. It was the last president before Obama who was just starting a second term, George W. Bush, who really revived the claim of political capital, which he was very fond of wielding. Then Bush promptly demonstrated that he didn’t fully understand the concept either.¶ At his first news conference after his 2004 victory, a confident-sounding Bush declared, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it. That’s my style.” The 43rd president threw all of his political capital at an overriding passion: the partial privatization of Social Security. He mounted a full-bore public-relations campaign that included town-hall meetings across the country.¶ Bush failed utterly, of course. But the problem was not that he didn’t have enough political capital. Yes, he may have overestimated his standing. Bush’s margin over John Kerry was thin—helped along by a bumbling Kerry campaign that was almost the mirror image of Romney’s gaffe-filled failure this time—but that was not the real mistake. The problem was that whatever credibility or stature Bush thought he had earned as a newly reelected president did nothing to make Social Security privatization a better idea in most people’s eyes. Voters didn’t trust the plan, and four years later, at the end of Bush’s term, the stock-market collapse bore out the public’s skepticism. Privatization just didn’t have any momentum behind it, no matter who was pushing it or how much capital Bush spent to sell it.¶ The mistake that Bush made with Social Security, says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University and a well-followed political blogger, “was that just because he won an election, he thought he had a green light. But there was no sense of any kind of public urgency on Social Security reform. It’s like he went into the garage where various Republican policy ideas were hanging up and picked one. I don’t think Obama’s going to make that mistake.… Bush decided he wanted to push a rock up a hill. He didn’t understand how steep the hill was. I think Obama has more momentum on his side because of the Republican Party’s concerns about the Latino vote and the shooting at Newtown.” Obama may also get his way on the debt ceiling, not because of his reelection, Sides says, “but because Republicans are beginning to doubt whether taking a hard line on fiscal policy is a good idea,” as the party suffers in the polls.¶ THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER¶ Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood.¶ Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.¶ Weighing the imponderables of momentum, the often-mystical calculations about when the historic moment is ripe for an issue, will never be a science. It is mainly intuition, and its best practitioners have a long history in American politics. This is a tale told well in Steven Spielberg’s hit movie Lincoln. Daniel Day-Lewis’s Abraham Lincoln attempts a lot of behind-the-scenes vote-buying to win passage of the 13th Amendment, banning slavery, along with eloquent attempts to move people’s hearts and minds. He appears to be using the political capital of his reelection and the turning of the tide in the Civil War. But it’s clear that a surge of conscience, a sense of the changing times, has as much to do with the final vote as all the backroom horse-trading. “The reason I think the idea of political capital is kind of distorting is that it implies you have chits you can give out to people. It really oversimplifies why you elect politicians, or why they can do what Lincoln did,” says Tommy Bruce, a former political consultant in Washington.¶ Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories.¶ In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction.¶ Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

Opp cost

#### Dems will insist on full pathway to citizenship – derails a deal

Elise Foley (writer for the Huffington Post) February 5, 2013 “House Republicans: Immigration Reform With Pathway To Citizenship 'Toxic,' 'Extreme'” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/05/house-republicans-immigration_n_2625107.html>

House Republicans insisted on Tuesday that Democrats are showing a lack of willingness to compromise on immigration reform by calling for a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, arguing that they should be more open to legislation without it.¶ "Are there options that we should consider between the extremes of mass deportation and the pathway to citizenship for those not lawfully present in the United States?" Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), who chairs the House Judiciary Committee, asked San Antonio Mayor Julián Castro (D) at a hearing on immigration reform, the first on the issue for the 113th Congress.¶ Another top Republican, immigration subcommittee chairman Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.), accused Democrats of refusing to come toward the center.¶ "I think you earlier referenced that [a pathway to citizenship] as compromise, and I'm curious, a compromise between what?" he said to Castro. "I don't see anyone advocating for full-fledged citizenship without background checks, for full-fledged citizenship without taxes, for full-fledged citizenship without fines. So It's a compromise between what?"¶ A number of other GOP members of the committee made similar statements. They questioned Castro in particular, repeatedly asking whether he would support immigration reform that did not allow undocumented immigrants already in the United States to become citizens. Castro is not a member of Congress, and won't get to vote on the matter, but lawmakers used him as a stand-in for Democrats who say any immigration bill must include such a pathway, arguing such an insistence could derail any reform efforts.¶ Castro reiterated that there must be a way for the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants already in the United States to become citizens.¶ "I do believe that a pathway to citizenship should be the option that Congress selects -- I don't see that as an extreme option," Castro replied to Goodlatte. "I would disagree with the characterization of that as the extreme," he added later.¶ Some Republicans hold that view, too, and previous attempts at immigration reform have always addressed the possibility. There would be a pathway to citizenship under a bipartisan Senate plan released by the "gang of eight" legislators last week, and one brewing fight appears to be over how difficult that road should be -- not whether it should exist at all. In the House, a bipartisan group is working on a similar effort, and many of its members also believe undocumented immigrants should be given a chance to become citizens.¶ But the progress made by those bipartisan groups on the issue masks the difficulty that remains. Gowdy indicated openness to the Senate plan when it was released last week, but Goodlatte told USA Today on Monday that is he not convinced by the Senate immigration plan because of supporters' insistence that there be a pathway to citizenship. He questioned whether Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) is "serious about doing immigration reform."¶ Despite arguments against a pathway to citizenship, the tone of the Judiciary Committee hearing was noticeably calmer from hearings on immigration last year. In March, some members insisted during the Judiciary's subcommittee hearings on immigration that immigrants in detention were being treated almost as if they were on a nice vacation.¶ Some who were more vocal at that hearing were less combative this time around. But they were still highly skeptical of reform. Gowdy asked Castro whether he thought people should be forced to become citizens even if they didn't want to. (Castro said he did not.)¶ Rep. Steve King (R-Iowa), one of the more outspoken hardliners on immigration, implied Castro was for open borders, an argument the mayor also rejected.¶ "I recall you mentioning that it's not a zero-sum game, that we can have skilled workers and unskilled workers and family reunification," King said. "A zero-sum game always gets my attention, because we have about 6.3 billion people on the planet. So that would be the universe you've addressed, I think. Do you believe there should be a limit to the people brought into the United States?"¶ Some committee members said they might be more likely to support piecemeal reform, including bills to improve the legal immigration process.¶ "When you take [on] comprehensive, then we're dealing with certain issues like full citizenship," said Rep. Spencer Bachus (R-Ala.). "Whatever else we disagree on, I think we can agree on that that's a more toxic and contentious issue -- ramming [through] full amnesty."

### Guar

Silverstein 1/15 (Ken, 1/15/13, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2013/01/15/after-fukushima-u-s-seeks-to-advance-small-nuclear-reactors/>, RBatra)

Two years ago, some thought that the nuclear energy had been leveled. But the industry today is picking up steam by getting construction licenses to build four new units and by getting government funding to develop smaller nuclear reactors that are less expensive and which may be less problematic when it comes to winning regulatory approval.

The creators of those roughly 100-megawatt electric modules want to sell their products first in this country before they would market them overseas to lesser-developed nations that don’t have a huge transmission infrastructure. They would be factory-built before being shipped and fueled to where the energy is needed. To the extent that more electric generation is required, no problem: Just lay the small-scale modules next to each other, making the financial outlays more manageable.

“Restarting the nation’s nuclear industry and advancing small modular reactor technologies will help create new jobs and export opportunities for American workers and businesses, and ensure we continue to take an all-of-the-above approach to American energy production,” says Energy Secretary Steven Chu.

To that end, the Obama administration is partnering with Babcock & Wilcox and Bechtel to develop those smaller nuclear reactors for the federally-owned utility Tennessee Valley Authority. The Department of Energy is expected to invest about $450 million in the project, which equates to roughly half of the overall cost. Industry will pony up the other half.

#### Nat gas and nuclear don’t compete—utilities will always rely on nuclear as a hedge

Lamonica ‘12

(Martin, “A Glut of Natural Gas Leaves Nuclear Power Stalled”, Technology Review by MIT, 8-9-2012, http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/)

Even in United States, of course, super cheap natural gas will not last forever. With supply exceeding demand, some drillers are said to be losing money on natural gas, which could push prices back up. Prices will also be pushed upward by utilities, as they come to rely on more natural gas for power generation, says James. Ali Azad, the chief business development officer at energy company Babcock & Wilcox, thinks the answer is making nuclear power smaller, cheaper, and faster. His is one of a handful of companies developing small modular reactors that can be built in three years, rather than 10 or more, for a fraction of the cost of gigawatt-size reactors. Although this technology is not yet commercially proven, the company has a customer in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which expects to have its first unit online in 2021 (see "A Preassembled Nuclear Reactor"). "When we arrive, we will have a level cost of energy on the grid, which competes favorably with a brand-new combined-cycle natural gas plants when gas prices are between $6 to $8," said Azad. He sees strong demand in power-hungry China and places such as Saudia Arabia, where power is needed for desalination. Even if natural gas remains cheaper, utilities don't want to find themselves with an overreliance on gas, which has been volatile on price in the past, so nuclear power will still contribute to the energy mix. "[Utilities] still continue [with nuclear] but with a lower level of enthusiasm—it's a hedging strategy," says Hans-Holger Rogner from the Planning and Economics Studies section of the International Atomic Energy Agency. "They don't want to pull all their eggs in one basket because of the new kid on the block called shale gas."

**No chance war goes nuclear**

**Enders 2** (Jan 30, David, Michigan Daily, “Experts say nuclear war still unlikely,” http://www.michigandaily.com/content/experts-say-nuclear-war-still-unlikely, mrs)

\* Ashutosh Varshney – Professor of Political Science and South Asia expert at the University of Michigan

\* Paul Huth – Professor of International Conflict and Security Affairs at the University of Maryland

\* Kenneth Lieberthal – Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan. Former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council

University political science Prof. Ashutosh Varshney becomes animated when asked about the likelihood of nuclear war between India and Pakistan.

"Odds are **close to zero**," Varshney said forcefully, standing up to pace a little bit in his office. "The assumption that India and Pakistan cannot manage their nuclear arsenals as well as the U.S.S.R. and U.S. or Russia and China concedes less to the intellect of leaders in both India and Pakistan than would be warranted."

The worlds two youngest nuclear powers first tested weapons in 1998, sparking fear of subcontinental nuclear war a fear Varshney finds ridiculous.

"The decision makers are aware of what nuclear weapons are, even if the masses are not," he said.

"Watching the evening news, CNN, I think they have **vastly overstated the threat of nuclear war,"** political science Prof. Paul Huth said.

Varshney added that there are numerous factors working against the possibility of nuclear war.

"India is committed to a no-first-strike policy," Varshney said. "It is virtually impossible for Pakistan to go for a first strike, because the retaliation would be gravely dangerous."

Political science Prof. Kenneth Lieberthal, a former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council, agreed. "Usually a country that is in the position that Pakistan is in would not shift to a level that would ensure their total destruction," Lieberthal said, making note of India"s considerably larger nuclear arsenal.

"American intervention is another reason not to expect nuclear war," Varshney said. "If anything has happened since September 11, it is that the command control system has strengthened. The trigger is in very safe hands."

But the low probability of nuclear war does not mean tensions between the two countries who have fought three wars since they were created in 1947 will not erupt. "The possibility of conventional war between the two is higher. Both sides are looking for ways out of the current tension," Lieberthal said.

**Multiple factors check nuclear escalation**

**Quester 92** – Chairman of the Department of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland (November 25, George, “NUCLEAR PAKISTAN AND NUCLEAR INDIA: STABLE DETERRENT OR PROLIFERATION CHALLENGE?,” http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/india/doctrine/nuclear.pdf, mrs)

There are some peculiar limits, in any event, to the ability of either side to make nuclear threats in the South Asian context. Virtually every Indian city has a sizable minority population of Muslims. It would hence be difficult for Pakistan, given its commitment to Islamic peoples and culture, to target any of such cities with the prospect of killing so many of the very people it has always claimed to represent. Moreover, the winds blow from west to east, and it will be similarly difficult for India to impose nuclear punishment on any targets in Pakistan without suffering a deadly dose of radioactive fallout as the aftermath. Most significantly, these are considerations introduced into discussions **by Pakistanis and Indians themselves, rather than being brought in by outsiders.**

**It wouldn’t cause extinction**

**Williscroft 2** – Former National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association Officer and Commentator for Defense Watch (June 12, RG, “Don't Fear an India-Pakistan Nuclear War”, http://argee.net/DefenseWatch/Dont%20Fear%20an%20India-Pakistan%20Nuclear%20War.htm, mrs)

What might be the consequences of such an exchange?

We have only one historical example against which we can measure potential damage from a nuclear strike. Both Hiroshima and Nagasaki were "paper cities," in the sense that a large portion of the residential areas consisted of flimsy traditional Japanese domestic dwellings constructed of light wood and paper.

The architectural infrastructure of likely target areas in both Pakistan and India are dramatically different. This opens our analysis to significant speculation, since brick-and-mortar structures can absorb a lot more blast energy than paper and wood, and offer dramatically increased protection against radiation.

Furthermore, modern nukes typically do not produce as much hard radiation as their ancestors, except for specifically designed "neutron" devices. These are designed to produce a high-level flood of initial high energy neutrons intended to kill living beings quickly and efficiently, while leaving as much infrastructure intact as possible.

Both India and Pakistan would gain the greatest benefit from neutron devices, because of the very large armies each can deploy on short notice. Intelligence estimates indicate, however, that only Pakistan is likely to have a neutron device, but the evidence is circumstantial, based primarily on the certain knowledge that Pakistan has received material assistance from China, and it is likely that China has such devices.

From intelligence estimates we know that Pakistan probably has 15 or so nuclear devices, based upon its ability to manufacture highly enriched uranium, which forms the basis of its nuclear program. They all may be sufficiently small to fit inside their ballistic missiles, and at least half may be neutron devices.

India may have as many as 50 nukes based upon its ability to produce weapons grade plutonium, employed by its design. These devices probably range from relatively unsophisticated devices manufactured in the 1970s to fairly complex systems of recent manufacture.

From these numbers one can assume that a total nuclear exchange might produce over 40 actual nuclear explosions, which assumes an Indian preemptive strike followed by full-scale retaliation by Pakistan, with 60-70 percent of the weapons actually exploding with a yield near their design parameters.

If one assumes that the Pakistani devices are primarily anti-personnel weapons, the overall projections regarding death and destruction are significantly less than the numbers typically tossed around by politicians and journalists ignorant of nuclear weapons effects. Instead of 20 million killed in the first two or three exchanges, it is much more likely that the number of those killed will range from the high hundreds of thousands to the low millions, depending on whether the Indian bombers make it through Pakistani defenses to Islamabad.

Because all the devices on both sides are relatively modern when compared with the bombs dropped on Japan, the global impact will be relatively small. Regional fallout will follow local wind patterns. Sensitive measuring devices will be able to pick up radioactive debris on a worldwide basis during the following months, but only because of the distinctive character of this fallout. The level will be well below normal background radiation from the sun and cosmic rays, **and will pose absolutely no hazard to world populations.**

While a nuclear exchange would be horrific to the soldiers and civilians caught in the cross-fire and would vastly complicate our ongoing war on terror, the one thing Americans, Europeans and most of the rest of the world don't have to worry about is radiation poisoning from such an exchange.

Obviously, we would lose Pakistan as an active partner in our ongoing Afghanistan operations, but other than a place from which to launch, it is arguable whether we are getting any other real value from our partnership anyway. Whatever complications we would experience in prosecuting our offensive against al Qaeda, they would experience in spades.

An international effort would certainly mount to assist survivors. We would clearly be part of that effort, and this would tend to distract us from the reason we are there in the first place. Since the probable outcome of a nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan would be considerably smaller than current public perceptions, our level of involvement would also be significantly smaller. Ironically, if the Pakistanis rely on neutron devices, which really do very little damage to the surrounding countryside, the net effect may be far less hungry mouths impacting a food supply that will not be very much different than before the conflict.

Within two or three weeks following such an exchange, the world should come to realize that the situation really is not so catastrophic. The world stock markets should recover quickly, and most of the world probably will go back to business as usual.

**Turn— Central Asia**

**Troop deployment to Afghanistan will be part of India’s war strategy**

**STRATFOR 9** (January 22, STRATFOR Global Intelligence, “Geopolitical Diary: India's Afghanistan Option,” http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical\_diary/20090121\_geopolitical\_diary, mrs)

But this is not to say that India is left without any options. On the contrary, New Delhi is keeping open the option of hot-pursuit strikes in Pakistani-administered Kashmir, and is moving forward with plans for covert operations inside Pakistan to target militant networks. The Indians also recognize that a follow-on attack would require them to take some level of military action. But there is another pressure tactic under consideration, which involves reaching into Afghanistan.

Afghanistan is essentially the extension of Pakistan’s western buffer against foreign threats. Without a foothold in Kabul, Pakistan runs the risk of being sandwiched between a hostile power to its west and its main rival, India, to the east — a position it was in during the Cold War when the Soviet Union, then allied with India, invaded Afghanistan. As a result, Pakistan must rely heavily on its Pashtun ties to Afghanistan to secure its western frontier.

The Indians know what makes the Pakistanis jumpy, and they have spent recent years increasing their involvement in reconstruction work in Afghanistan to make good with Kabul, whose relationship with Pakistan has grown shaky due to the Taliban insurgency plaguing the country. So far, India has not ventured beyond its $86 million reconstruction commitment to Afghanistan, but has been weighing the rather contentious possibility of sending troops to the country to help fight the insurgency.

This would be a gigantic step for India to take, and one that would send the Pakistanis through the roof. India is extremely wary of deploying forces beyond its border. (It learned the pains of counterinsurgency the hard way, while engaged in a bloody war of attrition with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam in the late 1980s.) New Delhi prefers to keep to itself in foreign policy matters, particularly when it comes to fighting other states’ wars. But sources in Indian defense circles say there are serious discussions going on among the political and military leadership over the Afghan option. Indian army chief Gen. Deepak Kapoor publicly raised the possibility Jan. 14, saying in a conference, “Changing our strategic policy towards Kabul in terms of raising military stakes is one of the factors that is to be determined politically.”

Kapoor was phrasing his statement carefully, essentially saying it is up to the politicians to give the military orders to deploy. But he also was deliberate in his message to Pakistan: If Islamabad continues to push India through its array of Islamist militant proxies, India could end up making a strategic decision to break through a few foreign policy barriers and shoulder some of the security burden on Pakistan’s western frontier. At a time when U.S. tolerance for Pakistan is wearing dangerously thin, and when the United States and India are exploring deeper, long-term and more strategic ties, this type of adversarial encirclement is a threat that potentially could shake Pakistan to its core.

**This will expand India’s influence throughout Central Asia**

**Singh 8** – Resident commentator on The Indian National Interest. (August 6, Pragati - The Indian National Interest Review, Sushant K, “Indian presence essential in Afghanistan,” http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Communities-and-Partners/Partners/Detail/?lng=en&id=88656, mrs)

Afghanistan at the crossroads and India, as a close ally of the Karzai government, has an important role to play. The debate on Indian involvement in Afghanistan is sharply polarized - between one group, which wishes to restrict Indian involvement to providing non-military support, primarily in the infrastructure and human resource development projects; and the another, which advocates Indian military involvement in Afghanistan. The arguments dominating the debate are put forth by those opposing Indian military involvement in Afghanistan: problems of overreach, difficult experiences of the US and NATO forces, uncertain commitment of the US in the region and fear of trapping the Indian armed forces in the Afghan quagmire. The most entreating argument put forth is that the current policy of soft power projection pursued by India there has so far been successful and thus warrants no change.

Shifting the battleground

A significant Indian military presence in Afghanistan will alter the geo-strategic landscape in the extended neighborhood by expanding India’s power projection in Central Asia. India has historically had a friendly relationship with both Iran and Russia. With Iran, India can also ride on the goodwill created by Zaranj-Delaram highway, which has provided a road link between Afghanistan and Iran. These nations could well be more amenable to an Indian military presence than they have been to the United States and its NATO allies in Afghanistan.

**That prevents security competition for Central Asia’s energy resources**

**Sikri 7** – Former Secretary at the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. (June 29, Rajiv, Opinion Asia, “Behind Oil and Gas: India's interests in Central Asia,” http://opinionasia.com/IndiasInterestsinCentralAsia, mrs)

Over the centuries, Central Asia has been India's door to the outside world and has deeply influenced India's history, culture and polity. While the region south of the Himalayas has largely determined the mainstream features of Indian civilisation, Central Asia has also influenced India in important ways. From a geopolitical and security perspective too, the Himalayas have never been India's frontier. Today, as in the past, Central Asia continues to play an important role in India's security. Thus India cannot afford a passive approach to Central Asia; it has to be a player in the region. What are India's interests in Central Asia? These are fundamentally strategic, but also economic. Briefly, India's interests are three pronged. From the security perspective, it would like to encourage the development of stable and secular regimes in Central Asia, lest weakened, unstable states with centrifugal tendencies become bases for terrorist, separatist and fundamentalist elements, which could link up with counterparts in Afghanistan and Pakistan. In tandem, India's interests coincides with ensuring that any instability and chaos in the region does not lead to a "domino effect", of which there is a serious danger. On the role major powers in the region, India is watchful of the possible impact of developments in Central Asia on the Xinjiang region of China that would have a direct bearing on India's security interests. Beyond that, India seeks to have a firm foothold and exercise influence in Central Asia along with other great powers so that this strategically located region does not become an area dominated by forces inimical or hostile to India's interests. In concert, it is in India's interests to track any military presence in the region that could potentially threaten it. From the commercial standpoint, India's interests determine that it gain access to the region's rich natural resources, such as oil and gas, uranium, rare earths and minerals, copper, gold, diamonds etc. and to acquire, if possible, some specialised defence technologies and defence production facilities. India has many advantages in Central Asia. It is not handicapped by any negative historical legacy. Nor does India pose to Central Asia any direct contemporary threat, whether ideological, demographic or territorial. On the other hand, as India has always had a romance and mystique for the people of this region, India's "soft power" has the potential to be a powerful influence on this region. India's technical-economic assistance programmes like ITEC (ITEC or Indian Technical Economic Cooperation is a bilateral programme of assistance of the Government of India), particularly in areas like information technology, are seen as very relevant and useful for Central Asia. India is also the nearest large market for products of the region. In addition, Central Asia's rich cultural heritage and natural beauty could attract large numbers of tourists from India and thereby give a boost to the local economies. At the same time, there are many glaring weaknesses in India's policy and approach towards Central Asia. When the Central Asian republics attained independence, they looked forward to India playing a prominent role as a major partner in all spheres of activity. Unfortunately India was unable to optimally convert the traditional goodwill into contemporary influence. Although this is changing now, the Indian presence and visibility in this part of the world still remains extremely poor. India's economic relations have woefully lagged behind the political relationship, principally because India is not economically rich enough, nor is its business, industrial and financial community aggressive enough to overcome India's geographical and other handicaps in dealing with Central Asia. From the perspective of the Central Asian countries, India has not been able to make a significant contribution to their immediate priorities viz. their search for national identity, security and, more recently, regime survival. Nor has it given meaningful help in their economic development. Thus India occupies a somewhat lower priority in the foreign policies of the Central Asian countries, at least in a short-term perspective. Of course, other powers pose their own set of problems for Central Asia. Even though the Central Asian countries, as an expression of their sovereignty and independent identity, seek to distance themselves from Russia, they can neither ignore nor do without Russia, whose clout in Central Asia remains considerable despite the growing influence of China and the US. The latter two countries have their own limitations – China has been traditionally regarded by Central Asians with suspicion as an expansionist and dominating power, and the US is suspected of actively working for regime change in these countries. Major bilateral and international donors too have not been able to make any meaningful difference to the lives of the people. Against this background, the Central Asian countries continue to have some expectations that India would play a much larger role in Central Asia, and, albeit somewhat vaguely, consider India as a potential balancing factor to the other major players in the region. However, India's good relations with Russia and the fact that it is a relatively minor player in Central Asia restricts its role as an effective balancing force. India's major dilemma and constraint is how to access Central Asia. Given the situation in Afghanistan, and Pakistan's unwillingness to offer transit facilities to India, the traditional access route via Afghanistan is blocked for the foreseeable future. All possible routes to Central Asia via Iran are neither reliable nor optimal, even less so in view of the international pressures on Iran today. India could, however, explore the possibility of establishing links with Central Asia via China, since that is the only other overland route to Central Asia from India. Given its inherent handicaps, India cannot achieve its objectives by acting on its own in Central Asia. As a geographical area that abuts on the borders of major powers in Asia, including India, Central Asia will always attract a foreign presence. It is a "negative security space", which the major powers cannot afford to let other powers or forces dominate. Thus, in order to protect and preserve its interests in the region, India has no alternative but to closely consult and cooperate with the other major powers who have an interest and a presence in Central Asia. Aspiring to be an influential global power, India has to be a player in the unfolding "Great Game" in Central Asia, on an equal footing with the other major players like the United States, Russia and China if it is to successfully protect its vital national interests in Central Asia. Thus India must remain integral to Eurasian energy politics. India needs to not only make significant oil and gas investments in Eurasia, but also leverage its position as a major existing and potential consumer of imported energy, and as a key transit country for Eurasian oil and gas to global markets. Eurasian oil and gas pipelines and power transmission lines from Central Asia to India would give India the much-needed meaningful economic links with, and an overland access route to, these countries. Were that to happen, Central Asia could be transformed into a strategic space uniting major Asian continental powers and energy producers and consumers, plus the omnipresent superpower, **in a web of interdependence rather than competition**. The need of the hour is for bold and creative thinking by all the major players present in Central Asia who are interested in a stable and peaceful Central Asia.

**The impact is nuclear war**

**Engdahl 8** – Political economist, degree in politics from Princeton University and graduate study in comparative economics at the University of Stockholm (August 14, F William, The Real News Network, “Nuclear war by miscalculation,” http://therealnews.com/t/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=2051, mrs)

F. WILLIAM ENGDAHL, AUTHOR AND POLITICAL ECONOMIST: What Washington is literally playing with here is nuclear war by miscalculation, thinking they can outflank the Russians psychologically and militarily. And I think this was a clear signal from the Russian government that they have drawn a line in the sand with Georgia and that they're not going to allow this kind of military adventurism. Georgia can take these areas back, South Ossetia and Abkhazia, both of which fought a war to be independent of Georgia in the early '90s. This region, including Georgia, has been, essentially, a part of the Russian Empire for 200 years, but Georgia is independent and has been since the early '90s. Russia's not demanding that Georgia become a part of the greater Russia, but what it's demanding is that Georgia stay neutral vis-à-vis NATO. Russia went into Georgia to essentially deliver a message. There were more than 1,000 US military special forces in Georgia training Georgian troops before Georgia launched the attack on Ossetia on 8 August. There are 1,000 Israeli troops at least, private security firms and military advisors, including advisors who are upgrading the Georgian air force in an installation near Tbilisi. That's what the Russian airplanes hit, and they essentially made the military strike on South Ossetia militarily impossible by making incursions inside Georgian territory before they announced that they were calling a halt to their military operations. What's at stake here is that since the end of the Cold War, there has been literally a new Cold War over oil in Central Asia. Caspian Sea has huge undeveloped reserves of oil from Kazakhstan to Azerbaijan, Baku, the old oilfields of early Russia, one of the first big oilfields in the world, actually, more than a century ago. And British Petroleum and several US companies went in early to try to lock up the oilfields in Baku, and with considerable cash under the table and over the table, according to various reports, they more or less locked the government of Azerbaijan into a US-friendly stance. And they built a pipeline, which was opened three years ago, called the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline (Ceyhan is a port on the Mediterranean side of Turkey) to bring oil from the Caspian Sea to the West, sidelining Russian territory. The Rose Revolution that brought President Saakashvili to power in Georgia in early 2004 was financed by the US State Department, the National Endowment for Democracy, and various NGOs that all receive money from the US government. So this was what the CIA did in Iran in the '50s or in Guatemala against Arbenz that they do with these NGOs now, called the color revolutions. And that's the operation that brought Saakashvili into power in 2004. So he's essentially a Washington proxy or puppet figure, if you will, and that's how Moscow regards it, and one that is committed to bringing Georgia into NATO, which is extremely provocative.

### Russia

**US can’t compete with Russia- productivity, volume, price**

**Orlov, 12** -- engineer

(Dmitry, "Shale Gas," 5-8-12, Club Orlov, cluborlov.blogspot.it/2012/05/shale-gas-view-from-russia.html, accessed 6-3-12, mss)

The official shale gas story goes something like this: recent technological breakthroughs by US energy companies have made it possible to tap an abundant but previously inaccessible source of clean, environmentally friendly natural gas. This has enabled the US to become the world leader in natural gas production, overtaking Russia, and getting ready to end of Russia's gas monopoly in Europe. Moreover, this new shale gas is found in many parts of the world, and will, in due course, enable the majority of the world's countries to achieve independence from traditional gas producers. Consequently, the ability of those countries with the largest natural gas reserves—Russia and Iran—to control the market for natural gas will be reduced, along with their overall geopolitical influence. If this were the case, then we should expect the Kremlin, along with Gazprom, to be quaking in their boots. But are they? Here is what Gazprom's chairman, Alexei Miller, recently told Süddeutsche Zeitung: “Shale gas is a well-organized global PR-campaign. There are many of them: global cooling, biofuels.” He pointed out that the technology for producing gas from shale is many decades old, and suggested the US turned to it out of desperation. He dismissed it as an energy alternative for Europe. Is this just the other's sides propaganda, or could Miller be simply stating the obvious? Let's explore. I will base my exploration on Russian sources, which is why all the numbers are in metric units. If you want to convert to Imperial, 1 m3 = 35 cubic feet, 1 km2 = .38 square miles, 1 tonne = 1.1 short tons). The best-developed shale gas basin is Barnett in Texas, responsible for 70% of all shale gas produced to date. By “developed” I mean drilled and drilled and drilled, and then drilled some more: just in 2006 there were about as many wells drilled into Barnett shale as are currently producing in all of Russia. This is because the average Barnett well yields only around 6.35 million m3 of gas, over its entire lifetime, which corresponds to the average monthly yield of a typical Russian well that continues to produce over a 15-20 year period, meaning that the yield of a typical shale gas well is at least 200 times smaller. This hectic activity cannot stop once a well has been drilled: in order to continue yielding even these meager quantities, the wells have to be regularly subjected to hydraulic fracturing, or "fracked": to produce each thousand m3 of gas, 100 kg of sand and 2 tonnes of water, combined with a proprietary chemical cocktail, have to be pumped into the well at high pressure. Half the water comes back up and has to be processed to remove the chemicals. Yearly fracking requirements for the Barnett basin run around 7.1 million tonnes of sand and 47.2 million tonnes of water, but the real numbers are probably lower, as many wells spend much of the time standing idle. In spite of the frantic drilling/fracking activity, this is all small potatoes by Russian standards. Russia's proven reserves of natural gas amount to 43.3 trillion m3, which is about a third of the world's total. At current consumption rates, that's enough to last 72 years. Russian gas production is constrained by demand, not by supply; it is currently down simply because Eurozone is in the midst of an economic crisis. Meanwhile, US production has surged ahead, for no adequately explored reason, crashing the price and making much of it unprofitable. Let's compare: Gazprom's price at the wellhead runs from US$3 to $50 per thousand m3, depending on the region. Compare that to shale gas in the US, which runs from $80 to $320 per thousand m3. At this price, the US cannot afford to sell shale gas on the European market. Moreover, the overall volume of shale gas being produced in the US, even given the feverish drilling rate of the past couple of years, if cleaned up, liquified, and shipped to Europe in LNG tankers, would not be enough to book up just the LNG terminal in Gdańsk, Poland, which is currently standing idle. It seems that Gazprom has little to worry about.

#### No impact to natural gas—market will adapt

Persily ‘12

(Larry Persily, “Experts say U.S. exports will push global LNG prices lower”, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects: Office of the Federal Coordinator, 8-30-2012, <http://www.arcticgas.gov/2012/experts-say-us-exports-will-push-global-lng-prices-lower>)

Exporting U.S. LNG will raise domestic natural gas prices little - and maybe not at all - because the global market won't take enough to make a difference. But it could help push down LNG prices in Asia and Europe. That was the conclusion of three economists who separately studied global prospects and presented their work at an Energy Information Administration workshop Aug. 23 in Washington. Kenneth Medlock, from the James A. Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University in Houston, said his models determined the world will not need all that much U.S. LNG. All three experts also said the LNG business is highly competitive and other players won't stand still while the U.S. enters the market. Philip Hanser, of The Brattle Group, said LNG requires so much up-front capital that the market for U.S. exports is small and the window is already closing. Producer nations like Canada, Russia, Qatar and Nigeria will protect their market shares and "will react even before we do anything," he said. Most of the LNG delivered to Asia and Europe is priced on contract formulas connected to oil. With high prices for crude driving up LNG in those markets, natural gas buyers are already balking and insisting on contract renegotiations. Hanser said he expects U.S. exports would push the rest of the world away from oil indexing and toward market-based prices. Medlock said U.S. LNG could exert "significant downward pressure on prices," particularly in Asia, while Dale Nesbitt, senior manager at Deloitte MarketPoint, said prices will "converge" globally with lower-priced U.S. LNG in the market.

#### Nat gas prices terminally low now—demand won’t be able to keep up with supply

Deutch ‘12

(John Deutch, “The U.S. Natural-Gas Boom Will Transform the World”, Wall Street Journal 8-14-2012, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303343404577514622469426012.html>)

Demand for natural gas has not kept up with the phenomenal growth in supply. That's indicated by the extremely low current price and the thousands of recently developed unconventional natural gas wells that are shut-in. Unconventional natural gas production from "dry" wells (those that don't produce useful petroleum liquid products) is at a virtual standstill. This signals that some recovery in North American natural gas prices is likely—to the range of $4 per thousand cubic feet, perhaps—which would be welcomed by producers. Consumers who heat their homes with gas, and chemical companies and other manufacturers who rely on this raw material for producing petrochemical and polymers, should enjoy several decades of abundant supply. It will take time for the demand for gas to grow, and it is uncertain how rapidly and how far it will. Incremental gas production will initially go the power sector, displacing coal-generating plants. Natural gas will offer the cheapest way to produce electricity, at six cents per kilowatt-hour—more than 20% lower than new coal, nuclear or most renewable alternatives. Because of its low price, some natural gas will also be used to extract crude from Canada's oil sands. But the main question will be how much natural gas displaces higher-priced gasoline and alcohol fuels in transportation.

**China triggers their links**

**Medlock, 11** -- Baker Institute Energy and Resource Economics fellow

(Kenneth, PhD in economics from Rice University, Rice University economics professor, Baker Institute Energy Forum’s natural gas program director, International Association for Energy Economics council member, United States Association for Energy Economics President for Academic Affairs, member of the American Economic Association and the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists, and Peter Hartley, PhD, Rice University Economics chair, Baker Institute scholar, "The Rise of China: And its Energy Implications," 12-2-11, www.bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-RiseOfChinaMedlockHartley-120211-WEB.pdf, accessed 9-19-12, mss)

The benefits extend beyond China's borders as well. This is evidenced in Figure ll through the impact that greater Chinese shale production has on prices. Asian prices are reduced by the greatest amount, but prices at both NBP and the Henry Hub are also reduced. This occurs as a result of the large reduction in LNG demand in Asia, which reduces competition for LNG imports. In fact, LNG imports to the U.S. and European nations increase (see Figure 13) in the High China Shale Case. We also see that global LNG exports are generally lower as a result of greater shale production in China, a result that reinforces the point that Asian demand is the driver of LNG growth in the Reference Case. Figure I2 indicates that in 2040 about 85 percent of the reduction in LNG exports falls on Iran, Qatar, Russia, and Venezuela. This is analogous to the point made in Medlock and Jaffe (2011) that shale resources tend to reduce the long-run market influence of Iran, Russia, and Venezuela.

#### This card slays their Russia impact-

**Story, 10/2/12** [Kathleen, Kate Story has had careers as a teacher and trainer, a computer analyst for an international corporation, and a licensed realtor in SC, NC, and FL in her thirty years of employment. She has  ECO certification from Asheville, is a member of the Green Building Council, buys and "greens" existing homes and promotes green building in the Greenville, SC area. She was an exhibitor at the annual Southern Energy & Environment Expo in Etowah, NC until its recent closing. its closing in 2011. She is an environmental and sustainability activist and member of Environmental Educators of NC,Green Building Products, and Bright Green Talent. Her current project is building a greenhouse with recycled glass bottles. Contact Kate at greenerbuilt1@gmail.com

 Russia vs United States in natural gas market”. <http://www.examiner.com/article/russia-vs-united-states-natural-gas-market>]

This October 2, 2012 morning, Russia's [Gazprom](http://www.gazprom.com) announced its signing of a contract for liquefied natural gas delivery to India's state-controlled GAIL (India) Ltd. for 20 years of 2.5 million tons per year. This news follows on the heels of reports that the United States with the hydraulic fracturing drilling process of its vast shale gas deposits was threatening Russian dominance on international gas markets.¶ Remember India's massive two day electric blackout in July 2012? Russia is now pursuing the booming Asian energy market. Unlike Russia and India, in the United States shale gas is not controlled by the government or any private company.The big controversy over the safety of [fracking](http://www.examiner.com/topic/fracking) and its environmental implications aside, the economic implications for the U.S., Russia and China are immense.¶ The expert on Russia at [Washington's Brookings Institution](http://www.brookings.edu/), Fiona Hill, says "Their days of dominating the European gas markets are gone." A summer 2012 report from Harvard University's [Kennedy School of Government](http://www.hks.harvard.edu/) stated, "The relative fortunes of the United States, Russia, and China -- and their ability to exert influence in the world -- are tied in no small measure to global gas developments."¶ In the U.S., the October 2012 price for gas is about three dollars per unit versus Russia's ten dollars for the large quantities of gas it has been exporting to Europe and other countries. Worldwide energy companies and politicians took notice since the profits for Russia's state-controlled Moscow-based [Gazprom](http://www.examiner.com/topic/gazprom/articles) energy corporation were $44 billion in 2011.¶ Russia had over 15 countries in Europe trying to find other energy sources in 2009 when a price payment dispute stopped Ukraine shipments for a couple weeks. Gazprom is the world's largest natural gas producer and exports it to other countries. Last month Gazprom said it couldn't justify investing in developing a new arctic gas field as profits dropped by nearly 25 percent.There were some rumors that Russia is secretly campaigning to stop the U.S. from taking over the natural gas market. Gazprom's head of export contracts and pricing, Sergei Komlev, in an email to the Associated Press admitted they were aware of decreasing dependence on Gazprom gas but do not expect U.S. abnormally low prices to last. He thanked the U.S. for being the "shale gas global lobbyist" since Gazprom believes natural gas beats other fossil fuels for environmental friendliness.

### 22

**Blees 11** [“Nuclear power and climate change – what now?”, May 28, 2011, Brave New World, Tom Blees. Tom an advanced energy systems consultant from Davis, California, and author of Prescription for the Planet – The Painless Remedy for Our Energy & Environmental Crises. Tom is also the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives , an international think tank of distinguished scientists dedicated to creating an environmentally sound energy-rich future for the entire human race]

Whatever one believes about the causes of climate change, there is no denying that glaciers around the world are receding at an alarming rate. Billions of people depend on such glaciers for their water supplies. We have already seen cases of civil strife and even warfare caused or exacerbated by competition over water supplies. Yet these are trifling spats when one considers that the approaching demographic avalanche will require us to supply about three billion more people with all the water they need within just four decades.There is no avoiding the fact that the water for all these people—and even more, if the glaciers continue to recede, as expected—will have to come from the ocean. That means a deployment of desalination facilities on an almost unimaginable scale. Not only will it take staggering amounts of energy just to desalinate such a quantity, but moving the water to where it is needed will be an additional energy burden of prodigious proportions. Given the formidable energy requirements for these water demands alone—not to mention the energy demands of the developing countries for all their other needs—any illusions about wind turbines and solar panels being able to supply all the energy humanity requires should be put to rest. Fortunately for all of us, the nuclear power technologies that can safely provide all the carbon-free energy that humanity will desire in the years to come have already been invented.

**Bell 09** – Research Associate at the David Livingstone Centre for Sustainability. He was a BBC presenter and correspondent who went on to head up policy for the Scottish Nationalist Party (SNP), set up allmediascotland.com and write columns for ­ e Herald. He has been investigating water for two years (Alexander, November, Peak Water: Civilization and the World’s Water Crisis, p. 208)

The idea of a water war has become commonplace. It may happen like the scenarios above, but I suspect the world has to face up to a more horrific future. Not one of **war** as we understand it in 20th century terms, but a state of **ongoing global trauma** as people witness civilization decay when the water runs out. How we respond to that catastrophe will be the mark of the human race. Almost **certainly** it will mean the **end of civilization** as we currently know it.