# warming

#### Don’t solve warming – tipping point inevitable, timeframe and insufficient amount of reductions block

**Smith, 11** [Gar, environmental journalist, He is the former editor of Earth Island Journal, and currently edits Earth Island Institute's weekly "eco-zine" The-Edge. NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCEhttp://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf]

More than 200 new reactors have been proposed around the world but not enough reactors can be built fast enough to replace the world’s vanishing fossil fuel resources.2 **Even if nuclear output** **could be tripled** by 2050 (which seems unlikely in light of the industry’s record to date), this would only lower greenhouse emissions by 25 to 40 billion annual tons—**12.5** to 20 percent **of the** **reductions needed to stabilize the climate**.3 The International Energy Agency estimates that renewables and efficiency measures could produce ten times these savings by 2050. The IEA estimates that cutting CO2 emissions in half by mid-century would require building 1,400 new 1,000-MW reactors—32 new reactors every year. But since it usually takes about 10 years from groundbreaking to atom-smashing, these reactors **could not be constructed fast enough to prevent an irreversible** “**tipping” of world climate**. This hardly seems feasible since the industry has only managed to bring 30 new reactors on-line over the past ten years. Of the 35 reactors the IEA listed as “under construction” in mid-2008, a third of these had been “under construction” for 20 years or longer. Some may never be completed. By contrast, a 1.5 MW wind turbine can be installed in a single day and can be operational 4 | The Watts Bar-1 reactor, 60 miles southwest of Knoxville, Tennesee, took 24 years to build. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION in two weeks.4 Still, the pace of nuclear construction has picked up lately. In 2010, the number of reactor projects underway had ballooned to 66—with most located in China (27) and Russia (11). And it’s not just a matter of designing and building new reactors.The construction of 1,400 new nuclear reactors also would require building 15 new uranium enrichment plants, 50 new reprocessing plants and 14 new waste storage sites—a deal-breaker since the sole proposed U.S. storage site at Yucca Mountain is apparently dead .The cost of this additional nuclear infrastructure has been estimated at $3 trillion.5 Moreover, since the operating lifetime of these new reactors would still be a mere 40 years, even if new construction was practical, quick and affordable, it would only “solve” the global-warming problem for another 40 years, at which point the plants would need to be decommissioned.

**No warming**

**Beisner 10** — former associate professor of interdisciplinary studies in economics, government, and public policy, Covenant. PhD, University of St. Andrews (Calvin, Forget Global Warming Mini Ice Age May Be on Its Way, 12 January 2010, http://www.rightsidenews.com/201001128144/energy-and-environment/forget-global-warming-mini-ice-age-may-be-on-its-way.html, AMiles) Note – graph omitted

The UK's MailOnline did just that this week under the headline The mini ice age starts here. Lead paragraph? "The bitter winter afflicting much of the Northern Hemisphere is only the start of a global trend towards cooler weather that is likely to last for 20 or 30 years, say some of the world's most eminent climate scientists." Right. MailOnline reporter David Rose doesn't call them "the world's leading climate skeptics." He calls them "some of the world's most eminent climate scientists"--and he goes on to cite "Mojib Latif, a leading member of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)," "Anastasios Tsonis, head of the University of Wisconsin Atmospheric Sciences Group," and "William Gray, emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Colorado State University." Contrary to fears of inexorably diminishing Arctic sea ice, Rose cites the U.S. National Snow and Ice Data Center as reporting that "Arctic summer sea ice has increased by 409,000 square miles, or 26 per cent, since 2007." Though snow's been unusual for most of the southern half of the United Kingdom in recent decades, the Mail published the accompanying satellite photo of Great Britain during the recent cold snap. The island is essentially all covered with snow. Rose reported record lows as far south as Cuba--something I can attest to, living near Miami in south Florida, where we experienced sub-freezing weather over the weekend. He quoted Tsonis as saying that last week 56% of the United States was covered by snow--something that hasn't happened in several decades. And the "'Arctic oscillation'--a weather pattern that sees the development of huge 'blocking' areas of high pressure in northern latitudes, driving polar winds far to the south . . . is at its strongest for at least 60 years. As a result, the jetstream--the high-altitude wind that circles the globe from west to east and normally pushes a series of wet but mild Atlantic lows across Britain--is currently running not over the English Channel but the Strait of Gibraltar." Consequently, most of the Northern Hemisphere is much colder this winter than it's been in decades--and the Southern Hemisphere is cooler, too. According to Rose, Latif, Tsonis, and other scientists attribute the cold shift primarily to a shift in the world's dominant ocean circulations--the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation--from a warm phase to a cool phase, something that happens about every 20 to 30 years. "The scientists' predictions also undermine the standard climate computer models, which assert that the warming of the Earth since 1900 has been driven solely by man-made greenhouse gas emissions and will continue as long as carbon dioxide levels rise. They say that their research shows that much of the warming was caused by oceanic cycles when they were in a 'warm mode' as opposed to the present 'cold mode'." That's a point made by Dr. Roy W. Spencer in the science chapter of the Cornwall Alliance's new document A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming and illustrated in the graph below. "A significant share of the warming we saw from 1980 to 2000 and at earlier periods in the 20th Century was due to these cycles," said Latif, "perhaps as much as 50 per cent. They have now gone into reverse, so winters like this one will become much more likely. Summers will also probably be cooler, and all this may well last two decades or longer. The extreme retreats that we have seen in glaciers and sea ice will come to a halt. For the time being, global warming has paused, and there may well be some cooling." Tsonis also believes that the ocean current cycles dominated global climate change in the 20th century, including the post-1970s, the period many point to as driven by human greenhouse gas emissions, but he doesn't venture to attribute specific percentages to the natural and human causes. "I do not believe in catastrophe theories," Rose quoted him as saying. "Man-made warming is balanced by the natural cycles, and I do not trust the computer models which state that if CO2 reaches a particular level then temperatures and sea levels will rise by a given amount. These models cannot be trusted to predict the weather for a week, yet they are running them to give readings for 100 years." Gray went farther: "Most of the rise in temperature from the Seventies to the Nineties was natural. Very little was down to CO2--in my view, as little as five to ten per cent." Gray, Tsonis, and Latif all agreed that the findings about the ocean currents undermined the credibility of the computer climate models on which the IPCC and other alarmists rely.

# 2nc overview—econ

**Econ collapse outweighs and turns case, that’s Friedberg and Schoenfeld—**

**A) Magnitude—recession triggers 1930’s regional trading blocs, empirically escalates and is uniquely likely to cause extinction**

**Mootry 2008,** [Primus, B.A. Northern Illinois University “Americans likely to face more difficult times” - The Herald Bulletin, 10/8/2008 http://www.theheraldbulletin.com/columns/local\_story\_282184703.html?keyword=secondarystory]

These are difficult times. The direct and indirect costs associated with the war on Iraq have nearly wrecked our economy. The recent $700 billion bailout, bank failures, and the failure of many small and large businesses across the nation will take years — perhaps decades — to surmount. Along with these rampant business failures, we have seen unemployment rates skyrocket, record numbers of home foreclosures, an explosion of uninsured Americans, and other economic woes that together have politicians now openly willing to mention the "D" word: Depression. These are difficult days. We have seen our international reputation sink to all time lows. We have seen great natural disasters such as hurricanes Ike and Katrina leaving hundreds of thousands of citizens stripped of all they own or permanently dislocated. In all my years, I have never seen a time such as this. To make matters worse, we are witnessing a resurgence of animosities between the United States and Russia, as well as the rapid growth of India and China. As to the growth of these two huge countries, the problem for us is that they are demanding more and more oil — millions of barrels more each week — and there is not much we can say or do about it. In the meantime, if America does not get the oil it needs, our entire economy will grind to a halt. In short, the challenges we face are complex and enormous. Incidentally, one of the factors that makes this time unlike any other in history is the potential for worldwide nuclear conflict. **There has never been a time in** the long **history** of ~~man~~ **when**, through his own technologies — and his arrogance — ~~he~~ can destroy the planet. Given the tensions around the world, **a mere spark could lead to global conflagration.**[This evidence has been gender paraphrased].

**B) Timeframe and Probability—econ at tipping point now, perception of irresponsibility will send us into another recession**

Victoria Craig **9/24** (writer for Fox Business) September 24**,** 2012 “Fiscal Pitfalls Hinge on Gridlocked Congress” http://www.foxbusiness.com/government/2012/09/20/fiscal-pitfalls-hinge-on-gridlocked-congress/

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

**D) Economic downturn collapses R&D in green energy, causes the aff to get rolled back**

**RICHARD 08** LLL & LLB . 2/6/08 (“Counter-Point: 4 Reasons Why Recession is BAD for the Environment” http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/02/4\_reasons\_recession\_bad\_environment.php)

As a counter-point to Lloyd's tongue-in-cheek post about 10 Ways the Recession Can Help the Environment, here are some eco-reasons why we should wish a speedy recovery (we won't get into non-green reasons here): Firstly, when **squeezed, companies will reduce their investments into research & development and green programs. These are usually not short-term profit centers, so that is what's axed first**. Some progress has been made in the past few years, it would be sad to lose ground now. Secondly, average people, when money is tight, will look for less expensive products (duh). Right now, that usually means that greener products won't make it. Maybe someday if we start taxing “bads” instead of “goods” (pollution, carbon, toxins instead of labor, income, capital gains) the least expensive products will also be the greenest, but right now that's not the case. Thirdly, there's less money going into the stock markets and bank loans are harder to get, which means that many small firms and startups working on the breakthrough green technologies of tomorrow can have trouble getting funds or can even go bankrupt, especially if their clients or backers decide to make cuts. Fourthly, during economic crises, voters want the government to appear to be doing something about the economy (even if it's government that screwed things up in the first place). They'll accept all kinds of measures and laws, including those that aren't good for the environment. Massive corn subsidies anyone? Don't even think about progress on global warming.

# 2nc heg & econ internal

**Sequestration guarantees collapse of the economy and hegemony – causes Middle East war**

Kay Bailey Hutchison (U.S. Senator from Texas) 9/21/2012 “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk. According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and a potentially catastrophic blow to our national defense and security capabilities in a time of increasing violence and danger. All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve. The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship. Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year. The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings. In the absence of U.S. military leadership, upheaval in the Middle East would be worse. As any student of history can attest, instability does not confine itself to national borders. Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region. Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological research, development and advantage - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities. Sequestration can still be avoided. But that will require leadership from the President that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

**Extinction**

**Stirling 2011** – Governor & Lord Lieutenant of Canada, Lord High Admiral of Nova Scotia, & B.Sc. in Pol. Sc. & History; M.A. in European Studies (The Earl of Stirling, “General Middle East War Nears - Syrian events more dangerous than even nuclear nightmare in Japan”, http://europebusines.blogspot.com/2011/03/general-middle-east-war-nears-syrian.html)

Saddam Hussein's military had prepared what it called the "great equalizer", an arsenal of 25 Scud warheads carrying over 11,000lb of biological agents, including deadly botulism poison and anthrax germs (an additional 33,000lb of germ agents were placed in artillery shells and bombs). It was only after he was forced into denuding himself of his advanced weaponry that the neo-cons were able to begin the Second Gulf War commonly called the Iraq War. After Iraq, the Likud/neo-con war strategy calls for the neutralizing of Iran and Syria. The Iranians response, to this strategy, was to train and equip Hezbollah in Lebanon and to deepen their strategic alliance with Syria. During the 2006 Second Lebanon War, the Iranian trained and equipped Hezbollah forces repeated the efforts of Saddam during the First Gulf War. They delivered a very large number of rockets with “dumb” high explosive warheads on Israel. The Hezbollah Special Forces are in-effect a highly trained and well-equipped Iranian commando force of at least a Brigade in size. They man and protect a large number of mostly unguided and rather crude rockets, generally Katyusha 122mm artillery rockets with a 19 mile/30km range and capable of delivering approximately 66 pounds/30kg of warheads. Additionally, Hezbollah are known to possess a considerable number of more advanced and longer range guided missiles. During the 2006 war Hezbollah fired approximately 4,000 rockets (95% of which were Katyshas) all utilizing only "dumb" high explosive warheads. Some Iranian build and supplied Fajr-3 and Ra'ad 1 liquid-fueled missiles were also fired. At the time of the 2006 war Hezbollah was reported to have in the range of 13,000 rockets. There are creditable reports that this number has been rebuilt and expanded upon since the end of that war and that the number of rockets is now at least 50,000 and perhaps 60,000 or more. During the 2006 war the world watched as Israeli towns were hit time and time again by the Katyushas. What was not discussed by the main stream news media was the fact that the ordinance delivered by the Katyushas was mainly harassment fire with very limited effect. The Iranian/Syrian trained and supplied Hezhollah commandos were holding back their "heavy stuff" both in terms of their longer range guided missiles capable of hitting southern Israel and most importantly warheads of strategic military importance. That is NBC (nuclear [in this case radiological] chemical and biological) and advanced-conventional warheads. They were demonstrating their ability to deliver "ordinance on target" and their ability to survive a heavy Israeli ground and air combined arms attack. Hezbollah has the capability of loading truly strategic warheads on the large number of mostly crude older technology unguided rockets that it has. The use of advanced-conventional fuel-air explosive (FAE) warheads on the Katyushas would have had a much more profound effect in Israeli cities. The use of FAE submunitions on the larger missiles capable of hitting any target in Israel would have given Hezbollah the firepower of low-yield nuclear weapons without crossing the nuclear threshold. Coupled with the large number of missiles in Syria and those in Iran, the Hezbollah rockets posed, and continue to pose, a truly grave strategic threat to Israel if FAE warheads are used. This threat is dramatically increased if radiological ("dirty bombs"), chemical, and/or advanced biological warheads are used. The massive number of Hezbollah rockets could also be outfitted with chemical warheads. It is worth noting that the joint Syrian-Iranian chemical warfare R&D and production program is perhaps the largest and most complicated on earth. Generally the Israelis have shown themselves to be prepared for chemical warfare, however a chemical war attack following closely behind a FAE attack (to open up bunkers and apartment buildings) would have greater effect. While it is not necessary to utilize a rocket to deliver a biological war attack, it could be done and there is some benefit militarily to a rapid dispersal of biowar agents under the cover of conventional attacks. Radiological weapons deliver the long term (which can be hundreds of thousands of years) lethal effects of radiation without the blast effect of a nuclear bomb. The combined military strategic capability of NBC/Advanced Conventional warheads and very large numbers of rockets operated and protected by Hezbollah, coupled with the arsenal of Syria and Iran (and Hamas) acts as a MAD (mutually assured destruction) between Israel and Iran/Syria. Yes the Israelis can nuke the hell out of both Iran and Syria; however, they possess a fatal return punch. Only a madman would consider starting a war in a MAD environment. The response from the Israeli and neo-con hardliners to the new MAD strategic environment has been frightening. Instead of recognizing the danger to Israel and to the entire world from the Iranian/Syrian “checkmate” on the aggressive Israeli/neo-con strategy, and making major changes to their strategy, they are attempting to “tough it out”. The issue of “danger from the Iranian nuclear program” is a smokescreen to facilitate the coming war on Iran and her allies (Syria, Hezbollah, and Hamas) and to continue with the next stage of the neo-con strategy. The response from the hardliners is more war and damn their WMD (weapons of mass destruction). This is most unwise and most dangerous to the entire world. When the USSR was falling apart, and in the aftermath of the USSR breakup, Iran spend a lot of money to hire some of the best Soviet biological war experts. The advanced biowar weapons that Iran has developed gives Iran a Global Strategic Weapon of Mass Destruction that can unleash levels of death among the populations of the major neo-con nations (USA, UK, France, German, Italy, etc.) very similar to that from a global strategic nuclear strike. This means that Iran and her allies have a MAD with America, Canada, the United Kingdom, France, German, Italy, etc. Most people think of biological warfare as anthrax and smallpox; they do not understand that there has been a major shift in technology. The difference between the old biowar (that most people think of) and advanced biowar (with its recombination DNA designer super killer viruses) is like the difference between an old Model T Ford and a 2011 Rolls Royce Phantom. Both are cars, or biological weapons, but there is a difference of several orders of magnitude. Regardless of how a war against Iran breaks out, it is likely to very quickly escalate to the usage of WMD. There has been talk among USAF war planners of a 1,200 (some say 2,000 to 3,000 or more) target attack on Iran’s nuclear, industrial, military, political and religious infrastructure. If a foreign enemy were to bomb 1,200 or more targets in the United States what would be the response of the American government and it’s military? Actually the answer to this question is well known. The stated doctrine of the United States of America is to rain hundreds of hydrogen bombs (WMD) on the territory and people of such an aggressor; this has been our policy for approximately 60 years. Why do we presuppose that the Iranians would not do the same? If Iran is hit by either an Israeli and/or an American air attack, it is certain that Iran will respond. This response, even if is non-WMD at first, will certainly result in more escalation and counter-escalation. The chances of a regional Middle East war between Iran/Syria/Hezbollah/Hamas and Israel/USA not becoming a nuclear and advanced biological war nightmare are very low. In fact, since both sides know this, there is a strong military incentive to move to all out usage of WMD when the first bombs begin to fall (in order to utilize more of one’s weaponry before its destruction). This could include Iranian/Syrian fire-on-warning system using a fiber-optic CCC link between all the launch bunkers in Lebanon, Syria, Iran, and Palestine to co-ordinate fire a truly massive barrage of rockets and guided missiles, with WMD warheads, upon Israel within the first five-minutes of a launch warning. A similar fire-on-warning system for Israel, only involving nuclear-armed IRBMs, and submarine launched cruise missiles (SLCMs), and rapid launch of aircraft carried air-launched cruise missiles (ALCMs). could also launch within five minutes of warning. This is the "hair-triggering" of WMD in the single most dangerous place on the planet Earth. The end result will be a brief battle of unbelievable intensity that will leave half or more of all Israelis dead and large parts of the Israeli nation poisoned for hundreds of thousands of years by radiological warheads. Syria, Iran, and large parts of Lebanon and Palestine will cease to exists and will be little more than a green radioactive debris field poisonous to all forms of life higher than a cockroach for hundreds of thousands of years (longer than modern man has existed). The Iranian oilfields and most likely the oilfields of a large part of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other areas of the Middle East are also apt to be so poisoned by Iranian radiological warheads or Israeli/American nuclear fallout, that production will effectively cease. The destruction of the Middle Eastern oilfields and the blocking of the Gulf will cause the world to suffer its most complete economic collapse in history. All of this will take less than one week from the beginning of the General Middle East War. At about two weeks, after the beginning of the war on Iran, emergency rooms and doctors offices will begin to see a sudden spike in a number of new diseases with numerous very ill people being admitted to hospitals in North America, and Western Europe and what is left of Israel. By that time the Iranian and Syrian states will have effectively ceased to exist with insufficient manpower and organization to even bury their dead. The many new genetically engineered viruses causing the strange diseases showing up will have been spread by sleeper agents supplied with a number of new viruses and distributed in public places (movie theaters, shopping malls, churches, etc.) quietly without anyone knowing. Humans themselves will become the vectors of the diseases/biowar agents. Although the Bush/Obama Administrations have spent well over $40 billion on biowar defense in the last few years, there is little that can realistically be done against a global strategic advanced biowar attack. The tactic of necessity will be to lock down everyone, with only key persons being allowed to leave their homes, in order to let the multiple genetically engineered diseases burn themselves out (a nice way of saying letting everyone who has the illnesses die off). Expect to see sub dermal RFID chips implanted under the skin of the population left in the major neo-con states to “prove your disease free status” and necessary to buy, sell, or work. Expect to see military checkpoints everywhere and total control by the neo-con national governments over all aspects of life. Expect to see concentration camps for persons suspected of disloyalty to the state (this will include many viewers of sites like this one). Expect to see levels of death, fear, repression that are almost incomprehensible. Expect to see the various biological warfare diseases spread throughout the world, even with a total shutdown of international travel. Many many millions will die in Russia and China. Expect to see those national governments not controlled by the neo-con masters to go ape shit when their populations face the nightmare of advanced biowar. Expect the regional war in the Middle East to trigger an all out global battle utilizing all forms of weapons of mass destruction within a few weeks to a few months of the initial attacks on Iran. Before we allow hardliners in Israel take us into yet another war, we need to take a very hard and realistic look at just what a war involving MAD on all sides would mean to Israel, to Europe, to North America and the entire world. The strategy of using war to effect change in the Middle East is no longer realistic, as we are in a mutually assured destruction (MAD) environment. It is also imperative, that the United States and Israel stop insisting on maintaining the Mubarak regime (perhaps minus Mubarak himself). With each passing day, week and month that the people of Egypt are prevented from successful revolution, the forces of the Muslim Brotherhood will grow. While not all in the Muslim Brotherhood are extremist, the danger is that a radicalized Egyptian population and a future government will not continue to support regional peace with Israel and that itself will dramatically raise regional danger levels. It is imperative, given the highly lethal nature of 21st Century warfare, that we stop the drive to war against Iran and stop the neocon strategy of using military force to reshape the Middle East. We (the Human Race) simply cannot survive the global use of Advanced Biological Warfare**.**

# 2nc turns warming

**Sequestration means you cant solve warming**

Cheryl Chumley (writer for the Washington Times) February 8, 2013 “Sequestration may force Obama to make climate change compromises” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/feb/8/sequestration-may-force-obama-make-climate-change-/?utm\_source=RSS\_Feed&utm\_medium=RSS

An internal U.S. Energy Department memo says that workers may face furloughs and other cuts if planned sequestration measures go forth in March — and if they do, that means the president may not get his planned climate change policies, according to one industry analyst.¶ “Given that less than one month remains until these cuts would take effect … our senior leadership team is engaged in extensive planning efforts to determine how we would deal with sequestration,” said deputy secretary Daniel Poneman, in a letter to employees, Newsmax reports.¶ Furloughs are likely, as are cuts in travel accounts, training, contracted services — and even office supplies, said Newsmax.¶ Mr. Poneman did not say in his letter what Energy programs were most at risk for cuts.¶ But at least one analyst sees the cuts as jeopardizing President Obama’s climate change policy plans.¶ “There is a whole range of activities that DOE is undertaking from near term programs to longer term scientific breakthroughs and everything in between that will add significantly to carbon emission reductions,” said Dan Reicher, an executive with the Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy, according to Newsmax. “It depends on whatever appropriations Congress provides and will be dictated by … funding.”

# 2nc econ turns everything

**Econ decline turns every advantage**

**Silk 93** (Leonard, Professor of Economics – Pace University, “Dangers of Slow Growth”, Foreign Affairs, 72(1), Winter, p. 173-174)

In the absence of such shifts of human and capital resources to expanding civilian industries, there are strong economic pressures on arms-producing nations to maintain high levels of military production and to sell weapons, both conventional and dual-use nuclear technology, wherever buyers can be found. Without a revival of national economies and the global economy, the production and proliferation of weapons will continue, creating more Iraqs, Yuugoslavias, Somalias and Cambodias - or worse. Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues. Growth will not solve all those problems by itself But economic growth - and growth alone - creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

# 2nc econ turns environment

**Economic growth’s a prerequisite to environmental care**

**Sagoff '97** (Mark, The Atlantic, "Do we consume too much?" http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/97jun/consume.htm)

Many have argued that economic activity, affluence, and growth automatically lead to resource depletion, environmental deterioration, and ecological collapse. Yet greater productivity and prosperity -- which is what economists mean by growth -- have become prerequisite for controlling urban pollution and protecting sensitive ecological systems such as rain forests. Otherwise, destitute people who are unable to acquire food and fuel will create pollution and destroy forests. Without economic growth, which also correlates with lower fertility, the environmental and population problems of the South will only get worse. For impoverished countries facing environmental disaster, economic growth may be the one thing that is sustainable.

# 2nc uniqueness wall

#### High level meetings have started being scheduled – they are happening now

Christopher Cavas, John Bennett and Marcus Weisgerber (writer for Defense News) February 2, 2013 “Military to Send Sequestration Plans to Obama This Week” http://www.defensenews.com/article/20130202/DEFREG02/302020012/Military-Send-Sequestration-Plans-Obama-Week?odyssey=tab|topnews|text|FRONTPAGE

By the end of this week, the Pentagon must submit its plans to the White House for how it will deal with automatic defense spending cuts set to kick in March 1, according to defense sources.¶ That Feb. 8 deadline will mark the beginning of a series of high-level meetings with lawmakers scheduled throughout what will be a hectic February as the calendar inches toward the automatic cuts, known as sequestration.¶ Unless Congress takes action, which seemed unlikely last week, sequestration calls for a series of defense spending cuts totaling $500 billion over 10 years.¶ On Feb. 15, the Pentagon will send Congress a request for authorization to furlough civilian workers, defense sources said. DoD is the only federal department that has to make this type of request, necessary to allow 45 days before furloughs begin.¶ While those behind-the-scenes moves take place, a number of 11th-hour hearings on the budget crisis are scheduled or are in the planning process.¶ Congressional aides and Pentagon officials are working to arrange a hearing with the service chiefs before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Feb. 12, defense sources said. The same Senate panel is planning a hearing Feb. 26 with former service chiefs. The service chiefs also are scheduled to appear before the House Appropriations defense subcommittee Feb. 26., sources said.

#### Obama has the leverage in sequestration cuts fights now

Julian Zelizer (writer for CNN) February 4, 2013 “Republicans, be smart about defense cuts” http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/04/opinion/zelizer-defense-spending/index.html

Right now, Republicans are not well positioned for this debate. Ironically, President Obama is -- given that during his first term he broke with his party with an aggressive stance toward terrorism, including the killing of Osama bin Laden, and potentially with picking a Republican secretary of defense. He is well positioned to push for defense cuts without opening himself up to charges of being a reckless dove.¶ Republicans need to show the nation that they can engage in serious debates over the policy needs of the nation, rather than simply reiterating talking points meant to please the base. If they don't, on this issue, like so many others, the party will stand far off center and make it that much harder for the next presidential candidate to build a winning coalition.

#### Obama has the PC to push through budget compromise now that is key to the economy – but the fight will be huge

Huffington Post January 20, 2013 “Obama's Deficit Demons Can Be Vanquished In Second Term Thanks To Political, Economic Momentum” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/20/obama-deficit-second-term\_n\_2506882.html

Three standoff scenarios are currently the talk of the Beltway:¶ 1. The debt-ceiling fight. Obama is thought to have the upper hand going into the latest battle over the debt limit, while congressional Republicans have everything to lose if they continue to play the role of hostage-taking obstructionists. They are already showing signs of bending, trying to stall the coming late-February face-off for another three months, pushing it as far back as June.¶ 2. A government shutdown. Leaders of both parties believe the GOP will be blamed for a default or a federal shutdown if Congress doesn't fund the government when it runs out of money at the end of March, even if Republicans help pass a debt-ceiling extension.¶ 3. The “sequestration.” The automatic budget cuts due to go into effect in early March will hit GOP-affiliated defense contractors hard, without cutting Social Security or Medicare benefits.¶ Getting through all three scenarios leaves Obama the opportunity to defuse the deficit as a political issue, perhaps without taking a hatchet to the social safety net.¶ He also may be able to shrink the deficit a surprisingly good deal. Obama has set a target of $4 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years -- a number that even many deficit hawk economists view as more than sufficient to stabilize the economy. Budget and spending deals he made in his first term are worth $2.5 trillion. So he’s already not too far from that target, and the GOP may be unable to stop him from getting the rest of the way there.¶ Of course navigating this tricky course will take both political will and the right policy priorities. Obama has himself repeatedly proposed cutting both Social Security and Medicare in the name of deficit reduction during prior standoffs, and has caved on other important policies as negotiations have come down to the wire. Will he stand firm this time?¶ The underpinnings of the current manufactured crises give him a chance. Despite the ubiquitous deficit hyperventilation in and around the Capitol, the fiscal situation Obama faces is not dire or insurmountable. Deficit woes are and always have been more political than economic.¶ The consensus of mainstream experts is that there is little risk of catastrophe in running large deficits over the next few years, and that the budget gap can be narrowed dramatically without attacking programs that benefit the elderly or the disadvantaged, as long as the economy continues its slow but steady recovery.¶ "The recovery is going along pretty well, in spite of the political system's attempts to derail it," said Alice Rivlin, a centrist Democrat who has worked with GOP stalwarts including former Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) and Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) on deficit-reduction plans.¶ The way Rivlin sees it, the biggest threats to the improving economy are those coming from Congress, either in continued brinkmanship or in cutting too deeply too fast.¶ "The thing not to do is to get hysterical about the current level of the deficit, but focus on the real problem, which is the future debt," Rivlin said. Deficits are the annual shortfalls the government runs, while debt is the long-term bill it owes. Deficits are now running above $1 trillion, but are projected to drop.¶ Total U.S. debt is about $16.4 trillion -- a scary, oft-cited number that's about equal to the country's total annual economic output. But that includes some $5 trillion that the government owes itself, primarily to the Social Security Trust Fund. The less-frightening amount that economists care about is what Uncle Sam owes the public, and that's a little over $11 trillion, or about three-quarters of the GDP. Such a debt level is historically high, but nowhere near a record. And it looks even better next to the significant assets the government holds.¶ Rivlin notes that while such debt ratios have sparked problems in other countries, including interest rate spikes and even banking crises, they're another matter for the United States. So far, investors have been perfectly comfortable with American debt. The only objective measurement of investor confidence -- interest rates on Treasury bonds -- are at record lows, indicating high confidence. Foreign governments in China and Japan have in fact been increasing their purchases of U.S. debt.¶ "The world has always been willing to lend us money at relatively low interest rates," said Rivlin. "The reason for being nervous is that may not last. It's almost certainly not going to last forever, and as your debt gets to be a larger and larger ratio to your economy, you're more and more vulnerable."¶ University of Texas economist James Galbraith, a former Democratic staffer on the congressional Joint Economic Committee who is even less concerned than Rivlin, notes that several factors -- the dollar's status as the reserve currency abroad, the United States' ability to borrow money in its own currency, and the Federal Reserve's operations -- make the U.S. deficit fundamentally different from deficits in other countries.¶ "The term 'deficit' presupposes and implies something bad that should be filled in or made up for," Galbraith said. "It suggests that the right norm is a deficit of zero, and all of this is completely without meaning in economics. Zero is not the middle number. ... There's no presumption that zero is better than some other number, and in the case of the U.S., it's absolutely the wrong number. The U.S. provides reserve assets to the rest of the world, so it has to run a deficit and it would be a bad thing if it did not."¶ Deficit concerns are usually raised as a proxy for unpopular ideological preferences, Galbraith notes. Instead of demanding cuts to Medicare because it constitutes what Ronald Reagan once called "socialized medicine," conservatives now insist that such programs must be cut to avoid the supposedly greater pain caused by fiscal trauma.¶ "The deficit is a front issue for a different agenda of rolling back the New Deal, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid," Galbraith said. "It's frustrating to have to shadow-box on this."¶ And indeed, staunch proponents of dramatic deficit reduction like the arch-conservative Club for Growth accompany their calls for tighter budgets with anti-government ideology. In an interview with The Huffington Post, Club spokesman Barney Keller suggested eliminating the Department of Commerce, the Department of Education and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to close the deficit. Paul Ryan's most famous budget proposal included a plan to privatize and cut Medicare benefits, while also cutting taxes so severely that it would have actually expanded deficits.¶ Total deficit failure in the U.S. isn't likely to end the way it has in other countries, like Greece, that can't borrow money in their own currency. When Greece gets in trouble, it is at the political mercy of the European Union. The United States, in contrast, is at the mercy of the Federal Reserve, which can always print more dollars to finance American debt. Eventually, printing money can result in inflation. But inflation isn't likely to get too out of hand thanks to the dollar's status as the international reserve currency. So the U.S. faces the prospect of mild long-term inflation if it doesn't get its fiscal house in order. That's very different from the bank runs in Argentina during the '90s, or the current humanitarian crisis in Greece.¶ If Obama can emerge from the looming policy battles with the bulk of his priorities in place -- and secure sufficient savings to satisfy the financial markets -- he'll have nearly his full second term to try to prove that progressive-leaning economics are not just good for people, they're better for the economy.¶ Public attitudes on the deficit are muddled. Two-thirds of respondents to a new HuffPost/YouGov poll said it was either "extremely important" or "very important" to "drastically reduce the federal budget deficit through either spending cuts or tax increases," and a narrow plurality -- 43 percent -- favored reduction through spending cuts alone, compared to 39 percent who favored both spending cuts and tax increases.¶ But when asked to specify what programs should be cut -- Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Defense, or "Something Else," respondents overwhelmingly favored Defense and Something Else, registering 39 percent and 34 percent each. Just 2 percent said Medicare, and 3 percent said Social Security. When asked which program is the biggest contributor to the deficit, a small plurality, 28 percent, said defense spending. The next most popular response was "foreign aid," at 22 percent.¶ The polling sentiment doesn’t square with the spending reality. Social Security, health care programs and defense spending each account for roughly 20 percent of the federal budget, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Foreign aid accounts for about 0.1 percent of the budget. All "non-defense discretionary spending" -- everything but defense, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security -- amounts to about 40 percent of the total deficit. Even if the U.S. cut every item under "something else," most of the deficit would remain. Many of those programs are popular or essential government functions -- like veteran's benefits, transportation funding and public education.¶ Obama's high approval rating and the actual state of the budget then give him a strong hand in the upcoming showdowns. He has been arguing for a "balanced approach" -- raising some taxes and making some cuts -- to find the remaining $1.5 trillion in his planned deficit reduction. Republicans have insisted that no revenue be raised, and that further reductions come from cuts alone.¶ But they lost in their bid to stick to that formula on New Year's Day, and had to swallow some $600 billion in tax hikes on the wealthy in the fiscal cliff deal. There has been no change in the public mood since. That suggests that whatever the GOP stance, the White House and Democrats are likely to continue seeking their balance.¶ Indeed, the deal that Obama and House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) nearly cut in December could have come very close to the overall $4 trillion target for deficit reduction.¶ Similar proposals are likely to emerge in the coming months. The largest pieces would curb tax breaks for the wealthy, perhaps limiting how much they can write off mortgage interest and other common deductions. That could bring in some $500 billion to $600 billion. There are also numerous other tax law loopholes -- such as oil subsidies and tax breaks for private jets that add up to hundreds of billions more.¶ The White House also has floated some $300 billion in health care cuts, and hundreds of billions in cuts to Social Security and mandatory spending programs.¶ There is a path to get such a plan passed -- especially, Democrats note, since Boehner nearly backed such a scheme in December and back in 2011.¶ “Everyone knows that the tax code is riddled with giveaways for the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations, and those should certainly be on the table as we work toward a balanced and bipartisan budget deal," said Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.) the chair of the Senate Budget Committee. "Speaker Boehner proposed to raise $800 billion by closing these loopholes during the last negotiation, so I am certainly going to fight to make sure that middle-class families and seniors aren’t being asked to bear the burden of the next round of deficit reduction alone.”¶ Republicans' leverage to demand cuts is essentially to threaten catastrophe -- a strategy that is increasingly unpopular, except with the GOP base in very red districts.¶ That schism has all-but paralyzed the House, dividing the Republicans into a Tea Party camp and a more realistic anti-tax group led by Boehner. The solution to the cliff standoff was to have Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) work out compromises with the White House and then leave them on Boehner's doorstep.¶ The GOP protested loudly. But once Boehner put the measures up for votes, they passed easily with support from Democrats and a minority of Republicans. Faced with both public pressure and the reality that shutting down the government or defaulting would be more harmful, that same scenario is likely to play out again and again.¶ If it does, it leaves the White House in an enviable position for the rest of Obama's administration. If bipartisanship takes root, it could open up the possibility of doing better still on spending, including on the real long-term driver of America's future debts: the high cost of health care.¶ The problem with focusing on health care, however, has always been that one side or the other invariably politicizes it. Finding health care savings doesn't have to mean slashing benefits. Strategies such permitting Medicare to negotiate with prescription drug companies could save billions without hitting seniors. But when Obama extracted such savings with the Affordable Care Act, Republicans demagogued the issue by saying he'd "cut Medicare," and Democrats lost control of the House.¶ Facing no reelection, and with the debt stabilized, Obama could wind up with the clout to start dealing with that root problem of health care costs, not to mention other priorities such as education and immigration.

# 2nc at: thumpers

### **Issues don’t cost capital till they are at the finish line, if they cant cite vote counts 0 weight**

Drum, 10 (Kevin, Political Blogger, Mother Jones, http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-

coming-back-burner)

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

#### Must be dealt with in less than 20 days

AllVoices (global news organization) February 6, 2013 “Obama has to cut deal on sequester by March 1” http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/13978090-obama-has-to-cut-deal-on-sequester-cuts-by-march-1

As part of the fiscal cliff deal, automatic across-the-board cuts to spending were put off until March 1. However, this leaves less than a month to work out a deal on a larger package or a smaller deal that would again postpone the cuts.¶ President Barack Obama warned on Tuesday that triggering of automatic spending cuts could cause serious consequences for the US economy. Obama was able to get a bill passed to raise the debt ceiling and signed the bill yesterday that temporarily suspends the $16.4 trillion limit. This will enable the government to pay $450 billion on interest payments and other obligations. As well as suspending the debt limit until May 18, the bill also suspends pay for Congress members if their chamber fails to pass a budget resolution by April 15.

#### Sequestration and budget fights are on the top of the docket

Austin Wright (writer for Politico) January 25, 2013 “Sequester now front and center - Navy warns of delayed deployments - AUSA Winter still on - Kerry defends Hagel - UN launches drone investigation” http://www.politico.com/morningdefense/0113/morningdefense9904.html?hp=l6\_b4

WHO WILL BLINK FIRST? With the debt-ceiling standoff delayed, the next battle on Capitol Hill is over sequestration and the budget, POLITICO’s Jake Sherman and Carrie Budoff Brown report on the homepage. “There’s almost no way for both sides to get what they want,” the pair write, “setting the nation on a course to a possible government shutdown or deep cuts to government programs that no one wants, unless someone blinks

#### Fiscal fights will come before other major domestic legislation – Obama has the PC to negotiate now

Leon Hadar (former research fellow with the Cato Institute, senior analyst at Wikistrat, global affairs journalist) January 22, 2013 “Much tougher job for Obama in second term;

Mid-term Congressional elections in 18 months among his major hurdles” Lexis

Mr Obama may have acquired more political capital in the aftermath of his 2012 presidential win and may be in a better position to negotiate a new fiscal deal with the Congressional Republicans. But Republican lawmakers, including many who subscribe to the anti-government agenda of the Tea Party, continue to rule over the House and are not likely to give the green light to Speaker Boehner to reach a long-term and comprehensive fiscal deal with the White House.¶ Moreover, some of the newly elected Democrats in the House and the Senate tend to be more liberal in their political orientation than Mr Obama and the centrist Democrats and are opposed to even the basic demands of the Republicans, such as raising the retirement age.¶ So, in many ways, Congress will remain as politically polarised as it had been during Mr Obama's first term and his supporters are probably going to resist pressure for a historic bipartisan fiscal agreements. Instead, we should expect a series of little deals that will be negotiated under the pressure of fiscal deadlines.¶ A series of new deadlines are going to affect the negotiations between the Congressional Republicans and the White House, including the automatic spending cuts taking effect in March followed by the requirement by Congress to approve the funding of the federal government and to pass a new budget.¶ It is not inconceivable that through an incremental process of approving a mix of spending cuts - call it the not-so-grand bargains - Mr Obama and the Republicans would be able to achieve the original goal of the grand bargain of reducing the deficit by about US$2.5 trillion.¶ And beyond fiscal policy, there is very little chance that Mr Obama would be able to get Congress to approve his ambitious domestic programmes. Even against the backdrop of the horrific shooting incidents of school kids in Connecticut and some indications that the American people would back tougher gun laws, a powerful coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats on Capitol Hill will probably not be willing to support any major restrictions on the purchasing of firearms.¶

#### Hagel nomination won’t cost PC – there is enough political cover – it would be more controversial for the GOP to deny confirmation

NYT (New York Times) January 6, 2013 “Obama’s Pick for Defense Is an Ally, and a Lightning Rod” http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/07/us/obama-expected-to-select-hagel-for-defense-post.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1&hp

The choice of Mr. Hagel, the first Vietnam veteran to be nominated for the post, would add a prominent Republican to Mr. Obama’s cabinet, providing some political cover for the president’s plans to exit Afghanistan and make cuts to a military budget that has roughly doubled since the 2001 terrorist attacks. But Republicans made clear on Sunday that they would give Mr. Hagel a rough ride on his path to the Pentagon, questioning his support for Israel, his seriousness about the Iranian nuclear threat and his commitment to an adequate defense budget. And Mr. Obama may also face difficulties from some Democrats who are wary of negative comments that Mr. Hagel made more than a decade ago about gays. Some Obama aides had doubts about the wisdom of the choice, given Mr. Hagel’s frosty relationship with members of his own party, but officials said they were confident that they could corral enough votes from both sides of the aisle to win confirmation in the Senate. White House officials confirmed on Sunday that Mr. Hagel was Mr. Obama’s pick for the job and said the announcement would come as early as Monday. Rather than turning to a defense technocrat, Mr. Obama decided on an independent politician whose service in Vietnam gave him a lifelong skepticism about the commitment of American lives in overseas conflicts. Like Mr. Obama, Mr. Hagel supported the war in Afghanistan but opposed the troop surge in Iraq under President George W. Bush. Mr. Hagel, 66, served as an enlisted man in Vietnam, won two Purple Hearts and still carries bits of shrapnel in his chest. He was the co-founder of a cellular telephone company and headed an investment banking firm before being elected to the Senate in 1996. He retired in 2009 and now teaches at Georgetown University and serves as chairman of the Atlantic Council, a centrist foreign policy group. In July 2008, during the presidential campaign, Mr. Hagel accompanied Mr. Obama, who was then in the Senate, on a six-day trip to Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan and Kuwait. When Senator John McCain, the Republican presidential nominee that year, asserted that Mr. Obama’s motive for the trip was political, Mr. Hagel strongly defended Mr. Obama, saying in a television interview that Mr. McCain was “on thin ground” in trying to impugn Mr. Obama’s patriotism. In the Senate, Mr. Hagel voted in favor of the resolution authorizing Mr. Bush to take military action in Iraq, which passed overwhelmingly in October 2002. But he soured on the effort early, and became an advocate of the view that America had lost sight of what it was trying to accomplish and that it was overestimating its ability to change Iraqi society. In some ways, Mr. Hagel bears a similarity to Susan E. Rice, the ambassador to the United Nations and Mr. Obama’s first choice for secretary of state. She withdrew her name from consideration, making way for the selection of Senator John F. Kerry. Ms. Rice, like Mr. Hagel, is a trusted Obama ally who spoke up for him during the 2008 presidential campaign and became a lightning rod for Republican attacks. “The president wants someone whose judgment he respects on the big questions of war and peace,” said Philip D. Zelikow, a senior State Department official under Mr. Bush and now a member of the President’s Intelligence Advisory Board. Mr. Hagel is co-chairman of the board. The White House is calculating that opposition to Mr. Hagel may be loud but not broad and that in end the Senate will confirm him. Administration officials argued that voting against a Republican war hero to run the Defense Department would not be easy for fellow Republicans, and they are confident that disgruntled Democrats will ultimately not deny their president his choice. At the end of the day, Republicans will support a decorated war hero who was their colleague for 12 years and has critical experience on veterans’ issues,” said an administration official who requested anonymity to discuss a nomination before it was announced. “It would be hard to explain a no vote just because he bucked his party on Iraq, a war most Americans think was a disaster.”

# 2nc nuclear links

#### The aff is politically toxic.

**Wood, 9-13-12**

[Elisa, AOL, “What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy,” http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/]

Still, nuclear is unlikely to become a bigger slice of the energy pie in the US over the next two decades because of the high cost to build new plants, according the US Energy Information Administration. That may explain part of the campaign silence about nuclear. Another is lingering public worry about Fukushima, say industry observers. Even those who see nuclear as safe, say they understand why the candidates would want to steer clear of the discussion. Daniel Krueger, a managing director for Accenture's utilities generation and energy markets practice, described nuclear as politically "toxic," but added, "To me as an industry guy, in my view Fukushima proved the safety of nuclear energy. We had a major plant which was hit by an earthquake and tidal wave, and no one died as a direct result of radiation exposure. And the operator willingly sacrificed a plant worth tens of billions to protect the public. It was unimaginable what hit that plant."

**Nuclear energy debates cost capital -- tons of strong opposition.**

Szondy, ‘12

[David, freelance writer -- Gizmag, 2-16, “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” <http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/>]

The problem is that nuclear energy is the proverbial political hot potato - even in early days when the new energy source exploded onto the world scene. The tremendous amount of energy locked in the atom held the promise of a future like something out of a technological Arabian Nights. It would be a world where electricity was too cheap to meter, deserts would bloom, ships would circle the Earth on a lump of fuel the size of a baseball, planes would fly for months without landing, the sick would be healed and even cars would be atom powered. But though nuclear power did bring about incredible changes in our world, in its primary role, generating electricity for homes and industry, it ended up as less of a miracle and more of a very complicated way of boiling water.¶ Not only complicated, but expensive and potentially dangerous. Though hundreds of reactors were built all over the world and some countries, such as France, generate most of their electricity from it, nuclear power has faced continuing questions over cost, safety, waste disposal and proliferation. One hundred and four nuclear plants provide the United States with 20 percent of the nation's power, but a building permit hadn't been issued since 1978 with no new reactors coming on line since 1996 and after the uproar from the environmental movement after nuclear accidents at Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, it seemed unlikely that any more would ever be approved - until now. This fierce domestic opposition to nuclear power has caused many governments to take an almost schizophrenic stance regarding the atom.

#### Debates on expanding nuclear power will cost political capital

**Ackley, 08** (Kate, Roll Call, 6/9, “Nuclear Energy Poisons Legislative Environment”, lexis) //DH

In the end, it wasn't a skirmish over nuclear power that blew up a sweeping climate change bill in the Senate last week - it was instead partisan politics and bickering over judicial nominations.¶ But the nuclear debate remains a large and looming danger for any such measure. Business lobbyists and several academic studies conclude that the United States cannot cut carbon emissions without beefing up nuclear power plants. But many key environmental lobbyists say that tax subsidies for nuclear power could become a poison pill for any global warming bill and that if a carbon reduction bill required a substantial nuclear power subsidy, that might be too high a price to pay.¶ In addition, nuclear opponents say that even without a climate change bill this year, they will be keeping close watch on all legislation in case the nuclear industry tries to use any other bills to further its agenda. "The debate is just going to intensify," said Kevin Kamps, radioactive waste watchdog for anti-nuclear lobby Beyond Nuclear. "We see industry trying to attach its money grabs to any legislation. They really do try to hitch their wagon to whatever's moving. We will remain vigilant for the rest of this year."¶ Specifically, Kamps said he would work to block loan guarantee programs for nuclear plants and any tax incentives for the industry.

#### Dems oppose

**Entine, 06** – fellow on science and public policy at the American Enterprise Institute (Jon, Transcript of an AEI Conferency, 10/6, [http://www.aei.org/events/filter.all,eventID.1394/transcript.asp](http://www.aei.org/events/filter.all%2CeventID.1394/transcript.asp)) //DH

At this conference at least we will set aside the debate over the myriad possible causes of global warming and focus on what we might do to address it; we are going to look today at nuclear energy.  Traditionally political predilection has driven the debate over nuclear energy with exceptions, of course.  Conservatives have tended to be supportive of nuclear technology considering the risks acceptable and the Left has been instinctively hostile.  Political passions have often masqueraded as economics and environmental science.  The double threat of global warming and high energy prices may be challenging those once rock-hard positions.

#### The coal and railroad industry will backlash

**Tucker, 06 -** author of Terrestrial Energy (William, Transcript of an AEI Conference, 10/6, [http://www.aei.org/events/filter.all,eventID.1394/transcript.asp](http://www.aei.org/events/filter.all%2CeventID.1394/transcript.asp)) //DH

Very simply, I think we need a nuclear-solar alliance.  I think that the nuclear and solar compliment each other very nicely.  The problem is to replace coal; coal is not going easily.  Coal is a huge industry and unfortunately the railroads even sort of own the coal industry, or vice versa.  A similar 70 percent of the freight carried in this country now is coal, so they are not to go down easily.

# at: link turns

#### No link turns – nuclear has no political clout – there’s not enough of a constituency

Tucker, 8-16-12

[William, veteran journalist, has written for many high-profile publications, “Nuclear’s Problem — Too Much Energy, Not Enough Jobs,” <http://www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-nuclear%E2%80%99s-problem-%E2%80%94-too-much-energy-not-enough-jobs/>]

So there you have it. America’s energy future is a contest between coal and wind. Which can create more jobs? If you think there’s a better option, you don’t have a place at the table. And that’s where nuclear stands today. Sure, there may be questions about potential accidents and the effects of radiation, but the real problem is this: Nuclear is so energy intensive that it doesn’t produce enough jobs to create a political constituency. Why does coal still have such enormous political clout? The answer is simple. It requires so much mining and transportation of raw material that hundreds of thousands of workers – whole states, in fact – become involved in the task. There are now 1300 coal mines in 27 states employing 88,000 workers. More than half a dozen of these states identify themselves as “coal states” – West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Colorado and Wyoming just fir a start. The state with the biggest coal reserves – Montana – hasn’t really started developing them yet. Next to farming, coal mining is most widely entrenched resource-based industry in the country. There is good reason for all this job creation. A1000-MW coal plant must be resupplied by a 110-car unit train arriving every 30 hours. Almost half the railroad freight in the U.S. is coal. Economists say there’s a real question of whether the railroads actually own the coal companies or the coal companies own the railroads. In any case, all this produces huge work forces with powerful labor union backing. Wind energy works the same way. Because each giant 45-story windmills produces only about 2 MW, thousands upon thousands will be required to produce electricity in commercial quantities. This creates a huge work force. The American Wind Energy Association claims 90,000 employees in the wind industry with more than 4,000 in California, Texas, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania and North Dakota. Building out the transmission lines to carry this electricity to population centers will eventually employ thousands more. Wind is nothing if not labor intensive. So how does nuclear do by comparison? According to the Uranium Producers of America, there are 13 uranium mines in the U.S. employing 1635 people. Their annual output was 16, 000 tons of uranium oxide – the equivalent of two coal trains leaving the Powder River Basin (where one now departs every eight minutes). Our domestic production of uranium has actually been suppressed over the last two decades because we have been using former Soviet weapons material for half our fuel in the Megatons to Megawatts program, although the pace may pick up when the treaty expires next year. Worldwide there are only 46 uranium mines – as opposed to 450 coal mines in Kentucky alone. Recently the Russians have proposed supplying the entire world out of one uranium mine in Siberia. Nuclear’s great energy density has one glaring weakness – there is no possibility of building a huge mining and transport constituencies that can support the technology. Uranium does require reprocessing and there are major facilities in Kentucky and Ohio. But even those hardly constitute more than a ripple in the two states’ economies. Traditionally, the only places where nuclear has gained a political foothold is those states that have national laboratories. New Mexico’s Democratic Senator Pete Domenici was long a leading supporter because of the Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories. Senator Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, which hosts Oak Ridge and the Tennessee Valley Authority, has now picked up the mantle. But Tennessee is much more involved in the auto industry and there is no “nuclear state” to match the half-dozen coal states. Well then, what about the 104 reactors that operate around the country? Don’t they generate some political support? The average reactor employs about 650 people and is extremely popular in its home territory. Bisconti Research has found that support for nuclear increases to around 85 percent in communities that host reactors. But this support tends to be highly localized and reactors create little ancillary employment. Replacing the fuel rods, for instance, requires only six tractor trailers arriving once every 18 months. Illinois gets almost half its electricity from nuclear and even Barack Obama was known to say a few nice things about it while he was Senator from Illinois. But most states with large nuclear complexes are equally committed to coal. Even in a state that is highly dependent on nuclear, the work force is so small as to be inconsequential. Vermont gets 60 percent of its electricity form Vermont Yankee, yet its efforts to close down the reactor have generated very little pushback. Vernon, the tiny town of 2,000 that supplies all this energy, is 100 percent in favor of keeping the reactor. But its interests are completed swamped by 623,000 other Vermonters who only get clean, cheap energy from nuclear and think they can do the same by covering the green mountains with 45-story windmills. The only place where nuclear has built a true constituency is in the South. This is partly because of the many military veterans in the region, since a large portion of the nuclear workforce has come up through the Nuclear Navy. South Carolina is probably the most pro-nuclear state in the country with Georgia and Tennessee also strongly in favor. It is no accident that the four new reactors licensed for construction will be built in Georgia and South Carolina. Areva is also completing its plutonium recycling plant at the Savannah River Site. But all these states are pretty much locked up for Republicans and have very little impact at the national level. So nuclear’s weakness is plain to see. It does very poorly at creating the kind of widespread employment that builds political constituencies. It is only good at producing energy.

# obama pushing

#### Obama push to delay sequestration now – will invest in protecting the military budget now

Antiwar.com February 6, 2013 “Obama Demands Delay to Avoid Military Spending Cuts” Lexis

The New Year dispute over sequestration and the possibility of actually cutting military spending ended with an agreement to punt the issue down the road until March 1, a date which is rapidly approaching. President Obama is demanding that Congress delay[1] the issue again, insisting it is vital to delay it for 'a few months.'¶ Much of the 'sequestration' cuts that were delayed were military spending cuts, which officials have been railing about ever since, insisting such cuts could never be allowed. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta even claimed the cuts, though minor, would turn the US into a 'second-rate power[2],' though still one with ten times the military budget of Russia.¶ The delay was nominally meant to provide more time to negotiate a deal, though President Obama made no specific proposal for such a deal and instead called for tax increases and spending cuts on something other than the military.¶ The issue splits broadly along partisan lines, with Democrats insisting no military spending cuts could ever be allowed and tax hikes are the only way, and Republicans insisting no military spending cuts could ever be allowed and that cutting other spending is the only way. Either way, despite Panetta et al. continuing to predict doom the bulk of Congress and the administration both seem to be pretty sure that the enormous military budget needs to be protected whatever the cost, and that if it isn't it will be someone else's fault.

#### Obama pushing sequestration deal now

Steve Kornacki (writer for Salon) February 6, 2013 “Obama’s dare to the GOP” http://www.salon.com/2013/02/06/obamas\_dare\_to\_the\_gop/

President Obama’s challenge to congressional Republicans to join with him in crafting legislation to delay the sequester puts the GOP in a tough spot. But it’s not impossible it’ll end up doing the same to Democrats too.¶ In brief remarks Tuesday afternoon, Obama called for passing a small package of revenue increases and spending cuts that would delay the implementation of the $1.2 trillion sequester, which is now scheduled to take effect March 1. A short-term fix would, in theory, spare the economy needless contraction and buy both parties time to craft an ever-elusive “grand bargain” – something Obama has pursued on and off with congressional Republicans for nearly two years now.¶ For the moment, Obama’s gambit puts the GOP on the defensive. The negative economic impact of the sequester, which is crafted to hit the Defense Department hardest and to spare Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, is fairly clear, and as March 1 nears the pressure to avoid it will grow. Defense contractors, traditionally a Republican-friendly constituency, will obviously push particularly hard for a workaround.¶ On top of this, the politics should play well for Obama. He didn’t spell out a specific blueprint on Tuesday, but his basic formula for a temporary fix – a “balanced” approach of more revenue from wealthy individuals or corporations and targeted spending cuts that won’t harm G.D.P. growth the way the sequester would – tends to test well in polling. As TPM’s Brian Beutler wrote, if Republicans resist, Obama will be free to tell voters that they “prefer the sequester to raising even a small amount of revenue from oil companies and other unpopular interests — that the only thing Republicans want more than the sequester is a wide range of cuts to services for the poor.”¶ As of now, though, this is the road Republicans are heading down. There is enormous, possibly prohibitive resistance within the party to any form of new revenue in the wake of the fiscal cliff deal, which raised rates on high-end earners. In response to Obama on Tuesday, House Speaker John Boehner said the GOP’s alternative to the sequester – a cuts-only plan that cleared the House last year but went nowhere in the Democratic Senate – remains party policy. And another top House Republican, who was among the first to express willingness to give in on revenues in the run-up to the fiscal cliff deal, suggested that accepting the sequester would be preferable to the sort of deal Obama is proposing.

# 2nc at: Hirsch

**Here’s evidence on that issue specific to the budget**

Mark Blumenthal (writer for the Huffington Post) January 21, 2013 “Barack Obama Rethinks The Bully Pulpit” www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/21/obama-bully-pulpit\_n\_2498852.html#slide=more261539

President Barack Obama begins his second term enjoying his strongest approval ratings in three years. Less clear is whether that newly gained popularity will power up Obama's bully pulpit, enabling him to break the political gridlock with a substantive agenda that includes economic recovery, gun violence prevention and immigration reform.¶ Political science studies suggest that presidents rarely change opinions with speeches, but they can influence debate by shining a spotlight on a policy that is more popular, but not widely appreciated as such.¶ In other words, presidents are trend-amplifiers, helping to push through Congress widely accepted measures -- like rigorous gun background checks and immigration reform with a path to citizenship.¶ Since the election, Obama's job approval rating, which had hovered in the mid-to-high 40 percent range for much of his first term, has surged to roughly 55 percent on the HuffPost Pollster average of all available national public polls.¶ Perhaps more important, Obama's popularity soars above that of his Republican opposition in Congress. As reported most recently by the Washington Post/ABC News poll, Obama's 55 percent approval rating is more than double that of "Republicans in Congress," who are earning just 24 percent approval.¶ As a series of HuffPost/YouGov online polls conducted in recent weeks reveal, large majorities of Americans believe a president can make at least a minor difference on a wide variety of issues, from reducing poverty and expanding the middle class, to improving education and preventing another financial crisis.¶ Yet while the contrast in approval ratings gives Obama "a clear upper hand over the deeply unpopular Congress," as ABC News put it, political scientists warn that little or no evidence exists to suggest that presidents can move public opinion on specific issues in their favor with speeches or other uses of the bully pulpit.¶ "Presidential speeches don't tend to persuade people on policy," wrote George Washington University professor John Sides. Sides cited the work of scholar George Edwards, who found that the "Great Communicator," President Ronald Reagan, failed to move opinion in his favor with nationally televised addresses on issues such as increased defense spending or aid to the Contra rebels in Nicaragua.¶ But Edwards didn't stop with Reagan. As Ezra Klein explained, Edwards "marshaled so much evidence" on the limits of the bully pulpit as used by presidents from Franklin Roosevelt to George W. Bush that his views have gained wide acceptance among other political scientists.¶ Still, Obama's team believe their experiences from the first term offer a formula to help break the legislative impasse on some issues. "Among the lessons we learned," a senior administration official told The Huffington Post, "is you can take an issue to the country and have some success, turn the dynamic around."¶ The official specifically cited last year's debate over extending low interest rates on subsidized student loans. In April, Obama took up the matter on the campaign trail, giving a series of speeches on college campuses. He even appeared on "Late Night With Jimmy Fallon," opening with a "slow jam the news" segment on the student loan issue.¶ Republicans initially resisted bringing the president's student loan proposal to a vote in the House. Under public pressure from Obama, however, GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney endorsed his proposal and Republicans ultimately brought the measure up for a vote. It passed both houses of Congress in July.¶ The student loan example is consistent with the findings of **Princeton political scientist Brandice Canes-Wrone, who examined televised presidential appeals on budget issues from 1957 to 2000. She found that presidents do "obtain significant legislative influence by promoting their proposals** in nationally televised speeches," but in a limited context: Their successful appeals tended to be on proposals that were already popular but that were stalled legislatively or otherwise unlikely to pass without the president's public sales pitch.¶ Canes-Wrone demonstrated that on budget issues, at least, the critical value of the bully pulpit is less about changing public opinion on policy measures and more about increasing awareness of lesser-known proposals that meet with approval. By loudly advocating on behalf of the latter policies, a president can show to opponents a willingness to use the proposals as campaign issues and thus change the legislative "dynamic."¶ While the subject of student loan interest rates had previously been "reserved for the deep weeds of Congressional committees," as The New York Times put it, a test of the issue in the spring of 2012 by the United Technologies/National Journal Congressional Connection Poll found popular support for the Obama administration's proposal.¶ Canes-Wrone was careful to emphasize the limits of her findings. "We do not argue that a president can achieve any policy goal by appealing to the public about it," she wrote.¶ Sides agrees. "It's really about the way in which the president's behavior changes the perceptions of other political leaders," he told HuffPost via email.

**Hirsch concedes capital can act as a magnifier—Obama swayed GOP direction to pass immigration sooner**

**Hirsch 2/7** Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal and former senior editor and columnist at Newsweek "There's no such thing as political capital", 2013

When he mounted his bully pulpit in Nevada, he delivered another new message as well: You Republicans don’t have to listen to what I say anymore. And don’t worry about who’s got the political capital. Just take a hard look at where I’m saying this: in a state you were supposed to have won but lost because of the rising Hispanic vote.

Obama was cleverly pointing the GOP toward conclusions that he knows it is already reaching on its own: If you, the Republicans, want to have any kind of a future in a vastly changed electoral map, you have no choice but to move. It’s your choice.

### Second, Winners don’t win

**A) Hirsch distinguishes between what Obama is doing and what Bush did with social security—the plan makes Obama into Bush 2.0 by trying to push the rock of nuclear power up a hill—Obama will resolve the economy now because of public urgency but nuclear power gives Republicans a rallying point**

**Hirsch 2/7** Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal and former senior editor and columnist at Newsweek "There's no such thing as political capital", 2013

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.

**B) Hirsch concedes tradeoffs happen especially between economic policy and especially if a policy is unpopular and out of sync with the country’s mood—ie the plan**

**Hirsch 2/7** Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal and former senior editor and columnist at Newsweek "There's no such thing as political capital", 2013

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.

**D) All of Hirsch’s examples are too old—doesn’t assume a divided congress or shortened attention spans that collapse momentum, plan fractures whatever honeymoon potential exists**

**Cillizza 2/6**

Chris Cillizza (writer for the Washington Post) February 6, 2013 “President Obama is enjoying a second political honeymoon. But how long will it last?” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/06/president-obama-is-enjoying-a-second-political-honeymoon-but-how-long-will-it-last/

President Obama is enjoying a sort of second political honeymoon in the wake of his re-election victory last November with a series of national polls showing his job approval rating climbing from the middling territory where it lagged for much of the last several years.¶ In the latest Real Clear Politics rolling average of all national polling, Obama approval is at 52 percent while his disapproval is at 43 percent. That may not seem like much but it marks a significant improvement over where he was for much of 2010 and 2011.¶ Here’s a look at Obama’s job approval trend line in Washington Post-ABC News polling from January 2011 until now:¶ Judging from his actions of late — most notably his surprising confrontational (and liberal) inaugural address — President Obama is well aware of the fact that he is enjoying a polling boom at the moment. And, even Republicans are tacitly acknowledging that Obama is living in a second honeymoon period by backing down on major legislative fights like the fiscal cliff and the debt ceiling.¶ The pertinent question then is how long it will last — and what the president can get done between now and when the good times (for him, at least) stop rolling.¶ Gallup has done considerable work on the lengths of political honeymoons and has concluded that they ain’t what they used to be. Here’s their chart documenting the relative honeymoon lengths — as defined by a job approval rating above the 55 percent mark — of presidents in their first terms:¶ Screen shot 2013-02-06 at 10.37.25 AM¶ As Gallup’s Jeffrey Jones wrote:¶ “Only one of the last six presidents — George H.W. Bush — had a honeymoon that extended beyond his ninth month in office. Bush’s ratings actually climbed for much of his first year and a half in office as the economy remained strong, several communist regimes fell in Europe, and the U.S. military was able to capture Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega and remove him from power.”¶ The explanations for the shortening of presidential honeymoons vary.¶ One theory is that modern presidents operate in a hyper-partisan world where the opposition party never rallies (or comes close to rallying) behind them. (In Gallup polling, nine of the ten most polarizing years of a presidency – as defined by the gap between presidential job approval among Democrats and job approval among Republicans — have come during the presidencies of George W. Bush and Obama.)¶ Because of that partisan division, modern presidents’ approval ratings start at a lower high point; that means the pace at which they dip below the 56 percent “honeymoon” mark is significantly hastened. The one and only Nate Silver makes just that point when examining second term presidential honeymoons in this post and accompanying chart:¶ Screen shot 2013-02-06 at 12.12.00 PM¶ Another factor contributing to the truncation of political honeymoons is that in the world of 24-hour cable networks, Twitter and the fracturing of the traditional media, the attention span of the American public is much shorter than it once was — meaning that momentum simply dies away much faster nowadays.¶ Regardless of the reason, it’s clear that Obama has a limited time — six months perhaps? — to take legislative advantage of his second political honeymoon.¶ He seems committed to taking on three separate and distinct fights during that time: 1) gun control 2) immigration reform 3) debt and spending. Each of those legislative scraps will shorten his honeymoon as he expends political capital to try to get what he wants out of a Congress — particularly in the House — that seems likely to be resistant.¶ And, it’s possible — given the glacially slow pace at which Congress works and the aforementioned partisanship that seems to seize any and every issue — that Obama’s honeymoon will fade well before he gets all three of those priorities accomplished.¶ A look back at the trend line on his job approval in his first term is telling in that regard.¶ 2013-02-06 Obama honeymoon 1Even though Obama started off considerably higher in his first term than he began his second term, by August 2009 he had dropped to 54 percent approval in WaPo-ABC polling — thanks to the bailout of the American auto industry, the fight over the economic stimulus package and the earlier positioning over his health-care bill.¶ Considering that Obama is — at best — in the mid-50s in terms of job approval at the moment and the fact that the past showdowns on fiscal issues have revealed the massively different approaches advocated by the two parties, it’s not at all far fetched to assume that taking on just one of those fights might be enough to end the president’s second term honeymoon.¶ In short: The time is now for Obama to act on his legislative priorities. His political honeymoon will almost certainly be over by the time Congress recesses for its month-long August break this summer.

# 2nc US economy internal

**Huge hit to the economy – markets haven’t prices the impact into their decisionmaking**

Sam Ro (writer for Business Insider) January 25, 2013 “MORGAN STANLEY: 'The Odds Favor A Government Shutdown'” http://www.businessinsider.com/reinhart-odds-favor-government-shutdown-2013-1

¶ However, Reinhart thinks that we are likely to see a government shutdown, or the freezing of non-essential services. And because the market has gotten used to fiscal brinksmanship, a shutdown could be bad news because the markets don't appear to have priced in the drag on the economy and shock to confidence.¶ ¶ From Reinhart:¶ ¶ The odds favor a government shut-down. The experience of 1995 to 1996 reassures that the world will not end. However, the drag on spending will likely be more significant than market participants expect. With the countdown clocks on cable television put back into motion, consumer confidence could take a hit. And, as always, the ratings agencies are a wild-card that could make this more of a market event, even if short lived.¶ ¶ Circling back to the start, the conversation at the policy-making scrum at the Conference Center at Davos shows the key problem for the US and Europe. Market observers are bored by the details of the political debate. Trained by last-minute bargains on both sides of the Atlantic, everyone assumes that nothing can go seriously wrong and compromise will win at the end. If nothing can go seriously wrong, it should not be embedded in market prices. And if market prices are not sending at least a yellow flashing signal of threat, politicians believe they have time to act. Politicians who think they have time to act use it. And what happens to market confidence in the absence of political action? We will find out.¶ ¶ We can hope for the best.

**brinksmanship --> credit downgrade**

**Schatz and Reis 1-1** – Joe, POLITICO Pro’s tax editor and Patrick, covers economics and the financial sector (Enjoy the fiscal cliff debate? Just wait for the debt ceiling, Politico, Read more: http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/enjoy-the-fiscal-cliff-debate-just-wait-for-the-debt-ceiling-85649.html#ixzz2GqK8XL00)

Treasury hit the debt ceiling Monday and Geithner began employing “extraordinary measures” — like postponing payments to government pension funds and suspending a securities program popular with cities and municipalities — to ward off default for about two months.

Democrats have complained that Republicans’ decision to draw a harder line over the debt limit last year went beyond the usual Washington power play and irresponsibly called into question the once unquestionable: whether the U.S. would pay its debts.

Even if Congress steers clear of default, another round of debt-ceiling brinkmanship could do further damage to the U.S. credit rating, analysts said.

“It's hard to predict when the global investing community might lose confidence in the United States but courting that possibility doesn't make sense,” said Rob Nichols, president of the Financial Services Forum, a group that represents the CEOs of large banks and other financial services companies.

Deficit hawks have long claimed that the nation’s deep debt, accompanied with negative reviews from credit agencies, could cause investors to demand higher interest rates from federal borrowers and driving the country further into the red.

Thus far, those fears have not panned out — U.S. borrowing costs have plunged since the S&P downgrade — but market watchers worry that another blow to the credit rating could tip the balance.

“If a second rating agency downgraded the U.S., there would be a real and dramatic effect,” said Brian Kessler, an economist at Moody’s Analytics. “Even if they kick the can down the road again and come up with a three-month raise for the ceiling, it’s still pushing the debate forward, and it shows the credit rating firms that there is an unwillingness to address this issue.”

**Independently causes economic collapse**

**Washington Times, 6/14** (Patrice Hill, The Washington Times, 14 June 2012, “Debt fight poses new risk to U.S. credit rating,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/14/debt-fight-poses-new-risk-to-us-credit-rating/?page=all)//CC

Any downgrade by Moody’s could be more devastating than a second downgrade by S&P, analysts say, because it would clearly move the U.S. out of the exclusive club of AAA-rated nations and throw into question the privileged status of U.S. Treasury securities as a safe haven for global investors. Threat to Treasury Any significant flight from the Treasury market triggered by a downgrade would raise Treasury bond rates and have devastating consequences. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that a 1-percentage-point increase in rates would increase Treasury’s debt payments by $1 trillion in the next decade, wiping out the benefit of all the budget cuts enacted by Congress last year. Treasury’s safe-haven status is the critical factor that enabled the U.S. to avoid a debilitating increase in interest rates after the S&P downgrade last year, said Ivan Rudolph-Shabinsky, an analyst at AllianceBernstein. In fact, Treasury rates declined after the S&P downgrade as the U.S. benefited from the turmoil created by the European debt crisis. The flight to safety by investors drawing out of Europe has pushed Treasury rates to record lows, with the yield on Treasury’s 10-year bond falling for the first time to 1.44 percent. Those extraordinarily low interest rates not only have enabled the U.S. government to easily finance its growing debt load, but have been a boon to the beleaguered U.S. housing market and indebted U.S. consumers. Thirty-year mortgage rates, which are linked to the 10-year bond rate, have plunged to record lows, below 4 percent, triggering a big wave of refinancings and boosting prospects for a budding housing recovery. Mr. Rudolph-Shabinsky said America’s safe-haven status doesn’t appear to be in much danger, but how markets view the political impasse will be critical. “The current assumption is that the threat of a potential crisis will spur the U.S. government to act” to reduce the debt at the end of the year, he said. But what if global investors conclude, like S&P, that “the U.S. is simply incapable of addressing its underlying structural issues with Social Security, Medicare and other entitlement programs?” In that case, Treasury yields will rise and “higher financing costs will cause a dramatic deterioration” in U.S. finances, he said, possibly putting the U.S. in the same boat with Greece, Spain and other debt-strapped European countries. “The U.S. might fall into the category of sovereign downgrades that accelerate an already-worsening fiscal situation,” he said.

#  at: econ impact defense

**Doesn’t assume protectionism**

Andrew Leonard, Salon staff writer, 9/21/**10**, "The nasty politics of 10 percent unemployment," http://www.salon.com/technology/how\_the\_world\_works/2010/09/21/lessons\_of\_the\_great\_depression/index.html

Why should governments care, above all else, about keeping unemployment down and ensuring that the greatest number of people get a fair share of the economic pie? Because if you don't, bad things happen. Europe's leaders learned this the hard way in the 1930s, but our historical memory seems fleeting.

That, in a nutshell, is the message of today's must read: Kevin O'Rourke's "Lessons from the Great Depression." (Hat tip, Mark Thoma.)

 ...[I]n late 1929, the Great Depression hit and everything fell apart. Thanks to Bruning's deflationary policies, Germany's national income fell by more than a quarter, and official unemployment rose to almost a third of the labor force. Optimism was replaced by a profound sense of insecurity. Inevitably, the extremist parties benefitted. In 1930 the Nazis increased their share of the vote to 18.3 percent, while in July 1932 they scored 37.8 percent. By this stage Bruning was gone, his successor adopted some modestly stimulative policies, and there were signs of a partial recovery. Not coincidentally, in November 1932 the Nazi share dipped to 33.1 percent; but by then it was too late, and the Weimar Republic was doomed.

The lesson was clear: states needed to provide their citizens with the security which the gold standard and the market system, left to their own devices, had so conspicuously failed to do. The alternative was nationalism in all its guises: economic nationalism at best, but potentially something much uglier and far more dangerous. And so the democracies of the postwar period became social democracies -- although British voters in 1945 judged that Churchill was not the man best suited to bringing this about.

O'Rourke observes that extremist parties have recently captured significant shares of the electorate in Hungary and Denmark, the most popular book on the German version of Amazon is an "anti-immigrant screed" and that in France, "the government has been fishing in National Front waters." The two words he most conspicuously does not mention? "Tea Party."

Perhaps it may be too soon to be making National Front/Tea Party connections, although listening to the way leading Republicans are talking about Islam today suggestions that a reluctance to connect such dots betrays a certain over-caution. But the more fundamental point is clear: A government failure to aggressively deal with unemployment, combined with a decades-long trend of increasing income equality, has created fertile ground for extremist, populist rage.

O'Rourke:

Anyone who believes that people are getting better has not been paying sufficiently close attention to the history of the twentieth century...

#  at: barnett

**Economic decline threatens supranational structures Barnett says keep the peace**

Jerry W. **Sanders ‘90**, Prof. Peace and Conflict Studies, UC, Berkeley

[“Global Ecology and World Economy: Collision Course or Sustainable Future”

Bulletin of Peace Proposals Vol. 21 (4) p. 395-401]

Circumstances of looming catastrophe like these call for a maximum of world order and international cooperation. Historically, however, it is in just such times that the political will for global governance is in shortest supply. In a period of economic stagnation and trade competition, a declining hegemonic power will think less about maintaining world order than about shoring up its position relative to new challengers and upstarts. Multilateral cooperation will run up against similar constraints, due to suspicions that others may gain at one’s own expense by ‘free riding’ on the ‘public goods’ provided by environmental protection, trade regulation, or collective security regimes. The tendency will be for states to withhold the resources and the legitimacy required for supranational structures to work. And left to fend for themselves in a climate of economic stagnation, individual nations will be little able and even less inclined to end their destabilizing environmental practices. Thus the groundwork will be laid for a chain reaction of conflicts across a spectrum of relations, with one nation after another forced into escalating confrontation along several fronts.

# credit

**Credit downgrade internal**

**Schatz and Reis 1-1** – Joe, POLITICO Pro’s tax editor and Patrick, covers economics and the financial sector (Enjoy the fiscal cliff debate? Just wait for the debt ceiling, Politico, Read more: http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/enjoy-the-fiscal-cliff-debate-just-wait-for-the-debt-ceiling-85649.html#ixzz2GqK8XL00)

Treasury hit the debt ceiling Monday and Geithner began employing “extraordinary measures” — like postponing payments to government pension funds and suspending a securities program popular with cities and municipalities — to ward off default for about two months.

Democrats have complained that Republicans’ decision to draw a harder line over the debt limit last year went beyond the usual Washington power play and irresponsibly called into question the once unquestionable: whether the U.S. would pay its debts.

Even if Congress steers clear of default, another round of debt-ceiling brinkmanship could do further damage to the U.S. credit rating, analysts said.

“It's hard to predict when the global investing community might lose confidence in the United States but courting that possibility doesn't make sense,” said Rob Nichols, president of the Financial Services Forum, a group that represents the CEOs of large banks and other financial services companies.

Deficit hawks have long claimed that the nation’s deep debt, accompanied with negative reviews from credit agencies, could cause investors to demand higher interest rates from federal borrowers and driving the country further into the red.

Thus far, those fears have not panned out — U.S. borrowing costs have plunged since the S&P downgrade — but market watchers worry that another blow to the credit rating could tip the balance.

“If a second rating agency downgraded the U.S., there would be a real and dramatic effect,” said Brian Kessler, an economist at Moody’s Analytics. “Even if they kick the can down the road again and come up with a three-month raise for the ceiling, it’s still pushing the debate forward, and it shows the credit rating firms that there is an unwillingness to address this issue.”

**Independently causes economic collapse**

**Washington Times, 6/14** (Patrice Hill, The Washington Times, 14 June 2012, “Debt fight poses new risk to U.S. credit rating,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/14/debt-fight-poses-new-risk-to-us-credit-rating/?page=all)//CC

Any downgrade by Moody’s could be more devastating than a second downgrade by S&P, analysts say, because it would clearly move the U.S. out of the exclusive club of AAA-rated nations and throw into question the privileged status of U.S. Treasury securities as a safe haven for global investors. Threat to Treasury Any significant flight from the Treasury market triggered by a downgrade would raise Treasury bond rates and have devastating consequences. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that a 1-percentage-point increase in rates would increase Treasury’s debt payments by $1 trillion in the next decade, wiping out the benefit of all the budget cuts enacted by Congress last year. Treasury’s safe-haven status is the critical factor that enabled the U.S. to avoid a debilitating increase in interest rates after the S&P downgrade last year, said Ivan Rudolph-Shabinsky, an analyst at AllianceBernstein. In fact, Treasury rates declined after the S&P downgrade as the U.S. benefited from the turmoil created by the European debt crisis. The flight to safety by investors drawing out of Europe has pushed Treasury rates to record lows, with the yield on Treasury’s 10-year bond falling for the first time to 1.44 percent. Those extraordinarily low interest rates not only have enabled the U.S. government to easily finance its growing debt load, but have been a boon to the beleaguered U.S. housing market and indebted U.S. consumers. Thirty-year mortgage rates, which are linked to the 10-year bond rate, have plunged to record lows, below 4 percent, triggering a big wave of refinancings and boosting prospects for a budding housing recovery. Mr. Rudolph-Shabinsky said America’s safe-haven status doesn’t appear to be in much danger, but how markets view the political impasse will be critical. “The current assumption is that the threat of a potential crisis will spur the U.S. government to act” to reduce the debt at the end of the year, he said. But what if global investors conclude, like S&P, that “the U.S. is simply incapable of addressing its underlying structural issues with Social Security, Medicare and other entitlement programs?” In that case, Treasury yields will rise and “higher financing costs will cause a dramatic deterioration” in U.S. finances, he said, possibly putting the U.S. in the same boat with Greece, Spain and other debt-strapped European countries. “The U.S. might fall into the category of sovereign downgrades that accelerate an already-worsening fiscal situation,” he said.