### 2NC Uniqueness Wall

#### Presidential push for a fiscal bargain solves status quo divisions

Vicki Needham (writer for The Hill) November 7, 2012 “Business groups urge quick extension of tax policies in lame duck” http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/266701-business-groups-urge-quick-extension-of-tax-policies-in-lame-duck

A grand bargain will require complex negotiations that will take more time than the six or so weeks left before year's end. "What we need is action," Engler said. Engler, Casey and Jay Timmons, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, told reporters that Obama must lay out a blueprint for Congress that will tackle the long list of these issues hampering a more robust economic recovery. "This is going to take executive leadership," Engler said. Timmons said it is time for unity to help the country improve its global competitiveness. "Our goal is to grow the economy," he said. The president talked to congressional leaders on Wednesday about the legislative agenda less than a day after winning reelection. But congressional leaders immediately staked out the same positions that have created so much division on Capitol Hill. Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) said he would not yield to raising any taxes this year, while Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) argued for letting tax rates expire for wealthier earners. Still, both men hinted that they need to find a way to work togther toward a bipartisan compromise.

#### This PC ensures sufficient numbers of Republican jump ship to resolve negotiations

Seth Fraser (writer for PolicyMic) November 8, 2012 “Should We Get Ready For 4 More Years of Ridiculous Obama vs GOP Obstructionism?” http://www.policymic.com/mobile/articles/18841/should-we-get-ready-for-4-more-years-of-ridiculous-obama-vs-gop-obstructionism

Whichever road taken, the GOP has about one and a half years to make votes on bills that suggest to their constituents that they have actually gotten something done. The incentive system hasn’t changed. In 2014, candidates will again have to report back to their districts and ask for your vote. What they have to show depends on Obama’s political agenda over the coming months and the Republicans' willingness to accept defeat and work with him. President Obama indeed owns a great deal of political capital. He has that much more momentum than Bush II, who famously said after his 2004 presidential win, “I have political capital. I intend to spend it.” The strategic political reason behind this momentum is due, in large part, to the way the GOP framed the election as a battle between big government and small government. In the end, voters wanted a president and a party in power that was pragmatic and could get things done. But now that Obama has won, it is difficult to argue that Obama’s victory wasn’t also a referendum on liberal or left-leaning ideals that government can play a meaningful part in people’s lives. Elizabeth Warren went as far as to say that the reason she was elected was because she stood up for the “core of liberalism.” The president also has economic winds at his back as the job and housing markets have shown signs of continuing recovery. The fact that there is evidence that the president’s policies are actually improving things should create a greater political willingness for Republicans to join the winning team, if only to take some of the credit. If things continue to improve and the Republicans still choose to obstruct and sit on the sidelines, the Democrats will be able to tout success once again in the face of Republican intransigence. These factors, as well as the increased media and public attention in the afterglow of the election, may provide an impetus for a new jobs bill and perhaps reaching a deal on raising new revenue, two things that will be addressed at the end of this year and early next year. Moreover, the Democrats will certainly continue to pound the strong narrative that the election was a mandate on raising new revenue, as Joe Biden recently pointed out.

#### GOP is giving ground now

Bill French (Writer for Democracy Arsenal) November 7, 2012 “Lame Duck Opening Moves: GOP Leadership Agrees DoD is on the Table?” http://www.democracyarsenal.org/2012/11/lame-duck-opening-moves-gop-leadership-agrees-dod-is-on-the-table-.html

Of those reductions, those affecting the Pentagon have received disproportionate attention. What role the Pentagon budget should play in avoiding the fiscal cliff has been hotly debated, with many – but by no means all – conservatives calling for a deal to exempt the DoD from cuts. Some, most notably Buck Mckeon (R-CA), have even called to reverse the cuts already in place, even though those "cuts" are from projected budgetary increases and the Pentagon budget is still on course to rise slightly over the next decade. But Boehner may have just signaled a significant softening of the GOP position. In his speech, he dedicated only one sentence to Pentagon spending to oppose “slashing” the DoD budget. Crucially, this is not objecting to reductions in Pentagon spending as such – a rhetorical fact which is likely indicative of GOP intentions when uttered in such a calibrated address. This interpretation would seem to be corroborated by House Majority Leader Eric Cantor's (R-VA) statements today when he similarly indicated merely opposing “massive defense cuts.” In looking forward to near-term the work required to avoid the fiscal cliff, it seems that the GOP leadership now tacitly agrees that Pentagon spending should remain on the table.

#### BUT, the plan picks a fight that makes the lame duck toxic

Richard Cowan (writer for Reuters) October 22, 2012 “Some in Congress look to $55 billion fiscal cliff 'fallback'” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/22/us-usa-congress-fiscalcliff-idUSBRE89L0YB20121022

Analysts are increasingly pointing to a status quo congressional election: one that keeps the House of Representatives under Republican control and the Senate under Democratic control. Even as Obama and Romney battle for votes in the last two weeks of their campaigns, some Republicans on Capitol Hill are speculating about a victory by the Democratic president. "If Obama wins, we're going to have to play the cards we're dealt and work out some negotiation with him," said one senior Republican aide who works on fiscal policy matters. Another Republican aide added that if Obama "squeaks out" a victory, the president "will have a choice to make: He can pick a fight, make the lame duck toxic and we can go over the fiscal cliff, or we can work to find common ground on the framework for a bigger tax and entitlement reform agreement" that could take at least a year to put together. At the same time, Democrats, who voice confidence in an Obama victory despite a late Romney surge, warn that they will stick to their demands that the wealthy share more of the burden of getting the U.S. fiscal house in order. "We really think we're going to have leverage and we will use it," the Senate Democratic aide said, pointing to a contentious lame duck session that might be in need of a "fallback."

### link

#### GOP hate clean energy policies as much as most hate Kanye West

Harder 3/22/12 (Amy Harder reports on energy and the environment for National Journal and moderates an expert blog on the topic as well. “Public Wary of Sequestration, Not Clean Energy,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/daily/public-wary-of-sequestration-not-clean-energy-20120522>)

 In a visit on Thursday to Iowa—the country’s second-largest wind-producing state after Texas—President Obama will urge Congress to extend a key production tax credit for wind and a clean-energy manufacturing credit. Congress is unlikely to consider these tax credits until year’s end when lawmakers take up the annual “tax-extenders” package. Whether congressional supporters of the tax credits, including senior Republican Sen. Chuck Grassley of Iowa, can muster enough support to extend the credits remains uncertain and likely depends on the outcome of the elections. Action this year on a clean-energy standard measure introduced by retiring Senate Energy and Natural Resources Chairman Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., is very unlikely **no matter how Election Day goes**.

While support for these clean-energy policies was predictably stronger among Democrats and independents than Republicans, respondents identifying with the GOP were split. Almost half of Republicans said they support extending clean-energy tax credits (48 percent) and enacting a clean-energy standard (47 percent). That support is not reflected in Washington, where most congressional **Republicans shun clean-energy** policies, especially an energy mandate, in favor of less government involvement and reducing the deficit.

#### Consistently unpopular

Mariotte 6/5/12 (Michael Mariotte, Executive Director of Nuclear Information and Resource Service, “Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the polls say,” http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say)

New nuclear reactors are simply too expensive for utilities to build with their own assets. Nor are banks willing to lend money for most nuclear projects; they’re considered too risky given the long history of cost overruns, defaults, cancellations and other problems. Thus, the only two means of financing a new reactor are to either get money from taxpayers, through direct federal loans or taxpayer-backed loan guarantees, or from ratepayers in a few, mostly Southern states, which allow utilities to collect money from ratepayers before reactors are built—a concept known either as “early cost recovery” or Construction Work in Progress (CWIP). ORC International (which polls for CNN, among others) has asked a straightforward question for the past two years (March 2011 and February 2012) in polls commissioned by the Civil Society Institute: “Should U.S. Taxpayers Take on the Risk of Backing New Nuclear Reactors?” The answer? Basically identical both years: 73% opposed in 2011, 72% opposed in 2012.

### impact

#### Prefer our impacts – strong statistical backing

Royal 10 – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-214

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 10981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Polllins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium, and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996,2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectation of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases , as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002, p.89). Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to create a ‘rally round the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997) Miller (1999) and Kisanganie and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force.