### 2AC DOD T – FI

**C/I- Financial incentives use public funds to motivate production**

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

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.¶ By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effectswhich exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### Precision- DOE definition

Waxman 1998 (Solicitor General of the US (Seth, Brief for the United States in Opposition for the US Supreme Court case HARBERT/LUMMUS AGRIFUELS PROJECTS, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, http://www.justice.gov/osg/briefs/1998/0responses/98-0697.resp.opp.pdf)

2 On November 15, 1986, Keefe was delegated “the authority, with respect to actions valued at $50 million or less, to approve, execute, enter into, modify, administer, closeout, terminate and take any other necessary and appropriate action (collectively, ‘Actions’) with respect to Financial Incentive awards.” Pet. App. 68, 111-112. Citing DOE Order No. 5700.5 (Jan. 12, 1981), the delegation defines “Financial Incentives” as the authorized financial incentive programs of DOE, “including direct loans, loan guarantees, purchase agreements, price supports, guaranteed market agreements and any others which may evolve.” The delegation proceeds to state, “[h]owever, a separate prior written approval of any such action must be given by or concurred in by Keefe to accompany the action.” The delegation also states that its exercise “shall be governed by the rules and regulations of [DOE] and policies and procedures prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate(s).” Pet. App. 111-113.

### Grid

**Military engagement inevitable**

Dorfman 2012 (Zach Dorfman, assistant editor of Ethics and International Affairs, May 18, 2012, “What We Talk About When We Talk About Isolationism,” Dissent Magazine, http://dissentmagazine.org/online.php?id=605)

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

#### No resilience- Experts give the grid a *D+*

Barrett 2012 (Michael Barrett, Lexington Institute, November 2012, “Ensuring the Resilience of the U.S. Electrical Grid Part II: Managing the Chaos – and Costs – of Shared Risks,” Lexington Institute, http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Energy/EnsuringResilienceofElectricalGridPartII.pdf)

The North American power grid is indeed a modern ¶ marvel, and yet at the same time it is increasingly a ¶ system facing great risk. Part of this is merely due to the ¶ age of many of its essential components, for as the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) has noted, ¶ Altogether, our nation’s electric energy infrastructure is a ¶ patchwork system that has evolved over a long period of ¶ time, with equipment of widely differing ages and ¶ capacities. For example, about 51% of the generating ¶ capacity of the U.S. is in plants that were at least 30 years ¶ old at the end of 2010. Most gas-fired capacity is less than ¶ 10 years old, while 73% of all coal-fired capacity is 30 ¶ years or older. Moreover, nationally, 70% of transmission lines and power transformers are 25 years or older, while ¶ 60% of circuit breakers are more than 30 years old”.¶ 1¶ The organization assigned the U.S. energy infrastructure a grade of “D+” on its most recent assessment in 2009.¶ 2¶ The Report Card for America’s Infrastructure went on to ¶ describe congestion in transmission and distribution ¶ systems that complicates routine maintenance and ¶ exacerbates risks of systemwide failures.¶ 3¶ MeasurIng the rIsks¶ Measurements of risk are generally described as a ¶ function of both the potential severity of an adverse event and the likelihood of such events taking place. ¶ This binary set of factors highlights the key relationship ¶ between not only if an event will happen but also how ¶ bad the impacts would be if it did, and enables effective ¶ risk-based decisions about how to reduce risk by ¶ helping distinguish frequent but relatively minor events ¶ from those that may be less frequent but would be ¶ significantly more important if they did occur. ¶ Importantly, while severe weather and other disruptive ¶ events provide ample evidence of the increased likelihood of events taking place, it is actually the increased ¶ severity that creates the more significant impacts, for in ¶ today’s hyper-complex and ever more interdependent ¶ world the impact of any given event can cascade well ¶ beyond its immediate vicinity. This reality was demonstrated on March 11, 2011 when a powerful tsunami hit ¶ Japan’s nuclear power generation capabilities in Fukushima and resulted in power and other disruptions that ¶ affected global manufacturing. As one analyst noted,¶ The quake and tsunami damaged or closed down key ports, ¶ and some airports shut briefly. This disrupted the global ¶ supply chain of semiconductor equipment and materials. ¶ Japan manufactures 20% of the world’s semiconductor products, including NAND flash, an indispensable ¶ electronic part of Apple’s iPad. Japan also supplies the ¶ wings, landing gears and other major parts of Boeing’s ¶ 787 Dreamliner… Automakers Toyota, Nissan, Honda, ¶ Mitsubishi and Suzuki [also] temporarily suspended ¶ production. Nissan may move one production line to the U.S. ¶ A total of 22 plants, including Sony, were shut in the area.¶ 4¶ As a result, the effects of a tsunami and related power ¶ disruption half the world away included a global ¶ economic impact totaling in the billions of dollars and ¶ lost economic productivity involving everything from ¶ consumer products to automobiles and companies in ¶ Japan, Vietnam and the United States, to name only a ¶ few. Given the trends of global trade and worldwide ¶ sourcing for everything from raw materials to consumer ¶ goods, industrial equipment, and even consulting and ¶ professional services, the scale of deleterious impacts ¶ from cascading failures in an interconnected world is ¶ significant and rising. ¶ sources of the growIng rIsk¶ 1) severity: Many risk analysts believe the most noteworthy trend of late has been the particular increase ¶ in probable severity of impacts from any significant ¶ disruption. The root cause of concern in this regard is ¶ the dramatic and mostly unconscious increase in the ¶ complexity of the interdependencies within our overall ¶ economy which mean that, because a disruption in a ¶ highly interconnected area like electrical power will ¶ have pronounced cascading effects across all manner of ¶ economic, transportation, telecommunications, and ¶ financial services industries, the severity of any disruption might be orders of magnitude worse than people would ¶ expect based on historical precedent. This was the case in ¶ the August 14, 2003, blackout in portions of the Northeast and Midwest United States and Ontario, Canada, ¶ causing an estimated economic loss of $6 billion in the ¶ United States alone (see case study in Part I). ¶ Specifically, some of the main concerns in this regard ¶ include the personal and private sector costs of disruptions through lost productivity or damage to homes and ¶ workplaces, as well as the social impact of potential ¶ widespread death and destruction such as when a severe ¶ heat wave that hit France in 2003 resulted in some 14,800 ¶ deaths. At the same time, one must also take account of ¶ potential national and homeland security impacts stemming from the loss of power to critical command ¶ and control centers that would negatively impact the ¶ coordination of response efforts, potentially including ¶ even our nation’s defensive forces. ¶ 2) Likelihood: The likelihood of the national power grid ¶ being impacted by adverse events is also on the rise due to ¶ myriad significant threats and hazards. In fact, according ¶ to the Department of Energy, of the five massive U.S. blackouts over the past 40 years, three of them occurred in the past nine years while the average outage from ¶ 1996-2000 affected 409,854 people, a 15% increase over ¶ the previous five-year period.¶ 5¶ This is in large part ¶ because today’s threats can stem from physical decay ¶ of the existing decades-old infrastructure as well as ¶ exposure of more and more of the system to the impacts ¶ of a growing population that is increasing per-person ¶ power consumption while moving both to crowded ¶ cities or spreading further and further into areas that ¶ were once scarcely inhabited. Hazards also come from changing weather patterns that ¶ include major storms and more days and even weeks ¶ or months of extreme temperatures. As can be plainly ¶ seen from the challenges of combating droughts and the ¶ buckling of the pavement of American highways during ¶ the summer of 2012, for example, the manifestation of ¶ extreme hot or cold weather can push infrastructure beyond its design limitations, which in turn creates ¶ additional unforeseen cascading effects. While the impact ¶ to various physical linkages, couplings, substations, and ¶ other equipment of the power grid may be less visible ¶ than buckling highways, the results of the extreme ¶ temperatures on the built environment of the electrical ¶ grid are no less pronounced, including equipment failure, high-stress of the system, and shorter maintenance ¶ and replacement intervals for critical components.¶ Another important potential risk facing the electrical grid is that of malicious actors, be they terrorists like ¶ al Qaeda or Hezbollah, the military of other nations ¶ competing economically or otherwise with the U.S., ¶ or even lone-wolf anarchists or disgruntled employees. ¶ While attacks like these may seem unlikely, their intent ¶ and potential impacts mean they must be considered in ¶ terms of protecting the power grid, especially in light of ¶ the well-publicized potential cyber vulnerabilities of key ¶ segments of our existing electrical grid infrastructure.

#### DOD renewable initiatives fail

Andres and Breetz 2011 (Richard B. Andres, Professor of national Security Strategy at the national War College and a Senior fellow and energy and environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic research, institute for national Strategic Studies, at the national Defense University, and Hanna L. Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts institute of technology, February 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications,” National Defense University Strategic Forum, http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/strforum/sf-262.pdf)

In recent years, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) has become increasingly interested in the potential of small (less than 300 megawatts electric [MWe]) nuclear reactors for military use.1 DOD’s attention to small reactors stems mainly from two critical vulnerabilities it has identified in its infrastructure and operations: the dependence of U.S. military bases on the fragile civilian electrical grid, and the challenge of safely and reliably supplying energy to troops in forward operating locations. DOD has responded to these challenges with an array of initiatives on energy efficiency and renewable and alternative fuels. Unfortunately, even with massive investment and ingenuity, these initiatives will be insufficient to solve DOD’s reliance on the civilian grid or its need for convoys in forward areas. The purpose of this paper is to explore the prospects for addressing these critical vulnerabilities through small-scale nuclear plants.

### RU

**YES nukes now- 50 countries- Their ev is a bad snapshot**

**Hussain 2012** (Yadullah Hussain, March 9, 2012, “50 countries developing nuclear energy plans: report,” Financial Post, http://business.financialpost.com/2012/03/09/50-countries-developing-nuclear-energy-plans-report/)

The nuclear-energy industry is recovering from the Fukushima nuclear power plant debacle, with at least **50 countries** building, operating or considering nuclear power as part of their energy mix, according to a study.¶ About half of these countries are newcomers to nuclear, and there are **more than 60** nuclear plants under construction, mainly in China, Russia, India and South Korea, says a report from the World Energy Council.¶ “Apart from the **limited cases** where the Fukushima accident has caused governments to think again, the majority of countries, **after the initial emotion**, are now engaged in a rational assessment of the pros and cons of nuclear to bring energy to their populations,” said Pierre Gadonneix, chairman of the WEC.¶ Meanwhile, U.N. atomic energy chief said on Friday that nuclear power is safer than it was a year ago. In a statement issued ahead of Sunday’s first anniversary of the world’s worst nuclear crisis since Chernobyl in 1986, Director General Yukiya Amano of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) said meaningful steps had been taken to strengthen global nuclear safety since Fukushima.¶ “Nuclear safety is stronger than it was a year ago,” he said. “We know what went wrong and we have a clear course of action to tackle those causes – not only in Japan, but anywhere in the world.”¶ Amano added: “Now we have to keep up the momentum. Complacency can kill.”¶ Still, the implications of the Fukushima disaster remain uncertain, especially after Germany, Switzerland and Belgium decided to move away from nuclear power altogether and build up alternative renewable energy sources instead.¶ “Among the long-term outcomes, may be a general sense that ambivalent or negative views of nuclear energy and, in particular, questions about its safety, were justified This may involve an increase in the so-called “not in my backyard” mentality, with people not wanting facilities/plants in their immediate vicinity or neighbourhood.”¶ The WEC report notes that progress in several national programmes, especially in countries new to nuclear power, has been delayed, especially with regard to near-term decisions to start such projects.¶ OECD countries dominate the market with the largest in the USA (104 reactors), followed by France (58 reactors) and Japan (54 reactors) but most of the nuclear plants under construction are in non-OECD countries. China alone accounted for 42% of the construction (27 reactors), followed by Russia with 17% (11 reactors), and India with 8% (five reactors).¶ Similarly, most of the planned and proposed reactors were also in non-OECD regions. Of the total 159 planned reactors, China accounted for 31% (50 reactors), followed by India 11% (18 reactors), Russia 9% (14 reactors), and Japan 8% (12 reactors). Of the 323 proposed reactors, China accounted for 34% (110), India 12% (40), Russia 9% (30), the USA 7% (23), and Ukraine 6% (20).

### Solvency

#### SMRs in 2015

Hise 2009 (Phaedra Hise, December 18, 2009, “Mini Reactors Show Promise for Clean Nuclear Power's Future,” Popular Mechanics, http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/energy/nuclear/4273386)

Interest in minireactors has grown over the past few years, according to Felix Killar at the Nuclear Energy Institute. "They're simple and robust, with safety features to allow a country without nuclear expertise to gradually put in small plants, and get people trained and familiar with them before moving into more complex plants." But small-scale plants could prove useful in the United States, too, particularly in areas where residents must now rely on diesel generators for electricity. Toshiba is reportedly working on a small-scale design for Galena, Alaska. But NuScale Power, the startup spun from Oregon State, is the first American company to submit plans to the NRC, which regulates all domestic nuclear power plants. ¶ The plant's design is similar to that of a Generation III+ "light water" reactor, but the size is unusual. "The whole thing is 65 ft. long," explains Jose Reyes, head of the nuclear engineering department at Oregon State and a co-founder of NuScale Power. The reactor unit of NuScale's containment unit is 14 ft., compared to a Westinghouse AP1000, a standard current design, which is about 120 ft. in diameter. It has to be built and serviced on-site, but NuScale's units could be manufactured at the factory, then shipped on a rail car or heavy truck to any location and returned for refueling. ¶ As in modern reactors, the containment shell acts as a heat exchanger, Reyes explains. The water closest to the core is vented into the outer shell as steam, where it condenses and drips into the cooling pool, which is recirculated to cool the core. The whole unit sits below grade, without telltale cooling towers. The reactor doesn't use pumps to circulate the water if the unit overheats, which means it needs no external power to cool down. That's a "passive safety" feature that protects the unit from electrical sabotage. ¶ The new unit can be manufactured cheaply, with standard turbines from General Electric, for example, rather than custom-made parts. Because the steel reactor vessel is only 9 ft. in diameter, it can be made entirely in the U.S., rather than relying on Japan Steel Works, the only manufacturer who can cast today's one-piece, 25-ft.-plus reactor vessels. ¶ Each 45-megawatt electrical unit would generate enough power for about 45,000 homes. By comparison, plants operated today generate 1000 to 1700 megawatts, according to NRC spokesman Scott Burnell. "You can't take an AP1000, a large base-load reactor, and put it down where there's no grid to support it. A smaller design could be useful in a remote setting." ¶ Large utilities could also use smaller units to their advantage, according to Reyes. Instead of shutting down an entire plant to replace fuel, as happens today, the utility could build a modular plant and then shut down only the unit affected. ¶ NuScale has built and tested a one-third-scale unit that uses electrical heat to simulate a nuclear core. After the design is presented to the NRC on July 24, NuScale will spend the next year and a half testing it. They will then submit a final report to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which can spend two or three years reviewing documentation before approval. If all goes according to schedule, Reyes estimates, the minireactors could start to go on line in 2015.

### 2AC Politics- Immigration

#### Non-Unique- DC appeals court will force Congress to revisit nuclear waste this week

Court should order US NRC to resume Yucca review: petition Washington (Platts)—1-4-2013/453 pm EST/2153 GMT http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/ElectricPower/6989382

Petitioners seeking to force US Nuclear Regulatory Commission to resume its review of the Department of Energy's application for a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, on Friday said Congress' failure to act on the matter means a federal court should immediately order resumption of the work. The US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit had ordered parties to submit an update to their positions by Friday to take into account any action by the 112th Congress, which ended Tuesday. A new Congress began its session Wednesday. The last Congress did not pass any legislation to modify the requirements in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act that NRC complete its review of DOE's application, petitioners Aiken County, South Carolina, Nye County, Nevada, South Carolina and Washington states, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners and three individuals said in their update to the court. The parties sued NRC in 2011 seeking to force it to resume the review, which the agency said it stopped because of a lack of funds. "The NRC's obligations to move forward on the license application ... should be enforced," the joint petitioner's update said. The court had extended an earlier December 14 deadline for the updates on congressional action, acting on an NRC request. NRC had said that "ongoing negotiations" between the executive branch and Congress might address the funding issue. DOE abandoned the project in 2010, citing opposition from the state of Nevada. Neither NRC nor DOE requested funds for Yucca Mountain licensing work in fiscal 2013, which started October 1. NRC said in its court filing Friday afternoon that Congress' failure to add funds for the Yucca Mountain review during negotiations to avoid the so-called fiscal cliff at year-end, President Barack Obama's re-election and the fact that neither chamber of Congress has changed party control means there is no reason to force it to resume the review. "The election returned to office an Executive Branch administration that has stated that it does not intend to seek a license for Yucca Mountain," NRC said. "And the election left the political balance of power unchanged in the Legislative Branch, which has repeatedly indicated through its recent funding decisions that it does not intend to appropriate additional Nuclear Waste Fund money for this project," it added. The agency has $10.5 million remaining in funds available for the Yucca Mountain review, an amount that would be insufficient for any long-term restart of its staff efforts, NRC said in the filing. The state of Nevada, which opposes the Yucca Mountain facility, said in its update, also filed Friday, that Congress failed to provide additional funding for NRC to continue the review. No such money was made available in a continuing resolution in September that funded government activities until the end of March, Nevada said. "Congress rejected, for the second straight fiscal year, the chance to provide the [NRC] with any money to continue the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding," Nevada said. Congress also did not provide DOE with additional money for advancing the license application, the state said. It is not clear when the court will make a final ruling. Two members of the three-judge panel have indicated in previous opinions they support ordering NRC to resume the review, even if Congress were not to act on the matter.

#### Won’t pass-

#### Opposition and other issues

Gonzalez 1/5 (Daniel González, “'Cliff' fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight,” The Town Talk, http://www.thetowntalk.com/article/20130105/NEWS/130105020?nclick\_check=1)

Although Obama says he wants to jump right into immigration reform, he and Congress will have to focus their attention for months on several unresolved issues left over from the New Year’s Day deal to avert the “fiscal cliff,” including a March1 deadline to avoid billions of dollars in across-the-board spending cuts and a late February/early March deadline to raise the debt ceiling.¶ “That is problem Number 1 for immigration reform. That will dominate the agenda for the time being,” said Louis DeSipio, a political-science professor at the University of California-Irvine.¶ Immigration reform also will have to compete with gun-control legislation. After the shooting in Newtown, Obama appointed Vice President Joe Biden to head an anti-violence commission to come up with new gun-control measures by the end of this month.¶ “That is going to put more pressure on Congress,” DeSipio said.¶ Gun control, plus the divisive atmosphere demonstrated by the Republican-controlled House and the Democrat-run Senate during the fiscal-cliff debate, “makes it more and more unlikely that Congress will actually be able to debate a comprehensive immigration-reform bill,” he said.

#### Obama

Munro 12/31 (Neil Munro, reporter for the Daily Caller, December 31, 2012, "Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest" dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/?print=1)

President Barack Obama promised Dec. 30 to introduce an immigration bill during 2013, but activists on all sides of the debate are trying to understand his strategy.¶ **He may be gunning for a victory in the mid-term elections by introducing** a bill so radical that it will **spark an emotional controversy from whites**, which would then **spur many angry Latino**s to vote Democratic in the 2014 midterm elections, said Robert de Posada, former head of a GOP-affiliated group, The Latino Coalition.¶ **“The word that I’ve heard from many, is [that** he will] submit a very, very liberal plan that most Republicans will not support, that most southern and moderate Democrats will not support**,”** he said.¶ When the bill fails**, “they can announce once again that they tried [and that Latinos] need to rally in the next election**,” said Posada, who helped President George W. Bush win 40 percent of the Latino vote in 2004, during the housing boom.

#### Hagel thumps the DA

Wong 1/6 (Scott Wong and Manu Raju, “Chuck Hagel takes fire from Capitol Hill,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/chuck-hagel-takes-fire-from-capitol-hill-85805.html)

Senate Democrats and Republicans are far from sold on President Barack Obama’s expected nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense.¶ In fact, Obama’s decision to tap the Vietnam veteran and outspoken former Republican senator is likely to spark another nasty fight with Congress right on the heels of the fiscal cliff showdown and just before another likely battle royal over the debt ceiling.¶ Republicans on Sunday unleashed a fresh barrage of attacks amid reports Obama would nominate Hagel on Monday for the top job at the Pentagon.¶ The new Senate minority whip, Texas Republican John Cornyn, said he’s firmly against Hagel’s nomination. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), an Air Force reservist who serves on the Armed Services Committee that will consider the nod, said Hagel would hold the “most antagonistic” views toward Israel of any defense secretary in U.S. history.¶ And despite heaping praise on Hagel when he retired from the Senate after the 2008 elections, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Sunday failed to extend an olive branch to the Nebraska Republican, instead suggesting there would be “tough questions” ahead.¶ Even Senate Democrats are privately signaling they‘re not yet on board with the Hagel pick, and that the White House has a lot of work to do to get him across the finish line.¶ The nomination comes at a tricky time for the administration — just as the fights over raising the debt ceiling and government appropriations are set to begin. And it could put a number of at-risk or pro-Israel Democrats in tough political spots — especially if the nomination fight grows even more contentious.¶ Democrats are also scratching their heads over why Obama appears willing to go to the mat for Hagel, while abandoning his push for a close friend and member of his inner circle, U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, to become secretary of state. Rice, an unabashed Democrat, abandoned her bid after withering GOP criticism over the deadly attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Libya.¶ Though different in substance, the controversy over Rice’s remarks is not unlike the current pushback over Hagel’s past foreign policy positions and controversial remarks. But Hagel lacks a natural constituency in the Senate, given that he’s grown alienated from the GOP, yet Democrats are suspicious of his record.¶ “It is a strange signal for the White House to send that they are willing to fight for Hagel but not Rice,” one Senate Democratic aide said Sunday. “Democrats are not currently unified behind Hagel, and it will take some real work by the administration to get them there, if it’s even possible.”¶ Senior Republicans agreed, noting that after Hagel infuriated Republicans and Democrats alike over the years, there isn’t a natural base for him.¶ “I can’t imagine why [Obama] would choose to burn his political capital on this nomination. For what? There is no constituency for Chuck Hagel,” one senior GOP aide said. “Obama will expend every ounce of political capital he has to get him across the finish line. Dems will hate this.”

#### Debt ceiling- top of the agenda

Nelson 1-2 [Colleen McCain Nelson 1-2-2013 Wall Street Journal “The Fiscal Cliff: Lack of Grand Bargain Complicates Obama's Priorities” ProQuest]

For President Barack Obama, the new year was supposed to bring an end to fiscal-cliff negotiations and the opportunity to begin work on a second-term agenda.¶ But the failure to craft a grand bargain to address the country's fiscal woes means that contentious discussions about spending cuts and the debt ceiling will continue in 2013 -- potentially diminishing the time and goodwill Mr. Obama needs to pursue his policy priorities.¶ Critics of the budget compromise already are signaling that hard feelings about this protracted process could linger, creating an uncertain path for the president as he tries to build support for proposals including an immigration-law overhaul, tax-code changes, energy legislation and other issues.¶ Still, the White House deal with Congress appears to have bolstered Mr. Obama's position in some ways. The president won a concession from Republicans in Congress on a central tenet of GOP ideology, which holds that tax rates should never rise. Moreover, Mr. Obama's success on that point came with a flourish -- a show of overwhelming support in the Senate, on a vote of 89-8.¶ Conservative opposition in the House failed to stop the deal, and that chamber approved the package late Tuesday.¶ Speaking minutes after the House vote, Mr. Obama said: "Thanks to the votes of Democrats and Republicans in Congress I will sign a law that raises taxes on the wealthiest 2% of Americans while preventing a middle-class tax hike that could have sent the economy back into recession."¶ Mr. Obama said he would like to take additional steps to reduce the nation's deficit, "with a little bit less drama, a little less brinksmanship." After his speech, Mr. Obama planned to fly to Hawaii to rejoin his family on vacation. Tuesday's developments not only suggest that the White House can strike deals with congressional Republicans in what has seemed like an ossified Washington political culture, but also that Mr. Obama has momentum in pursuing his goals. Mr. Obama appears to have a channel to negotiate with the GOP, by having Vice President Joe Biden work with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R., Ky.).¶ The cost to Mr. Obama is some complaining from the political left, which among other things notes that he has abandoned his campaign pledge to raise tax rates on household incomes above $250,000 in favor of the negotiated level of $450,000 for couples.¶ The White House believes the compromise is a victory for the president.¶ A person familiar with the discussions noted that Mr. Obama faced determined Republican opposition and still managed to forge an agreement that raises tax rates for the first time in a generation.¶ "The president has delivered on a major campaign promise and broken Republicans' backs on a 20-year pledge" to oppose tax rate increases, a White House official said.¶ But some Republicans have said that Mr. Obama fouled the water during the fiscal-cliff talks with combative, cajoling tactics. The president drew Republican ire Monday when he held a campaign-style event as the fiscal-cliff deadline loomed and passage of a deal remained uncertain.¶ Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.) called the gathering a "cheerleading rally." Sen. Bob Corker, a Tennessee Republican, accused the president of heckling Congress.¶ The White House said the appearance had been long in the works and was meant to highlight the real-world consequences of going over the fiscal cliff.¶ Rep. Mike Rogers (R., Mich.) said the president has focused his efforts during the past few weeks on railing against Congress and Republicans in particular instead of launching a dialogue.¶ "The president just doesn't play well with others," he said. "I do think he's up for a bumpy road, given his tactics."¶ Historically, second-term presidents have had a limited window to roll out major policy proposals before lame-duck status sets in and passing significant legislation becomes a steeper challenge. With that in mind, Mr. Obama has said he would roll out proposals aimed at reducing gun violence and overhauling immigration laws early this year.¶ The White House view is that Mr. Obama would have been ill-positioned to pass policy priorities if the country was still preoccupied with the effects of having gone over the fiscal cliff.¶ But now, because lawmakers postponed for two months the spending cuts that were set to take effect Wednesday, fiscal issues will continue to consume much of the political oxygen in the near future. So will talks about whether to raise the nation's statutory borrowing limit.

#### Winners win- Second term depends on bold legislative moves

Ignatius 11/7 (David Ignatius, longtime writer and reporter, studied political theory at Harvard College and economics at Kings College, Cambridge, November 7, 2012, “A time for Obama to be bold,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/president-obama-go-big/2012/11/07/dbf545f8-28fc-11e2-bab2-eda299503684\_story.html?hpid=z4)

Barack Obama will be getting advice by the boatload over the next few weeks, but the best guidance may be what emerges from Caro’s biography “The Passage of Power”: Think big. Find strategies and pressure points that can break the gridlock in Congress, which was as rigid in 1963 as it is today. Surprise your adversaries with bold moves and concessions that create new space on which to govern.¶ As I watched Tuesday’s triumph, it seemed obvious that Obama needs the policy equivalent of David Plouffe, his senior campaign adviser. Plouffe’s genius was to decide early on that the race depended on nine battleground states; if he could deliver those states by a relentless and sometimes ruthless assault, he would win the larger victory. He was like a general who concentrates his forces at the points of greatest vulnerability and then prevails through sheer force of will.¶ Obama’s performance as president has often lacked this decisive, strategic quality. The notes are there but not the policy “music.” In both foreign and domestic policy, the impression of Obama, after his blunderbuss, first-year battles on health care and the Israeli-Palestinian issue, has been of a careful president who reacts to events, waits for others to make the first moves and plays to avoid losing rather than to win.¶ Well, Mr. President, what the hell’s the presidency for?¶ A strategic second term would begin by identifying a list of necessary and achievable goals, and then pursuing them with the unyielding manipulative skill of a Lyndon Johnson. On the top of everybody’s list would be a budget deal. Everybody knows, more or less, what it will require: changes in Social Security and Medicare that slow the growth of entitlement spending; reform of the tax code that produces a fairer and simpler system that raises revenue without limiting growth.¶ A road map is there in the Simpson-Bowles deficit-reduction plan, and Obama administration officials have been thinking privately for months about how to tweak the plan so it’s better and fairer. Mitt Romney’s generous concession speech Tuesday night opened a possible door, and the president should follow up his statement that he will “look forward to sitting down with Governor Romney to talk about where we can work together to move this country forward.” The president and his new Treasury secretary (Jack Lew?) should take the next step and ask Romney to help close the budget deal the country needs.¶ In foreign policy, Obama will need to be equally strategic. What does he want to accomplish? My list: a deal with Iran that verifiably limits its nuclear program and avoids war; a deal in Afghanistan that averts civil war when U.S. forces leave in 2014; a deal for a political transition in Syria (a shorthand Syria summary would be to organize the opposition so that it’s strong enough to bargain, then help win a Nobel Peace Prize for Vladimir Putin). And, finally, a deal to create a Palestinian state so that Israel has secure borders and the Arab world can get on with the process of becoming modern and democratic.¶ All these primary foreign policy goals are “deals,” and it follows that the president needs a dealmaker as secretary of state. Who could do that, after Hillary Clinton leaves, probably at the end of January? John Kerry is an experienced man who thinks outside the box and is willing to take risks. Even if the president is said to have found him somewhat windy as the stand-in for Romney during debate preparation, Kerry has shown over the past four years a willingness to negotiate with adversaries, in secret, to achieve results.¶ A longtime Democratic adviser argues that Obama needs the “Bolten Plan,” as in Josh Bolten, the White House chief of staff who mobilized the machinery of government to get it moving in the same direction in George W. Bush’s second term. This will never be a happy model for Democrats, but it captures an important point: A successful second term is less about ideology than about results.¶ Think big. Take risks. Get it done. Maybe someone should slip a note in Obama’s desk drawer that asks: What would Lyndon Johnson have done to make it happen?

**Congress loves the plan- they requested it**

Matthews 2010 (William Matthews, February 15, 2010, “The Nuclear Option,” Defense News, http://www.defensenews.com/article/20100215/DEFFEAT01/2150310/The-Nuclear-Option)

The electric grids that the United States depends on for computers, communications gear and command centers are increasingly unreliable. They're strained by growing civilian demand, enfeebled by aging equipment and vulnerable to cyber and other attacks.¶ So the military is considering generating its own electricity, possibly with nuclear energy.¶ The push comes partially from the U.S. Congress, which last fall ordered the Defense Department to study the feasibility of building nuclear power plants on military installations. A report is due to lawmakers June 1.

#### Nuke lobby

Samuelsohn 2011 (Darren Samuelsohn, March 16, 2011, “Nuclear industry lobbyists' clout felt on Hill,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0311/51367.html)

Facing its biggest crisis in 25 years, the U.S. nuclear power industry can count on plenty of Democratic and Republican friends in both high and low places.¶ During the past election cycle alone, the Nuclear Energy Institute and more than a dozen companies with big nuclear portfolios have spent tens of millions of dollars on lobbying and campaign contributions to lawmakers in key leadership slots and across influential state delegations.¶ The donations and lobbying funds came at a critical moment for the nuclear industry as its largest trade group and major companies pushed for passage of a cap-and-trade bill.¶ While that effort failed, the money is sure to keep doors open on Capitol Hill as lawmakers consider any response to the safety issues highlighted by multiple nuclear reactor meltdowns in Japan in the aftermath of last week’s monster earthquake and tsunami.¶ “The bottom line is you’ve got a variety of industrial interests that care about nuclear power and have a heck of a lot of money to spend if their business and their bottom line is put in political jeopardy,” said Dave Levinthal, communications director at the Center for Responsive Politics. “As Congress is talking about potentially diving deeper, these companies bring a lot of resources and a heck of a lot of cash to bear if tDhis fight goes forward.”¶ NEI, the industry’s biggest voice in Washington, for example, spent $3.76 million to lobby the federal government and an additional $323,000 through its political action committee on a bipartisan congressional slate, including 134 House and 30 Senate candidates, according to data compiled by the CRP.¶ Alex Flint, NEI’s senior vice president for government affairs, said the spending is a byproduct of record high demand for his industry.¶ “The fact that the day after the election, both the president and [House Speaker John Boehner] said nuclear was an area where it’s something they can agree, it’s made us that much more in demand,” Flint said. “Our lobbying expenses have gone up more in large part because we have more people talking to more members of Congress.”

Aff solves impact- Dobransky

**Nuke leadership key to influence rogue states**

**UIB 2010** (Unistar Issue Brief, Publication of Constellation Energy and EDF Group, “The Global Nuclear Marketplace: A Case for Engagement,” http://www.unistarnuclear.com/IB/global\_marketplace.pdf)

The Consequences of Inaction

A significant global expansion of nuclear energy occurred while the United States sat on the sidelines, having last ordered a new nuclear energy facility in the late 1970s. As a result, America¶ lost much of its nuclear energy supply-chain capacity and manufacturing infrastructure and continues to fall behind other nations that have complete nuclear fuel cycles.¶ The United States needs to aggressively pursue advanced nuclear technologies to maintain leadership on international nuclear energy and security issues.¶ By hesitating to join the global nuclear energy renaissance, the United States puts itself at risk of losing influence over wider nuclear issues, such as preventing the proliferation of nuclear¶ weapons. Rogue states and unstable governments are trying to acquire such weapons. If we have nothing to offer, we lose a great deal of leverage on this and other international nuclear issues, increasing our own national security risks.¶ Moving Forward By CoMMitting to nuClear energy¶ At UniStar Nuclear Energy, we are doing our part to spur on the rebuilding of America. Our investments in new nuclear facilities have fueled the U.S. expansion plans of Alstom, AREVA and Northrup Grumman, among others. And we have already created almost 600 new jobs!¶ UniStar Nuclear Energy believes that the United States needs to become a full partner in the nuclear energy renaissance that is underway worldwide. This requires engagement not only on proliferation issues, but also in the supply chain and commercial nuclear energy development. Reviving the nation’s commercial nuclear energy manufacturing capacity will allow us to export materials and knowledge. It will provide us with economic benefits, and present an opportunity to support the expansion of emissions-free nuclear energy and strengthen our influence on nuclear energy issues worldwide.

### 2AC States

#### Can’t solve the aff-

#### Investor confidence

Domenici and Miller 2012 (Senator Pete Domenici, Bipartisan Policy Center Senior Fellow, and Dr. Warren F. “Pete” Miller, Co-chair, Bipartisan Policy Center Nuclear Initiative¶ And Former Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, July 2012, “Maintaining U.S.¶ Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets,” http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Leadership%20in%20Nuclear%20Energy%20Markets.pdf)

Electric utilities in the United States face a changing market environment, one that features low natural gas prices, flattening electric demand, and the prospect of further environmental regulations. In this context of substantial uncertainty about the future, fuel diversity is especially important as a way to help ensure that the electric power sector can deliver reliable, affordable, and secure energy services over long timeframes. Market signals alone are unlikely to result in a diverse fuel mix, so helping to maintain and improve a range of electricity supply options remains a role for federal policy. In particular, U.S. policy should be aimed at helping to preserve nuclear energy as an important technology option for near- or longer-term deployment.

#### Exports

Domenici and Miller 2012 (Senator Pete Domenici, Bipartisan Policy Center Senior Fellow, and Dr. Warren F. “Pete” Miller, Co-chair, Bipartisan Policy Center Nuclear Initiative¶ And Former Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, July 2012, “Maintaining U.S.¶ Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets,” http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Leadership%20in%20Nuclear%20Energy%20Markets.pdf)

In an attempt to ameliorate current competitive disadvantages, the Obama administration recently created a new position within the National Security Council to coordinate civilian nuclear policy. We support the creation of this new position to improve coordination of executive branch policy for nuclear energy policy and international affairs. We believe continued efforts to improve coordination between government and industry stakeholders and to more efficiently apply federal export regulations will allow U.S. companies to compete more effectively in the global nuclear marketplace.

#### Too slow

Freed 2010 (Josh Freed, Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Elizabeth Horwitz, Policy Advisor at Third Way’s Clean Energy Program, Jeremy Ershow formerly a Policy Advisor at Third Way, September 2010, “Thinking Small On Nuclear Power,” Third Way, http://content.thirdway.org/publications/340/Third\_Way\_Idea\_Brief\_-\_Thinking\_Small\_On\_Nuclear\_Power.pdf)

Small Reactors will be ready when they are ready—we shouldn’t spend government money on them. Getting small reactors deployed quickly is a national imperative. Our energy needs demand it, and the economic upside of becoming a leader in this space is tremendous. Moreover, the moment for economic leadership is fleeting,¶ with emerging international competitors including designs backed by the governments of South Korea, China, India, and Russia.30 The federal government has unique resources to help this happen, and we should put them to use. This includes its research and development from our national labs or the purchasing power of DOD or DOE to create first markets and help drive down costs of first- mover technologies.

#### Licensing

Waterman 2009 (Richard W. Waterman, Professor of Political Science at University of Kentucky, 2009, “Bush and Nuclear Regulatory Commission,” President George W. Bush’s Influence Over Bureacracy and Policy, google books)

The historic 1994 congressional elections, however, are consistent with expectations. When the Republicans took control of Congress for the first time in 40 years (in January 1995), there was a decline of almost 3.5 civil penalties assessed per month. Since the 1994 electoral earthquake meant that the chairs of both the House and Senate oversight committees were in the hands of Republicans for the first time since the NRC was established, this likely sent shockwaves throughout the agency. Because Congress possesses both the power of the purse and oversight authority, NRC personnel altered their enforcement behavior in a manner that was consistent with the political philosophy of the new dominant coalition in Congress.

**Lock out- Can’t solve the grid adv**

Andres and Breetz 2011 (Richard B. Andres, Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and a Senior fellow in energy and environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic research, institute for national Strategic Studies, at the national Defense University, and Hanna L. Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts institute of technology, February 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications,” National Defense University Strategic Forum, http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/strforum/sf-262.pdf)

Technological Lock-in. A second risk is that if small reactors do reach the market without DOD assistance, the designs that succeed may not be optimal for DOD’s applications. Due to a variety of positive feedback and increasing returns to adoption (including demonstration effects, technological interdependence, network and learning effects, and economies of scale), the designs that are initially developed can become **“locked in.”**34 Competing designs—even if they are superior in some respects or better for certain market segments— can face barriers to entry that lock them out of the market. If DOD wants to ensure that its preferred designs are not locked out, then it should take a first mover role on small reactors. It is far too early to gauge whether the private market and DOD have aligned interests in reactor designs. On one hand, Matthew Bunn and Martin Malin argue that what the world needs is cheaper, safer, more secure, and more proliferation-resistant nuclear reactors; presumably, many of the same broad qualities would be favored by DOD.35 There are many varied market niches that could be filled by small reactors, because there are many different applications and settings in which they can be used, and it is quite possible that some of those niches will be compatible with DOD’s interests.36 On the other hand, DOD may have specific needs (transportability, for instance) **that would not be a high priority** for any other market segment. Moreover, while DOD has unique technical and organizational capabilities that could enable it to pursue more radically innovative reactor lines, DOE has indicated that it will focus its initial small reactor deployment efforts on LWR designs.37 If DOD wants to ensure that its preferred reactors are developed and available in the future, it should take a leadership role now. Taking a first mover role does not necessarily mean that DOD would be “picking a winner” among small reactors, as the market will probably pursue multiple types of small reactors. Nevertheless, DOD leadership would likely have a profound effect on the industry’s timeline and trajectory.

**Licensing- Only DOD solves it**

CSPO 2010 (Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes at Arizona State, June 2010, “Four Policy Principles for Energy Innovation and Climate Change: A Synthesis,” http://www.catf.us/resources/publications/files/Synthesis.pdf)

Government purchase of new technologies is a powerful way to accelerate innovation through increased demand (Principle 3a). We explore how this principle can be applied by considering how the DoD could purchase new nuclear reactor designs to meet electric power needs for DoD bases and operations. Small modular nuclear power reactors (SMRs), which generate less than 300 MW of power (as compared to more typical reactors built in the 1000 MW range) are often listed as a potentially transformative energy technology. While typical traditional large-scale nuclear power plants can cost five to eight billion dollars, smaller nuclear reactors could be developed at smaller scale, thus not presenting a “bet the company” financial risk. SMRs could potentially be mass manufactured as standardized modules and then delivered to sites, which could significantly reduce costs per unit of installed capacity as compared to today’s large scale conventional reactor designs. It is likely that some advanced reactors designs – including molten salt reactors and reactors utilizing thorium fuels – could be developed as SMRs. Each of these designs offers some combination of inherently safe operation, very little nuclear proliferation risk, relatively small nuclear waste management needs, very abundant domestic fuel resources, and high power densities – all of which are desirable attributes for significant expansion of nuclear energy. Currently, several corporations have been developing small nuclear reactors. Table 2 lists several of these companies and their reactor power capacities, as well as an indication of the other types of reactor innovations that are being incorporated into the designs. Some of these technologies depend on the well-established light water reactor, while others use higher energy neutrons, coolants capable of higher temperature operation, and other innovative approaches. Some of these companies, such as NuScale, intend to be able to connect as many as 24 different nuclear modules together to form one larger nuclear power plant. In addition to the different power ranges described in Table 2, these reactors vary greatly in size, some being only 3 to 6 feet on each side, while the NuScale reactor is 60 feet long and 14 feet in diameter. Further, many of these reactors produce significant amounts of high-temperature heat, which can be harnessed for process heating, gas turbine generators, and other operations. One major obstacle is to rapid commercialization and development are prolonged multi-year licensing times with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Currently, the NRC will not consider a reactor for licensing unless there is a power utility already prepared to purchase the device. Recent Senate legislation introduced by Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) has pushed for DOE support in bringing down reactor costs and in helping to license and certify two reactor designs with the NRC. Some additional opportunities to facilitate the NRC licensing process for innovative small modular reactors would be to fund NRC to conduct participatory research to get ahead of potential license applications (this might require ~$100million/year) and potentially revise the current requirement that licensing fees cover nearly all NRC licensing review costs. One option for accelerating SMR development and commercialization, would be for DOD to establish SMR procurement specifications (to include cost) and agree to purchase a sufficient amount of SMR’s to underwrite private sector SMR development. Of note here may be that DARPA recently (3/30/10) issued a “Request for Information (RFI) on Deployable Reactor Technologies for Generating Power and Logistic Fuels”2 that specifies may features that would be highly desirable in an advanced commercial SMR. While other specifications including coproduction of mobility fuel are different than those of a commercial SMR power reactor, it is likely that a core reactor design meeting the DARPA inquiry specifications would be adaptable to commercial applications. While nuclear reactors purchased and used by DOD are potentially exempt from many NRC licensing requirements3, any reactor design resulting from a DOD procurement contract would need to proceed through NRC licensing before it could be commercially offered. Successful use of procured SMR’s for DOD purposes could provide the knowledge and operational experience needed to aid NRC licensing and it might be possible for the SMR contractor to begin licensing at some point in the SMR development process4. Potential purchase of small modular nuclear reactors would be a powerful but proven way in which government procurement of new energy technologies could encourage innovation. Public procurement of other renewable energy technologies could be similarly important.

### 2AC Community Relations DA

#### SMR inevitable 1AC Biello

#### Plan boosts public trust of SMRs their ev is a snapshot

Reichart 2011 (Joshua Reichert, managing director, “From Barracks to the BattleField: clean energy innovation and america’s armed Forces,” PEW PROJECT ON¶ NATIONAL SECURITY, ENERGY AND CLIMATE, http://www.pewenvironment.org/uploadedFiles/PEG/Publications/Report/DoD-Report\_FINAL.pdf)

Trust—DoD enjoys high levels of trust among the public and policymakers alike. A Gallup poll in 2009 found overall public support for DoD at 78 percent,¶ and broad public esteem for the military.59 As a result, technologies that have met the rigorous requirements and certifications demanded by DoD are well regarded in the commercial sector.

#### SMRs are already publicly popular

Steiner 2010 (K. Steiner-Dicks, October 18, 2010, “The economy of small: how SMRs have captured the imagination of US policy makers and industry leaders,” Nuclear Energy Insider, http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/small-modular-reactors/economy-small-how-smrs-have-captured-imagination-us-policy-makers-and-industr)

Another benefit of the SMRs is that they’re likely to be more publically acceptable than the larger nuclear reactors.¶ As Jim Conca, Director at Carlsbad Environmental Monitoring and Research Center at New Mexico State University, observes: “They’ll also help on the public acceptance side of things. People will naturally think ‘small is safer’.¶ “There’s certainly not the same kind of spent fuel from small reactors. Depending upon the design, they won’t need refuelling; the core will just be removed and a new one put in.¶ “And this again will help with public perception, because spent fuel and the risk of proliferation has become such a sensitive local issue.”¶ It’s an issue that Bill Gates and his team at TerraPower have been alive to in the design and development of their small ‘travelling wave reactor’.¶ Billed as “financially and socially attractive” nuclear technology, Gates’ reactor is said to “offer a path to zero-emission, proliferation-resistant energy that produces significantly smaller amounts of nuclear waste than conventional nuclear reactors.”

#### 50 DOD energy projects now- goal of islanding non-uniques the link

Sarewitz 2012 (Daniel Sarewitz and Samuel Thernstrom, Co-Directors, March 2012, “ENERGY INNOVATION¶ at the¶ ¶ DEPARTMENT of DEFENSE ASSESSING THE OPPORTUNITIES,” online)

To date, nearly 50 demonstrations are under way across DoD as part of ESTCP’s Installation Energy Test Bed (see figure 3.8).DoD plans to continue this program in FY2012. A competitive process is under way to identify the next round of technology demonstrations in the following areas: 1) Smart microgrids and energy storage to increase energy security on DoD installations 2) Renewable energy generation on DoD installations 3) Advanced component technologies to improve building energy efficiency 4) Advanced building energy management and control 5) Tools and processes for design, assessment, and decisionmaking associated with energy use and management The interest from industry has been extremely high. Companies see the ongoing demonstrations as crucial means of bringing their technologies to full commercialization and widespread deployment. The current solicitation has attracted enormous interest, highlighting the pent-up need for efforts to move energy technologies beyond research and development and to overcome the Valley of Death.

#### Traditional training doesn’t matter anymore- The definition of readiness is changing- 4gw reachback- doesn’t require huge training grounds

#### No impact to encroachment- no threshold, workarounds solve- their evidence has no data

Holman 2002 (Barry W. Holman, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, May 16, 2002, “Military Training: DOD Needs a Comprehensive Plan to Manage Encroachment on Training Ranges,” GAO, Testimony Before the Committee on Government Reform, House of

Representatives, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GAOREPORTS-GAO-02-727T/html/GAOREPORTS-GAO-02-727T.htm)

Despite the loss of some training range capabilities, service readiness data¶ do not indicate that encroachment has significantly affected training¶ readiness. Even though in testimonies and during many other occasions DOD¶ officials have cited encroachment as preventing the services from training¶ as they would like, DOD?s primary readiness reporting system does not¶ reflect the extent to which encroachment is a problem. In fact, it rarely¶ cites training range limitations at all. Similarly, DOD?s quarterly reports¶ to Congress, which should identify specific readiness problems, hardly ever¶ mention encroachment as a problem. I should also note that our recent¶ assessment of training limitations overseas (which are often greater than¶ those found stateside) found that units abroad rarely report lower training¶ readiness in spite of concerns cited by DOD officials that training¶ constraints overseas can require work- arounds or in some instances prevent¶ training from being accomplished.

## \*\*\*1AR\*\*\*

### Grid YES

#### Grid failure inevitable, 4 reasons: Overload, weather, cyber attacks, supply disruption

DSB Taskforce 2008 (Defense Science Board Task Force, Federal Advisory Committee established to provide independent advice to the Secretary of Defense, Tom Morehouse, editor, February 2008, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense For Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, http://www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/reports/ADA477619.pdf)

The first risk is from overload. As wires become overloaded, they heat up and sag, making them vulnerable to entanglement with trees and other objects. This happened near Cleveland, Ohio on August 14, 2003. According to the U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force, high demand caused a high-voltage line to come in contact with overgrown trees. The resulting cascade of failures plunged many of the 50 million people in the Northeast U.S. and Canada living in an area covering 9,300 square miles into darkness. It shut down more than 500 generating units at 265 power plants, including 22 nuclear plants.29¶ A second risk comes from natural disasters, such as hurricanes, tornadoes, electrical storms or other extreme weather events. The consequences could be very much as described above, but with the added risk of physical damage to the infrastructure. Favorable commentary about the performance of the grid following the August 2003 outage focused on the fact that restoration occurred fairly quickly. Within a few days power was restored virtually everywhere, with much of the area back up within a few hours. This was largely because safety features built into the grid successfully prevented damage to critical equipment such as generators, breakers and transformers. 30 However, the Task Force is concerned that such an extensive outage could be caused by such a commonplace event – a single line contacting a tree. This inevitably raises the next issue below: what the result might have been had there been physical damage to infrastructure, such as from a deliberate attack by knowledgeable adversaries?¶ A third risk comes from sabotage or terrorist activity, whether local, trans-national, or state-sponsored, and including both conventional and nuclear attack. Nuclear attack could take place either directly or through the generation of a high altitude electromagnetic pulse (EMP). The grid is a relatively easy target for a terrorist. It is brittle, increasingly centralized, capacity-strained, and largely unprotected from physical attack, with little stockpiling of critical hardware. Although the system is designed to survive single points of failure, increasing demand on the system and increasing network constraints make multiple points of failure more likely. These are difficult to anticipate and more likely to result in cascading outages and catastrophic outages that cover large areas for long periods of time. Network Single Points of Failure (NSPF) are abundant. High voltage transformers, breakers, and other long-lead time items are particularly critical system elements.31 They can be easily targeted and destroyed. Grid sections could be taken down for months even if replacement transformers and breakers could be found; or for years if certain components need to be newly manufactured and transported. There are only limited backups located around the country—generally co-located with operating equipment. For some of the largest equipment, there is no domestic supply and only limited overseas production capacity which is fully booked years ahead. 32 For example, 765 kV transformers are manufactured only by one company in Canada. Armed with the right knowledge, a small number of people could shut down electricity over significant areas for an extended period of time, including power to critical DoD missions. The grid is not designed to withstand a coordinated multi-pronged or wide-area attack.33 The Task Force noted that attacks on the grid are one of the most common and effective tactics of insurgents in Iraq, and are increasingly seen in Afghanistan.34¶ In addition to physical attacks on the grid, there is the potential for cyber attacks. U.S. grid control systems are continuously probed electronically, and there have been numerous attempted attacks on the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems that operate the grid. None have yet resulted in major problems in the U.S., but the potential exists for major outages in the same way successful hackers can disrupt computer networks.35 Further details regarding the potential for deliberate attacks to the grid and their potential consequences are contained in a classified annex to this report.¶ A fourth risk comes from interruptions in supplies to generating plants, which can be caused by natural events, infrastructure failures, attack or even market forces. This occurred in California during 2000 and 2001 when supplies of natural gas were interrupted and forced a reduction in electricity generation.36 Approximately 20% of U.S. electricity is generated by natural gas and market prices have swung wildly over the past several years.37 Approximately 52% of U.S. electricity is generated by coal and transportation routes that move coal from mines to generating plants are sometimes remote and lacking in alternatives. Critical rail lines or bridges could be taken out by determined saboteurs. For example, in May 2005, 43 rail cars came off the tracks. The disruption to coal deliveries caused prices to spike, and raised electricity prices by 6% nationally, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The 100 mile length of rail line through Wyoming that carries the output of the Western coal belt to power plants is the most heavily traveled in the nation.38 So in addition to risks from grid outage, there are risks to the supply chain that enables the grid to work—not least from electricity supply failures themselves, which could disable the pipelines and controls used by other forms of energy, notably oil and gas.

### Accidents

**No SMR meltdowns**

**Rosner and Goldberg 2011** (Robert Rosner, astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, and Stephen Goldberg, Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.”, Technical Paper, Revision 1, November 2011)

While the focus in this paper is on the business case for SMRs, the safety case also is an important element of the case for SMRs. Although SMRs (the designs addressed in this paper) use the same fuel type and the same light water cooling as gigawatt (GW)-scale light water reactors (LWRs), there are significant enhancements in the reactor design that contribute to the upgraded safety case. Appendix A provides a brief overview of the various technology options for SMRs, including the light water SMR designs that are the focus of the present analysis.¶ Light water SMR designs proposed to date incorporate passive safety features that utilize gravity-driven or natural convection systems – rather than engineered, pump-driven systems – to supply backup cooling in unusual circumstances. These passive systems should also minimize the need for prompt operator actions in any upset condition. The designs rely on natural circulation for both normal operations and accident conditions, requiring no primary system pumps. In addition, these SMR designs utilize integral designs, meaning all major primary components are located in a single, high-strength pressure vessel. That feature is expected to result in a much lower susceptibility to certain potential events, such as a loss of coolant accident, because there is no large external primary piping. In addition, light water SMRs would have a much lower level of decay heat than large plants and, therefore, would require less cooling after reactor shutdown. Specifically, in a post-Fukushima lessons-learned environment, the study team believes that the current SMR designs have three inherent advantages over the current class of large operating reactors, namely:¶ 1. These designs mitigate and, potentially, eliminate the need for back-up or emergency electrical generators, relying exclusively on robust battery power to maintain minimal safety operations.¶ 2. They improve seismic capability with the containment and reactor vessels in a pool of water underground; this dampens the effects of any earth movement and greatly enhances the ability of the system to withstand earthquakes.¶ 3. They provide large and robust underground pool storage for the spent fuel, drastically reducing the potential of uncovering of these pools.

### SMRS now

#### Other countries looking to SMRs

Taso 2011 (Firas Eugen Taso, masters thesis for double MA in Urban and Environmental Policy Planning and Law and Diplomacy from Tufts, May 2011, “21st Century Civilian Nuclear Power and the Role of Small Modular Reactors,” online)

There are currently of two types of SMRs: first-to market LWR reactors with a timeframe of coming online of five to 10 years, or advanced, non-LWR designs which have a longer timeframe of coming to market of 10-25+ years.163 None are currently licensed, though applications are currently being discussed and, in the case of some reactors, are close to being filed with the NRC, as Mike Snodderly mentions. Others are looking at SMRs as well. Russia, for example, has explored SMRs on ice-breakers in the Baltic for decades, and has a unit, the Akademik Lomonosov which has already been launched in 2010 with anticipated deployment after commissioning by 2012, and others in the works.164 China, India and South Korea are also looking at the technology not only for domestic use, but for international exports and building a new industry market.165 For example, China has already exported small and medium power reactors. In 1991, China began building a reactor in Pakistan and started constructing a second reactor there in 2005.166 While the French and the Japanese are still not committed to SMRs, the interest in SMRs is growing around the world, some of the technology is rather familiar and some argue trusted, and the future of the nuclear industry may be influenced by these reactors.167

### Labor

#### Won’t impact SMR

Rosner 2011 (Robert Rosner, astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, and Stephen Goldberg, Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, November 2011, “Small Modular Reactors: Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.,” online)

The economics for SMRs directly challenges two of the well-established pillars of large LWRs: the economies of scale and the economies of large nuclear fleet operations (i.e., large skilled workforce at each plant site). The SMR community postulates an alternative cost model based on the “economies of mass manufacturing.” The key aspect of this concept is that significant cost savings can be realized through more productive use of highly skilled craft labor in the manufacture of the SMR modules and portions of the nuclear island. The labor cost savings are achievable through fabrication of the modules in manufacturing plants combined with the potential to achieve significant productivity improvements through “learning by doing” in the manufacturing of a large number of reactor modules.

### June

#### No vote til June

Foley 1/2 (Elise Foley “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2398507.html)

It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push.

### Hagel

#### Opposition will blind side Obama

Schwirtz 1/6 (Michael Schwirtz, “Obama to Name Hagel for Defense, Despite Opposition,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/07/us/obama-expected-to-select-hagel-for-defense-post.html?\_r=0)

Those sentiments were echoed by Senator Ted Cruz, Republican of Texas, who said Mr. Obama was being overly dismissive of criticism about Mr. Hagel.¶ “I think this is a president right now who has drunk the tea,” Mr. Cruz said on “Fox News Sunday.” “He is feeling very good about himself; he is feeling like there can be no opposition to his position. And so, it doesn’t seem — he doesn’t seem terribly concerned that there’s not a lot of support for Chuck Hagel in the Senate.”

#### Both sides hate Hagel

Fox News 1/6 (“Hagel to get defense secretary nomination Monday, but little Republican support,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/06/hagel-gets-little-support-from-fellow-republicans-in-potential-defense/#ixzz2HFZCtkMR)

Hagel has criticized discussion of a military strike by either the U.S. or Israel against Iran. He also has backed efforts to bring Iran to the table for talks on future peace in Afghanistan.¶ "This is a controversial pick," Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., told CNN. "He is an antagonistic figure when it comes to the state of Israel. It's a signal you're sending to Iran at the worst possible time and to our allies."¶ Officials close to the White House have talked up Hagel as a patriot who served in the military with distinction during Vietnam and someone who shares the president's skepticism about potential conflict with Iran and a large U.S. footprint in Afghanistan. ¶ Liberals have expressed anger over an anti-gay remark Hagel made in the Clinton administration for which he recently apologized.

### Debt Ceiling

#### No vote til June

Foley 1/2 (Elise Foley “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2398507.html)

It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push.

#### Debt ceiling is top of the agenda

Barbieri and Sahadi 1-2 [Rich Barbieri and Jeanne Sahadi 1-2-2013 CNN Money “It's official: U.S. hits debt ceiling” http://money.cnn.com/2012/12/31/news/economy/debt-ceiling/]

It's official: U.S. debt reached its legal borrowing limit Monday, giving Congress about two months before it must raise the debt ceiling or risk causing the government to default on its bills and financial obligations.¶ "I can confirm we will reach the statutory debt limit today, Dec. 31," a Treasury Department official said Monday.¶ A bipartisan fiscal cliff deal passed by the Senate early Tuesday and awaiting a vote in the House did not address the debt ceiling issue.¶ As expected, Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner had submitted a letter to Congress on Monday saying he had begun a "debt issuance suspension period" that would last through Feb. 28. That means Treasury will employ a series of "extraordinary measures" so it does not exceed the debt limit, currently set at $16.394 trillion.¶ Such measures include suspending the reinvestment of federal workers' retirement account contributions in short-term government bonds.¶ By taking those steps, Treasury can buy about $200 billion of headroom. That normally can cover about two months' worth of borrowing, although continuing uncertainty about tax rates and spending make it hard to determine precisely how long the extraordinary measures will last.¶ The bottom line: Congress will have to raise the debt ceiling soon -- as soon as late February.¶ And that sets the stage for yet another fight on Capitol Hill, where some Republican lawmakers view the debt limit as leverage in negotiations with President Obama over spending cuts and reforms to Medicare and Social Security.

### Winners win

#### Psychology

Creamer 2012 (Robert Creamer, political organizer and strategist, January 2, 2012, "Why GOP Collapse on the Payroll Tax Could be a Turning Point Moment", [www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-creamer/why-gop-collapse-on-the-p\_b\_1167491.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-creamer/why-gop-collapse-on-the-p_b_1167491.html))

Strength and victory are enormous political assets. Going into the New Year, they now belong to the President and the Democrats. One of the reasons why the debt ceiling battle inflicted political damage on President Obama is that it made him appear ineffectual - a powerful figure who had been ensnared and held hostage by the Lilliputian pettiness of hundreds of swarming Tea Party ideological zealots. In the last few months -- as he campaigned for the American Jobs Act -- he has shaken free of those bonds. Now voters have just watched James Bond or Indiana Jones escape and turn the tables on his adversary. Great stories are about a protagonist who meets and overcomes a challenge and is victorious. The capitulation of the House Tea Party Republicans is so important because it feels like the beginning of that kind of heroic narrative. Even today most Americans believe that George Bush and the big Wall Street Banks - not by President Obama -- caused the economic crisis. Swing voters have never lost their fondness for the President and don't doubt his sincerity. But they had begun to doubt his effectiveness. They have had increasing doubts that Obama was up to the challenge of leading them back to economic prosperity. The narrative set in motion by the events of the last several weeks could be a turning point in voter perception. It could well begin to convince skeptical voters that Obama is precisely the kind of leader they thought he was back in 2008 - a guy with the ability to lead them out of adversity - a leader with the strength, patience, skill, will and resoluteness to lead them to victory. That now contrasts with the sheer political incompetence of the House Republican Leadership that allowed themselves to be cornered and now find themselves in political disarray. And it certainly contrasts with the political circus we have been watching in the Republican Presidential primary campaign. 3). This victory will inspire the dispirited Democratic base. Inspiration is the feeling of empowerment - the feeling that you are part of something larger than yourself and can personally play a significant role in achieving that goal. It comes from feeling that together you can overcome challenges and win. Nothing will do more to inspire committed Democrats than the sight of their leader -- President Obama - out maneuvering the House Republicans and forcing them into complete capitulation. The events of the last several weeks will send a jolt of electricity through the Progressive community. The right is counting on Progressives to be demoralized and dispirited in the coming election. The President's victory on the payroll tax and unemployment will make it ever more likely that they will be wrong. 4). When you have them on the run, that's the time to chase them. The most important thing about the outcome of the battle over the payroll tax and unemployment is that it shifts the political momentum at a critical time. Momentum is an independent variable in any competitive activity - including politics. In a football or basketball game you can feel the momentum shift. The tide of battle is all about momentum. The same is true in politics. And in politics it is even more important because the "spectators" are also the players - the voters. People follow - and vote -- for winners. The bandwagon effect is enormously important in political decision-making. Human beings like to travel in packs. They like to be at the center of the mainstream. Momentum shifts affect their perceptions of the mainstream. For the last two years, the right wing has been on the offensive. Its Tea Party shock troops took the battle to Democratic Members of Congress. In the Mid-Terms Democrats were routed in district after district. Now the tide has turned. And when the tide turns -when you have them on the run - that's the time to chase them.

#### Bold moves boost capital

Green, 2010 (David Michael Green, professor of political science at Hofstra University, “The Do-Nothing 44th President” June 11, google)

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

#### PC replenishes quickly

Mitchell 2009 (Lincoln Mitchell, Assistant Professor in the Practice of International Politics, Columbia University, “Time for Obama to Start Spending Political Capital” June 18, google)

Throughout his presidential campaign, but more notably, during his presidency, President Obama has shown himself to have an impressive ability to accumulate political capital. During his tenure in the White House, Obama has done this by reaching out to a range of constituencies, moderating some of his programs, pursuing middle of the road approaches on key foreign policy questions and, not insignificantly, working to ensure that his approval rating remains quite high. Political capital is not, however, like money, it cannot be saved up interminably while its owner waits for the right moment to spend it. Political capital has a shelf life, and often not a very long one. If it is not used relatively quickly, it dissipates and becomes useless to its owner. This is the moment in which Obama, who has spent the first few months of his presidency diligently accumulating political capital, now finds himself. The next few months will be a key time for Obama. If Obama does not spend this political capital during the next months, it will likely be gone by the New Year anyway. Much of what President Obama has done in his first six months or so in office has been designed to build political capital, interestingly he has sought to build this capital from both domestic and foreign sources. He has done this by traveling extensively, reintroducing to America to foreign audiences and by a governance style that has very cleverly succeeded in pushing his political opponents to the fringes. This tactic was displayed during the effort to pass the stimulus package as Republican opposition was relegated to a loud and annoying, but largely irrelevant, distraction. Building political capital was, or should have been, a major goal of Obama's recent speech in Cairo as well. Significantly, Obama has yet to spend any of his political capital by meaningfully taking on any powerful interests. He declined to take Wall Street on regarding the financial crisis, has prepared to, but not yet fully, challenged the power of the AMA or the insurance companies, nor has he really confronted any important Democratic Party groups such as organized labor. This strategy, however, will not be fruitful for much longer. There are now some very clear issues where Obama should be spending political capital. The most obvious of these is health care. The battle for health care reform will be a major defining issue, not just for the Obama presidency, but for American society over the next decades. It is imperative that Obama push for the best and most comprehensive health care reform possible. This will likely mean not just a bruising legislative battle, but one that will pit powerful interests, not just angry Republican ideologues, against the President. The legislative struggle will also pull many Democrats between the President and powerful interest groups. Obama must make it clear that there will be an enormous political cost which Democrats who vote against the bill will have to pay. Before any bill is voted upon, however, is perhaps an even more critical time as pressure from insurance groups, business groups and doctors organizations will be brought to bear both on congress, but also on the administration as it works with congress to craft the legislation. This is not the time when the administration must focus on making friends and being liked, but on standing their ground and getting a strong and inclusive health care reform bill. Obama will have to take a similar approach to any other major domestic legislation as well. This is, of course, the way the presidency has worked for decades. Obama is in an unusual situation because a similar dynamic is at work at the international level. A major part of Obama's first six months in office have involved pursuing a foreign policy that implicitly has sought to rebuild both the image of the US abroad, but also American political capital. It is less clear how Obama can use this capital, but now is the time to use it. A cynical interpretation of the choice facing Obama is that he can remain popular or he can have legislative and other policy accomplishments, but this interpretation would be wrong. By early 2010, Obama, and his party will, fairly or not, be increasingly judged by what they have accomplished in office, not by how deftly they have handled political challenges. Therefore, the only way he can remain popular and get new political capital is through converting his current political capital into concrete legislative accomplishments. Health care will be the first and very likely most important, test.