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### 2AC DOD T – FI

#### W/M-

**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.

#### Only predictable limit- 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.

### Afgh

#### Generators aren’t enough

King 2011 (Marcus King, LaVar Huntzinger, and Thoi Nguyen, March 2011, “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations,” CNAS Analysis and Solutions, http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf)

Having a reliable source of electricity is critically important for many DoD installations. Fort Meade, Maryland, which hosts the National Security Agency’s power intensive computers, is an example of where electricity is mission critical. Installations need to be more robust against interruptions caused by natural forces or intentional attack. Most installations currently rely on the commercial electricity grid and backup generators.¶ Reliance on generators presents some limitations. A building dedicated generator only provides electricity to a specific building when there is a power outage. Typically, diesel standby generators have an availability of 85 percent when operated for more than 24 hours [38]. Most DoD installations keep less than a 5-day supply of fuel.¶ Small nuclear power plants could contribute to electrical energy surety and survivability. Having nuclear power plants networked with the grid and other backup generating systems could give DoD instal- lations higher power availability during extended utility power outages and more days of utility-independent operation. Existing large commercial nuclear power plants have an availability of over 90 percent. When a small nuclear power plant is networked with existing backup generating systems and the grid, overall availability values could be as high as 99.6 percent [39]. Since proposed small reactors have long refueling intervals (from 4 to 30 years), if power from the commercial grid became unavailable, a small reactor could provide years of electrical power independent of the commercial grid [4].

### Case

#### No overstretch

NEI 2011 (Nuclear Energy Institute, last date cited is June 7, 2011, “Myths and Facts about Small Modular Reactors (SMRs),” pdf online)

UCS statement: “The distributed deployment of small reactors would put great strains on licensing and inspection resources. Nuclear reactors are qualitatively different from other types of generating facilities, not least because they require a much more intensive safety and security inspection regime.”¶ The Facts: This is speculation that is not supported by any measure of NRC’s past and present resources. NRC has consistently been appropriated sufficient resources, and licensees then reimburse the agency for all licensing and inspection costs, so there is no factual evidence that deployment of SMRs would place any strain on NRC resources.

#### The public likes SMRs

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.”

#### Inevitable accidents irradiate the sea

Grossman 2010 (Karl Grossman, full professor of journalism at the State University of New York College, July 28, 2010, “Floating Chernobyls,” Counterpunch, http://nuclearfreeplanet.org/blogs/counterpunch--karl-grossman-floating-chernobyls.html)

However, David Lochbaum, senior safety engineer at the Union of Concerned Scientists, describes an accident at a floating nuclear power plant as “worse” than at a land-based plant. “In a meltdown, a China syndrome accident, the molten mass of what had been the core would burrow into the ground and some of the radioactive material held there. But with a floating nuclear plant, all the molten mass would drop into the water and there would be a steam explosion and the release of a tremendous amount of energy and radioactive material. It would be like a bomb going off,” said Lochbaum, director of the Nuclear Safety Project at Washington-based UCS.¶ ¶ “With a floating nuclear plant you have a mechanism to significantly increase the amount of radioactive material going into the environment,” said Lochbaum, who worked 18 years as an engineer in the nuclear industry and also for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. A large plume of radioactive poisons would be formed and “many more people would be put in harm’s way.” Further, there would be radioactive pollution of the sea, he noted.¶ ¶ Nuclear experts in Europe—including in Russia—are as critical as Lochbaum is about floating nuclear power plants and their unique accident potential. Other issues raised include the floating plants being sources of fuel for nuclear weapons and easy targets for terrorists.¶ ¶ “This project is clearly a risky venture,” said Alexander Nitikin, a former chief engineer on nuclear-powered submarines of the Soviet Union and senior inspector for the Nuclear and Radiation Safety Inspection Department for its Department of Defense. He is now head of the St. Petersburg branch of the Bellona Foundation, an international environmental organization. “Safety shouldn’t be neglected for the profits Rosatom wants to get from selling floating nuclear power plants to the troubled regions. Such Rosatom activities simply violate the idea of non-proliferation.”¶ “Such installations could heighten the risk of radioactive contamination of the sea and shore zones…by many times,” said Andrei Ponomarenko, coordinator for the Radiation and Nuclear Safety Project of Bellona’s chapter in Murmansk.¶ ¶ In a statement describing the plants “floating Chernobyls in waiting,” the main office of Norway-headquartered Bellona said that “Russia has neither the means nor infrastructure to ensure their safe operation, has made no plans for disposing of their spent fuel, and has not taken into consideration the enormous nuclear proliferation risks posed.”

#### Extinction

Craig 2003 (Robin Kundis Craig, Associate Professor at Indiana University School of Law, “Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection”, McGeorge Law Review, Winter)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. 856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. 857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." 858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." 859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. 860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. 861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." 862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almostdead, 863 its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, "starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen's nets, and converting theweb of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly." 864 More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique.

**US nukes inevitable- Existing plants and new construction**

**Mauldin 2012** (Paul Mauldin, June 12, 2012,“Nuclear Power: A Stay of Execution?,” Smart Energy Portal, http://smartenergyportal.net/article/nuclear-power-stay-execution)

In the meantime, even though the Fukushima disaster caused a ripple in the endemic U.S. anti-nuke community, the U.S. government is thankfully not suggesting that we abandon nuclear power anytime soon, and particularly not while we're trying to recover from a recession. Our 104 nuclear reactors produced 807 billion kWh in 2010, over 20% of total U.S. electrical output. Nuclear power has served us well and it's **not going away**. Following a 30-year period in which few new reactors were built in the U.S., as many as 6 new units may come on line by 2020 and there are 16 license applications to build 24 new nuclear reactors.

### Solvency

#### No bottlenecks

ITA 2011 (International Trade Administration, February 2011, “The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors” Manufacturing and Services Competitiveness Report, US Department of Commerce, online)

A serious obstacle to the resurgence of traditional nuclear power in the United States is the eroded domestic manufacturing capacity for the major nuclear components. A robust program of build- ing SMRs, however, could make use of existing domestic capacity that is already capable of completely constructing most proposed SMR designs. SMRs would not require the ultra-heavy forgings that currently can only be made overseas. U.S. suppliers say that firms could retool using existing capabilities and resources and could source most of the components of SMRs here in the United States. This ability could mean tremendous new commercial opportunities for U.S. firms and workers.

**2AC ARPA-E CP**

**Shifting risk to the govt through grants disincentivizes learning effects that are key to economies of multiples**

**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)

Capital Cost Incentive: A capital cost incentive would reduce the effective overnight capital cost through either direct government cost sharing or through an investment tax credit.41 There are policy precedents for both. DOE provides direct cost sharing for demonstration projects involving FOAK coal generation technology under the Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI). Congress provided a capital cost incentive for renewable energy projects in the form of an Investment Tax Credit (ITC), which currently can be converted to an upfront cash grant.42 Capital cost incentives help “buy down” the initial capital cost of SMR deployments, thus reducing the capital recovery requirements that would otherwise be reflected in the LCOE. A direct buy-down of the capital cost protects project sponsors against construction risk for SMRs by shifting a portion of that risk to the government. It also shifts performance risk from the project sponsor to the federal government, i.e., the federal government pays the capital cost incentive regardless of whether the project performs as planned or not. In the case of SMRs, shifting a portion of performance risk from the SMR community to the government also may adversely impact the risk-reward structure guiding the learning process. For example, a capital cost incentive for SMRs would be fixed, regardless of whether the investment achieved the estimated learning performance. Consequently, capital cost incentives were not incorporated into the business case analysis for SMRs.

**Prevents commercialization**

**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)

The favorability of SMR economics is strongly dependent on the degree of cost savings achievable through off-site factory manufacturing of the reactors and the subsequent learning-by-doing achieved after production of multiple modules. This phenomenon has been well demonstrated in a variety of manufacturing enterprises, including shipbuilding, and initial analysis suggests that this type of learning experience is applicable to the manufacturing of SMR modules. In addition, the shipbuilding experience also shows that achievement of significant cost savings in the manufacturing process could require additional upfront investment in engineering to improve the ease of manufacturing of the design. The economics of the manufacturing learning process is addressed in more detail in Appendix C.2. Based on this experience, the study team believes that a more robust DD&E effort can improve the economics of SMR manufacturing through more cost- efficient design enhancements. The achievement of a high learning rate is a **key** precursor to a viable SMR industry. The study team is planning to perform additional research in this area.

### 2AC Fiscal Cliff- Link Turn

#### No deal- ideological lines in the sand

Zurko 11/9 (Roz Zurko, Wall Street reacts to Obama and Boehner's 'lines in the sand', Examiner, http://www.examiner.com/article/wall-street-reacts-to-obama-and-boehner-s-lines-the-sand)

Boehner called on Obama to lead the efforts to avoid the fiscal cliff, but took the same stand against increasing the taxes for the wealthy. Obama later invited the congressional leaders to the White House to start in the negotiations in a deal to avoid the fiscal cliff. He remained adamant on his stand for wanting higher taxes for the wealthy. So there you have it, it doesn’t look as if a thing has changed. This also seems to be the mindset of Wall Street, nothing has changed and not a hint of a rescue is seen for the dreaded fiscal cliff.¶ Mohannad Aama, managing director of Beam Capitol Management LLC in New York said,¶ "Investors were disappointed. There was anticipation that there may be more willingness to compromise, but just like Boehner did earlier in the day, both camps stuck to their lines in the sand, so to speak."

#### Obama’s PC is failing

KOSU News 11/9 (“Deja Vu All Over Again: Obama And Boehner Clash On Fiscal Cliff And Taxes,” http://kosu.org/2012/11/deja-vu-all-over-again-obama-and-boehner-clash-on-fiscal-cliff-and-taxes/)

If you fell asleep Rip Van Winkle-like earlier in the year only to wake up Friday, you might be forgiven for thinking no time had passed.

Because on Friday, President Obama called for higher taxes on the wealthy to be part of any agreement to avoid the fiscal cliff, while House Speaker John Boehner strongly indicated that proposal was a non-starter with House Republicans.¶ But, of course, we just had an election in which the president won a second term and, through that, some political capital. Exactly how much remains to be seen.¶ So with the president’s big — and, to many Republicans, unexpected — win Tuesday in the Electoral College behind him, Obama made an offer he’s counting on Boehner finding hard to refuse in the coming, tense negotiations over a deficit-cutting deal.¶ The president proposed that Republicans should immediately agree to extend the middle-class tax cuts scheduled to expire at the end of the year while discussions continue on a more comprehensive agreement to avert the spending cuts and tax increases due to take effect in the new year, the so-called fiscal cliff, which experts warn could return the U.S. economy to recession.¶ At a White House event that featured a diverse group of people standing on risers behind him, which gave the appearance that for the White House, Tuesday was just a pause in the presidential campaign, Obama said:¶ “So let’s not wait. Even as we’re negotiating a broader deficit reduction package, let’s extend the middle-class tax cuts right now. Let’s do that right now.¶ “That one step, that one step would give millions of families, 98 percent of Americans and 97 percent of small businesses, the certainty that they need going into the new year. It would immediately take a huge chunk of the economic uncertainty off the table. And that will lead to new jobs and faster growth. Business will know that consumers, they’re not going to see a big tax increase. They’ll know that most small businesses won’t see this increase. And so a lot of uncertainty that you’re reading about, that will be removed.”¶ Not only did Obama have Tuesday’s Electoral College and popular vote on his side, he also had exit polling. Sixty percent of voters surveyed said they thought taxes should be increased on either all taxpayers or those with more than $250,000 in annual income.¶ Even a significant minority of voters who backed Republican Mitt Romney — 29 percent — agreed that taxes should be raised on those with income over $250,000.¶ Because Romney made opposition to raising tax rates on the superwealthy part of his campaign, Obama seemed to interpret his defeat of his GOP challenger as a referendum on this point:¶ “And I just want to point out, this was a central question during the election. It was debated over and over again. And on Tuesday night, we found out that the majority of Americans agree with my approach. And that includes Democrats, independents and a lot of Republicans across the country, as well as independent economists and budget experts.”¶ Obama was clearly trying to pressure Republicans by putting on the table an extension of the middle-class tax cuts that were part of tax-reduction packages enacted by his predecessor, George W. Bush.¶ By calling for an immediate extension of the middle-class tax cuts, Obama was attempting to paint congressional Republicans into a corner. While he didn’t say it, the implication was clear: If taxes go up next year on millions of middle-income earners, Obama will blame Republican resistance to raising tax rates on the wealthy as the cause.¶ The president’s proposal was reminiscent of earlier tactical moves in his presidency. When Bush-era tax cuts were due to expire at the end of 2010, for instance, the president linked an extension of those cuts to a renewal of long-term unemployment insurance.¶ Republicans initially balked, but a deal was reached as the deadline approached that extended the jobless benefits. The tax cuts were extended as well for two years, including cuts for the wealthiest taxpayers.¶ If Republican leaders on Capitol Hill were feeling any pressure from the president’s gambit, it wasn’t readily apparent.¶ On election night, Boehner offered this interpretation of the election returns while speaking at the Republican National Committee:¶ “The American people want solutions — and tonight, they’ve responded by renewing our House Republican majority. With this vote, the American people have also made clear that there is no mandate for raising tax rates.”¶ On Friday, after the president cited legislation he supports and that the Democratic-controlled Senate passed that would raise rates on those with the highest income, Boehner said:¶ “The increased tax rates that would be allowed under the Senate-passed bill are part of the fiscal cliff that economists are warning us to avoid. Those increased tax rates will destroy jobs in America by hurting small businesses across the country. Republicans are eager to get to work on an agreement that averts the entire fiscal cliff.”¶ While the words from Obama and Boehner on Friday could be properly viewed as the two men staking out opening positions in the coming negotiations over solving the fiscal cliff, they also could be seen as addressing the two very different constituencies the men must answer to.¶ Obama won re-election largely because of support from a coalition of more progressive supporters in urban and suburban areas, many of them minorities and women, who came out for him on Tuesday and during early voting in the weeks before.¶ Boehner, meanwhile, retained his House majority largely because of strong support in congressional districts with primarily white voters in conservative suburban and rural areas.

#### No impact to fiscal cliff

Gradual slope

Policy mitigation

Reversibility

Stone 2012 (Chad Stone, PhD in Economics from Yale, Chief Economist at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities where he specializes in the economic analysis of budget and policy issues, acting executive director of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress in 2007 and before that staff director and chief economist for the Democratic staff of the committee from 2002 to 2006, chief economist for the Senate Budget Committee in 2001-02 and a senior economist and then chief economist at the President’s Council of Economic Advisers from 1996 to 2001, senior researcher at the Urban Institute and taught for several years at Swarthmore College, October 10, 2012, “It’s a Slope, Not a Cliff,” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, http://www.offthechartsblog.org/its-a-slope-not-a-cliff/)

Will the bell toll on the economic recovery at midnight December 31st if policymakers allow the tax and spending changes required under current law to kick in — that is, if we go over the so-called “fiscal cliff”? We’ve said no, and a new analysis by Goldman Sachs (GS) economists Alec Phillips and Jan Hatzius reaches broadly similar conclusions.¶ Policymakers still would have some time in early 2013 to work out a responsible long-term budget deal that reduces deficits in a way that does not wreck the recovery.¶ If the scheduled tax and spending changes take effect, the economy will start down a slope that would likely be relatively modest at first, but then much steeper if 2013 unfolds without a budget deal. Thus, if policymakers strike a deal before the economy has gone very far down that slope, any harm to the recovery is likely to be much smaller than if there is no agreement and all the “fiscal cliff” measures stay in effect.¶ Here’s how GS sees it:¶ It is likely that if Congress were to fail to address this issue before the end of the year [2012], lawmakers would return in January and reach an agreement fairly quickly. The debt limit, which Congress must raise no later than early March according to our projections, might serve as a deadline for action on the fiscal cliff if public pressure hasn’t already forced an agreement. If, for example, an agreement were reached in January, we assume it would reinstate most policies retroactively, meaning that much of the effect would be reversed before the end of the quarter, reducing the overall economic effect.¶ Both sides of the political aisle have proposed extending President Bush’s “middle-class” tax cuts for another year. The sticking point is the upper-income Bush tax cuts. GS argues that it might be easier to reach agreement once all the tax cuts have expired, “since lawmakers could claim that setting tax rates and/or revenue levels higher than 2012 would nevertheless constitute a ‘tax cut’ compared with the policies that would be in effect in January 2013.”¶ GS goes on to argue that if policymakers appear likely to extend at least some of the tax cuts retroactively, the Treasury Department might have the flexibility to maintain tax withholding at 2012 levels for a while, which “would cushion the effect of a short lapse.”¶ Similarly, GS observes, government agencies might be able to phase in the automatic spending cuts (the “sequester”) that the Budget Control Act requires in 2013 if a budget deal appeared likely.¶ The fact that the economy will start down a slope in January, not plunge over a cliff, gives policymakers an opportunity to craft a responsible budget agreement in January or February if they can’t do it before then. If they seize that opportunity, the economy will be little the worse for wear as a result of the delay — and the budget outlook may be greatly improved.

#### Political capital theory is bankrupt

Dickinson2009 (Matthew Dickinson, professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power” May, google)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

**Congress requested the plan**

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.

#### Plan evaporates Republican resistance

Book 11/7 http://www.eenews.net/tv/transcript/1599 Election 2012: ClearView's Book talks Obama win, impact on energy, environment policy with new Congress OnPoint Kevin Book, managing director at ClearView Energy Partners, November 07, 2012

Monica Trauzzi: So we're going to get into more specifics on that in a second. On President Obama specifically, do you think that he is going to work with Congressional leadership differently now, because he doesn't have to worry about getting reelected? Is there going to be more compromise? Kevin Book: The Bill Clinton question. Is this the moment where he can move to the center safely? And the answer is probably yes, except that he has to have somebody on the other side moving with him. If you look at the demographics of the Senate, you have another election in 2014 where the Republicans still have a chance. It may be that holding the line is the way to go. If the Tea Party comes in strong, and it looks like they're still holding, and we'll find out final results at the end of the day, probably, then what we'll know is that there's a, sort of a reinforced, emboldened Republican will to resist and to ask for the big deal, even though the President retained election, even though the Republicans didn't claim the Senate, because there is still a 2014 possibility. If that evaporates because Republicans are willing to do a deal in the Senate, then the centrist ovations of the President might be answered. But I wouldn't think it starts out that way.

#### Independently plan solves inev collapse

Freeman 2009 (Marsha Freeman, Technology Editor, Executive Intelligence Review Magazine and Associate Editor, 21st Century Science and Technology Magazine, Spring 2009, “Stimulate The Economy: Build New Nuclear Plants!,” http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles\_2009/Stimulate\_Nucl\_sp09.pdf)

But economic growth will depend upon trillions of dollars of Federal investment that ameliorate the immediate situation by laying the basis for the long-term increased productivity of the economy, as a whole. It is not a question of simply creating jobs, but increasing the capital- intensity of the economy, and raising the productive level of the nation’s work- force. This is the function of investments in basic economic infrastructure.¶ There will be no economic recovery, or growth, without a massive expansion and upgrading of the nation’s energy supply and distribution system. Contrary to “popular opinion,” which has been shaped by scam artists like T. Boone “Windbag” Pickens, and “green” ideologues like Al Gore, only a massive expansion of nuclear energy can provide the quality and quantity of energy that a 21st Century economy requires. Although the first tentative steps have been taken by electric utilities to restart the construction of new nuclear power plants, with more than two dozen reactor license applications filed with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, this “renaissance” in nuclear power will not materialize without a Federally directed “stimulus.” Similarly, the disappearance of the U.S. nuclear manufacturing industry has begun to be reversed, but the re- constitution of a nuclear industry, based on the most modern power plant designs and advanced manufacturing techniques, will not happen without a nationally directed effort. For decades, the mass-production auto industry, and its component manufacturers, created one out of every thirteen industrial jobs in the United States. This was the reservoir of the nation’s machine tool design and industrial engineering talent. The industry, which now lies in ruin, must be retooled and mobilized to recreate a nuclear manufacturing industry.

 **2AC DOD Tradeoff DA**

**Cuts inevitable and no impact- their card**

**Harrison 2012** (Todd Harrison, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Priorities, August 24, 2012, “ANALYSIS OF THE FY 2013 DEFENSE BUDGET AND SEQUESTRATION,” http://www.csbaonline.org/publications/2012/08/analysis-of-the-fy2013-defense-budget-and-sequestration/)

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 defense budget currently being debated in Congress is a departure from previous budgets in several respects. It is the first budget submitted following the release of the Pentagon’s new strategic guidance, marking the beginning of a “pivot” from the wars of the past decade to the Asia-Pacific region. It is also the first budget request in more than a decade to propose a real decline in defense spending from the level currently enacted. Moreover, the prospect of sequestration hangs over the budget, threatening to cut some 10 percent of funding if Congress does not act to prevent it. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta has argued that the budget request is a “complete package,” that “there is little room here for significant modification,” and that any further funding reductions, such as those called for by sequestration, would require the Department to fundamentally rethink its new strategy.1 Nevertheless, the FY 2013 request is **unlikely to survive unscathed** and the Department will likely be forced to revise its strategic guidance.

\*\*\*their card stops\*\*\*

For this reason, the specifics of this budget request **matter less than the general themes** it contains. The budget is likely to be modified substantially by the Congressional authorization and appropriations process, and the across-the-board cuts sequestration would impose—or some alternative to sequestration devised by Congress—would further disrupt the detailed plans contained in the budget. Instead of diving into the details of the budget request and the proposed changes in specific programs, this analysis focuses on the overall direction of the budget request, its alignment with the new strategic guidance, and the details of how sequestration would be implemented. It evaluates the impact sequestration would have on different types of accounts and notes the things sequestration would not affect. It also explores some of the major budgetary issues facing the Department even if sequestration is avoided.

**No link-**

**No upfront cost**

**DOE 2011** (“Funding Federal Energy and Water Projects,” July 2011, http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/52085.pdf)

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

**Only trades off with other energy projects**

**GAO 2012** (Government Accountability Office, April 2012, “RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT FINANCING:

Improved Guidance and Information Sharing Needed for DOD Project-Level Officials,” online)

Availability of funding. Some military service headquarters and installation officials said that, in recent years, they have preferred to use up-front appropriations to pay for renewable energy projects on installations since an increased amount of appropriated funding has been available for such projects through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, the Energy Conservation Investment Program, and centrally managed operation and maintenance funding from the military services. However, officials said that they expect they will need to seek alternative financing for renewable energy projects in the future due to likely reductions in the availability of up-front appropriated funding. Some officials noted that a drawback of each of the appropriated fund sources is that renewable energy projects must compete with other projects for funding and renewable energy projects are often a **lower priority** than other projects because of the relatively higher cost and lower savings generated from such projects. For example, officials at some installations said that they generally do not use installation-managed operation and maintenance funds for renewable energy projects because of competing demands for this funding for repairs and other maintenance of existing facilities on the installation. With regard to the Energy Conservation Investment Program, renewable energy projects must **compete against other renewable energy projects** as well as energy efficiency projects for limited funding and, according to officials, energy efficiency projects are often more cost-effective than renewable energy projects and receive higher priority for funding.

**DOD will get more money if needed**

**Masters 2012** (Jonathan Masters, quotes Anthony Cordesman, Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “A Defense Budget at the Crossroads,” Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/us-strategy-and-politics/defense-budget-crossroads/p27318)

Projecting defense spending in an evolving security environment may also be more **aspirational** than practical. "While everybody talks about ten years, if the American economy recovers, if there's a new threat, if technology changes, **so does everything in the defense budget** (CNN)," says military expert Anthony Cordesman.

**FY13 budget as is undermines the pivot**

**Manyin 2012** (Mark E. Manyin, Specialist in Asian Affairs at the CRS, March 28, 2012, “Pivot to the Pacific? The Obama Administration’s ‘Rebalancing’ Toward Asia,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42448.pdf)

The depth of the Obama Administration’s “rebalancing” toward the Asia-Pacific region also may be called into question as time goes on. As yet, it does not appear that the Administration has translated its pronouncements into an across-the-government plan to implement the new elements of the strategy. The Administration’s budget request for FY2013 sends **ambiguous signals**. On the one hand, the proposed budget includes a 5% decrease for East Asia and Pacific (EAP) bilateral assistance programs below projected spending levels for FY2012. On the other hand, compared to some other aid regions, funding for EAP remains relatively stable. Overall assistance funding to Europe, Eurasia, and Central Asia (which includes Afghanistan), for example, is to fall by 18%, according to the FY2013 budget request.25 Additionally, the prominence the Obama Administration has given to the initiative has undoubtedly raised the potential costs to the United States if it or successor administrations fail to follow through on public pledges. Chinese analysts have already expressed skepticism about the U.S. ability to follow through on the “pivot,” given U.S. economic difficulties and the continuing turmoil in the Middle East, Afghanistan, and other areas.26 If such predictions come to pass, U.S. influence may fall farther and faster due to the Obama Administration’s high profile announcements.

### 2AC SBSP CP

#### SBSP fails multiple reasons their authors are caught up in hype

Murphy 2012 (Tom Murphy, associate professor of physics at UCSD, March 23, 2012, “The future, and fantasy, of space solar power,” Gigaom, http://gigaom.com/cleantech/the-future-and-fantasy-of-space-solar-power/)

I sense that people have a tendency to think space is easy. We have lots of satellites, we’ve gone to the Moon (remember that?!), we used to have a space shuttle program, and we have seen many movies and television shows set in space. But space is a very challenging environment, and it is extremely costly and difficult to deliver things there. If you go to the Fed-Ex site to get delivery costs, you immediately get hung up on not knowing the postal-code for space. Once in space, failures cannot be serviced. The usual mitigation strategy is redundancy, adding weight and cost. A space-based solar power system might sound very cool and futuristic, and it may seem at first blush an obvious answer to intermittency, but this comes at a big cost. Among the possibly unanticipated challenges:¶ The gain over the a good location on the ground is only a factor of 3 (2.4× in summer, 4.2× in winter at 35° latitude).¶ It’s almost as hard to get energy back to the ground as it is to get the equipment into space in the first place.¶ The microwave link faces problems with transmission through the atmosphere, and also flirts with roasting ducks on the wing.¶ Diffraction of the downlink beam, together with energy density limits, means that very large areas of the ground still need to be dedicated to energy collection.¶ Traditional solar photovoltaics in good locations can accomplish much the same for much reduced cost, and with only a few times more land than the microwave link approach would demand. The installations will be serviceable and will last longer. Batteries seem an easier way to cover storage shortcomings than launching stuff to space. I did not even address solar thermal schemes in this post, which competes well with photovoltaics and can very naturally build in storage capability.¶ I am left puzzled as to why we would want to take a harder, more expensive road to solar power. I think it is just not intuitive to most how difficult and expensive space is. And perhaps they think it’s very futuristic and cool to push our power generation out to space: it fits the preferred narrative about where we’re going. I don’t know—I’m just guessing.

#### Disruptions all the time- doesn’t solve grid

Murphy 2012 (Tom Murphy, associate professor of physics at UCSD, March 23, 2012, “The future, and fantasy, of space solar power,” Gigaom, http://gigaom.com/cleantech/the-future-and-fantasy-of-space-solar-power/)

Are we indeed dealing with 24 hours of exposure in space? A common run-of-the mill low-earth-orbit (LEO) satellite orbits at a height of about 500 km. At this height, the earth-hugging satellite spends almost half its time blocked from the Sun by the Earth. The actual number for that altitude is 38 percent of the time, or 15 hours per day of sun exposure. It is possible to arrange a nearly polar “sun synchronous” orbit that rides the sunrise/sunset line on Earth so that the satellite is always bathed in sunlight, with no eclipsing by Earth.¶ But any LEO satellite will sweep past the ground at over 7 km/s, appearing for only 2 minutes above a 30° elevation even for a direct overhead pass (and only about 6 minutes from horizon to horizon). What’s worse, this particular satellite in a sun-synchronous orbit will not frequently generate overhead passes at the same point on the Earth, which rotates underneath the orbit.¶ In short, solar installations in LEO could at best provide intermittent power to any given site—which is the main rationale for leaving the ground in the first place. Possibly an armada of smaller installations could zip by, each squirting out energy as it passes by. But besides being a colossal headache to coordinate, the sun-synchronous full-sun satellites would necessarily only pass over sites experiencing sunrise or sunset. You would get all your energy in two doses per day, which is not a very smooth packaging, and seems to defeat a primary advantage of space-based solar power in avoiding the need for storage.

#### Optimistic assessments say it takes 30 years

Foust 2011 (Jeff Foust, editor and publisher of The Space Review, November 28, 2011, “Making the case, again, for space-based solar power,” Space Review, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1978/1)

One of the biggest obstacles for SBSP has been, and remains, space transportation: the business case for these systems doesn’t close without the development of new, presumably reusable, launch systems which could launch payloads for much lower costs than existing expendable systems. The IAA report agrees that such transportation “is an enabling capability to the economic viability of space solar power” and while arguing that such systems “appear to be technically feasible during the coming 20–30 years”, admits that “the technologies required for this future space capability are not sufficiently mature for system development to begin at present.”

#### 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.

#### 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.

No readiness impact-

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

### Delay

**Expertise and designs ready- Market pull solves**

Adams 2010 (Rod Adams, nuclear power expert with experience designing and operating small nuclear reactors and a former Submarine Engineer Officer, March 23, 2010, “Small Modular Reactors Could Be An American Export – But We Need to Move Faster,” Atomic Insights, http://atomicinsights.com/2010/03/small-modular-reactors-could-be-an-american-export-but-we-need-to-move-faster.html)

In the March 23, 2010 issue of the Wall Street Journal, Dr. Steven Chu published an op-ed piece titled America’sNew Nuclear Option that describes the Administration’s growing interest in smaller nuclear energy systems that can be produced in factories and delivered nearly complete to sites around the country and around the world. Here is a quote from that editorial:¶ As this paper recently reported, one of the most promising areas is small modular reactors (SMRs). If we can develop this technology in the U.S. and build these reactors with American workers, we will have a key competitive edge.¶ Small modular reactors would be less than one-third the size of current plants. They have compact designs and could be made in factories and transported to sites by truck or rail. SMRs would be ready to “plug and play” upon arrival.¶ If commercially successful, SMRs would significantly expand the options for nuclear power and its applications. Their small size makes them suitable to small electric grids so they are a good option for locations that cannot accommodate large-scale plants. The modular construction process would make them more affordable by reducing capital costs and construction times.¶ Their size would also increase flexibility for utilities since they could add units as demand changes, or use them for on-site replacement of aging fossil fuel plants.¶ Those are some terrific words, but the message loses some of its impact when the numbers are revealed later down the page. In the 2011 budget, the Administration requested just $39 million for a program aimed specifically at small reactors. That amount of money would not even pay for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission costs of reviewing the license for a single nuclear energy system design certification. In an agency whose total budget request is in excess of $28,000 million ($28 billion), a $39 million line item gets lost in the decimal dust.¶ There is an old saying that is appropriate here – “For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also”. The effort by Dr. Chu to publish a piece favorable to small nuclear energy systems in the Wall Street Journal is commendable, but the tiny slice of resource support indicates that there is still a lot of work to be done to enable the technology to reach the market, especially when compared to the massive number of dollars available for industrial wind deployment as a gift from taxpayers to companies like BP, Chevron, GE, FPL, and Siemens.¶ It is beyond comprehension to me that it will take us “about 10 years” (in Dr. Chu’s words) to license and deploy smaller, light water reactors that use essentially the same technology that we have been using successfully for nearly 60 years. We have the knowledge base and the manufacturing capability now; we should build several plants in controlled locations so we can show the regulators how their safety systems work to keep the public protected.¶ Dr. Chu’s op-ed piece concludes with some additional good words about the future potential of systems using high temperature gas – one of my favorites – and fast neutrons for better fuel economy plus the use of modern modeling and simulation techniquest. Dr. Chu’s head is in the right place, but he could use some encouragement to move more aggressively to take advantage of what is currently an American strong suit.¶ There are some Americans who know more than anyone else about what it takes to build durable, safe, secure, small reactors that use light water as a heat transfer and moderating fluid and steam as the power section working fluid. We can improve the economics through well understood principles of series production. The Department of Energy’s budget request for FY2011 currently includes more than $1,000 million for small, light water reactors whose allowed market is limited to military vessels. It would seem that technologies used in that program could be used as the basis for prototype licenses for systems like the mPowerTM and NuScale in a process that could take far less than 10 years.¶ There are several places in the US (Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico and Alaska) where early adoption of such systems could dramatically reduce the cost of electricity, reduce the dependence on a fragile fossil fuel tether, and improve its production cleanliness. Success in those locations could lead to successes in similar markets around the world and perhaps even in system refinements allow competitive costs in more traditional electrical power production markets. What are we waiting for?

### Microgrids

#### SMRs key, microgrids and renewables fail

Barton 2011 (Charles Barton, founder of the Nuclear Green Revolution blog with an MA in philosophy, April 1, 2011, “Future storm damage to the grid may carry unacceptable costs,” http://nucleargreen.blogspot.com/2011\_04\_01\_archive.html)

Amory Lovins has long argued that the traditional grid is vulnerable to this sort of damage. Lovins proposed a paradigm shift from centralized to distributed generation and from fossil fuels and nuclear power to renewable based micro-generation. Critics have pointed to flaws in Lovins model. Renewable generation systems are unreliable and their output varies from locality to locality, as well as from day to day, and hour to hour. In order to bring greater stability and predictability to the grid, electrical engineers have proposed expanding the electrical transmission system with thousands of new miles of transmission cables to be added to bring electricity from high wind and high sunshine areas, to consumers. This would lead, if anything, to greater grid vulnerability to storm damage in a high renewable penetration situation. Thus Lovins renewables/distributed generation model breaks down in the face of renewables limitations. Renewables penetration, will increase the distance between electrical generation facilities and customer homes and businesses, increasing the grid vulnerable to large scale damage, rather than enhancing reliability. Unfortunately Lovins failed to note that the distributed generation model actually worked much better with small nuclear power plants than with renewable generated electricity. Small nuclear plants could be located much closer to customer's homes, decreasing the probability of storm damage to transmission lines. At the very worst, small NPPs would stop the slide toward increased grid expansion. Small reactors have been proposed as electrical sources for isolated communities that are too remote for grid hookups. If the cost of small reactors can be lowered sufficiently it might be possible for many and perhaps even most communities to unhook from the grid while maintaining a reliable electrical supply. It is likely that electrical power will play an even more central role in a post-carbon energy era. Increased electrical dependency requires increased electrical reliability, and grid vulnerabilities limit electrical reliability. Storm damage can disrupt electrical service for days and even weeks. In a future, electricity dependent economy, grid damage can actually impede storm recovery efforts, making large scale grid damage semi-self perpetuating. Such grid unreliability becomes a threat to public health and safety. Thus grid reliability will be a more pressing future issue, than it has been. It is clear that renewable energy sources will worsen grid reliability, Some renewable advocates have suggested that the so called "smart grid" will prevent grid outages. Yet the grid will never be smart enough to repair its own damaged power lines. In addition the "smart grid" will be venerable to hackers, and would be a handy target to statures. A smart grid would be an easy target for a Stuxnet type virus attack. Not only does the "smart grid" not solve the problem posed by grid vulnerability to storm damage, but efficiency, another energy approach thought to be a panacea for electrical supply problems would be equally useless. Thus, decentralized electrical generation through the use of small nuclear power plants offers real potential for increasing electrical reliability, but successful use of renewable electrical generation approaches may worsen rather than improved grid reliability.

### 1AR No Impact- General

#### No impact to fiscal cliff

Jones 10/10 (Forrest Jones, “Economist Stone: Fiscal Cliff to More Resemble Fiscal ‘Slope’,” Money News, http://www.moneynews.com/StreetTalk/Stone-fiscal-cliff-slope/2012/10/10/id/459446)

The fast-approaching combination of tax hikes and spending cuts that could throw the country into a recession might instead gently nudge the country into decline — if at all, experts say.¶ At the end of this year, a series of tax breaks expire at the same time cuts to government spending take effect, a combination known as a fiscal cliff that could throw the country into a recession if left unchecked by Congress.¶ Successful aversion of the fiscal cliff could still mean adjustments to taxes and government spending, which could dampen growth next year.¶ But the worst-case scenario, under which Congress fails to agree on a way to steer the country away from the cliff, wouldn’t result in a major shock to the economy, but would instead result in gradual and even reversible losses.¶ “The slope would likely be relatively modest at first,” Chad Stone, the chief economist at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a research group based in Washington, wrote in a recent analysis, according to The New York Times. ¶ “A relatively brief implementation of the tax and spending changes required by current law should cause little short-term damage to the economy as a whole.”

### 1AR Politics

#### PC doesn’t solve- House GOP is bucking Obama’s overtures

Taylor 11/8 (Andrew Taylor, “Fiscal cliff: Impasse on tax rates is big hurdle,” AP, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jy2WZo\_a8HqccfWT5FAVpVwuGvRA?docId=f024325e89f740d784c8e535f2f12eb6)

WASHINGTON (AP) — House Republicans' hard line against higher tax rates for upper-income earners leaves re-elected President Barack Obama with a tough, core decision: Does he pick a fight and risk falling off a "fiscal cliff" or does he rush to compromise and risk alienating liberal Democrats?¶ Or is there another way that will allow both sides to claim victory?¶ Obama has been silent since his victory speech early Wednesday morning, but is set to weigh in Friday in remarks at the White House.¶ Capitol Hill Republicans, meanwhile, vow to stand resolutely against any effort by the president to fulfill a campaign promise to raise the top two income tax rates to Clinton-era levels. A battle would set the tone for the start of the president's second term.

### 1AR PC = Myth

#### Ideology

Fleisher Bond and Wood 2008 (Richard Fleisher, Fordham University Professor Department of Political Science, Jon R. Bond, Texas A&M University Professor Department of Political Science, and B. Dan Wood Texas A&M University Professor Department of Political Science, “Which Presidents Are Uncommonly Successful in Congress?” in Presidential Leadership: The Vortex of Power, http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/ebook/p/2005/american\_congress/congress.wustl.edu/fleisher.pdf)

We should also continue to work to improve our understanding of the conditions that affect presidential success, and how they operate. Our finding of significant interactions of party polarization with public approval and majority control is noteworthy. Party control sets the basic condition for presidential success, and presidents do somewhat better in their honeymoon year. The marginal effect of public opinion on success is conditioned by the level of partisanship in Congress. At low levels of partisanship, the president’s standing with the public has a modest positive effect on success. But at high levels of partisanship, which have characterized Congress in recent decades, the marginal effect of public approval diminishes (and even turns negative in the House). Party polarization also interacts with party control, enhancing the benefit of majority status. Thus, polarized parties further reduce the ability of presidential activities to affect success even at the margins. In polarized periods, electoral processes reduce the number of moderate and cross-pressured members, the very members who are most inclined to search beyond the primary cues of party and ideology for guidance in making decisions. Fewer members who look beyond party and ideology, means fewer members subject to presidential persuasion. This condition places a high premium on having majorities in the House and Senate. Unless the level of partisanship in Congress declines, a rational strategy for a president who seeks to improve his legislative success is to focus on maintaining or winning partisan majorities in the House and Senate. President Bush seems to have successfully followed this strategy in the 2002 midterm elections. Ironically, electoral activities aimed at electing sympathetic majorities in Congress are likely to contribute to more party polarization.

#### High salience issues

Peake 2001 (Jeffrey S. Peake professor at Bowling Green State University Political Research Quarterly, March 2001, “Presidential Agenda Setting in Foreign Policy,” Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 69-86)

Issues examined here are less salient than issues studied previously High salience hinders the President's capacity to affect the agenda. If Congress and the media consistently attend to an issue (due to its high salience), it is less likely that activity by the President designed to increase the salience of an issue will have as noticeable an effect compared to an issue that is less salient. Moderate to low salience issues may provide the President opportunities to noticeably affect congressional or media attention. Lower salience decreases the competition Presidents receive from the media, possibly increasing the President's influence in relation to other agenda setters. Salience is also tied to the political importance of an issue. Increased political importance leads to high salience over time for an issue among the media, the people, and Congress, so the President is not without competition to influence the agenda. Congress and the media attend to highly salient issues regardless of the President's agenda.