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## 2AC

### Topicality – energy production

#### C/I - Financial incentives include loan guarantees - distinguished from rules, regulations and policies.

DSIRE (Database of State Incentives for Renewables & Efficiency), 2012, Database of State Incentives for Renewables & Efficiency, Glossary, “Financial Incentives,” http://www.dsireusa.org/glossary/

DSIRE organizes incentives and policies that promote renewable energy and energy efficiency into two general categories -- (1) Financial Incentives and (2) Rules, Regulations & Policies -- and roughly 30 specific types of incentives and policies. This glossary provides a description of each specific incentive and policy type. FINANCIAL INCENTIVES (click to expand section) Corporate Tax Incentives Corporate tax incentives include tax credits, deductions and exemptions. These incentives are available in some states to corporations that purchase and install eligible renewable energy or energy efficiency equipment, or to construct green buildings. In a few cases, the incentive is based on the amount of energy produced by an eligible facility. Some states allow the tax credit only if a corporation has invested a minimum amount in an eligible project. Typically, there is a maximum limit on the dollar amount of the credit or deduction. In recent years, the federal government has offered corporate tax incentives for renewables and energy efficiency. (Note that corporate tax incentives designed to support manufacturing and the development of renewable energy systems or equipment, or energy efficiency equipment, are categorized as “Industry Recruitment/Support” in DSIRE.)Grant Programs States offer a variety of grant programs to encourage the use and development of renewables and energy efficiency. Most programs offer support for a broad range of technologies, while a few programs focus on promoting a single technology, such as photovoltaic (PV) systems. Grants are available primarily to the commercial, industrial, utility, education and/or government sectors. Most grant programs are designed to pay down the cost of eligible systems or equipment. Others focus on research and development, or support project commercialization. In recent years, the federal government has offered grants for renewables and energy efficiency projects for end-users. Grants are usually competitive. Green Building Incentives Green buildings are designed and constructed using practices and materials that minimize the impacts of the building on the environment and human health. Many cities and counties offer financial incentives to promote green building. The most common form of incentive is a reduction or waiver of a building permit fee. The U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) is a popular point-based certification program for green buildings. The LEED system awards points for site selection and development; material, energy and water efficiency; indoor air quality; innovation; and the application of renewable technologies. (Note that this category includes green building incentives that do not fall under other DSIRE incentive categories, such as tax incentives and grant programs.)Industry Recruitment/Support To promote economic development and the creation of jobs, some states offer financial incentives to recruit or cultivate the manufacturing and development of renewable energy systems and equipment. These incentives commonly take the form of tax credits, tax exemptions and grants. In some cases, the amount of the incentive depends on the quantity of eligible equipment that a company manufactures. Most of these incentives apply to several renewable energy technologies, but a few states target specific technologies, such as wind or solar. These incentives are usually designed as temporary measures to support industries in their early years. They commonly include a sunset provision to encourage the industries to become self-sufficient. Loan Programs Loan programs provide financing for the purchase of renewable energy or energy efficiency systems or equipment. Low-interest or zero-interest loans for energy efficiency projects are a common demand-side management (DSM) practice for electric utilities. State governments also offer low-interest loans for a broad range of renewable energy and energy efficiency measures. These programs are commonly available to the residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, public and/or non-profit sectors. Loan rates and terms vary by program; in some cases, they are determined on an individual project basis. Loan terms are generally 10 years or less. In recent years, the federal government has offered loans and/or loan guarantees for renewables and energy efficiency projects. PACE Financing Property-Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing effectively allows property owners to borrow money to pay for renewable energy and/or energy-efficiency improvements. The amount borrowed is typically repaid over a period of years via a special assessment on the owner's property. In general, local governments (such as cities and counties) that choose to offer PACE financing must be authorized to do so by state law. Performance-Based Incentives Performance-based incentives (PBIs), also known as production incentives, provide cash payments based on the number of kilowatt-hours (kWh) or BTUs

#### Targeted towards obtaining energy production.

Richard R. Lancaster & Mark J. Berndt, June 1984, is with the Minnesota Department of Public Service, Mark J. Berndt is with the Minnesota Department of Energy and Economic Development, “Alternative energy development in the USA The effectiveness of state government incentives,” Energy Policy, Science Direct

Feiveson and Rabi 14 classify the range of possible government incentives to alternative energy into five categories: targeted incentives, direct regulation, incentives based on energy saved, non-targeted incentives and conventional fuel taxes. The predominant incentives used by state governments are targeted incentives, such as income tax credits, sales tax exemptions, property tax exemptions and grant and loan programs aimed at specific resources or technologies, followed by the conventional fuel tax, which has the effect of raising fuel prices. This study addresses the effectiveness of targeted incentives and conventional fuel taxes. The other three types of incentive are either difficult to quantify or are used in very few states, and do not lend themselves to empirical analysis. An alternative to incentives would be to remove existing subsidies to conventional fuels. Although this is straightforward in concept, it might not be in practice because of resistance from the constituencies that benefit from the subsidies.

#### We meet – was created to address energy demands.

Steve Kirsch, 2009, M.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), writer for the Huffington Post, CEO Kirsch foundation on climate, founder/head of Center for Energy and Climate Change, National Award from the Caring Institute in Washington DC, written much about the Integral Fast Reactor, Fellow, with the Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Steve Kirsch’s blog, “The Integral Fast Reactor (IFR) project: Congress Q&A,” <http://skirsch.com/politics/ifr/QAcongressKirsch.htm>

\*\*\*cites Charles Till, former Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, The National Academy Studies, James Hansen, Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Ray Hunter, former Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Leonard Koch, winner of the Global Energy International Prize, Barry Brook Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change\*\*\*

There is no other alternative energy technology which eats our nuclear waste for fuel. So a billion dollars to solve a $100 billion dollar nuclear waste problem is a good deal. You get the power for free. Secondly, we need a technology to offer to India and China that is more attractive than coal. None of the alternatives you are funding now do that. But if we don't do it, the planet will suffer damages beyond repair. We must get rid of coal or we are hosed. Nothing we can do will matter. This project will take 5 years if Obama orders the NRC to fast-track the certification of the PRISM and the longer we keep putting it off, the more damage will be done. It gets exponentially harder to stop global warming as time goes on. The least expensive approach is to start yesterday. While a billion dollars is a large earmark, it is tiny in comparison to the magnitude of the problem it solves. Thirdly, because our government already invested 10 years and $1 billion into it already and then pulled the rug out from under it even though it met all expectations. Fourth, because this technology was invented by our nation's top energy scientists at our top energy national lab to solve our energy problems. How can you not fund your own top scientists especially when they proved they were right and that we now need it more than ever?

#### More ev. - decreases energy costs.

Steve Kirsch, 11-25-2009, M.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), writer for the Huffington Post, CEO Kirsch foundation on climate, founder/head of Center for Energy and Climate Change, National Award from the Caring Institute in Washington DC, written much about the Integral Fast Reactor, Fellow, with the Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Steve Kirsch’s blog, “Why We Should Build an Integral Fast Reactor Now,” <http://skirsch.wordpress.com/2009/11/25/ifr/>

\*\*\*cites Charles Till, former Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, The National Academy Studies, James Hansen, Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Ray Hunter, former Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Leonard Koch, winner of the Global Energy International Prize, Barry Brook Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change\*\*\*

A successful IFR demonstration has the following important benefits: The only technology we have with a realistic potential to save the planet. Eliminating carbon emissions from coal plants worldwide is required to prevent a climate catastrophe. But using carbon capture adds cost and may not be practical or viable. The IFR, on the other hand, can replace the burner in an existing coal plant while reducing operating costs. So countries will actually want to eliminate their carbon emissions because they’ll save money. This is why the IFR is one of Jim Hansen’s top five priorities for saving the planet: because the IFR is the only viable solution we know of today can eliminate CO2 emissions from coal plants without increasing energy costs. Addresses the climate change problem while helping our ecomomy with lower energy costs and increased jobs. Unlike many renewable sources, nuclear power has the potential to decrease energy costs and create new high paying jobs.

### 2AC fissile material – PRISM

#### Critical to overwhelming squo alt causes.

Richard Weitz, 3-6-2012, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, World Politics Review Senior Editor, “Global Insights: U.S.-Russia Arms Control Prospects Under Putin”, World Politics Review, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11681/global-insights-u-s-russia-arms-control-prospects-under-putin>

This weekend’s election in Russia has unsurprisingly returned Vladimir Putin to the country’s presidency. In contrast to the preordained outcome of the Russian voting, the winner of this November’s U.S. presidential election is not yet known. But whoever occupies the White House in 2013 will need to consider the bilateral arms control relationship with Russia in coming years. And although the implementation of the New START agreement is going well, there are sharp differences in Washington and Moscow over where to go next. Moscow’s main concerns focus on U.S. missile defense and U.S. superiority in conventional forces. Both conditions work against Russia’s willingness to cut its offensive nuclear forces even further, which is the U.S. priority, especially with regard to the issue of Russian tactical nuclear weapons. In his recent Moscow News article on Russian foreign policy, Putin railed against what he called the U.S. quest for “absolute security.” In his words, the problem is that “absolute invulnerability for one country would in theory require absolute vulnerability for all others.” Instead, Putin again insisted on the right of all states to equal security, as well as Russia’s right to maintain the capacity to attack the United States with nuclear weapons if necessary. Putin argued that faced with U.S. plans for deploying a European-based missile defense system, Russia had two options: a symmetrical response of creating its own system or an asymmetrical strategy of strengthening Russia’s offensive strategic weapons to ensure that they are capable of overcoming any NATO system and thereby preserving mutual deterrence. The first choice being too costly and technically challenging, he said Russia would follow the second course. In Moscow’s view, the problem of equal security also applies to the imbalance in conventional forces in Europe. The United States recently followed Russia’s lead in ending implementation of the original Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. Russian officials have also given up on the idea of ratifying the Adapted CFE Treaty, since NATO insists that Russia withdraw its military forces from Georgia as part of its Istanbul Commitments. Given these complications, Russians are uninterested in various U.S. proposals for a “grand bargain” that would seek to address the CFE and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe simultaneously. Russian policymakers have also expressed a new complaint in the form of their open doubt over the United States’ ability to ratify the kinds of binding legal agreements that Moscow demands. They note the difficulties that the Obama administration had in securing U.S. Senate ratification of New START, which required a White House commitment to modernize the U.S. nuclear arsenal, even if that is now falling victim to budgetary pressures. Russians insist that they want another legally binding agreement to constrain U.S. missile defenses. The Obama administration has been offering a politically binding agreement on missile defense, but has refused to accept legally binding constraints on how the missile defense program might develop. Although U.S. officials stress that they will not try to negate Russia’s nuclear deterrent, whose massive size and great sophistication would make such an effort impossible in any case, Congress would never accept a legally binding agreement that commits the United States to deliberately constrain its ability to protect Americans and their allies from foreign missile attacks. At best, the administration is willing to offer nonbinding political guarantees that they will not seek to negate Russia’s strategic nuclear deterrent. Russian officials refuse to accept mere political declarations on such important issues. They claim the United States earlier violated such agreements when it enlarged NATO after the Cold War and moved NATO forces into former Soviet-bloc states. In contrast, they note that even when the United States withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 2001, the predictable and legal manner in which the withdrawal was carried out reassured Putin and others in Moscow who opposed the U.S. decision. Russians also point out that political agreements lend themselves to different interpretations depending on who is viewing the issue. Although they do not seem to worry about another Obama presidency, they claim to fear that some future U.S. administration will try to expand U.S. missile defenses to be able to intercept Russian strategic missiles. These differences highlight the uncertain climate surrounding the nuclear arms control agenda, which is compounded by Russian concerns about U.S. space, cyber and other weapons. But progress could be possible in several other areas. First, Russians are eager to help counter nuclear terrorism through the mechanisms of the Nuclear Security Summit forums and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. Both countries want to revive the civilian use of nuclear power under safe and secure conditions, making sure that those countries now considering starting nuclear energy programs receive training and guidance on how to avoid accidents and protect the nuclear material at their facilities. Second, Russian-U.S. collaboration on regional proliferation challenges is important, since both countries are veto-wielding members of the U.N. Security Council. Russian officials are unlikely to accept any more U.N. sanctions on Iran given their different assessment of Iranian motives, unless incontrovertible evidence that Tehran is seeking a nuclear weapon emerges. But cooperation is possible regarding North Korea, where Russia and the United States share the goal of stabilizing the Korean Peninsula. Third, the Carnegie Endowment and other institutions have been developing a number of potential informal confidence and transparency-building measures that the two sides could pursue. These would help to lead toward a new strategic arms control treaty in a few years if the bilateral relationship improves, but could serve a valuable stabilizing function even without one. These measures include renewed efforts to expand the application of restrictions in the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty and other bilateral arms control agreements to other countries, as well as measures to increase transparency regarding the capacity of each sides’ nuclear weapons-production complexes to construct new nuclear forces in any attempt to rapidly break out of a strategic arms control agreement. Finally, Russians are eager to work on civilian nuclear energy cooperation with the United States. The two sides’ recently ratified 123 agreement allows Russian and U.S. firms to cooperate to produce new types of civilian power reactors that would be less prone to proliferation than existing models. Such collaboration could prove very useful in helping develop new commercial stakeholders in both countries that have an interest in maintaining good Russian-U.S. relations. The economic relationship between Russia and the United States remains relatively undeveloped, since Americans buy Russia’s main exports -- oil, gas and weapons -- elsewhere, while various impediments hobble mutual investments. At present, the constituencies favoring strong bilateral ties in both countries are small, consisting mainly of arms control advocates and foreign policy experts. As a result, the Russian-U.S. agenda is still dominated by Cold War-type issues, including nuclear arms control, which position the two parties in an adversarial relationship. Only by moving away from this orientation can both sides begin to overcome the mutual confidence gap that exacerbates many of their other differences. Though Putin’s return to the presidency could augur a hard line on a number of issues where the U.S. and Russian positions diverge, his pragmatism and opportunism could lead to progress in the areas where the two sides’ interests overlap.

### 2AC solvency – PRISM

#### PRISM could be developed in five years – other reprocessing alternatives create worse waste problems.

Fred Pearce, 8-8-2012, is a freelance author and journalist based in the UK, he serves as environmental consultant for New Scientist magazine and is the author of numerous books, including When The Rivers Run Dry and With Speed and Violence, in previous articles for Yale Environment 360, environment 360, Breakthrough Institute, “Nuclear Fast Reactor: The Saviour of Nuclear Power?,” <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Nuclear-Fast-Reactor-The-Saviour-of-Nuclear-Power.html>

The PRISM fast reactor is attracting friends among environmentalists formerly opposed to nuclear power. They include leading thinkers such as Stewart Brand and British columnist George Monbiot. And, despite the cold shoulder from the Obama administration, some U.S. government officials seem quietly keen to help the British experiment get under way. They have approved the export of the PRISM technology to Britain and the release of secret technical information from the old research program. And the U.S. Export-Import Bank is reportedly ready to provide financing. Britain has not made up its mind yet, however. Having decided to try and re-use its stockpile of plutonium dioxide, its Nuclear Decommissioning Authority has embarked on a study to determine which re-use option to support. There is no firm date, but the decision, which will require government approval, should be reached within two years. Apart from a fast-breeder reactor, the main alternative is to blend the plutonium with other fuel to create a mixed-oxide fuel (mox) that will burn in conventional nuclear power plants. Britain has a history of embarrassing failures with mox, including the closure last year of a $2 billion blending plant that spent 10 years producing a scant amount of fuel. And critics say that, even if it works properly, mox fuel is an expensive way of generating not much energy, while leaving most of the plutonium intact, albeit in a less dangerous form. Only fast reactors can consume the plutonium. Many think that will ultimately be the UK choice. If so, the PRISM plant would take five years to license, five years to build, and could destroy probably the world's most dangerous stockpile of plutonium by the end of the 2020s. GEH has not publicly put a cost on building the plant, but it says it will foot the bill, with Proponents of fast reactors see them as the nuclear application of one of the totems of environmentalism: recycling. the British government only paying by results, as the plutonium is destroyed. The idea of fast breeders as the ultimate goal of nuclear power engineering goes back to the 1950s, when experts predicted that fast-breeders would generate all Britain's electricity by the 1970s. But the Clinton administration eventually shut down the U.S.'s research program in 1994. Britain followed soon after, shutting its Dounreay fast-breeder reactor on the north coast of Scotland in 1995. Other countries have continued with fast-breeder research programs, including France, China, Japan, India, South Korea, and Russia, which has been running a plant at Sverdlovsk for 32 years.

### States CP

#### Won’t work without a sustained federal commitment.

Frank Bowman, 6-19-2008, a retired four-star Admiral, is the former Chief of Naval Personnel and former Director of Naval Nuclear Propulsion, an Honorary Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (KBE), Master's Degree in nuclear engineering and naval architecture/marine engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters from Duke University, CQ Congressional Testimony, “Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction,” Lexis Nexis

In terms of new nuclear plant construction, one of the most significant financing challenges is the cost of these projects relative to the size, market value and financing capability of the companies that will build them. New nuclear power plants are expected to cost at least $6 to 7 billion. U.S. electric power companies do not have the size, financing capability or financial strength to finance new nuclear power projects on balance sheet, on their own-particularly at a time when they are investing heavily in other generating capacity, transmission and distribution infrastructure, and environmental controls. These first projects must have financing support-either loan guarantees from the federal government or assurance of investment recovery from state governments, or both. The states are doing their part. Throughout the South and Southeast, state governments have enacted legislation or implemented new regulations to encourage new nuclear plant construction. Comparable federal government commitment is essential. The modest loan guarantee program authorized by the 2005 Energy Policy Act was a small step in the right direction, but it does not represent a sufficient response to the urgent need to rebuild our critical electric power infrastructure. We believe the United States will need something similar to the Clean Energy Bank concept now under consideration by a number of members of Congress-a government corporation, modeled on the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, to provide loan guarantees and other forms of financing support to ensure that capital flows to clean technology deployment in the electric sector. Creation of such a financing entity should be an integral component of any climate change legislation. Such a concept serves at least two national imperatives. First, it addresses the challenge mentioned earlier-the disparity between the size of these projects relative to the size of the companies that will build them. In the absence of a concept like a Clean Energy Bank, new nuclear plants and other clean energy projects will certainly be built, but in smaller numbers over a longer period of time. Second, federal loan guarantees provide a substantial consumer benefit. A loan guarantee allows more leverage in a project's capital structure, which reduces the cost of capital, in turn reducing the cost of electricity from the project. Electricity consumers-residential, commercial and industrial-are already struggling with increases in oil, natural gas and electricity prices. The high cost of energy and fuel price volatility has already compromised the competitive position of American industry. We know that the next generation of clean energy technologies will be more costly than the capital stock in place today. In this environment, we see a compelling case for federal financing support that would reduce consumer costs. If it is structured like the loan guarantee program authorized by Title XVII of the 2005 Energy Policy Act, in which project sponsors are expected to pay the cost of the loan guarantee, such a program would be revenue-neutral and would not represent a subsidy. The public benefits associated with a robust energy loan guarantee program-lower cost electricity, deployment of clean energy technologies at the scale necessary to reduce carbon emissions-are significant. That is why the U.S. government routinely uses loan guarantee programs to support activities that serve the public good and the national interest-including shipbuilding, steelmaking, student loans, rural electrification, affordable housing, construction of critical transportation infrastructure, and for many other purposes. Achieving significant expansion of nuclear power in the United States will require stable and sustained federal and state government policies relating to nuclear energy. The new nuclear power projects now in the early stages of development will not enter service until the 2016-2020. Like all other advanced energy technologies, continued progress requires sustained policy and political support. In closing let me assure you that the U.S. nuclear industry is moving forward as quickly as we are able to license, finance and build new nuclear plants in the United States. Seventeen companies or groups of companies are preparing license applications for as many as 31 new reactors. Nine applications for construction and operating licenses are currently under review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a total of 15 new plants. We expect four to eight new U.S. nuclear plants in operation by 2016 or so. Assuming those first plants are meeting their construction schedules and cost estimates, the rate of construction would accelerate thereafter. With the necessary investment stimulus and financing support, we could see approximately 20,000 MW of new nuclear capacity (that would be about 15 plants) on line in the 2020 to 2022 time frame, and 65,000 to 70,000 megawatts (or 45 to 50 plants) by 2030. These plants will produce clean, safe, reliable electricity, around the clock, at a stable price, immune to price volatility in the oil and natural gas markets.

#### Federal loan guarantees is the vital to investment in nuclear power.

Joe C. Turnage et. al, 7-2-2007, Senior Vice President, Constellation Energy Group Inc., Theodore Bunting Jr., Senior Vice President of Finance, Entergy Corp, John F Young, Executive Vice President and CFO, Exelon Corp, and Steve Winn, Executive Vice President, NRG Energy, Inc., “Join Comments of Constellation Group, Inc, Entergy Corporation, Exelon Corporation, and NRG Energy, Inc. regarding Proposed Rule, Loan Guarantees for Projects that Employ Innovative Technologies,” <http://www.lgprogram.energy.gov/nopr-comments/comment41.pdf>

Following the enactment of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, numerous companies announced plans to develop applications to be submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to obtain licenses for the development of new nuclear power generation facilities. NRC has developed a new "one step" licensing process for nuclear projects, where applicants would receive a combined construction and operating license or "COL," and it is hoped that this will provide a transparent and predictable licensing process which will be demonstrated with the first "wave" of COL applications. These projects involve new nuclear plants using advanced technologies of five advanced reactor designs that promise to be even safer and more reliable than the existing "fleet" of nuclear reactors. In this first stage of development, the companies at the leading edge of development are committing many tens of millions of dollars to the NRC licensing process for COL applications that will be submitted later this year and in 2008. NRC's review process is then expected to take 2-4 years, which would lead to full scale construction activities commencing in the 2009-2012 time-frame for the first units of each new technology type. Given the nature of the multi-year licensing and construction schedule, as well as the world-wide competition for resources required to build these nuclear plants, companies planning to build the first plants are already beginning the process of committing to these projects what will likely be the first several hundred million dollars for each multi-billion dollar project, and in some cases, companies with their project partners have already spent such amounts. This means that in the near-term, these companies will need to either secure financing or commit equity in order to maintain schedules to prepare for plant construction. Significantly, however, newly all of these efforts are premised upon the assumption that the promise of Title XVII of EP Act 2005 will be realized for the first wave of new nuclear plants. These companies strongly believe that loan guarantees are necessary to access the credit markets. In addition, for new nuclear facilities that will be subject to cost-of-service regulation, companies will need to demonstrate to state public service commissions that the financing costs for these facilities were prudently incurred. Simply put, further commitment of capital requires that companies secure confidence that DOE will develop and implement a workable loan guarantee program to provide the badly needed access to large amounts of capital necessary to finance the development of the first 3-5 plants of each of the new reactor designs. For some companies, this may require securing loan guarantee commitments as soon as 2008, shortly after NRC has accepted a COL application as "administratively complete" and "docketed" the application. At a minimum, however, this requires the clear and unambiguous availability of loan guarantees in the 2009-2012 timeframe for a significant number of capital intensive central power generation facilities (new nuclear and clean coal plants). A workable loan guarantee program necessary to support new nuclear power development in the U.S. must have the following three elements: The guarantee itself must be a commercially viable financing instrument, in line with other Federal loan guarantee instruments; There should be a transparent methodology for calculating the subsidy cost to be paid by sponsors, and such costs should be reasonable and commercially viable; and There should be certainty as to the future availability of guarantees, and this self-pay program should be insulated from the uncertainty of the annual appropriations process. The size and scale of nuclear projects, and the multi-year commitments that need to be made by private industry, make it imperative that DOE create certainty in the near-term around the future availability of the Title XVII Loan Guarantee Program for nuclear power projects. As part of the public-private partnership that has been essential to "jump-starting" the development of new, base-load nuclear generation, the multi-year commitment being made by private parties needs to be matched with a multi-year commitment from the federal government. The federal government cannot expect private parties to make hundreds of millions of dollars in commitments premised upon the expectation of they will obtain loan guarantees in 2009-2012 without reasonable progress being made by the federal government toward establishing a program that can be expected to be available to facilitate the financing of the first wave of new nuclear plants throughout the next five years.

#### Federal funds drive private investment and recruitment of skilled workers for PRISMs.

Daniel Kammen, 6-12-2003, professor of nuclear engineering at Berkeley, Federal News Service, Prepared Testimony before the House Committee on Science, Lexis Nexis

The federal government plays the pivotal role in the encouragement of innovation in the energy sector. Not only are federal funds critical, but as my work and that of others has demonstrated6, private funds generally follow areas of public sector support. One particularly useful metric although certainly not the only measure --. of the relationship between funding and innovation is based on patents. Total public sector funding and the number of patents - across all disciplines in the United States have both increased steadily over at least the past three decades (Figure 5). The situation depicted here, with steadily increasing trends for funding and results (measured imperfectly, but consistently, by patents) is not as rosy when energy R&D alone is considered. In that case the same close correlation exists, but the funding pattern has been one of decreasing resources (Figure 6A). Figure 6A shows energy funding levels (symbol: o) and patents held by the national laboratories (symbol: ). The situation need not be as bleak as it seems. During the 1980s a number of changes in U.S. patent law permitted the national laboratories to engage in patent partnerships with the private sector. This increased both the interest in developing patents, and increased the interest by the private sector in pursuing patents on energy technologies. The squares (l) in figure 6 show that overall patents in the energy sector derived. Figure 6B reveals that patent levels in the nuclear field have declined, but not only that, public private partnerships have taken placed (shaded bars), but have not increased as dramatically as in energy field overall (Figure 6A). There are a number of issues here, so a simple comparison of nuclear R&D to that on for example, fuel cells, is not appropriate. But it is a valid to explore ways to increase both the diversity of the R&D. This is a particularly important message for federal policy. Novel approaches are needed to encourage new and innovative modes of research, teaching, and industrial innovation in the nuclear energy field. To spur innovation in nuclear science a concerted effort would be needed to increase the types and levels of cooperation by universities and industries in areas that depart significantly from the current 'Generation III+' and equally, away from the 'Generation IV' designs. Similar conclusions were reached by M. Granger Morgan, head of the Engineering and Public Policy Program at Carnegie Mellon University, in his evaluation of the need for innovative in the organization and sociology of the U. S. nuclear power industry’s. A second important issue that this Committee might consider is the degree of federal support for nuclear fission relative to other nations. Funding levels in the U.S. are significantly lower than in both Japan and France. Far from recommending higher public sector funding, what is arguably a more successful strategy would be to increase the private sector support for nuclear R&D and student training fellowships. Importantly, this is precisely the sort of expanded public private partnership that has been relatively successful in the energy sector generally. It is incorrect, however, to think that this is a process that can be left to the private sector. There are key issues that inhibit private sector innovation. As one example, many nuclear operating companies have large coal assets, and thus are unlikely to push overly hard, in areas that threaten another core business. This emphasis on industry resources used to support and expanded nuclear program - under careful public sector management - has-been echoed by a variety of nuclear engineering faculty members: I believe that if you. were to survey nuclear engineering department heads, most would select a national policy to support new nuclear construction, over a policy to increase direct financial support to nuclear engineering departments. A firm commitment by the federal government, to create incentives sufficient to ensure the construction of a modest number of new nuclear plants, with the incentives reduced for subsequent plants, would be the best thing that could possibly be done for nuclear engineering education and revitalization of the national workforce for nuclear science and technology. - Professor Per Peterson, Chair, Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

#### Needs centralized planning for investors to target energy needs.

Gene Preston, 4-15-2012, CEO at Transmission Adequacy Consulting, Manager System Planning at Austin Energy, Ph.D. and P.E. from the University of Texas in Electrical Engineering and physics, http://bravenewclimate.com/2012/04/12/the-nuclear-energy-solution/

The problem with electric markets in the US is that they have no long term outlook. The biddings for power sales extend into the future as far as the next Ipad model at Walmart, which is a few months at the most. You can’t build the equivalent of an Egyptian pyramid or Great Wall of China on such a short time scale. Our markets operate on the principle that if there are batches of trees to exploit, we should go cut them down and sell them immediately, and to heck with the next decade. So how do we pay for nuclear power plants? If the government ran the entire operation from conception to construction to operation to mothballing, then the financing and planning could be long term and being centralized it would all be coordinated. Ah, but this doesn’t allow the JP Morgan types to make money, because they would not own the nuclear resource. So here in the US the government has gotten out of the nuclear business. It doesn’t even want to deal with the waste issue. So let’s think for a moment. Investors are not interested in getting returns from their investments so far into the future so they aren’t interested in nuclear power. Most utilities are not interested in taking such a large financial risk so they aren’t interested in large nuclear plants. And individual customers don’t know how to invest or cannot invest in their own power supplies, either long term or short term. So there you have it. The reason we are not building nuclear plants is because there is no structure in place in the US to support the financing of large capital investments that pay off big time in the future.

#### Eliminating federal pre-emption destroys nuclear energy – small claims juries.

Donald E. Jose & Michael A. Garza, Spring 2007, Managing partner of Jose & Associates and J.D. at Georgetown, “The Complete Federal Preemption of Nuclear Safety Should Prevent Scientifically Irrational Jury Verdicts in Radiation Litigation,” Lexis Nexis

Federal law preempts radiation safety. n53 Unfortunately, the Cook judge and jury disregarded federal regulations of radiation safety. There are currently 104 NRC licensed operating nuclear reactors in the United States. n54 They provide 20% of the [\*10]nation's electricity. n55 In addition, there are 18 nuclear facilities associated with nuclear weapons production, one of which was Rocky Flats. n56 Finally, there are many nuclear fuel cycle sites where some work is done with radioactive material. n57 At some point each of these sites will be decommissioned, as Rocky Flats was, and the land transferred to other uses. The NRC allows the land upon which a nuclear power plant once stood to be decommissioned and transferred to private ownership for unrestricted uses as long as the residual radioactivity on the land (i.e. the "contamination" remaining after clean-up) would not cause a dose to a resident of the land exceeding 25 millirem per year. n58 The EPA agrees with the 25 millirem standard. n59 Yet, the Cook jury assessed half a billion dollars damages for a dose 10 times less. Obviously, a severe conflict exists between the federal regulation of nuclear safety and the Cook jury verdict. Either the federal agency with expertise backed by complete federal preemption controls the extent of decontamination required, or a lay jury can assert control through the damages they assess. Both the judgment of the federal agency and the judgment of the jury cannot be right and they cannot co-exist. One must be subjugated to the other. Either the federal agency with expertise in nuclear safety regulates clean-up to acceptable levels or the latest lay jury award effectively regulates through monetary damages, and perhaps destroys n60 the nuclear industry.

#### Compacts stick specifically to Obama.

Ted Cruz & Mario Loyola, December 2010, Senior Fellow at Center for Tenth Amendment Studies, Director at Center for Tenth Amendment Studies, “Shield of Federalism: Interstate Compacts in Our Constitution,” Texas Public Policy Foundation, <http://www.texaspolicy.com/center/tenth-amendment/reports/shield-federalism-interstate-compacts-our-constitution>

The American Republic is facing one of the greatest challenges of our history. In Washington, Republicans and Democrats alike have indulged the runaway spending and regulatory overreach of a federal government that continues to expand the scope of its powers unabated. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (“ObamaCare”) marks a dramatic new milestone in that expansion. Americans are starting to realize that restoring and protecting self-government requires a return to our founding principles of limited government and local control. As this nationwide movement gathers momentum, Americans are searching for tools to restore the Constitution’s founding principles. Among the most promising is the interstate compact. Its power as a constitutional device to regulate a multitude of regional issues has already been demonstrated: More than 200 interstate compacts are currently in force. And yet, as this paper shows, that power remains largely unexploited. Under our Constitution, interstate compacts that regulate matters within the enumerated powers of the federal government require congressional consent. That consent can be express (an affirmative majority vote in Congress) or even implied by congressional acquiescence. In the case of express congressional consent, historically that has been accomplished through either a bill or a resolution that typically has been presented to the President for his signature into law. Critically, once Congress consents to an interstate compact, the compact carries the force of federal law, trumping all prior federal and state law.

### Environmental Managerialism

#### Utilitarianism inevitable and good.

Joseph S. Nye, 1986, Phd Political Science Harvard. University; Served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; “Nuclear Ethics,” pg. 18-19

The significance and the limits of the two broad traditions can be captured by contemplating a hypothetical case.34 Imagine that you are visiting a Central American country and you happen upon a village square where an army captain is about to order his men to shoot two peasants lined up against a wall. When you ask the reason, you are told someone in this village shot at the captain's men last night. When you object to the killing of possibly innocent people, you are told that civil wars do not permit moral niceties. Just to prove the point that we all have dirty hands in such situations, the captain hands you a rifle and tells you that if you will shoot one peasant, he will free the other. Otherwise both die. He warns you not to try any tricks because his men have their guns trained on you. Will you shoot one person with the consequences of saving one, or will you allow both to die but preserve your moral integrity by refusing to play his dirty game? The point of the story is to show the value and limits of both traditions. Integrity is clearly an important value, and many of us would refuse to shoot. But at what point does the principle of not taking an innocent life collapse before the consequentialist burden? Would it matter if there were twenty or 1,000 peasants to be saved? What if killing or torturing one innocent person could save a city of 10 million persons from a terrorists' nuclear device? At some point does not integrity become the ultimate egoism of fastidious self-righteousness in which the purity of the self is more important than the lives of countless others? Is it not better to follow a consequentialist approach, admit remorse or regret over the immoral means, but justify the action by the consequences? Do absolutist approaches to integrity become self-contradictory in a world of nuclear weapons? "Do what is right though the world should perish" was a difficult principle even when Kant expounded it in the eighteenth century, and there is some evidence that he did not mean it to be taken literally even then. Now that it may be literally possible in the nuclear age, it seems more than ever to be self-contradictory.35 Absolutist ethics bear a heavier burden of proof in the nuclear age than ever before.

#### The perm solves.

Thomas Rohkrämer, 2005, History and Philosophy professor at Lancaster University, How Green Were the Nazis: Martin Heidegger, National Socialism, and Environmentalism, p. 184-5

Heidegger's topic was, then, rather common, but the grounding within the framework of Heidegger's philosophy made it highly original. Whereas previous cultural critics saw technology either as a tool that humans have to learn to use properly for the right purposes or as a demonic force that threatens to enslave humankind, Heidegger broke with them over the idea of regarding either humans or technology as autonomous agents. Humans are not transcendent subjects who use technology freely as a tool, hut have been born into and shaped by the technical world. On the other hand, technology cannot be an autonomous agent either: this view, a misplaced personification, ignores the fact that humans created the technical world, that they are part of it and have developed a "technological mentality" within the process of technological modernization. If all this is the case, then we cannot study technology from the outside or step out of the technological world, because its logic is part of our fundamental thought structure. Heidegger thus maintained his argument from "The Age of the World Picture" that our whole horizon of truth is scientific and technological; consequently, we cannot "unchoose" technology, as this would involve stepping out of the life-world that is historically given to us. Our horizon of truth makes us think and act technologically; we may work on realizing the limitations of this perspective, which Heidegger came to regard as imposing a partial blindness, and on altering this way of seeing the world, but we cannot simply step out of it.

#### Managerialism is key to prevent extinction.

Neil Levy, 1999, fellow of the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at Charles Sturt University, “Discourses of the Environment,” p. 215

If the ‘technological fix’ is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our uses of resources, we are nevertheless unable to simply leave the environment as it is. There is a real and pressing need for more, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have already set in train will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us, for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to develop real, concrete proposals for action, to reverse, or at least limit, the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behaviour towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207). In fact, we risk exacerbating these inequalities. It is no us, but the poor of Brazil, who will bear the brunt of the misery which would result form a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternative which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current greenhouse gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals for concrete action must be formiulated by ecologists, environmentalist, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impacts which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, very much the province for Foucault’s specific intellectual, the one who works ‘within specific sectors, at the precise points where their won conditions of life or work situate them’ (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as ‘the strategists of life and death’ than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man’s ‘politics places his existence as a living being in question’ (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the fate of our species, and of those with whone we share this planet, will be decided.

#### Even anti-managerialists would vote aff – the alternative would be a disaster.

Michael Zimmerman, 1989, “Introducution to Deep Ecology,” http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC22/Zimmrman.htm

A critique I hear often is that deep ecologists want to return to a way of life that's totally tied to the rhythms of the Earth, but at this point we have so disturbed those rhythms that we can't even consider going back. To retreat to a pre-technological state would in fact be dooming the Earth to destruction, whereas what we need now is to be more engaged in trying to repair the damage. How would a deep ecologist respond? Michael: I think deep ecologists have mixed emotions about that, but I would agree with that critique. For example, if we stopped our development at the current level, it would be a catastrophe, because our production methods are so dirty and inefficient and destructive that if we keep this up, we're really in trouble. Some deep ecologists say that it would be all for the best if the industrial world were just to collapse, despite all the human suffering that would entail. If such a thing ever occurs, some people have suggested, we could never revive industrialization again because the raw materials are no longer easily accessible. I hope that doesn't happen, and yet it may happen. Now, social ecologists say that deep ecologists flirt with fascism when they talk about returning to an "organic" social system that is "attuned to nature." They note that reactionary thinkers often contrast the supposedly "natural" way of life - which to them means social Darwinism and authoritarian social systems - with "modernity," which in politial terms means progressive social movements like liberalism and Marxism. But deep ecologists recognize this danger. They call not for a regression to collective authoritarianism, but for the evolution of a mode of awareness that doesn't lend itself to authoritarianism of any kind. So I think the only thing we can do is to move forward. We need to develop our efficiency and production methods so that we'll be able to take some of the pressure off the environment. We also need to develop increasing wealth for the highly populated countries so their populations will go down. [Ed. Note: See Lappé and Schurman, "The Population Puzzle," in IC #21.] There's a necessity for new technology. The question is, can it be made consistent with our growing awareness that the planet is really hurting?

#### The alternative can’t solve – it gets rolled back.

George Kateb, 1997, William Nelson Cromwell Professor of Politics, Emeritus, at Princeton University, “Technology and Society,” Social research Vol. 64 Issue 3

But the question arises as to where a genuine principle of limitation on technological endeavor would come from. It is scarcely conceivable that Western humanity – and by now most of humanity , because of their pleasures and interests and theor won passions and desires and motives – would halt the technological project. Even if, by some change of heart, Western humanity could adopt an alterned relation to reality and human beings, how could it be enforced and allowed to yield its effects? The technological project can only be stopped by some global catastrophe that it had helped or cause or was powerless to avoid. Heidegger’s teasing invocation of the idea that a saving remedy grows with the worst danger is useless. In any case, no one would want the technological project halted, if the only way was a global catastrophe. Perhaps even the survivors would not want to block it reemergence.

#### Human-centeredness is key to solving climate – Aff is a DA.

David Schmidtz, 2000. Philosophy, University of Arizona, Environmental Ethics, p. 379-408

Like economic reasoning, ecological reasoning is reasoning about equilibria and perturbations that keep systems from converging on equilibria. Like economic reasoning, ecological reasoning is reasoning about competition and unintended consequences, and the internal logic of systems, a logic that dictates how a system responds to attempts to manipulate it. Environmental activism and regulation do not automatically improve the environment. It is a truism in ecology, as in economics, that well-intentioned interventions do not necessarily translate into good results. Ecology (human and nonhuman) is complicated, our knowledge is limited, and environmentalists are themselves only human. Intervention that works with the system’s logic rather than against it can have good consequences. Even in a centrally planned economy, the shape taken by the economy mainly is a function not of the central plan but of how people respond to it, and people respond to central plans in ways that best serve their purposes, not the central planner’s. Therefore, even a dictator is in no position simply to decide how things are going to go. Ecologists understand that this same point applies in their own discipline. They understand that an ecology’s internal logic limits the directions in which it can be taken by would-be ecological engineers. Within environmental philosophy, most of us have come around to something like Aldo Leopold’s view of humans as plain citizens of the biotic community.[[21]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn22) As Bryan Norton notes, the contrast between anthropocentrism and biocentrism obscures the fact that we increasingly need to be nature-centered to be properly human-centered; we need to focus on "saving the ecological systems that are the context of human cultural and economic activities." [[22]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn23) If we do not tend to what is good for nature, we will not be tending to what is good for people either. As Gary Varner recently put it, on purely anthropocentric grounds we have reason to think biocentrically.[[23]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn24) I completely agree. What I wish to add is that the converse is also true: on purely biocentric grounds, we have reason to think anthropocentrically. We need to be human-centered to be properly nature-centered, for if we do not tend to what is good for people, we will not be tending to what is good for nature either. From a biocentric perspective, preservationists sometimes are not anthropocentric enough. They sometimes advocate policies and regulations with no concern for values and priorities that differ from their own. Even from a purely biocentric perspective, such slights are illegitimate. Policy makers who ignore human values and human priorities that differ from their own will, in effect, be committed to mismanaging the ecology of which those ignored values and priorities are an integral part.

#### The move to let beings be and stop all modes of production is ethically bankrupt.

Tom Blees, 2008, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Prescription for the Planet, p. 124

This is illustrative of a general disconnect between scientific progress and the evolution of social consciousness. The advances of science seem to have outpaced humanity’s ability to adapt. Rather than encouraging people to examine pressing issues with logic and reason, an antagonistic anti-intellectualism has taken hold of many, certainly in America at least. So we find ourselves on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand we have the seemingly unstoppable march of science, and on the other an anachronistic mindset more suited to life in the Dark Ages. The ensuing problems are exacerbated by the sheer volume of people on the planet, and that number is rising with appalling speed, lending an urgency to our environmental problems that might otherwise be somewhat postponed. Yet who is prepared to forgo the benefits of modern medicine in order to bring the critical population portion of our dilemma under control? This is not to say that many people wouldn’t be perfectly happy—or at least willfully oblivious—to withholding modern124medicine from others in geographically and culturally distant lands. Such an execrably inhumane attitude confronted me when I founded a nonprofit organization some years ago with the intention of drilling water wells in poor villages to prevent the dreadful rates of mortality from waterborne disease. I was frankly aghast at the number of seemingly normal people who, in one way or another, cast doubt upon the advisability of preventing the needless deaths of children in underdeveloped countries lest they survive to reproductive age and only add to our population dilemma. Let it be said that those who are unwilling to forgo the benefits of modern medicine, electricity, air travel, safe food and water, and all the other fruits of technology have no right to expect others to deny themselves those same things simply by dint of their nation of birth. Indeed, the well-documented link between an improvement in standard of living and population self-control would more logically lead us to attempt to spread both education and modernity to all corners of the earth. Such a course of action would most effectively address the population growth that is arguably one of the greatest developing crises in the history of our planet. It is the height of selfishness to countenance consigning billions of people to an inferior life so that the “civilized” nations can greedily pillage the world’s resources. Such a position, besides being ethically unconscionable, is based on outmoded thinking, as will be made clear in the pages to follow.

#### The alternative fails – distinguishing between humans and the rest of the environment is inevitable.

Eugene Hargrove, 2003, “Weak Antrhopecentric Intrinsic Value,” Blackwell Synergy

I have used the term weak anthropocentrism, rather than simply anthropocentrism, in the title of this paper to help call attention to the fact that not all anthropocentric valuing is instrumental. Wihtout the addition of the word weak, no doubt many nonanthropocentrists would probably conclude that the title contained a typographical error or was a contradiction in terms: “instrumentali intrinsic value.” While I do no think that labels are important, it is useful to call the view I represent weak anthropocentrism at least until it becomes generally recognized that anthropocentrism does no imply instrumentalism. I do not think that it is possible for humans to avoid being anthropocentric given that whatever we humans value will always be form a human (or anthropocentric) point of view, even when we try to imagine what is might be like to have the point of view of (or be) a bat, a tree, or a mountain, in my view, we are still looking at the world anthropocentrically – the way a human imagines that a nonhuman might look at the world.

### Agenda Politics

#### Fiscal cliff won’t be addressed right away – Congress will punt the problem – no direct trade-off.

Patti Domm, 11-9-2012, CNBC business, “What Markets Want from Washington on 'Fiscal Cliff',” <http://www.cnbc.com/id/49759522>

McCarthy expects the process to go well into next year and he expects it to be difficult. Some analysts expect Congress to find a way to punt the problem into next year, by partially resolving some issues this year. “This is not going to go smoothly and I’m not optimistic about what happens between now and year end, but I am optimistic that some type of coherent agreement will be reached by the middle of next year,” he said. “The fiscal cliff is going to morph into fiscal water torture. There will be a series of crisis driven events that force them to address the budget, and it will happen right after the inauguration because that’s when the debt ceiling will become a binding constraint and when that happens it threatens the Treasury auctions and it threatens government shutdown.”

#### Don’t buy their doomsday fiscal cliff scenarios – it’s more of a gentle slope.

Danielle Kurtzleben, 11-8-2012, is a business and economics reporter for U.S. News & World Report, U.S. News & World Report, “An Extremely Simple Explanation of the 'Fiscal Cliff',” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/11/08/an-extremely-simple-explanation-of-the-fiscal-cliff?page=2>

So if they don't do anything by New Year's Eve, then we're all doomed? Things will be bad, yes, but not immediately. With all of the scary talk about recessions and unemployment, it's easy to think of all this as a reason for a Y2K-style, build-a-bunker-and-amass-weaponry freak-out. But the effects won't be immediate. Rather, the fiscal cliff is really more of a hill—we wouldn't all wake up on Jan. 1 to a new jobs crisis and immediate recession. The provisions would affect the economy over months. Defense cuts could hurt defense contractors, causing those companies to lay off workers. And tax hikes could mean that, come April, tax bills could be thousands of dollars higher for some families. So calling it a "fiscal gentle slope" doesn't really convey a sense of the painful recession it could cause (not to mention the fact that it's not very punchy).

#### Congress is far apart from a compromise on the fiscal cliff now – tax rates – won’t happen in the lame duck.

John H. Cushman Jr., 11-7-2012, The New York Times, “Boehner Strikes Conciliatory Tone in Talk of Fiscal Cliff,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/08/us/politics/back-to-bargaining-table-with-fiscal-cliff-dead-ahead.html?pagewanted=all>

 “Mr. President, this is your moment,” Mr. Boehner told reporters in the Capitol. “We’re ready to be led, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans.” The offer may be enough to bring the parties to the table in the wake of an election that kept President Obama in power, strengthened the Democrats’ grip on the Senate and chipped away at the still-large Republican majority in the House. But Democrats and Republicans are still far apart. Mr. Boehner made it clear that his vision for additional revenue includes a tax code that lowers even the top income tax rate from where it is now, 35 percent, not where it would be in January when the Bush-era tax cuts are set to expire — 39.6 percent. At least some of that additional revenue would come from economic growth that he said would be fueled by a simpler tax code. Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, the third-ranking Democrat, has said those constructs are unacceptable. Democratic leaders say tax reform that lowers tax rates across the board would either hurt the middle class by trimming vital tax benefits like the home mortgage deduction or would not raise enough taxes to meaningfully reduce the deficit. Mr. Reid underscored Mr. Obama’s contention that tax rates on the rich must rise, saying “the vast majority of Americans” support that, “including rich people.” But in language and timing, the leaders of Congress’s two chambers left the unmistakable impression that they want a deal at least large enough to avert the worst economic impacts of a sudden rise in income, payroll, capital gains, dividend, interest and estate tax rates that would affect virtually every American family, working or not. Mr. Boehner has said for months that a deal to reform taxes and entitlements and substantially lower the deficit is not appropriate for a lame-duck Congress.

#### Carbon tax bundled in kill’s consensus.

Reuters, 11-8-2012, “Carbon tax suddenly part of 'fiscal cliff' debate,” <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/49751113/ns/us_news-environment/>

A potential tax on big polluters, a taboo subject in the United States in recent years, has come back into the spotlight as some sense potential for a revenue windfall at a time lawmakers look for ways to the so-called "fiscal cliff" of tax rises and spending cuts due in early 2013. The aftermath of Superstorm Sandy, which devastated parts of the U.S. East Coast last week, has raised fresh questions about the links between climate change and extreme weather events, which also makes the idea of a carbon tax more appealing. A carbon tax is a mechanism to charge emitters of greenhouse gases, such as power plants and oil refiners, for each ton of carbon dioxide they emit. Prospects for such a tax as a way to address pollution and climate are probably dim in a still deeply-divided Congress, but some analysts say the measure would be more attractive if positioned as a source of new revenue. In fact, a recent report by the Congressional Research Service, suggesting a $20 per ton tax on carbon emissions could halve the U.S. budget deficit over time. Such a tax would generate about $88 billion in 2012, rising to $144 billion by 2020, the report said, slashing U.S. debt by between 12 and 50 percent within a decade, depending on how high the deficit climbs, the report said. A handful of former Republican policymakers - ones most likely to reject new or higher taxes as a matter of principle - have been touting its potential to raise revenue for a cash-strapped federal budget. In research notes after Tuesday's presidential election, analysts at global banks HSBC and Citigroup flagged a carbon tax as a program that could potentially emerge in President Barack Obama's second term." One major fiscal possibility is a new carbon tax, which is likely to garner far more support this time around than at any time in the past and could become an appealing part of an emerging consensus on how to avoid the fiscal cliff," said a note from Citigroup's investment research group. Paul Bledsoe, an independent policy consultant, said a carbon tax on polluters would be "better for the economy than our current taxes on work." The measure would garner more support if its economic benefits are touted rather than its ability to help the administration achieve its green goals, said Bledsoe, who served as staff on the Senate finance committee during the 1993 budget negotiations. The U.S. Treasury has funded a major carbon tax analysis that will explore how the country's tax code can be used to cut greenhouse gas emissions. The report is being drafted by the National Academies of Science (NAS), which has commissioned a panel of economic specialists to analyze how to reform the way the government raises revenue to encourage cuts in emissions of gases that are blamed for climate change. The committee, which has met five times since April 2011, is reviewing how direct taxes, such as fuel-related provisions, and indirect measures, such as home mortgage deductions, will increase or decrease emissions rates. The paper was commissioned by legislation enacted during the George W. Bush administration in 2008, but not funded until 2009. It will be submitted to Congress next spring. In recent months, a number of moderate Republicans, including a few economists that advised Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney, have declared their support for a carbon tax, leading some to believe there is a chance for bipartisan support in Congress. Harvard professor Gregory Mankiw, economic adviser to Romney, wrote in a 2007 column that "if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax." Former Republican Congressmen Sherwood Boehlert and Wayne Gilchrest joined Democrats Henry Waxman and Ed Markey to support a carbon tax in February. In July, former Republican Congressman Bob Inglis launched a think tank to promote a plan to raise taxes on fossil fuels while cutting income tax, a concept previously supported by former Democratic Vice President Al Gore. Even George Shultz, Ronald Reagan's former Secretary of State and a fellow at the Hoover Institution, entered the fray, saying that a carbon tax that returns revenue to taxpayers could garner the support of his party." The fact that you are seeing more voices come into the conversation and talk about it is a welcome one," said Nat Keohane, vice president at the Environmental Defense Fund and former special assistant to Obama on energy and environmental issues. "Hurricane Sandy has helped reboot this conversation," he said, by becoming just the latest in a year of extreme weather events in the United States, including major droughts and historic wildfires. Some remain unconvinced that the Republican-controlled House Of Representatives will be anything but hostile to attempts to price carbon, despite the post-election, post-Sandy buzz. "I'm quite a skeptic regarding carbon taxes, and I doubt that President Obama could gain enough support in the House to enact one even as part of a broader tax-reform package," said Kenneth Green, a resident scholar at the conservative American Enterprise Institute.

#### More evidence.

Tom Blees, 5-31-2011, is the author of Prescription for the Planet, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Idaho Samizdat: Nuke Notes, “Critique of MIT Nuclear Fuel Cycle Report,” <http://djysrv.blogspot.com/2011/05/critique-of-mit-nuclear-fuel-cycle.html>

The public views adequate nuclear waste management as a critical linchpin in further development of nuclear energy. The technical community, therefore, needs to provide a practical approach to deal with the waste issue. The Fukushima accidents call attention to the importance of managing spent fuel safely. It appears the best technical approach is extracting the actinides from spent fuel, which reduces the effective lifetime of nuclear wastes from ~300,000 years to ~300 years. Extracting actinides (and using them to generate power) is by far the best technical approach to dealing with nuclear wastes. The MIT Study fails to mention this important possibility. If actinide extraction is chosen as a pathway for waste “disposal,” the recovered actinides still must be transmuted to fissile material or fissioned directly. This can be done only in fast reactors. Actinides can be burned in fast reactors, generating energy and at the same time creating more fissile material for the future. A key advantage of fast reactors is that they can be utilized as “burners” when excess plutonium inventories exist, and then converted to “breeders” whenever needed. Only fast reactors can satisfy the waste-disposal mission simply and effectively while extending utilization of the uranium resources by more than two orders of magnitude. Thermal reactors—such as LWRs and high-temperature gas-cooled reactors—utilize less than 1% of uranium resources, even with recycling of plutonium and some of the uranium. Thermal-spectrum reactors, even optimized, can extend the resource utilization only marginally, and they cannot burn actinides effectively. Actinide recycling also requires an efficient processing technology, with improved economics and nonproliferation characteristics. The pyroprocessing technique based on electrorefining, developed in the IFR program, has the potential to recover the actinides from LWR spent fuel as well as to fully recycle fuel in fast reactors. The fundamentals of pyroprocessing have already been demonstrated – this is not new science. The technology is now ready for pilot-scale demonstration, and it should be given the highest priority. We do not need decades of R&D to pursue all esoteric ideas. We already have in our hands on the most advanced technology, technology that no other countries possess. The MIT Study also talks about the inter-generational equity considerations. We believe that our generation should demonstrate the technologies that will solve the energy supply and waste management problems, rather than proposing a century-long interim storage of the spent nuclear fuel.

#### Loan guarantees for nuclear specifically popular – lower tax liability.

Sharon Squassoni, November 2009, is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in the nonprolifera-tion program. Prior to joining Carnegie, she held various positions in the US government, including at the Congressional research Service, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the US State Department, is a frequent contributor to journals, magazines and books on nuclear proliferation and defense, The Centre for International Governance Innovation, No. 7, “The US Nuclear Industry: Current Status and Prospects under the Obama Administration,” p. 8, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Nuclear_Energy_7_0.pdf>

The single most important spur to build new reactors in the United States is loan guarantees. In fact, industry sources indicate they are so critical that new plants may not be built without them. These guarantees are attractive to the US Congress because they offer a way to influence markets and incentivize specific projects, and because they are “scored” as a lower liability for the taxpayer than the actual amount. Thus, a potential US$50 billion in loan guarantees could be scored by the Congressional Budget Office as only costing the taxpayer US$500 million. As originally proposed in the Energy Policy Act (EPACT) of 2005, loan guarantees would only have applied to nuclear power, but this was broadened to apply to a wide range of “innovative energy technologies,” including renewable energy technologies, which further extends their attractiveness within Congress.

#### Bipartisan support –strong interest group backing, state approval.

Press Action, 3-12-2012, “U.S. Nuclear Industry Operates as if Fukushima Never Happened,” <http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/nuclearsubsidies03122012/>

Both Democrats and Republicans have had a long love affair with commercial nuclear power, and the relationship is showing no signs of losing steam. Since the 1950s, members of both parties have enthusiastically lavished electric utility companies with expensive gifts, ranging from subsidies to protection from liability for disasters to loan guarantees, all underwritten by U.S. taxpayers. The political calculus is simple: nuclear power enjoys unanimous support in Washington. Try to name one member of the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives who favors shutting down the nation’s 104 commercial nuclear reactors. Federal agencies, from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Department of Energy to the Nuclear Regulatory, have worked diligently through the years to promote nuclear power. At the state level, support for nuclear power also is extremely strong, although there are some politicians—albeit a tiny number—who have publicly called for the closure of certain nuclear plants.

#### Political capital theory not true.

Lawrence Jacobs & Desmond King, 2010, University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics

 But personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency. Modern presidents have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they have routinely failed to enact much of their agendas. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas, and often accommodated stakeholders. Decades of rigorous research find that impersonal, structural forces offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact.8 Quantitative research that compares legislative success and presidential personality finds no overall relationship.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 Findings point to the predominant influence on presidential legislative success of the ideological and partisan composition of Congress, entrenched interests, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority. The widespread presumption, then, that Obama's personal traits or leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by a generation of scholarship on the presidency. Indeed, the presumption is not simply problematic analytically, but practically as well. For the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may, paradoxically, induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. Presidential sales pitches go only so far.

#### We would quickly readjust to the fiscal cliff.

Cyrus Sanati, 11-9-2012, market analyst, CNN, Finance-Fortune, “The fiscal cliff may be overblown,” <http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2012/11/09/fiscal-cliff-2/>

The increase in federal taxes and the reductions in federal spending would cut the budget deficit (the difference between how much revenue the government takes in how much it spends) from $1.1 trillion last year to $641 billion in fiscal 2013, roughly a $500 billion cut. That represents a reduction in the budget deficit (as a percentage share of GDP) not seen since 1969 when the conservative Richard Nixon booted the free-spending Lyndon Johnson out of the White House. The cuts in spending and the increased taxes will cause thousands of people to lose their jobs pretty much overnight (millions of Americans owe their jobs directly or indirectly to federal government spending). This would push unemployment up across the country from 7.9% to 9.1%. As a result, the CBO projects that real GDP would drop by 0.5% in 2013 after growing by 2.1% in 2012. Real GDP would fall at an annual rate of 2.9% in the first half of next year, tipping the nation into a recession that the CBO figures would be similar in magnitude to the one the nation experienced following the first Persian Gulf War in the early 1990s (for those who didn't live through that, it was bad). The CBO anticipates that the Federal Reserve would engage in another round of quantitative easing and buy up bonds in the open markets to keep rates low – this would ironically be done by printing money out of thin air (but no one in Washington, save Rep. Ron Paul, seems to care about that). This counterweight to the spending cuts should help support the markets, but it probably won't be enough to counter the negative impact associated with the tax increases on dividends and capital gains. That all sounds pretty grim, but the CBO suggests that the nation would begin to rapidly adjust to the fiscal cliff, projecting that economic growth would "be brisk" in 2014 and 2015, pushing economic output back to where it projects it will be if the government doesn't head down the fiscal cliff. Unemployment would remain elevated but would fall back to 8.4% in the last quarter of 2014 and then drift down slowly to a more reasonable 5.7% by the end of 2017. For all the panic that the fiscal cliff has set off, it doesn't seem like the end of the world.

## 1AR

### 1AR politics

#### U.S. not key to global economy.

NYT (New York Times), July 2009 “In Asia, a Derided Theory Returns,” http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C0CEFDE163EF932A35754C0A96F9C8B63&pagewanted=1

For a while, when the global economic crisis was at its worst, it was a dirty word that only the most provocative of analysts dared to use. Now, the D-word -- decoupling -- is making a comeback, and nowhere more so than in Asia. Put simply, the term refers to the theory that emerging countries -- whether China or Chile -- will become more independent of the ups and downs in the United States as their economies become stronger and more sophisticated. For much of last year, the theory held up. Many emerging economies had steered clear of investments that dragged down a string of banking behemoths in the West, and saw nothing like the turmoil that began to engulf the United States and Europe in 2007. But then, last autumn, when the collapse of Lehman Brothers caused the global financial system to convulse and consumer demand to shrivel, emerging economies around the world got caught in the downdraft, and the D-word became mud. Now, the tables are turning again, especially in Asia, where many emerging economies are showing signs of a stronger recovery than in the West. And economists here have begun to use the D-word in public once again. ''Decoupling is happening for real,'' the chief Asia-Pacific economist at Goldman Sachs in Hong Kong, Michael Buchanan, said in a recent interview. Or as the senior Asia economist at HSBC, Frederic Neumann, said, ''Decoupling is not a dirty word.'' To be sure, the once sizzling pace of Asian economic growth has slowed sharply as exports to and investments from outside the region slumped. Across Asia, millions of people have lost their jobs as business drops off and companies cut costs and output. Asia is heavily dependent upon selling its products to consumers in the United States and Europe, and many executives still say a strong U.S. economy is a prerequisite for a return to the boom of years past. Nevertheless, the theory of decoupling is back on the table. For the past couple of months, data from around the world have revealed a growing divergence between Western economies and those in much of Asia, notably China and India. The World Bank last week forecast that the economies of the euro zone and the United States would contract 4.5 percent and 3 percent, respectively, this year -- in sharp contrast to the 7.2 percent and 5.1 percent economic growth it forecasts for China and India. Forecasts from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that were also published last week backed up this general trend. Major statistics for June, due Wednesday, are expected to show manufacturing activity in China and India are on the mend. By contrast, purchasing managers' indexes for Europe and the United States are forecast to be merely less grim than before but still show contractions. Why this diverging picture? The crisis hit Asia much later. While the U.S. economy began languishing in 2007, Asian economies were still doing well right up until the collapse of Lehman Brothers last September. What followed was a rush of stimulus measures -- rate cuts and government spending programs. In Asia's case, these came soon after things soured for the region; in the United States, they came much later in the country's crisis. Moreover, developing Asian economies were in pretty good shape when the crisis struck. The last major crisis to hit the region -- the financial turmoil of 1997-98 -- forced governments in Asia to introduce overhauls that ultimately left them with lower debt levels, more resilient banking and regulatory systems and often large foreign exchange reserves. Another crucial difference is that Asia, unlike the United States and Europe, has not had a banking crisis. Bank profits in Asia have plunged and some have had to raise extra capital but there have been no major collapses and no bailouts. ''The single most important thing to have happened in Asia is that there has not been a banking crisis,'' said Andrew Freris, a regional strategist at BNP Paribas in Hong Kong. ''Asia is coming though this crisis with its banking system intact. Yes, some banks may not be making profits -- but it is cyclical and not systemic.''

### 1AR States CP

#### Reprocessing would be a less attractive option under state action – wouldn’t be economically competitive.

Sherwood L. Boehlert, 2006, New York Judge, circuit chairman, ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF NUCLEAR FUEL REPROCESSING, Hearing before the Committee on Science House of Representatives, One Hundred Ninth Congress, <http://www.house.gov/science>

Some of the major factors influencing the economic competitiveness of reprocessing are: the availability and cost of uranium, costs associated with interim storage and long-term disposal in a geologic repository, reprocessing plant construction and operating costs, and costs associated with transmutation, the process by which certain parts of the spent fuel are actively reduced in toxicity to address long-term waste management. Costs associated with reducing greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel-powered plants could help make nuclear power, including reprocessing, economically competitive with other sources of electricity in a free market. It is not clear who would pay for reprocessing in the U.S. The options are: the government paying, the utilities themselves paying (not likely) or consumers paying in the form of higher electric rates. Passing the cost increases on to the consumer may not be as simple as it seems in the context of the current regulatory environment. In States with regulated utilities, regulators generally insist on using the lowest-cost source of electricity available and in States with competing electricity providers, the utilities themselves favor the lowest-cost solutions for the power they provide. To the extent that reprocessing raises the cost of nuclear power relative to other sources, reprocessing would be less attractive in both of these situations. As a result, utilities have shown little interest in reprocessing.