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#### Agency discussions are essential to education about energy policy

Valentine 10 Scott Victor Valentine - Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, Singapore, “Canada’s constitutional separation of (wind) power” Energy Policy, Volume 38, Issue 4, April 2010,

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009227

Should policymakers facilitate renewable energy capacity development **through distributive policies (i.e. subsidies), regulatory policies** (i.e. CO2 emission caps), redistributive policies (i.e. carbon taxes) or constituent policies (i.e. green energy campaigns) (Lowi, 1972)? A preponderance of research has gone into addressing this question from **various conceptual perspectives**, which include popular themes such as comparing the efficacy of various policy instruments (cf. Blakeway and White, 2005; EWEA, 2005; Menza and Vachona, 2006; cf. Lipp, 2007), championing the efficacy of one specific instrument (cf. Sorrell and Sijm, 2003; cf. Mathews, 2008), assessing the impact that socio-economic dynamics have on the selection or design of policy instruments (cf. Maruyama et al., 2007; cf. Huang and Wu, 2009), investigating policy instrument selection in stakeholder networks (cf. Rowlands, 2007; cf. Mander, 2008), investigating hurdles to effective policy instruments implementation (cf. Alvarez-Farizo and Hanley, 2002), and examining challenges associated with evaluating policy instrument efficacy (cf. Mallon, 2006; cf. Vine, 2008).

**Despite the proliferation of studies on policy instruments in the** renewable **energy policy field**, there are no prominent examples of studies which investigate the impact that the federal form of government has on strategic selection of policy instruments. Federal government systems are characterized by power-sharing between the central authority and the regions comprising the federation. For federal policymakers, the manner in which power is divided can pose significant policy-making problems (Thorlakson, 2003). Specifically, federal attempts to apply coercive policy instruments in policy areas of regional or concurrent (shared) authority can generate political, legal or operational resistance by regional authorities. Even when developing policy for areas under federal jurisdiction, regional authorities have to avail their various “thrust and riposte” tactics to undermine the efficacy of disagreeable federal policies (Braun et al., 2002). Given that there are 24 nations with a federal government structure (including the major economies of the United States, Germany, Canada, Australia, Russia, India, Spain, Brazil and Mexico), a **formal enquiry into the impact that federal structure has on renewable energy policy instrument development is merited.**

#### VI for limits and ground---hundreds of relevant actors, from the DoE to DOD, courts, executive all conduct different energy programs and have different restrictions ---overstretches our research burden and wrecks 1NC strategy.

### 1NC

#### The United States federal government should establish a cap-and-trade system for carbon emissions in the United States. The federal government should reduce the corporate income tax and business capital-gains taxes

#### Targeting specific industries and technology fails---cap and trade is key to market-based solutions that solve the case better

Morris et al 12 Adele C. Morris, Fellow and Deputy Director of the. Climate and Energy Economics project at Brookings, Pietro S. Nivola, Charles Schultze, Brookings Scholars, "CLEAN ENERGY:REVISITING THE CHALLENGES OF INDUSTRIAL POLICY" June 4 www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/04%20clean%20energy%20morris%20nivola%20schultze/04\_clean\_energy\_morris\_nivola\_schultze.pdf

Public investments of these magnitudes, targeted at specific industries, arguably constitute an industrial policy, albeit a sectoral one, unlike the earlier proposals of the 1980's —that is, a government strategy to steer resources toward select producers or technologies. The rationale and efficacy of these clean-energy expenditures call for scrutiny.

Proponents offer numerous reasons for scaling up particular energy technologies at the taxpayer's expense. One set of reasons involves the need to remediate market failures that have not been corrected by other policies. For example, clean-energy technologies are said to emit fewer greenhouse gases than do traditional sources per unit of energy produced. The United States does not have an economy-wide policy to control greenhouse gases, most notably, one that puts a price on C02 that reflects the environmental harm associated with use of fossil fuels.

A far more effective policy than subsidies for clean energy research, development and demonstration would be a tax or a cap-and-trade regime that would put an appropriate price on carbon and other greenhouse gases. Properly implemented, this alternative approach would help level the playing field for greener energy sources, for it would require emitters to pay prices that reflect the costs their emissions impose on society. The enhanced efficiency that would result has been widely recognized by economists.6 True costs would flow to purchasers of goods and services that require energy, suitably inducing conservation. Emitters would have incentives to invest in equipment and new production techniques, use alternative fuels, and seek other methods to reduce emissions. And America's innovators would channel their efforts into inventing, scaling up, and marketing competitive forms of clean energy. However, because existing market signals do not suffice to encourage climate-friendly technologies, carefully targeted federal funding seems warranted. But as we explain later, it is ironically only after incorporating the social costs of energy into market prices that many clean energy subsidies will succeed in deploying new technologies.

#### Incentives cause government dependence and undermines innovation

Loris 11 Nicolas Loris is an analyst in the Heritage Foundation’s Roe Institute of Economic Policy Studies. "Power Down the Subsidies to Energy Producers" Aug 3 www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/08/power-down-the-subsidies-to-energy-producers

America has an energy addiction - and it’s not an addiction to oil, as many politicians would have you think. It’s an addiction to government subsidies. The addicts, you see, are energy producers, not the consumers.

Their growing dependence on federal handouts is the real cause of America’s energy crisis. Energy subsidies have needlessly wasted taxpayer dollars, retarded commercialization of new technologies and failed to reduce our reliance on foreign energy sources. Washington would do well to end all energy subsidies.

Energy subsidies come in numerous forms ranging from direct expenditures to targeted tax breaks, from production mandates to loan guarantees. Basically, any public policy that favorsthe production or consumption of one type of energy over another can be considered a subsidy.

None of them come cheap. According to the Energy Information Agency, the federal government gave the energy industry $8.2 billion in subsidies and financial aid in 1999. This figure more than doubled to $17.9 billion in 2007 and more than doubled again to $37.2 billion last year.

But the damage subsidies inflict on our economy extends well beyond direct costs. A special endorsement from the government artificially props up that technology. This reduces the incentive for the producer to become cost-competitive, stifles innovation and encourages government dependence.

The federal government has no business picking commercial winners and losers. That’s the job of the marketplace. Indeed, it’s doubly damaging when government decides to manipulate the market through subsidies, because government - almost invariably - picks losers. That’s not surprising, because companies that seek handouts most strenuously are those that cannot compete without them.

#### Solves great power war

**Baru 9** Sanjaya is a Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School in Singapore Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis, Strategic Analysis, Volume 33, Issue 2 March 2009 , pages 163 – 168

Hence, economic policies and performance do have **strategic consequences.**2 In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the **foundation of power** was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. 'Victory (in war)', Kennedy claimed, 'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base'.3 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic **wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to** efficiently **mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence**, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, 'that all of the major shifts in the world's military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the **major Great Power wars**, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.4 In Kennedy's view, the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis, or even decline, would be transmitted through a nation's inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and **military power**.

#### Nuclear is overwhelmingly uncompetitive even with loan guarantees

Lovins 10 AMORY B. LOVINS is Chair and Chief Scientist of Rocky Mountain Institute "Nuclear Socialism" Weekly Standard, VOL. 16, NO. 06 Oct 25 www.weeklystandard.com/articles/nuclear-socialism\_508830.html?page=1

Yet nuclear subsidies to some of the world’s largest corporations have become shockingly large. A Maryland reactor’s developer reckoned just its requested federal loan guarantee would transfer $14.8 billion of net present value, comparable to its construction cost, from American taxpayers to the project’s 50/50 owners—Électricité de France (EDF), 84 percent owned by the French government, and a private utility 9.5 percent owned by EDF. The project’s builder, AREVA, is 93 percent owned by the French state, yet has been promised a $2 billion U.S. loan guarantee for a fuel plant competing with an American one. EDF just booked a billion-euro loss provision, mainly over the Maryland plant’s deteriorating prospects. AREVA’s construction fiascoes in Finland and France have “seriously shaken” confidence, says EDF’s ex-chairman, and four nations’ safety regulators have criticized the design. Meanwhile, the chairman of Exelon, the top U.S. nuclear operator, says cheap natural gas will postpone new nuclear plants for a decade or two. Slack electricity demand and unpriced carbon emissions further weaken the nuclear case. Markets would therefore charge a risk premium. But U.S. nuclear power evades market discipline​—or did until October 8, 2010, when the Maryland promoter shelved the project because, for its $7.5 billion federal loan guarantee, it would have to have paid an “unworkable” $0.88 billion fee, or 11.6 percent, to cover the default risk to taxpayers.

### 1NC

#### Fiscal cliff compromise will pass but political capital is key

Kimberly Atkins 11-8, Boston Herald columnist, “Prez returns to D.C. with more clout,” 11/8/12, http://bostonherald.com/news/columnists/view/20221108prez\_returns\_to\_dc\_with\_more\_clout

When President Obama returned yesterday to the White House, he brought with him political capital earned in a tough re-election fight as well as a mandate from voters — which means bold changes and bruising fights could lie ahead. ¶ The first agenda item is already waiting for him: reaching an agreement with lawmakers to avert the looming fiscal cliff. GOP lawmakers have previously shot down any plan involving tax increases. Obama’s win — based in part on a message of making the wealthiest Americans pay more — may already be paying dividends.¶ In remarks at the Capitol yesterday, House Speaker John Boehner seemed to acknowledge the GOP has to take a different tack than the obstructionism that has marred progress in the past.¶ “The president has signaled a willingness to do tax reform with lower rates. Republicans have signaled a willingness to accept new revenue if it comes from growth and reform,” Boehner said. “Let’s start the discussion there.” ¶ Obama’s fresh political clout could extend to longer term fiscal policies beyond the fiscal cliff, though don’t expect GOP pushback to vanish. House Republicans still have plenty of fight in them. ¶ Comprehensive immigration reform — designed to smooth the path to citizenship while also strengthening the nation’s borders — also will be high on the president’s priority list. But unlike in his first term, when such a plan got little more than lip service in the face of staunch GOP opposition, Obama’s 3-to-1 support from Latinos on Election Day gives him the incentive to get it done. It also robs Republicans, who learned firsthand that dwindling support from Hispanics and other minority groups is costing them dearly, of any reason to stand in the way. ¶ An influx of new female voices in the Senate could also make Obama’s next four years the “Term of the Woman,” putting a new focus on equal pay and reproductive rights. ¶ U.S. Sen. Patty Murray of Washington state, who chairs the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, told reporters yesterday that having a historically high 20 women in the Senate in January won’t just mean more attention to women’s issues. She said the Senate will function better overall with “great women who have really strong voices” on board, such as U.S. Sen.-elect Elizabeth Warren. “There is no stronger advocate for middle-class Americans,” Murray said of Warren. ¶ None of this, of course, will be a cakewalk, but unlike his first term, Obama will have more power to push back.

#### Plan’s massively unpopular

Werbach 11 Adam Werbach is the author of Strategy for Sustainability: A Business Manifesto and the Chief Sustainability Officer for global agency Saatchi & Saatchi. “Japan Quake May Stall U.S. Nuclear-Power Expansion Plans,” March 15, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2011/03/japan-quake-may-stall-us-nuclear-power-expansion-plans/72485/

Renewable energy advocates are concerned that the unraveling nuclear crisis in Japan may prove to be a setback for U.S. clean energy policy. Efforts to stop and contain the meltdown at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station are intensifying as an attempt to pump ocean water into a crippled reactor temporarily failed yesterday, increasing the risk of the release of larger amounts of radioactive material. As nuclear fears grow, the anxiety could spell an end to the fragile truce between environmental advocates and nuclear power advocates -- the basis for the Obama administration's attempts to promote clean energy in the U.S.¶ "It's going to be more **difficult to build a bipartisan consensus** around clean energy," says Jesse Jenkins, director of energy and climate policy for the Breakthrough Institute. The Breakthrough Institute supports nuclear energy as part of the clean energy mix. During the state of the union speech, President Obama endorsed a goal of 80 percent of electricity produced by clean energy sources by 2035. He noted that this would include nuclear, wind, solar, and clean coal. By bringing together advocates for clean coal, nuclear and renewable energy sources like wind and solar, the administration hoped to build a bipartisan consensus.¶ Renewable energy advocates, already squeamish about this partnership, **are having second thoughts**. "This highlights one of the downsides, to put it mildly, of depending on nuclear energy for your energy supply," says Adam Browning, executive director of Vote Solar. Browning recalls that efforts to pull together a cap and trade climate bill and additional clean energy efforts collapsed following the Gulf oil spill. "In Florida," Browning says, "the oil industry had made an agreement that in return for the ability to expand offshore drilling off the coast, some portion of oil royalties would go to solar installations in Florida." After the BP disaster, Florida solar advocates withdrew from the deal. The efforts of Congressional leaders to fashion a clean energy and cap and trade compromise were also built on promises to support expanded offshore drilling. The BP disaster made expanding oil drilling politically untenable, one of many reasons why legislative leaders were unable to agree on a bill.¶ Greenpeace is collecting signatures on a new petition to stop "taxpayer-funded giveaways to the nuclear power industry." Greenpeace, founded in opposition to nuclear testing, is likely to intensify its opposition to nuclear power in the United States. Jenkins, of the Breakthrough Institute says, "there are very few scenarios where we get to the Obama clean energy goal without nuclear power." According to Jenkins, nuclear energy provides about 20 percent of U.S. electricity and 80 percent of zero-carbon electricity. Greenpeace has published a roadmap that it says will reach the goal of meeting the world's energy needs without using oil, coal, or nuclear energy.¶ The early signals from legislative leaders have been cautious, with Senator Joe Lieberman, an advocate of nuclear power, calling for a temporary halt for new nuclear power plants. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell suggested that policy-making should slow down in the midst of a crisis. "I don't think right after a major environmental catastrophe is a very good time to be making American domestic policy," he said on Fox News Sunday. Despite the legislative stall, solar stocks jumped today.

Sequestration destroys US global military power---collapses deterrence and triggers multiple scenarios for nuclear war (Iranian adventurism, Hormuz closing, African instability, terrorism, Korean war, Taiwan war, Russian military modernization, Afghanistan instability, naval power)

Hunter 9/30 Duncan is a U.S. Representative from Alaska. “SEQUESTRATION SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE,” 2012, http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/sep/30/tp-sequestration-sends-wrong-message-to-us/?page=1#article

Over the next 10 years, because of **sequestration**, the Pentagon will be forced to absorb $500 billion in budget cuts that **will** **strike at the heart of America’s military**. Making this even more dangerous is the fact that the legislation triggering sequestration, the Budget Control Act, also imposed an additional $450 billion in defense budget cuts for a total of nearly $1 trillion of reductions over the next decade. The next 10 years are sure to be no different from the last. In the Middle East, Iranis desperately searching to fill a regional power vacuum and enhance its weapons program**, while threatening to** close the Strait of Hormuz **and targeting Israel** with unapologetic provocation. Meanwhile, the United States still has an obligation to Iraq. There is a necessity for diplomatic support and engagement, even though the ground combat mission is over. Africa is also experiencing power struggles of its own. The situations in Libya and Egypt are evolving, while Yemen and Somalia are acting as staging grounds for al-Qaeda. There is also the threat of Somali pirates in international waters. Multiple high-profile hostage situations and combat rescues show just how serious of a threat that rogue bands of pirates are to naval and commercial shipping lanes. **There is also the threat of** North Korea **with its aggressive pursuit of advanced aerial weaponry,** Russia **with its focus on arms modernization, and** China **with its large-scale and rapid military buildup.** China’s **display of hostility toward** Taiwan — a friend and ally of the United States — **also shows no sign of diminishing**. With all of this, more than 70,000 American troops are in Afghanistan, facing down a dangerous enemy. For the United States and other nations, interest in Afghanistan and the region will continue long after the last of the coalition ground forces leave and the next phase of the mission begins. **Ignoring America’s obligation as a world leader and the patchwork of threats that exist today won’t eliminate the risk posed by an Iran that one day acquires nuclear weapons or a North Korea that eventually acquires effective strike capabilit**y. More likely, **these and other threats will develop more quickly and efficiently, putting the** global interests **of the U.S. directly in the cross hairs.** Through a robust national defense, the United States has always sent a clear message around the world that American intentions are good and we stand by our allies. **The strength of the U.S. military has** dissuaded conflict **and suggested to adversaries that challenging freedom is a losing proposition**. **It was this deterrent**, in fact, **that won the Cold War and turned the U.S. military into the world’s most effective fighting force.** Sequestration would change all of this**, for the worse.** In the words of Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, sequestration is a “nutty formula, and it’s goofy to begin with, and it’s not something, frankly, that anybody responsible ought to put into effect.” He also said **sequestration is the equivalent of “**shooting ourselves in the head**.”** Tough words, but Secretary Panetta is right. Sequestration would produce **the smallest ground force since 1940**, the smallest Navy since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in Air Force history. Ironically, the president’s defense policy shift to the Pacific increases reliance on the Navy, but with the smallest fleet in nearly a century, controlling the oceans and projecting force will become an even more difficult and selective process, requiring prioritization that would create vulnerabilities elsewhere. Resetting America’s armed forces after a decade-plus of combat action is another necessity that cannot be overlooked. There is also a guarantee of pink slips throughout the uniformed services and every industry that directly supports the U.S. military. In San Diego, the military sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs, and billions of dollars in economic productivity. San Diego — even for all of its strategic value — is not immune to job loss and other economic impacts accompanying deep budget cuts. Sequestration is a term Americans should get to know and understand, because it will have real and lasting consequences if left unchecked. The upside is that the risks and dangers can be avoided as long as Congress and the president act in the coming months. The clock is ticking to stave off sequestration — a move that **would signal to our friends and enemies alike that we uphold our promises and stand ready to defend our interests against any threat.**

#### Hegemony solves nuke war and extinction

Thomas P.M. Barnett 11 Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably **the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured**, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our **stunningly successful stewardship of global order** since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the **guardian of globalization**, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be** no identifiable human civilization left**, once** nuclear weapons **entered the killing equation.** But the world did not keep sliding down that **path of perpetual war**. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by **ushering in our now-**perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the **international liberal trade order known as** globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a **profound and persistent reduction in** battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. ¶ As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw **a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars**. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are **clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity**, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.

### 1NC

#### Text:

#### The 50 states should repeal all state-level restrictions on the use of nuclear power. The 50 states should substantially increase the available funding for nuclear loan guarantees.

#### State governments can use financial incentives to spur nuclear power

NEI 09 (Nuclear Energy Institute, “Policies That Support New Nuclear Power Plant Development”, http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/factsheet/policiessupportnewplantdevelopment/?print=true)

State Policies Several states have passed legislation or implemented regulations, or both, to support construction of new nuclear power plants. These policies range from property tax incentives to pre-determination of rate-making principles for a project before construction begins. The policies that help most with financing new plants in regulated states are those that: Require the state public utility commission to determine if a proposed plant is prudent before construction begins and approve costs periodically during construction, thereby guaranteeing these capital costs will be added to the rate base when the plant comes online. Allow the carrying cost of construction work in progress (CWIP)—or the financing cost associated with¶ construction—to be passed on to ratepayers during construction. Allowing CWIP reduces the cost ratepayers will pay for power from the plant when it goes into commercial operation. Some unregulated states assist with financing for unregulated plants by allowing pre-negotiated, long-term power purchase agreements (PPA). PPAs guarantee the project will have a source of cash flow (and cost recovery) once it is operational. State-level policies send positive signals to the financial community, helping companies finance projects reasonably, and, thereby, keeping the cost of electricity for consumers lower.

### 1NC

#### The United States Department of the Interior should prohibit fracking for natural gas.

#### Fracking regulations change the economics and make nuclear power more competitive – the CP is sufficient to restart the renaissance

Linda C. Byus, chartered financial analyst, May 2012, “The nuclear renaissance: First, the good news…” Nuclear News, ln

On February 9, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by a 4-1 vote approved combined construction and operating licenses (COL) for two Westinghouse AP1000 reactors at the Vogtle site in Georgia, the first construction approval granted by the NRC since 1978. The estimated cost of the two units is approximately $14 billion, with service dates in the 2016-2017 time frame. Southern Company and its partners in the project have been offered a total of $8.3 billion in loan guarantees from the Department of Energy. All of this is good news for the nuclear power industry and may signal the start of the so-called nuclear renaissance. So why then is there not more excitement in the nuclear power industry? During the first quarter of 2012, several economic and political issues could be viewed as negative indicators, or "bad news," for the nuclear industry. Also, mild weather in the winter of 2011-2012 dampened the demand for electricity. Weather, however, is variable month-to-month and year-to-year and is not necessarily indicative of a long-term trend. The big economic story for the energy industry so far in 2012 is the low cost and abundant supply of natural gas. Prices have fallen over the last two years as a result of the increased use of horizontal drilling techniques and hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking." To date, the environmental impact of fracking for natural gas has been primarily regulated at the state level, but the federal government is now scrambling to add regulatory oversight. In a recent speech, U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu said, "The technology for recovering oil and gas through hydraulic fracturing has really raced ahead. There has to be a regulatory role because there may be some people who want to cut corners." On April 18, the Environmental Protection Agency issued the first-ever regulations to address air pollution from natural gas wells that use fracking. Natural gas supply is abundant and production remains robust. With the spot price consistently well below $2.50 per million Btu and future prices expected to remain low, natural gas has once again become an attractive source of fuel for power generation. The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) has indicated that it currently costs about $978 per kilowatt to build and fuel a large gas-fired power plant, compared to the estimated cost of new nuclear power at $5339 per kW. The EIA estimates that by 2035, the United States will add 222 GW of generating capacity, 58 percent from natural gas and only 4 percent from nuclear. Politically speaking, the NRC's approval of COLs for the new Vogtle units was not all good news, as Chairman Gregory Jaczko cast the lone dissenting vote. His explanation for his lack of support for the licenses was concern that the new reactors would not be modified to meet the recommendations of the NRC's Near-Term Task Force on the accident at Japan's Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant last year. Jaczko said, "I think this license needed something that ensured that the changes as a result of Fukushima would be implemented." Some supporters of the new plants, and nuclear power in general, saw Jaczko's "no" vote as representative of political infighting at the commission, but whatever the reason for his dissenting vote, it took some of the sheen off a landmark day for the nuclear power industry. Also, the finalization of the DOE loan guarantees for the Vogtle plant has slowed down, primarily because of political concerns. Because of the financial failure of several high-profile loan guarantee recipients, the DOE's commitment to the Vogtle project is being reviewed. At this time, the partners in the Vogtle project anticipate that the loans will be finalized around mid-2012. What's next for the nuclear renaissance? The fundamental facts that support nuclear generation as part of a diversified energy portfolio remain valid. Because of the price volatility of various fuels, as well as shifting political tides, a diversified generating portfolio is prudent business. While gas prices are currently low, there is no guarantee that they will stay low. In fact, if producers were to deem that prices are too low, they could limit production to drive prices up. Coal is clearly out of favor because of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and much of the older coal generating capacity in the United States will be replaced by cleaner fuels. While natural gas is much cleaner than coal, it still releases significant quantities of carbon dioxide. Nuclear plants, on the other hand, are truly clean with respect to GHGs. Increased restrictions of GHG emissions could hurt gas generation in favor of nuclear generation, and increased regulation of fracking could change the economics of gas. Also, questions remain about the scale and cost of both wind and solar generation. And so, long term, there are good reasons for nuclear to be part of the U.S. generating mix. However, nuclear power continues to have an image problem.

## Solvency

### 1NC Expansion Impossible

#### Nuclear expansion impossible – laundry list of supply and siting constraints

Lisa Zyga, 5-11-2011, “Why nuclear power will never supply the world’s energy needs,” PhysOrg, http://phys.org/news/2011-05-nuclear-power-world-energy.html

The 440 commercial nuclear reactors in use worldwide are currently helping to minimize our consumption of fossil fuels, but how much bigger can nuclear power get? In an analysis to be published in a future issue of the Proceedings of the IEEE, Derek Abbott, Professor of Electrical and Electronic Engineering at the University of Adelaide in Australia, has concluded that nuclear power cannot be globally scaled to supply the world’s energy needs for numerous reasons. The results suggest that we’re likely better off investing in other energy solutions that are truly scalable. As Abbott notes in his study, global power consumption today is about 15 terawatts (TW). Currently, the global nuclear power supply capacity is only 375 gigawatts (GW). In order to examine the large-scale limits of nuclear power, Abbott estimates that to supply 15 TW with nuclear only, we would need about 15,000 nuclear reactors. In his analysis, Abbott explores the consequences of building, operating, and decommissioning 15,000 reactors on the Earth, looking at factors such as the amount of land required, radioactive waste, accident rate, risk of proliferation into weapons, uranium abundance and extraction, and the exotic metals used to build the reactors themselves. “A nuclear power station is resource-hungry and, apart from the fuel, uses many rare metals in its construction,” Abbott told PhysOrg.com. “The dream of a utopia where the world is powered off fission or fusion reactors is simply unattainable. Even a supply of as little as 1 TW stretches resources considerably.” His findings, some of which are based on the results of previous studies, are summarized below. Land and location: One nuclear reactor plant requires about 20.5 km2 (7.9 mi2) of land to accommodate the nuclear power station itself, its exclusion zone, its enrichment plant, ore processing, and supporting infrastructure. Secondly, nuclear reactors need to be located near a massive body of coolant water, but away from dense population zones and natural disaster zones. Simply finding 15,000 locations on Earth that fulfill these requirements is extremely challenging. Lifetime: Every nuclear power station needs to be decommissioned after 40-60 years of operation due to neutron embrittlement - cracks that develop on the metal surfaces due to radiation. If nuclear stations need to be replaced every 50 years on average, then with 15,000 nuclear power stations, one station would need to be built and another decommissioned somewhere in the world every day. Currently, it takes 6-12 years to build a nuclear station, and up to 20 years to decommission one, making this rate of replacement unrealistic. Nuclear waste: Although nuclear technology has been around for 60 years, there is still no universally agreed mode of disposal. It’s uncertain whether burying the spent fuel and the spent reactor vessels (which are also highly radioactive) may cause radioactive leakage into groundwater or the environment via geological movement. Accident rate: To date, there have been 11 nuclear accidents at the level of a full or partial core-melt. These accidents are not the minor accidents that can be avoided with improved safety technology; they are rare events that are not even possible to model in a system as complex as a nuclear station, and arise from unforeseen pathways and unpredictable circumstances (such as the Fukushima accident). Considering that these 11 accidents occurred during a cumulated total of 14,000 reactor-years of nuclear operations, scaling up to 15,000 reactors would mean we would have a major accident somewhere in the world every month. Proliferation: The more nuclear power stations, the greater the likelihood that materials and expertise for making nuclear weapons may proliferate. Although reactors have proliferation resistance measures, maintaining accountability for 15,000 reactor sites worldwide would be nearly impossible. Uranium abundance: At the current rate of uranium consumption with conventional reactors, the world supply of viable uranium, which is the most common nuclear fuel, will last for 80 years. Scaling consumption up to 15 TW, the viable uranium supply will last for less than 5 years. (Viable uranium is the uranium that exists in a high enough ore concentration so that extracting the ore is economically justified.) Uranium extraction from seawater: Uranium is most often mined from the Earth’s crust, but it can also be extracted from seawater, which contains large quantities of uranium (3.3 ppb, or 4.6 trillion kg). Theoretically, that amount would last for 5,700 years using conventional reactors to supply 15 TW of power. (In fast breeder reactors, which extend the use of uranium by a factor of 60, the uranium could last for 300,000 years. However, Abbott argues that these reactors’ complexity and cost makes them uncompetitive.) Moreover, as uranium is extracted, the uranium concentration of seawater decreases, so that greater and greater quantities of water are needed to be processed in order to extract the same amount of uranium. Abbott calculates that the volume of seawater that would need to be processed would become economically impractical in much less than 30 years. Exotic metals: The nuclear containment vessel is made of a variety of exotic rare metals that control and contain the nuclear reaction: hafnium as a neutron absorber, beryllium as a neutron reflector, zirconium for cladding, and niobium to alloy steel and make it last 40-60 years against neutron embrittlement. Extracting these metals raises issues involving cost, sustainability, and environmental impact. In addition, these metals have many competing industrial uses; for example, hafnium is used in microchips and beryllium by the semiconductor industry. If a nuclear reactor is built every day, the global supply of these exotic metals needed to build nuclear containment vessels would quickly run down and create a mineral resource crisis. This is a new argument that Abbott puts on the table, which places resource limits on all future-generation nuclear reactors, whether they are fueled by thorium or uranium. As Abbott notes, many of these same problems would plague fusion reactors in addition to fission reactors, even though commercial fusion is still likely a long way off.

### 1NC Incentives Fail – Laundry List

#### Plan’s not sufficient---no nuclear absent gas prices doubling, carbon pricing and incentives

Maize 12 Kennedy, contributing editor to POWER and executive editor of the online magazine MANAGING POWER, "Fukushima Disaster Continues to Cloud Nuclear Outlook", July, Vol. 156, Issue 7, EBSCO

With new reactors finally under construction, this should be an optimistic time for nuclear power in the U.S. But cheap natural gas, rising construction costs, and the Fukushima accident's lingering pall have darkened the mood.¶ Although the events in Japan that destroyed much of Tokyo Electric Power Co.'s Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power station were more than a year in the past, their memory provided the backdrop for the nuclear track at the ELECTRIC POWER Conference in Baltimore in May. The events in Japan of March 2011 clearly changed the nature of the discussion of nuclear power and its future.¶ In the 14 months since the Fukushima accident, the rest of Japan's once-considerable nuclear fleet had gone offline. By the time of the Baltimore meeting, Japan was without any nuclear-generated electricity for the first time in 42 years. The country once had an ambitious nuclear program that provided a third of its electric generating capacity, and there were plans to build more reactors. (See "Japan Scrambles to Revamp Its Energy Sector" in POWER'S June 2012 issue, and the web supplement "Japan's Nuclear Infrastructure," at www.powermag.com for a detailed look at where the nation's energy policy was headed before last year and where it is being redirected.)¶ As the nuclear track was under way, British author Mark Lynas wrote in the UK's Guardian newspaper that "the long shadow cast by Fukushima has extended over a much wider area than any scientific assessment of radiological hazard would argue is necessary." Parents in a village 20 kilometers from the reactor reportedly refuse to let their children play outdoors and believe that dosimeter readings barely above background levels are incorrect.¶ Lynas contrasted Japan's widespread revulsion toward nuclear power with the response in South Korea, which today gets some 30% of its generation from nuclear plants and plans to increase that amount to 60%. South Korea -- like its neighbor Japan -- also faces limited domestic energy resources.¶ Despite the emergence of a small but vocal anti-nuclear movement, Korea's government has made clear it plans to stay the nuclear course. But Heung Gyu Park, a senior vice president of KEPCO E&C, the country's nuclear engineering and construction company, said in Baltimore that his country has made changes since the Japanese disaster.¶ Soon after the events in Japan, Korea Electric Power Corp. (KEPCO, parent of KEPCO E&C) initiated a full-scale review of its 21 operating units and concluded that they were capable of withstanding events similar to those that devastated the Japanese units. As in Japan, all of South Korea's reactors are sited on the coast and cooled by seawater. The country is also located on the seismically active Pacific "ring of fire."¶ In addition to the KEPCO review, a South Korean government inquiry followed the Japanese event. That effort developed an action plan for steps KEPCO should take to improve its emergency preparedness and operational safety.¶ A key to the government's response, Park said, was creation of a new regulatory agency, the Nuclear Safety and Security Commission, launched last October and located in the office of the South Korean president. The new, higher-level agency replaces the South Korean Institute of Nuclear Safety as the primary regulatory body, separating nuclear power promotion from its regulation. The institute has become a technical advisor to the new board.¶ South Korea remains on track to build eight nuclear units, all of the advanced Korean-designed (in conjunction with Japan's Toshiba) 1,400-MW pressurized water reactor. KEPCO broke ground for two of these units the same week that Japan's final operating nuclear unit shut down and just prior to ELECTRIC POWER.¶ Muted Celebration¶ J. Frank Russell, senior vice president at Concentric Energy Advisors, described the ambiguous status of nuclear power today from a U.S. perspective. By many counts, he said, "this should be a year of celebration for 'new nuclear' in the U.S." because Southern Co. is building Vogtle Units 3 and 4, and Scana Corp. has a green light from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for the two new units at its V.C. Summer station.¶ In contrast to what could be justified optimism, "the reality is different," Russell said. "The pipeline is empty, with other proposed units stalled or delayed by the sponsors." The promise of "up to a dozen" new units that was common in the industry a few years ago "has mostly gone away," and the industry has awakened to a less-friendly environment.¶ Many reasons account for faded nuclear dreams in the U.S., Russell said. The 2008 recession lowered demand for power and reduced financial markets' appetite for risk. The collapse of natural gas prices as a result of the shale gas revolution undercut the economics. So did the federal government's failure to put a price on carbon emissions. Fukushima also played a role. But the key factor dogging the U.S. nuclear sector has been the high and growing cost of nuclear power plants. "While many of these issues may be considered temporary," said Russell, "the sheer total cost of large-scale new nuclear units is just too large for many companies to bear."¶ Few companies have the capitalization and appetite for risk to take on a project that could cost $10 billion, the current estimate for a new nuclear unit in the U.S. For a merchant generator, finding the equity capital for such an undertaking is problematic. "Even with a loan guarantee," he said, "the equity may be impossible to raise."¶ What will it take for a real U.S. nuclear turnaround? Russell offered a list, with each item necessary to achieving rebirth but none sufficient in itself. He said that demand growth will have to return and that the current generating capacity surplus must decline. Natural gas prices will have to double to at least $4/million cubic feet. A carbon price also must be put in place. The Vogtle and Summer units must come in on schedule and must meet budget targets (an outcome already put in doubt by cost increases recently announced at Vogtle). And policy makers and the public must be positive and supportive.

### Incentives Fail – Laundry List

#### Impossible for nuclear reactors to be cost competitive

Mark Cooper 9, PhD, Senior Fellow @ Vermont Law, November 2009, “All Risk, No Reward for Taxpayers and Ratepayers,” http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/11\_03\_09\_Cooper%20All%20Risk%20Full%20Report.pdf

A recent analysis of nuclear reactor economics, based on a 2009 MIT study that was highly favorable to nuclear reactors in a number of ways and openly sought to promote nuclear power, could only arrive at the following, tepid conclusion. All things considered, the best economic case supporting a significant expansion in nuclear power capacity involves significant CO2 emissions charges, moderate to high fossil fuel prices (including implicit prices reflecting energy security considerations), declining nuclear plant construction costs, and an efficient licensing regulatory framework. 22 As this analysis and The Economics of Nuclear Reactors show, none of the four conditions that might make the economics of nuclear reactors attractive is present. The absence of those conditions is not a mistake or market failure; it reflects fundamental economic conditions and the risks that nuclear reactors face in the real world: • CO2 emissions charges are projected to be more modest than originally thought because federal policy is contemplating promoting options that are low-cost approaches to carbon reduction (policy risk). • Fossil fuel prices have moderated, particularly for natural gas, based on dramatic improvements in technologies to exploit the resource base, not to mention growing confidence in efficiency and renewables to meet the needs for electricity at much lower cost than nuclear reactors (technological risk creating marketplace risk). • Nuclear reactor construction costs estimates have risen substantially (technology risk and execution risk). • The licensing process has proven challenging, not because the licensing authority is inept, but because the designs are not well-conceived and site-specific issues are substantial (regulatory risk). • The overwhelming majority of states have refused to subsidize nuclear reactors with ratepayer money and special treatment (regulatory risk). Simply put, the best case scenario has no chance of coming to pass. New nuclear reactors are the worst case for taxpayers and ratepayers if they are forced to subsidize the construction of a new generation of nuclear reactors with loan guarantees and construction work in progress. The last time the nuclear industry circumvented the judgment of the marketplace, it resulted in what Forbes magazine called the “largest managerial disaster in business history.” 23 This is a mistake that can be avoided by not forcing taxpayers and ratepayer to subsidize the nuclear renaissance.

## China Adv

### 1NC– Yes Nuclear Leadership

#### US is still the nuclear tech leader

Pete Domenici 12, senator and Warren Miller, co-chair of Nuclear Initiative, former DOE Assist. Sec., July 2012, “Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets,” Bipartisan Policy Center

Nuclear power already plays an important role in the U.S. energy supply mix: The nation’s existing fleet of 104 reactors currently accounts for close to 20 percent of overall electricity production. In many parts of the country, nuclear plants help to assure grid stability and have been a major source of cost-effective, low-carbon base-load power for decades. The NRC, the industry’s chief regulatory overseer, is expected to approve extension of the operating licenses for most of these plants to 60 years while striving for improved safety and increasingly efficient operations. At present, the domestic nuclear industry is looking at limited opportunities for expansion in terms of increasing the number of U.S. plants. Currently, four new Generation III+ nuclear reactors have been licensed by the NRC and are under construction in the Southeast. In addition, the Tennessee Valley Authority has restarted construction activities at Watts Bar II. Given this near-term expansion, the United States will continue to be a world leader in the development of advanced reactor technologies, including Generation III+ advanced passive reactors and SMRs. International interest in developing new nuclear-generating capacity, on the other hand, presents potentially substantial business opportunities for the domestic nuclear industry. Commercial nuclear exports generate obvious economic benefits for U.S. firms and for the nation’s overall balance of trade. Importantly, they also help the United States retain a major role in the evolution and maintenance of international nuclear safety and nonproliferation regimes. Other nations not only look to the U.S. industry for operational expertise, they see the NRC as setting the international gold standard for safety and physical security regulation. DOE’s National Nuclear Security Administration, meanwhile, has a great deal of influence over the nonproliferation aspects of international fuel-cycle issues.

### No Asia War

#### Multiple factors make Asia war unlikely

Vannarith 10—Executive Director of the Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace. PhD in Asia Pacific Studies, Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific U (Chheang, Asia Pacific Security Issues: Challenges and Adaptive Mechanism, <http://www.cicp.org.kh/download/CICP%20Policy%20brief/CICP%20Policy%20brief%20No%203.pdf>)

Some people look to China for economic and strategic interests while others still stick to the US. Since, as a human nature, change is not widely acceptable due to the high level of uncertainty. It is therefore logical to say that most of the regional leaders prefer to see the status quo of security architecture in the Asia Pacific Region in which US is the hub of security provision. But it is impossible to preserve the status quo since China needs to strategically outreach to the wider region in order to get necessary resources especially energy and raw materials to maintain her economic growth in the home country. It is understandable that China needs to have stable high economic growth of about 8 percent GDP growth per year for her own economic and political survival. Widening development gap and employment are the two main issues facing China. Without China, the world will not enjoy peace, stability, and development. China is the locomotive of global and regional economic development and contributes to global and regional peace and stability. It is understandable that China is struggling to break the so-called containment strategy imposed by the US since the post Cold War. Whether this tendency can lead to the greater strategic division is still unknown. Nevertheless, many observers agree that whatever changes may take place, a multi-polar world and multilateralism prevail. The reasons or logics supporting multilateralism are mainly based on the fact that no one country can really address the security issues embedded with international dimension, no one country has the capacity to adapt and adopt to new changes alone, and it needs cooperation and coordination among the nation states and relevant stakeholders including the private sector and civil societies. Large scale interstate war or armed conflict is **unthinkable** in the region due to the high level of interdependency and democratization. It is believed that economic interdependency can reduce conflicts and prevent war. Democracy can lead to more transparency, accountability, and participation that can reduce collective fears and create more confidence and trust among the people in the region. In addition, globalism and regionalism are taking the center stage of national and foreign policy of many governments in the region except North Korea. The combination of those elements of peace is necessary for peace and stability in the region and those elements are **present and being improved in this region.**

### 1NC AT Japan Rearm

#### Multiple barriers to japan mil

Chanlett-Avery & Nikitin, 09 – \*Specialist in Asian Affairs AND \*\*Analyst in Nonproliferation at the Congressional Research Service (2/19/09, Emma and Mary Beth, “Japan’s Nuclear Future: Policy Debate, Prospects and U.S. Interests,” http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/09024CRS.pdf, JMP)

This paper examines the prospects for Japan pursuing a nuclear weapons capability by assessing the existing technical infrastructure of its extensive civilian nuclear energy program. It explores the range of challenges that Japan would have to overcome to transform its current program into a military program. Presently, Japan appears to lack several of the prerequisites for a full-scale nuclear weapons deterrent: expertise on bomb design, reliable delivery vehicles, an intelligence program to protect and conceal assets, and sites for nuclear testing. In addition, a range of legal and political restraints on Japan’s development of nuclear weapons, including averse public and elite opinion, restrictive domestic laws and practices, and the negative diplomatic consequences of abandoning its traditional approach is analyzed.

### 1NC No Indo/Pak War

#### No Indo/Pak war

Turkish Weekly 11 (28 July 2011, India and Pakistan Pledge 'New Spirit of Cooperation', http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/120330/india-and-pakistan-pledge-39-new-spirit-of-cooperation-39-.html)

The foreign ministers of India and Pakistan have called for a new spirit of cooperation between their countries.

SM Krishna and Hina Rabbani Khar are holding talks in Delhi, the first such meeting between the two nuclear rivals in a year.

The meeting comes five months after the South Asian neighbors resumed bilateral discussions.

Talks were suspended after the 2008 Mumbai (Bombay) attacks which India blamed on Pakistan-based militants.

But earlier this year, leaders vowed to resume their dialogue.

Correspondents say the talks are unlikely to throw up any major policy statements, but they will be another step in improving relations between the neighbors.

Indian Foreign Minister SM Krishna said before the meeting that his country wanted to see ""a stable, smooth and prosperous Pakistan"".

Khar, Pakistan's newly appointed and first ever female foreign minister, said ties between the two countries ""should not be held hostage to the past.""

But soon after her arrival in India on Tuesday, she met with Kashmiri separatist leaders, a move that would not have gone down well with her hosts, says the BBC's Sanjoy Majumder in Delhi.

The two sides are expected to discuss the contentious issue of disputed Kashmir.

The Himalayan region is claimed by both India and Pakistan in its entirety, but has been divided since 1948. It has been the cause of three wars between the countries.

India will also press Pakistan to take action against militant groups based on its soil, especially those perceived to be behind the 2008 Mumbai attacks.

Since February, Indian and Pakistani officials have met to discuss a range of issues in an attempt to find ways to build trust and promote peace.

Last month, the foreign secretaries of the two countries held two days of talks where they agreed to discuss new nuclear confidence-building measures.

### 1NC No Escalation

#### Indo Pak War won’t go nuclear

Enders 2 (Jan 30, David, Michigan Daily, “Experts say nuclear war still unlikely,” http://www.michigandaily.com/content/experts-say-nuclear-war-still-unlikely)

**\* Ashutosh Varshney – Professor of Political Science and South Asia expert at the University of Michigan**

**\* Paul Huth – Professor of International Conflict and Security Affairs at the University of Maryland**

**\* Kenneth Lieberthal – Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan. Former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council**

University political science Prof. Ashutosh Varshney becomes animated when asked about the likelihood of nuclear war between India and Pakistan.

"Odds are close to zero," Varshney said forcefully, standing up to pace a little bit in his office. "The assumption that India and Pakistan cannot manage their nuclear arsenals as well as the U.S.S.R. and U.S. or Russia and China concedes less to the intellect of leaders in both India and Pakistan than would be warranted."

The worlds two youngest nuclear powers first tested weapons in 1998, sparking fear of subcontinental nuclear war a fear Varshney finds ridiculous.

"The decision makers are aware of what nuclear weapons are, even if the masses are not," he said.

"Watching the evening news, CNN, I think they have vastly overstated the threat of nuclear war," political science Prof. Paul Huth said.

Varshney added that there are numerous factors working against the possibility of nuclear war.

"India is committed to a no-first-strike policy," Varshney said. "It is virtually impossible for Pakistan to go for a first strike, because the retaliation would be gravely dangerous."

Political science Prof. Kenneth Lieberthal, a former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council, agreed. "Usually a country that is in the position that Pakistan is in would not shift to a level that would ensure their total destruction," Lieberthal said, making note of India"s considerably larger nuclear arsenal.

"American intervention is another reason not to expect nuclear war," Varshney said. "If anything has happened since September 11, it is that the command control system has strengthened. The trigger is in very safe hands."

### 1NC---China/Taiwan War

#### No Taiwan war

**TT 11**—official website of the Philadelphia Trumpet newsmagazine (The Trumpet, Taiwan’s Strides Toward China Accelerate, http://www.thetrumpet.com/?q=7808.6407.0.0)

Ma = Taiwanese PM

Ma explained that since people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait share common ancestry, they should build mutual trust and dispel their disagreements. Their common culture, Ma said, should give Taiwan and China the wisdom to find satisfactory solutions to their quarrels.

And **the thawing tensions extend far beyond words.**

On January 3, Taiwanese media reported that Taipei has scrapped its plans to deploy its powerful new “Thunder 2000″ rocket system on islands near mainland China. Analysts believe Beijing could respond by reducing its battery of Taiwan-aimed missiles.

Two weeks earlier, Beijing and Taipei signed deals regarding drug development and disease outbreaks, the latest in a **long string of agreements** between the two sides.

On January 4, China and Taiwan tightened their economic ties by implementing a pivotal phase of the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ecfa) called the “early harvest program.” Under the deal, China has cut tariffs on 539 Taiwanese products and Taiwan has reduced duties for 267 Chinese goods. By 2013, all of the duties on those goods will come down to zero.

Also on the same day, in an indication of strengthening cultural ties, Taiwan’s Education Ministry announced that the island’s universities will admit their first batch of Chinese students this year.

## Nuclear Labor Adv

### STEM Adv 1NC

#### High number of nuclear PhDs even if the industry declines.

Patel 12—Prachi Patel, March 2012, Should You Still Choose Nuclear Engineering as a Career? Inside Technology Spectrum, <http://spectrum.ieee.org/at-work/tech-careers/should-you-still-choose-nuclear-engineering-as-a-career>

The chairs of 47 nuclear engineering departments in North America regularly discuss concerns about their academic programs. After the Fukushima Dai-ichi incident unfolded, one question was on everyone’s mind: Would nuclear engineering take a hit? E-mails were quickly exchanged among the group members, and the clear answer was no. Students were not dropping the major, and engineering freshmen were still just as interested in it.¶ “We’re now accepting applications for 2012, and they are on track to be equivalent to last year’s numbers,” says Kathryn Higley, head of the nuclear engineering and radiation health physics department at Oregon State University, in Corvallis.¶ It has been only a year since Fukushima, but the continuing student interest is an indication that the discipline is holding its ground. The industry, bolstered by the need for carbon-free energy, is on its way up, and nuclear engineering remains a solid career path, says Arthur Motta, chair of Pennsylvania State University’s nuclear engineering program. “Even if the United States doesn’t build any new plants right now, 20 percent of our power is from nuclear, and that’s not going away anytime soon,” Motta says.¶ And not just in the United States. Germany and Italy have backpedaled, but many other countries are forging ahead with nuclear power. And with the Fukushima incident highlighting the need for improved reactors and better safety measures, the demand for nuclear engineers will only increase.¶ The contrast with the 1980s is striking. After Chernobyl, the nuclear industry buckled, and academic programs in nuclear science and engineering languished around the world. U.S. enrollments plummeted, bottoming out in 2000. But over time, the industry’s reputation has healed. Concerned about both nuclear security and a diminishing workforce, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the U.S. Department of Energy have been supporting nuclear engineering programs through scholarships and internships.¶ The result is skyrocketing enrollments. In the freshman class of 2000 at North Carolina State University, in Raleigh, there were 37 nuclear engineering majors; this year there are 209. Other schools show similar trends.¶ This past December, the NRC approved Westinghouse Electric Co.’s new AP1000 nuclear reactor design, clearing the path for two utilities to build new plants. This has boosted confidence among academics and the industry, says Yousry Azmy, head of the nuclear engineering department at NCSU.¶ Nuclear engineering graduates work mostly for utility companies and for vendors such as Westinghouse, GE, and Areva. Some go to national laboratories, regulatory agencies, or into nuclear medicine. But nuclear engineers gain systems and engineering skills, along with a solid background that they can apply to other realms. “Even if the market shifts, students will have a versatile tool kit and abilities that will allow them to move around,” Higley says. During the nuclear power lull in the early 2000s, many graduates went to computer chip and software companies, she points out.¶ Besides, Azmy says, “The future of nuclear engineering education in the United States isn’t entirely held hostage to the utilities in this country.” China is building 27 new reactors and expects to have another 120 operating within the next two decades. Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, and Vietnam are actively building new nuclear power programs. “Many jobs will materialize in the United States and Europe,” says Azmy.

#### There are tons of jobs and interesting work involving current reactor development

Schiermeier 9—Quirin Schiermeier, Nature's Germany correspondent, 5/6/09, Going nuclear, http://www.nature.com/naturejobs/science/articles/10.1038/nj7243-124a

The search is on for the scientists and engineers who will design, build and operate these nuclear reactors, but also for the experts who will guide uranium mining, design and partition nuclear fuels (that is, transmute radioactive waste into non-radioactive elements), dispose of radioactive waste, and protect nuclear workers and the world at large from harmful radiation. "There is a strong and increasingly competitive job market emerging," says Carol Berrigan, who monitors the nuclear workforce for the Nuclear Energy Institute, an industry group based in Washington DC.¶ Academic institutions have responded to the nuclear comeback. Many universities have revived nuclear programmes that closed in the 1980s and 1990s because of lack of demand. In the United States alone, six new departments or programmes have been created in recent years at universities in Colorado, South Carolina, Texas and Virginia, and there are plans to set up programmes at the University of California, Los Angeles, and possibly also at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. Since 1999, enrolment in undergraduate nuclear engineering programmes in the United States has grown from 470 to around 2,000, while graduate enrolments have climbed from 220 to around 1,200, Berrigan found.¶ In Europe, advanced training and master's programmes in nuclear engineering exist, for example, at the University of Paris South 11, the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich and Lausanne, and the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT) in Germany. In the United Kingdom, vocational training and advanced courses in nuclear engineering are also offered by industry agencies such as Cogent and the National Skills Academy for Nuclear.¶ When it comes to exploiting that education, prospects in the US job market are promising. Graduate and postgraduate science and engineering students interested in pursuing a career in the nuclear industry have ample choices between jobs at government labs, with private plant operators, in reactor construction or in the defence business, says Michael Corradini, head of nuclear engineering at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. "It's an incredibly healthy and vibrant environment for us right now, despite the economic downturn," he says. "Most of my students can choose from at least a handful of job offerings; ten years ago they were glad when they got one." Students often start with bachelor's degrees in civil, chemical or process engineering, then specialize in nuclear engineering as part of a master's degree.¶ Employment prospects in many regions of Europe are just as encouraging. "If a talented student turns up today, he or she will have a work contract tomorrow, either from me or from a company we're collaborating with," says Joachim Knebel, head of nuclear safety research and acting head of neutron physics and reactor technology at KIT. The Areva Nuclear Professional School was established at KIT in February, funded by Areva, the Paris-based company that is the world's largest manufacturer of reactor components and nuclear fuel. It provides postgraduate training for young scientists and engineers specializing in various fields of nuclear engineering. The 30 PhD students enrolled at the school at any one time are paid by Areva and have a guarantee that they will be employed when their training is completed. Areva, with a workforce of 75,000 and euro dollar13.2 billion (US$17.2 billion) in global sales, is the market leader in the field and is now hiring about 1,000 people a month globally. Engineers of all sorts, from civil, electromechanical, chemical and process engineers to automation and computation experts, account for roughly one-half of newly hired staff.¶ Ongoing technological challenges should provide work for the most enterprising. Generation IV nuclear reactors are intended to replace current types such as the European Pressurized Reactor (also called Evolutionary Power Reactor or just EPR), a generation III reactor design that uses water under high pressure as coolant. A mammoth research and development challenge ahead is the next generation of thermal and fast reactors (where the chain reaction is sustained by fast neutrons), which are designed to produce significantly less radioactive waste, to cost less and to be less vulnerable to violent attack. In principle, these systems would partition and reprocess nuclear waste repeatedly, which will require new technologies and new materials. These reactors could become commercially available in 20 to 30 years' time.

#### Decline in nuclear PhDs hasn’t affected the weapons program—they train in house.

APS 8—Readiness of the U.S. Nuclear Workforce for 21st Century Challenges, A Report from the American Physical Society Panel on Public Affairs Committee on Energy and Environment, June 2008, http://www.aps.org/policy/reports/popa-reports/upload/Nuclear-Readiness-Report-FINAL-2.pdf

6. One might expect that the reduced university-based training opportunities in nuclear science and engineering would have had a dramatic effect on the manpower levels in the nuclear weapons complex. This does not appear to have been the case. This is understandable, if only from the point of view that the design and construction of nuclear weapons will never be a part of publicly-available nuclear science and engineering curricula. Rather, these workforce members for the most part will be trained in situ. Perhaps that is why the steady and precipitous 40-year decline in the number of Ph.D.'s granted in nuclear chemistry - to the point where the numbers each year are now in the low single digits - seems to have had little effect on our nuclear weapons programs. However, with the recent reconfiguring and downsizing of the weapons labs, coupled with an aging (and now retiring) workforce, this situation is confused and uncertain at best (the same is true for many other aspects of the critical technologies workforce). These matters have been, and are, being studied carefully by the DOE-NNSA, the NSTC, and a number of professional organizations because it is clear that for the foreseeable future the Nation will continue to need a significant number of talented, well-trained nuclear scientists and engineers, physicists, chemists, mathematicians, and computer scientists to maintain the strength of its homeland security and nuclear weapons programs.

#### Other factors undermine recruitment at the national labs—aff can’t overcome.

Aloise 12—Gene Aloise, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO, April 26, 2012, MODERNIZING THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE: Strategies and Challenges in Sustaining Critical Skills in Federal and Contractor Workforces, Report to the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate

Officials from NNSA site offices and M&O contractor work sites reported that their secure work environment and location make recruitment of advanced science and technology candidates more challenging. Due to the sensitive nature of nuclear weapons work, NNSA and M&O contractor sites must be more secure than most private sector laboratories or commercial plants. To meet this security requirement, laboratories and plants in the enterprise tend to be restrictive environments, isolated from security threats by geography and classification protocols. In addition to these potentially undesirable traits, in the view of some candidates, some sites are further constrained by a high cost of living.¶ Restrictive environment. Officials from most M&O contractors reported that the restrictive environment required for nuclear weapons research and maintenance is a disadvantage in recruiting new staff with the potential to become weapons experts. Staff typically need to acquire and maintain high-level clearances and must often work in secure areas that prohibit the use of personal cell phones, personal e-mail, and social media. In particular, they told us younger candidates typically expect to stay continuously connected to their peers via cell phone and social media. Furthermore, any research completed in classified work can only be seen within the classified community; for researchers who desire broader recognition of their work and opportunities for wider collaboration, academia or private industry may be more attractive. Because of these restrictions, most M&O contractor human resources staff told us that it was more difficult to recruit younger scientists and engineers.¶ Isolation. An isolated location may be desirable for building or maintaining nuclear weapons, but it may not appeal to some desirable candidates with advanced degrees in science, technology, and engineering. For example, Los Alamos National Laboratory officials told us that the laboratory’s relative isolation––nearly 100 miles from Albuquerque, New Mexico–– may make it less appealing to some candidates. In addition, the relative lack of other types of employment opportunities nearby may pose challenges for candidates with spouses in careers outside of science, technology and engineering. Officials at two of the three weapons laboratories told us they focus on recruiting top candidates nationwide to gain a wide breadth of thought and opinion among their staff. The laboratories track the proportion of job offers accepted but cannot always ascertain or be sure of the reason a candidate rejects an offer because, according to officials at Lawrence Livermore, candidates may simply state they declined an offer for “personal reasons.”¶ In addition, some of the production plants and the test site are also in isolated locations and face some of the same challenges as the laboratories. However, these sites require fewer candidates with advanced degrees and can generally rely on the local workforce to fill other types of critical skills positions. For example, Savannah River Site and Pantex are also both located far from other large cities. However, because of their relative isolation, they are among the biggest employers in these areas, and many local candidates are qualified and eager to accept positions in weapons manufacturing and maintenance. Pantex officials reported that they do not have difficulty finding most workers to perform weapons maintenance, which requires a shorter amount of on-the-job training than weapons design but nonetheless requires a set of critical skills. However, site staff have had to develop strategies to attract candidates to fill those positions that require advanced degrees. Unlike the laboratories, officials at all of the production plants told us that they focus their recruiting efforts for these positions at local and regional colleges and universities. Officials at Y-12, for example, have identified competitive science and engineering programs at universities within 300 miles of their plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Y-12 officials reported that they have better results in both recruiting and retaining critically skilled workers when those workers have personal ties to the area. In contrast, M&O contractor officials from the laboratories told us that they needed to recruit from the top academic programs across the country.¶ High cost and competition. Two enterprise sites are located in areas with high costs of living, which can deter qualified candidates—Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore. NNSA and its M&O contractors have flexibility to offer higher compensation for some critical skills, but some candidates are unwilling to live in high cost areas. For example, housing in Los Alamos is expensive and scarce. According to Los Alamos National Laboratory staff, some employees commute nearly 100 miles each way from Albuquerque every day partly due to cost of living constraints. Los Alamos Human Resources managers reported that high housing costs are a concern among current and prospective employees. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, located in the San Francisco Bay Area, is also a high cost area. NNSA has authorized higher salaries for some critically skilled M&O contractor employees but delays during the hiring process can give private sector recruiters an advantage with critically skilled candidates. Lawrence Livermore uses the flexibilities it has to negotiate competitive compensation, but a candidate interested in weapons work may be drawn to another site with a lower cost of living, such as Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque or one of the production plants.

#### Nuclear fusion expertise doesn’t spill over to weapons.

Murdock 9—Clark Murdock, Senior Advisor, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 12/09, Technical Challenges Associated With the New U.S. Nuclear Agenda, http://csis.org/publication/technical-challenges-associated-new-us-nuclear-agenda

Participants also discussed the leveraging of other national security missions in maintaining¶ capabilities. Several believe that there is room to improve synergies between nuclear weapons and¶ other national security missions with the goal of better leveraging flow of personnel and use of¶ physical capabilities to the benefit of both. However, it was also noted that there is no substitute for¶ nuclear weapons design and that these capabilities cannot be purely sustained by exercise that does¶ not include such nuclear weapons design; the kinds of environments and requirements that nuclear¶ weapons must be designed too often have no analogue outside the weapons program.

### Defense

#### Nuclear deterrence is not credible

Gormley 9 – Dennis Gormley, Senior Fellow in the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute for International Studies, Fall 2009, “The Path to Deep Nuclear Reductions: Dealing with American Conventional Superiority,” online: http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite\_defense/PP29\_Gormley.pdf

Of course, the decided advantage that precision conventional weapons have over nuclear weapons is that an adversary knows full well that the United States is highly likely to use its conventional advantage should its security interests become seriously threatened. As for nuclear threats, the only ones that may prove salient are ones that threaten nuclear retaliation during an ongoing conventional war against a regional state in possession of a small nuclear capability. But still, U.S. reliance on precision conventional weapons represents the best form of deterrence – pre-war and intra-war – if only because of the declining value of the threat of nuclear use. As previously noted, Paul Nitze argued in 1994 that nuclear weapons were unlikely to deter regional aggressors as well as precision conventional weapons, not least because of the growing effectiveness of non-nuclear options but also because American presidents would be unwilling to use nuclear weapons.22 Notably, after the 1991 Persian Gulf War, Colin Powell dismissed the utility to nuclear use, while his commander-in-chief, President George H.W. Bush, acknowledged in his memoir that he had ruled out a nuclear response in that war.23

## Economy Adv

### 1NC AT: Econ Advantage – Timeframe

#### The stimulus effect from nuclear takes too long to be effective

Thomas ’10 – professor at the University of Greenwich Business School, and has been a researcher in the area of energy policy for over 25 years (Stephen, Nuclear Power's Global Expansion: Weighing Its Costs and Risks, Chapter 4: “The Credit Crunch and Nuclear Power,” December, Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, published by U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, pg. 132-133, <http://npolicy.org/userfiles/image/The%20Credit%20Crunch%20and%20Nuclear%20Power_pdf.pdf>)

KEYNESIAN STIMULATION¶ With governments desperately looking for measures that will prevent their economies from slipping too deeply into recession, there is bound to be some pressure for Keynesian measures to stimulate the economy through government or government-inspired investment in infrastructure. Building nuclear power plants might seem to be a good way to do this. To some extent, any major infrastructure project will stimulate the economy because it will employ labor and use materials but that does not avoid the need for governments to choose projects that have long-term value to the economy so choices still have to be made. The other relevant issue is how quickly can the chosen project have an impact, and this is the major weakness for nuclear projects. Even in the countries where the process of restarting nuclear ordering is most advanced, notably the United States and the UK, no orders can be realistically placed for 4-5 years.¶ If an immediate stimulus is needed in the energy sector, energy efficiency measures, which have a short lead-time, which employ a large number of workers with varying skills and which have a huge long-term welfare benefit would seem likely to be far more effective. It is therefore particularly surprising that the British government is cutting funding for its flagship energy efficiency program, Warmfront.9

### 1NC AT: Econ Advantage – Too Small

#### Power plants don’t create enough jobs

Tucker 8/16/12 – the author of Terrestrial Energy: How Nuclear Power Will Lead the Green Revolution and End America's Energy Odyssey (William, “Nuclear’s Problem — Too Much Energy, Not Enough Jobs,” Nuclear Townhall, <http://www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-nuclear%E2%80%99s-problem-%E2%80%94-too-much-energy-not-enough-jobs/>)

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

### 1NC No War

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Global economy resilient

Zakaria 9—PhD in pol sci from Harvard. Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, The Secrets of Stability, 12 December 2009, http://www.fareedzakaria.com/articles/articles.html)

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s.¶ Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression."¶ Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets.¶ Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization.¶ One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.¶ A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"¶ This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies.¶ It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit.¶ Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

# 2NC

## Fiscal Cliff

### Impact Calculus

#### Unchecked Iranian influence triggers nuclear war

Ben-Meir 7 – Alon, professor of international relations at the Center for Global Affairs at NYU, UPI, February 6, Realpolitik: Ending Iran's defiance

That Iran stands today able to challenge or even defy the United States in every sphere of American influence in the Middle East attests to the dismal failure of the Bush administration's policy toward it during the last six years. Feeling **emboldened and unrestrained**, Tehran may, however, miscalculate the consequences of its own actions, which could **precipitate a catastrophic regional war**. The Bush administration has less than a year to rein in Iran's reckless behavior if it hopes to prevent such an ominous outcome and achieve, at least, a modicum of regional stability. By all assessments, Iran has reaped the greatest benefits from the Iraq war. The war's consequences and the American preoccupation with it have provided Iran with an historic opportunity to establish Shiite dominance in the region while aggressively pursuing a nuclear weapon program to deter any challenge to its strategy. Tehran is fully cognizant that the successful pursuit of its regional hegemony has now become intertwined with the clout that a nuclear program bestows. Therefore, it is most unlikely that Iran will give up its nuclear ambitions at this juncture, unless it concludes that the price will be too high to bear. That is, whereas before the Iraq war Washington could deal with Iran's nuclear program by itself, now the Bush administration must also disabuse Iran of the belief that it can achieve its regional objectives with impunity. Thus, while the administration attempts to stem the Sunni-Shiite violence in Iraq to prevent it from engulfing other states in the region, Washington must also take a clear stand in Lebanon. Under no circumstances should Iranian-backed Hezbollah be allowed to topple the secular Lebanese government. If this were to occur, it would trigger not only a devastating civil war in Lebanon but a wider Sunni-Shiite bloody conflict. The Arab Sunni states, especially, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Jordan, are terrified of this possible outcome. For them Lebanon may well provide the litmus test of the administration's resolve to inhibit Tehran's adventurism but they must be prepared to directly support U.S. efforts. In this regard, the Bush administration must wean Syria from Iran. This move is of paramount importance because not only could Syria end its political and logistical support for Hezbollah, but it could return Syria, which is predominantly Sunni, to the Arab-Sunni fold. President Bush must realize that Damascus' strategic interests are not compatible with Tehran's and the Assad regime knows only too well its future political stability and economic prosperity depends on peace with Israel and normal relations with the United States. President Bashar Assad may talk tough and embrace militancy as a policy tool; he is, however, the same president who called, more than once, for unconditional resumption of peace negotiation with Israel and was rebuffed. The stakes for the United States and its allies in the region are too high to preclude testing Syria's real intentions which can be ascertained only through direct talks. It is high time for the administration to reassess its policy toward Syria and begin by abandoning its schemes of regime change in Damascus. Syria simply matters; the administration must end its efforts to marginalize a country that can play such a pivotal role in changing the political dynamic for the better throughout the region. Although ideally direct negotiations between the United States and Iran should be the first resort to resolve the nuclear issue, as long as Tehran does not feel seriously threatened, it seems unlikely that the clergy will at this stage end the nuclear program. In possession of nuclear weapons Iran will intimidate the larger Sunni Arab states in the region, bully smaller states into submission, threaten Israel's very existence, use oil as a political weapon to blackmail the West and instigate regional proliferation of nuclear weapons' programs. In short, if unchecked, **Iran could plunge the Middle East into a deliberate or inadvertent nuclear conflagration**. If we take the administration at its word that it would not tolerate a nuclear Iran and considering these regional implications, Washington is left with no choice but to warn Iran of the severe consequences of not halting its nuclear program.

#### African instability goes global

Glick 7 – senior ME Fellow @ Center for Security Policy in Washington DC

Caroline B. Glick, the senior Middle East fellow at the Center for Security Policy in Washington, D.C., The Center for Security Policy is a non-profit, non-partisan national security organization. 12/11/2007. “Condi's African holiday”. http://www.carolineglick.com/e/2007/12/condis-african-holiday.php?pf=yes

The Horn of Africa is a dangerous and strategically vital place. Small wars, which rage continuously, can easily escalate into big wars. Local conflicts have regional and global aspects. All of the conflicts in this tinderbox, which controls shipping lanes from the Indian Ocean into the Red Sea, can potentially give rise to regional, and indeed global conflagrations between competing regional actors and global powers.

#### Terrorism will go nuclear - extinction

Hellman 8[Martin E. Hellman, emeritus prof of engineering @ Stanford, “Risk Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence” SPRING 2008 THE BENT OF TAU BETA PI, http://www.nuclearrisk.org/paper.pdf]

The threat of nuclear terrorism looms much larger in the public’s mind than the threat of a full-scale nuclear war, yet this article focuses primarily on the latter. An explanation is therefore in order before proceeding. A terrorist attack involving a nuclear weapon would be a catastrophe of immense proportions: “A 10-kiloton bomb detonated at Grand Central Station on a typical work day would likely kill some half a million people, and inflict over a trillion dollars in direct economic damage. America and its way of life would be changed forever.” [Bunn 2003, pages viii-ix]. The likelihood of such an attack is also significant. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry has estimated the chance of a nuclear terrorist incident within the next decade to be roughly 50 percent [Bunn 2007, page 15]. David Albright, a former weapons inspector in Iraq, estimates those odds at less than one percent, but notes, “We would never accept a situation where the chance of a major nuclear accident like Chernobyl would be anywhere near 1% .... A nuclear terrorism attack is a low-probability event, but we can’t live in a world where it’s anything but extremely low-probability.” [Hegland 2005]. In a survey of 85 national security experts, Senator Richard Lugar found a median estimate of 20 percent for the “probability of an attack involving a nuclear explosion occurring somewhere in the world in the next 10 years,” with 79 percent of the respondents believing “it more likely to be carried out by terrorists” than by a government [Lugar 2005, pp. 14-15]. I support increased efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism, but that is not inconsistent with the approach of this article. Because terrorism is one of the potential trigger mechanisms for a full-scale nuclear war, the risk analyses proposed herein will include estimating the risk of nuclear terrorism as one component of the overall risk. If that risk, the overall risk, or both are found to be unacceptable, then the proposed remedies would be directed to reduce which- ever risk(s) warrant attention. Similar remarks apply to a number of other threats (e.g., nuclear war between the U.S. and China over Taiwan). his article would be incomplete if it only dealt with the threat of nuclear terrorism and neglected the threat of full- scale nuclear war. If both risks are unacceptable, an effort to reduce only the terrorist component would leave humanity in great peril. In fact, society’s almost total neglect of the threat of full-scale nuclear war makes studying that risk all the more important. The cosT of World War iii The danger associated with nuclear deterrence depends on both the cost of a failure and the failure rate.3 This section explores the cost of a failure of nuclear deterrence, and the next section is concerned with the failure rate. While other definitions are possible, this article defines a failure of deterrence to mean a full-scale exchange of all nuclear weapons available to the U.S. and Russia, an event that will be termed World War III. Approximately 20 million people died as a result of the first World War. World War II’s fatalities were double or triple that number—chaos prevented a more precise deter- mination. In both cases humanity recovered, and the world today bears few scars that attest to the horror of those two wars. Many people therefore implicitly believe that a third World War would be horrible but survivable, an extrapola- tion of the effects of the first two global wars. In that view, World War III, while horrible, is something that humanity may just have to face and from which it will then have to recover. In contrast, some of those most qualified to assess the situation hold a very different view. In a 1961 speech to a joint session of the Philippine Con- gress, General Douglas MacArthur, stated, “Global war has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. … If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess even the chance of the winner of a duel. It contains now only the germs of double suicide.” Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ex- pressed a similar view: “If deterrence fails and conflict develops, the present U.S. and NATO strategy carries with it a high risk that Western civilization will be destroyed” [McNamara 1986, page 6]. More recently, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn4 echoed those concerns when they quoted President Reagan’s belief that nuclear weapons were “totally irrational, totally inhu- mane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilization.” [Shultz 2007] Official studies, while couched in less emotional terms, still convey the horrendous toll that World War III would exact: “The resulting deaths would be far beyond any precedent. Executive branch calculations show a range of U.S. deaths from 35 to 77 percent (i.e., 79-160 million dead) … a change in targeting could kill somewhere between 20 million and 30 million additional people on each side .... These calculations reflect only deaths during the first 30 days. Additional millions would be injured, and many would eventually die from lack of adequate medical care … millions of people might starve or freeze during the follow- ing winter, but it is not possible to estimate how many. … further millions … might eventually die of latent radiation effects.” [OTA 1979, page 8] This OTA report also noted the possibility of serious ecological damage [OTA 1979, page 9], a concern that as- sumed a new potentiality when the TTAPS report [TTAPS 1983] proposed that the ash and dust from so many nearly simultaneous nuclear explosions and their resultant fire- storms could usher in a nuclear winter that might erase homo sapiens from the face of the earth, much as many scientists now believe the K-T Extinction that wiped out the dinosaurs resulted from an impact winter caused by ash and dust from a large asteroid or comet striking Earth. The TTAPS report produced a heated debate, and there is still no scientific consensus on whether a nuclear winter would follow a full-scale nuclear war. Recent work [Robock 2007, Toon 2007] suggests that even a limited nuclear exchange or one between newer nuclear-weapon states, such as India and Pakistan, could have devastating long-lasting climatic consequences due to the large volumes of smoke that would be generated by fires in modern megacities. While it is uncertain how destructive World War III would be, prudence dictates that we apply the same engi- neering conservatism that saved the Golden Gate Bridge from collapsing on its 50th anniversary and assume that preventing World War III is a necessity—not an option.

#### **Sequestration tanks heg---kills readiness, military modernization, flexibility, and perceptions of security assurances---our evidence is more qualified**

BPC 12 Bipartisan Policy Center's Task Force on Defense Budget and Strategy. Co-Chairs: Senator Pete Domenici, Former Chairman of the U.S. Senate Budget Committee and Senior Fellow at the BPC, Secretary Dan Glickman, Former U.S. Agricultural Secretary and Former Chairman of the U.S. House Select Intelligence Committee and Senior Fellow at the BPC, and General James Jones, Former National Security Advisor and Former Commander of U.S. European Command and Senior Fellow at the BPC. Members: Dr. Graham Allison, Director of the Belfer Center at Harvard, Ross Perot, General Peter Chiarelli, Former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Major General Arnold Punaro, Senior Fellow of the Defense Business Board and Former Staff Director of the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, Admiral Greg Johnson, Former Commander of U.S. Naval Forces in Europe, Dr. Abram Shulsky, Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute, General George Joulwan, Former Commander of U.S. European Command, General Charles Wald, Former Deputy Commander of U.S. European Command, Read Admiral David Mercer, Former Commander of Navy Region Europe, Dr. Dov Zakheim, Former Under Secretary of Defense, and Dr. Michael O'Hanlon, Senior Fellow at the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution. "Indefensible: The Sequester’s Mechanics and Adverse Effects on National and Economic Security," June, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/6-7-12%20FINAL%20Sequester%20White%20Paper.pdf

Note: Charts omitted

The FY 2013 sequester will replace the ability of elected leaders to set defense policy with a procedure that will indiscriminately cut 15 percent from defense programs. Indeed, at a time when the military is reorienting its missions to new strategic priorities and seeking to modernize its forces as two major land wars wind down, **these across-the-board cuts will make it significantly more difficult to ensure** readiness**, procure** new weapons **systems, and invest in** new tech**nology to meet** emerging threats. ¶ The president is charged with defining the threats that the United States is likely to confront and a strategic vision for how to avoid or defeat them. The Pentagon contributes to formulating that strategy, and is responsible for ensuring that our forces are prepared and have the necessary equipment to enact it. Through the authorization and appropriations processes, lawmakers are able to modify that blueprint to best serve the security interests of the nation. But on January 2, 2013, the views of the president, Pentagon, and Congress will matter little. ¶ The sequester will deprive all three of these stakeholders of their power to shape the country’s defense policy. Instead, a mechanism that uniformly slashes 15 percent from most defense budget accounts will take the place of the best judgments of our elected representatives and their appointed officials about what is needed to keep us safe. ¶ Such cuts, **blind to strategic priorities**, will leave the U.S. military unable to implement effectively any credible national security strategy – whether President Obama’s or any other one – because arbitrary reductions will have taken the place of deliberative planning. Cuts made in this fashion will eliminate almost all of DoD’s discretion to preserve funding for the most important and efficient national security missions and capabilities. ¶ As an example, consider the administration’s Strategic Guidance issued in January 2012 and the capabilities that the Pentagon has deemed necessary. This new strategy highlights that “U.S. economic and security interests are inextricably linked to developments in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia,” 17 and therefore, “we will of necessity rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region.” Accomplishing this, according to the Pentagon, will require the military to shift toward a leaner, more agile force – one that can effectively project its power across the vast distances of the Pacific Ocean. Accordingly, military planners have identified the need for greater investment in technologically-superior air-, sea- and cyber-power at the cost of heavy ground forces. Additionally, after 10 years of war, military leaders have made it clear that our troops need to recover and aging equipment needs to be repaired. ¶ The Pentagon’s budget request for FY 2013 reflects these priorities – increasing funding for weapons platforms that support power projection and other missions critical to the new strategy, and cutting money for programs that military leaders no longer have deemed to be as critical. As Secretary Panetta told an Asian security conference on June 2, 2012: ¶ We are investing specifically in those kinds of capabilities – such as an advanced fifth-generation fighter, an enhanced Virginia-class submarine, new electronic warfare and communications capabilities, and improved precision weapons – that will provide our forces with freedom of maneuver in areas in which our access and freedom of action may be threatened. We recognize the challenges of operating over the Pacific’s vast distances. That is why we are investing in new aerial-refueling tankers, a new bomber, and advanced maritime patrol and anti-submarine warfare aircraft. 18 ¶ DoD’s budget request strives to meet the demands of the president’s new defense strategy while roughly abiding by the original BCA cap levels for defense spending, lowering the base defense budget by about $5 billion compared to FY 2012, but without accounting for the sequester’s further automatic cuts. ¶ Our analysis, however, indicates that the sequester will greatly constrain the Pentagon’s ability to execute any of these strategic shifts in its procurement, planning, and training. Without meaningful reforms, inefficiencies in the defense budget are already eroding funds needed to train, equip, and deploy our forces. Now, the combination of continued FY 2012 funding, which does not reflect the president’s new strategic priorities, and the indiscriminate 15 percent sequester cut mean that funds available to DoD on January 2, 2013, will differ greatly from those it requested. Indeed, some priority projects might receive as much as 75 percent less funding than the Pentagon determined was needed for FY 2013. Conversely, weapons systems for which DoD has requested reduced funding because of their lower priority in light of the new strategy could receive as much as nine times more funding than requested. ¶ More specifically, our calculations indicate that refurbishment of the nearly 25-year-old USS Abraham Lincoln aircraft carrier, development and purchases of a new aerial refueling tanker, and funding for resetting and retraining troops could be cut by 72, 57, and 42 percent, respectively, relative to the Pentagon’s FY 2013 request. Additionally, funding could fall roughly $1.7 billion short of the nearly $4 billion requested by DoD and Homeland Security for investments in the personnel, technology, and infrastructure needed to protect our sensitive computer networks by developing offensive cyber capabilities. Simultaneously, funding for Heavy Tactical Vehicles, the M-1 Abrams tank, and Stryker armored vehicles – all ground vehicles that serve little purpose in the Asia-Pacific region – could be increased by 934, 442, and 107 percent, respectively, over the Pentagon’s request for FY 2013. ¶ Thus, the sequester will leave military leaders with some combination of three options, each of which will increase risks and costs: ¶ • Indefinitely delay implementation of the new strategy, and accept the strategic risks that would flow from not moving to address the threats identified in the Strategic Guidance. ¶ • Attempt to pursue the new strategy with fewer of the new capabilities and weapons platforms than the Pentagon has deemed necessary, and accept the operational risks that come from not having enough of the right tools for the job and lower force readiness. ¶ • Make do with the older weapons systems that DoD already possesses, and accept the tactical and safety risks of using outdated technology that does not fulfill the requirements of current missions, and is also more likely to fail. ¶ The first two options cause contract delays, reductions, and renegotiations, contributing to increases in per-unit costs. The last option will result in increased maintenance costs, as antiquated planes, ships, and helicopters are pushed beyond their expected service lives. Either way, the military eventually will need some of the weapons that the sequester will keep us from purchasing today. Indeed, nearly one-quarter of our ships failed inspection last year. The average age of our fighter jets is 22 years, our bombers 35 years, and our aerial refueling tankers 47 years. The longer we put off modernizing our armed forces, the greater the risk to our troops and the greater the eventual procurement costs will be, defeating the very logic of deficit reduction. ¶ Meanwhile, although China’s military power is still inferior to that of the United States, Beijing’s actions – and fear of its intentions – have already led many regional countries to look to the United States for security guarantees and cooperation. **If U.S. commitment to these alliances is perceived to be weakening, or our ability to defend them waning, our partners could feel pressured to accommodate China’s growing ambitions.** ¶ At a time when the military is reconstituting itself as two major land wars wind down, being called upon to reorient its missions to new strategic priorities and seeking to modernize its forces, across-the-board cuts will make it significantly more difficult to properly ensure readiness, procure new weapons systems, and invest in new technology to meet emerging threats. As a result, **the U.S. military will be left in a holding pattern, trying to make do with yesterday’s military to fight tomorrow’s wars.**

#### Going over the fiscal cliff causes a second great depression

Morici 8/7 Peter, PhD, is a "recognized expert on economic policy and international economics." He is a Professor of International Business at the R.H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland. "Fix fiscal cliff now or face next Great Depression," 2012, http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/08/07/fix-fiscal-cliff-now-or-face-next-great-depression/

President Obama and Republicans are engaging in dangerous brinksmanship. Putting off a political solution to the looming “fiscal cliff” until after the election **risks a** second Great Depression.¶ Without a compromise by January, $400 billion in mandatory spending cuts and more than $100 billion in tax increases will immediately go into effect. **With our economy only growing by only $300 billion annually, such a shock would thrust it into a prolonged contraction.**

#### The economy’s growing steadily now, but fiscal cliff would trigger global collapse

Schoen 11/7 John, NBC News. “Obama victory clouded by looming fiscal battle with Congress,” 2012, http://www.nbcnews.com/business/economywatch/obama-victory-clouded-looming-fiscal-battle-congress-1C6892841

The slow, steady improvement in the economy that helped Obama defeat Republican nominee Mitt Romney Tuesday is in peril if he can’t quickly forge agreement with a still-divided Congress on a new budget that delays steep tax increases and deep spending cuts.¶ The so-called “fiscal cliff” – set to take effect Jan.1 – is a doomsday budget package Congress enacted in 2011 to try to force compromise on a series of bitterly divisive policy choices. The budget package is a witch's brew of harsh measures designed to inflict political pain as widely as possible, the better to prompt all sides to reach the compromise that would prevent it from taking effect.¶ The law slashes Obama’s popular payroll tax cut, cancels extended jobless benefits, imposes deep cuts in Medicare reimbursements to doctors, exposes millions of Americans to the dreaded Alternative Minimum Tax, eliminates tax deductions for state and local sales taxes and child care tax credits (among others), takes a meat ax to defense spending and slashes “discretionary” spending – on everything from education to homeland security – by as much as 10 percent.¶ Economists and politicians, including Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, have warned it would almost certainly wipe out any progress the White House has made in reviving the economy and creating jobs.¶ Concern about the fiscal cliff was among the factors driving down stock prices sharply in a post-election slump. The Dow Jones industrial average was down nearly 300 points in its biggest one-day slump in nearly a year, pushing the benchmark index below the 13,000 level before it recovered slightly.¶ Recent reports have shown the economy picking up strength. Growth in U.S. gross domestic product, though still sluggish, picked up to a 2.0 percent annual pace in the third quarter from a 1.3 percent rate in the second. After a pause this spring, the pace of hiring picked up this summer, with employers now adding some 175,000 new jobs a month to payrolls. Consumers are spending more on big-ticket items, like cars and appliances.¶ A prolonged budget impasse would reverse those gains. The hit to consumer spending from higher taxes, along with the loss of government spending, would knock 3 to 4 percent from GDP, according to the Congressional Budget Office.¶ Related: Stocks plunge on worries about fiscal cliff, Europe¶ "If we go back into recession, we will likely pull the global economy with us," said Ameriprise Financial economist Russell Price. "The longer a (budget) deal takes, the longer the economy suffers. It’s just that simple."

### 2NC Will Pass

#### Will pass---Obama has momentum and the upper-hand

Cohen 11/9 Tom is a writer for CNN. “Obama calls on House to pass tax hikes for wealthy,” 2012, http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/09/politics/obama-fiscal-cliff/index.html?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+rss%2Fcnn\_allpolitics+%28RSS%3A+Politics%29&utm\_content=Google+Reader

Washington (CNN) -- Flush with **re-election vigor**, President Barack Obama called Friday for House Republicans to immediately pass a bill already approved by the Senate to extend current tax rates for middle class Americans while allowing a tax hike for wealthier citizens.¶ In his first public comments since winning Tuesday's vote, Obama expressed openness to negotiate with Congress on how to deal with pending tax hikes and spending cuts that create the so-called fiscal cliff facing the economy at the end of the year.¶ However, he also repeated a longstanding demand from well before the election that Republican opponents to any kind of tax increase relent to the will of the White House and the Senate, and now the American people as well, on letting tax rates increase on income over $250,000.¶ Nobody in either party wants the middle class, identified as families making less than $250,000 a year, to see taxes increase at the end of the year when lower rates set during the administration of former President George W. Bush will expire, Obama said.¶ "That makes no sense. It would be bad for the economy," he told a White House gathering of what aides described as middle class Americans. "Let's extend middle class tax cuts right now. Let's do that right now. That one step would give millions of families, 98% of Americans, 97% of small businesses, the certainty that they need going into the new year."¶ Noting the Senate previously passed a bill to extend the tax cuts to the middle class, but not income over $250,000, Obama said "all we need is action from the House."¶ "I've got the pen," he said, reaching into his pocket to hold one up as the crowd applauded. "I'm ready to sign the bill right away. I'm ready to do it."¶ The president also announced he invited congressional leaders from both parties to the White House next week to launch talks on finding a solution to the fiscal cliff, as well as consensus on how to strike a comprehensive deal to reduce the nation's chronic federal deficits and debt.¶ While offering to consider unspecified reforms to costly entitlement programs sought by Republicans, Obama' s initial salvo in what will be a long and tough negotiation signaled **he was unwilling to back down** on the tax issue that was a central theme of his election campaign.¶ "Our job now is to get a majority in Congress to reflect the will of the American people," the president said.¶ Obama and House Speaker John Boehner are positioned as the lead negotiators in a showdown between Democrats and Republicans over the issue identified by voters as a top priority: reducing the chronic federal deficits and debt considered a threat to economic prosperity and national security.¶ Boehner, R-Ohio, signaled a willingness to deal on Friday but also maintained hard-line GOP opposition to any tax increase.¶ "Raising tax rates will slow down our ability to create the jobs everyone says they want," Boehner said at a news conference, noting that higher taxes on the wealthy will hit small business owners.¶ But he also said that "everything on the revenue side and on the spending side has to be looked at."¶ Boehner called on Obama to take the lead in offering a workable plan that Republicans can accept but stopped short of providing details, saying: "I don't want to limit the options available to me or limit the options that might be available to the White House."¶ Asked if tea party conservatives or others in his caucus might oppose an agreement they don't like, Boehner responded: "When the president and I have been able to come to an agreement, there has been no problem in getting it passed here in the House."¶ Obama was scheduled to deliver a statement on the economy at the White House later on Friday.¶ **Boehner's hand was weakened by the election results** Tuesday that returned Obama to the White House, broadened the Democratic majority in the Senate and slightly narrowed the Republican majority in the House.¶ Pawlenty: Fiscal cliff can be solved Consequences of failing to compromise¶ Retiring GOP Rep. Steve LaTourette of Ohio told CNN that a poll commissioned by centrist Republicans showed that voters wanted Congress to fix the nation's fiscal problems rather than cling to political orthodoxy.¶ "They didn't send the same bunch back to town in this election because they love what they're doing," LaTourette said. "They sent him back because they don't trust either side, but they do expect them to get this thing done."¶ While the result was another split Congress like the current session that has become a symbol of legislative dysfunction, both sides have signaled a possible new openness to an agreement that was unreachable in the past two years.¶ In the final days of the campaign, Vice President Joe Biden referred to private talks with members of Congress on the pending fiscal impacts of expiring tax cuts and mandatory budget cuts. This week, Boehner called on Obama to work with him to complete a comprehensive deficit reduction agreement -- the "grand bargain" that eluded them last year.

#### Passage is likely---Obama’s push will get it done---Republicans agree

Montgomery and Goldfarb 11/6 Lori and Zachary are writer for the Washington Post. “Fresh from reelection, president finds himself on edge of ‘fiscal cliff’,” 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/decision2012/fiscal-cliff-clock-starts-in-earnest-as-election-fades-to-background/2012/11/06/c4dfde6e-27b2-11e2-b2a0-ae18d6159439\_story.html

President Obama returns to Washington from the campaign trail Wednesday to face an epic year-end battle over taxes and spending that could ultimately tame the national debt and advance his ambitions for a second term.¶ The president, who won reelection late Tuesday, must now confront the “fiscal cliff,” nearly $500 billion in automatic tax hikes and spending cuts set to take effect in January that could throw the nation back into recession.¶ If Obama can engineer a compromise to avert the cliff with the freshly reelected Republican House, he could set the stage for progress on other second-term priorities, including immigration reform, climate change and investments in education and manufacturing. Such a compromise could also infuse fresh energy into an economic recovery that has suffered from uncertainty over the future of federal budget policies.¶ “Getting a deal on long-term fiscal soundness is paramount to move forward and to see the economy really keep improving,” said Bill Daley, Obama’s former chief of staff. It will also “give confidence that the political system can address a major issue.”¶ With Congress scheduled to return to Washington next week for a post-election legislative session**, policymakers will have just 49 days to reach consensus**. At stake is the fate of dozens of expiring tax breaks — including lower rates for all taxpayers adopted during the George W. Bush administration — and deep cuts to the Pentagon and other agency budgets.¶ Obama has threatened to veto legislation to avert the cliff that extends the Bush tax rates for the wealthy. After a campaign focused heavily on that pledge, Democrats say **the president is prepared to draw a firm line in the sand**, even if it means letting one of the largest tax hikes in U.S. history take effect on Jan. 1.¶ “Republicans face a choice, and the choice is theirs,” said Rep. Chris Van Hollen (Md.), the senior Democrat on the House Budget Committee. “If they want to drive off the fiscal cliff, that means they want to go into January demanding that people like Mitt Romney get a bonus tax break or nobody gets any tax relief.”¶ Despite the risks to the economy — and the potential disruption to the 2012 tax filing season — Democrats see a clear advantage to going over the cliff. In January, once the Bush tax cuts have expired, Democrats would be free to draft their own plan to cut taxes for the middle class, but not the wealthy, and dare Republicans to reject it.¶ “If you allow all the tax rates to revert, you’re talking about raising $5 trillion over 10 years,” Van Hollen said. “So Republicans will have to choose: Do they prefer $5 trillion in [new] revenue? Or something in the range of $2 trillion?” The latter revenue figure is the target amount set by the independent fiscal commission led by Democrat Erskine Bowles and former GOP senator Alan K. Simpson of Wyoming.¶ Obama’s most recent budget request called for more than $1.5 trillion in new revenue over the next decade, primarily by raising rates and limiting the value of deductions on annual income over $250,000. In the coming days, Democrats say, Obama is likely to launch a concerted public relations campaign in support of his budget plan, continuing his call for a “balanced approach” to debt reduction.¶ Republicans have long resisted any increase in taxes, and conservatives say they will not bend, even if it means letting tax rates rise across the board.¶ “It’s a difficult position to be in,” acknowledged Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio), chairman of the conservative Republican Study Committee. “But just two years ago, the American people sent 65 new Republicans to the House of Representatives. And they said, ‘Don’t go there and compromise with Barack Obama. Go there and stop him.’ ”¶ House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) took a similar stand late Tuesday after voters returned a Republican majority in the House. By renewing the GOP majority, he said during an event in Washington, “the American people have . . . made clear that there is no mandate for raising tax rates.”¶ Still, **faced with a** determined **Democratic president**, many Republicans on Capitol Hill and elsewhere say the GOP will have **few options but to compromise**.¶ ¶ “I love what John Boehner is saying, but **I have a hard time believing Republicans won’t cave**,” said GOP tax lobbyist Kenneth J. Kies. To resist Obama, “you have to be prepared to shoot the hostages. You have to be prepared to let it all expire. And it takes a lot of courage to do that.”

#### Will pass---momentum---Boehner will compromise---PC is key

Chicago Tribune 11/7 “Obama wins but 'fiscal cliff' looms,” 2012, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/chi-obama-fiscal-cliff-20121107,0,7326267.story?page=1

Even before Obama gets to his second inaugural on Jan. 20, he must deal with the threatened "fiscal cliff." A combination of automatic tax increases and steep across-the-board spending cuts are set to take effect in January if Washington doesn't quickly reach a budget deal. Experts have warned that the economy could tip back into recession without an agreement.¶ The top Democrat in Congress called Wednesday for a quick solution to Washington's "fiscal cliff" in an upcoming post-election session of Congress.¶ At the same time, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said that asking wealthier people to pay higher taxes needs to be part of any solution to the government's budget woes.¶ The Nevada Democrat told reporters in Washington he's "not for kicking the can down the road" and that any solution should include higher taxes on "the richest of the rich."¶ The fiscal cliff is the one-two punch of expiring Bush-era tax cuts and across-the-board spending cuts to the Pentagon and domestic programs that could total $800 billion next year, based on Congressional Budget Office estimates.¶ "The vast majority of the American people &#8212; rich, poor, everybody agrees &#8212; the richest of the rich have to help a little bit," Reid said.¶ A **rejuvenated Obama** still confronts a re-elected House GOP majority that stands in powerful opposition to his promise to raise tax rates on upper-bracket earners, although House Speaker John **Boehner**, R-Ohio, **has left the door open for** other forms of new revenue as part of **a deal** totackle the spiraling national debt.¶ "The American people have also made clear that there is no mandate for raising tax rates," Boehner said Tuesday night. "What Americans want are solutions that will ease the burden on small businesses, bring jobs home, and let our economy grow. **We stand ready to work** with any willing partner &#8212; Republican, Democrat, or otherwise &#8212; who shares a commitment to getting these things done."¶ The Ohio Republican is scheduled to address the issue Wednesday afternoon.¶ Reid also said he anticipates addressing the need to increase the government's borrowing cap early next year and not in the post-election session of Congress.¶ Newly elected Democrats signaled they want compromise to avoid the fiscal cliff.¶ Sen.-elect Tim Kaine, a former Virginia governor who defeated Republican George Allen, said on NBC's "Today" show that voters sent a message they want "cooperative government." But he also says the election results show that the public doesn't want "all the levers in one party's hands" on Capitol Hill.¶ From Massachusetts, Elizabeth Warren said on "CBS This Morning" that those who voted for her opponent, Republican Sen. Scott Brown, expressed a desire for lawmakers to work together. She says: "I heard that loud and clear."¶ Obama repeated his campaign slogan of moving "forward" repeatedly in a victory speech early Wednesday in his hometown of Chicago.¶ "We will disagree, sometimes fiercely, about how to get there," he said. "As it has for more than two centuries, progress will come in fits and starts. It's not always a straight line. It's not always a smooth path. By itself, the recognition that we have common hopes and dreams won't end all the gridlock, or solve all our problems, or substitute for the painstaking work of building consensus, and making the difficult compromises needed to move this country forward. But that common bond is where we must begin."¶ Former **Obama** adviser Anita Dunn told "CBS This Morning" that the president made it clear in his acceptance speech that he **will be reaching out,** and she warned GOP House leaders, representing Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin, to keep in mind that their voters also wanted to keep Obama.¶ "Clearly there's a lot of momentum and a lot of incentive for people to work together to really find answers to the challenges," she said.¶ One of those lawmakers Dunn was referring to was GOP vice presidential nominee Paul Ryan, the Wisconsin congressman who said Wednesday that he plans to return as House Budget Committee chairman. He'll be involved in negotiations with the White House over fiscal policy, while keeping an eye on a possible presidential run in 2016.¶ Even though the tea party lost some ground with defeat of some of the movement-backed incumbents, Obama still will have to deal with a large faction of those lawmakers in the House and Senate. Republican Ted Cruz, who handily won his race for a Senate seat in Texas with tea party support, said he plans on compromising only if Obama does the same.

### Top of the Docket

#### Obama’s investing his PC in fiscal cliff now---it’s top of the docket

Kumar 11/9 Nikhil is a writer at The Independent. “President Obama's first business of new term: avert a fiscal cliff,” 2012, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/president-obamas-first-business-of-new-term-avert-a-fiscal-cliff-8301360.html

Fresh from an electoral triumph, President **Obama began to spend some of his newly-accumulated political capital** last night with a public call for Congress to avert the looming "fiscal cliff".¶ Flanked by Vice-President Joe Biden in the East Room of The White House, the President said: "Now that those of us on the campaign trail have had a chance to get a little sleep, it's time to get back to work... The American people vote for action, not for politics as usual."¶ He added: "**I've put forward a detailed plan** that allows us to make... investments while reducing our deficit by $4 trillion over the next decade."¶ While he went on to signal his openness to compromise, and to new ideas, Mr Obama, well aware of election exit polls that showed most Americans agreed with the imposition of a greater burden on the better-off, dealt head-on with the Republican opposition to higher taxes on those earning more than $250,000-a-year (£157,000).

#### It’s top of the agenda---nothing else comes before it

Espo 11/8 David is a writer for the Associated Press. “AVERTING ‘FISCAL CLIFF’ MOVES TO TOP OF AGENDA,” 2012, http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:6H1SIjsXWsoJ:www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/nov/08/tp-averting-fiscal-cliff-moves-to-top-of-agenda/+&cd=6&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us

AVERTING ‘FISCAL CLIFF’ MOVES TO TOP OF AGENDA¶ WASHINGTON — One day after a bruising, mixed-verdict election, President Barack Obama and Republican House Speaker John Boehner both pledged Wednesday to seek a compromise to avert looming spending cuts and tax increases that threaten to plunge the economy back into recession.¶ Added Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev.: “Of course” an agreement is possible.¶ While all three men spoke in general terms, Boehner stressed that Republicans would be willing to accept higher tax revenue under the right conditions as part of a more sweeping attempt to reduce deficits and restore the economy to full health.¶ While the impending “fiscal cliff” **dominates** the postelection agenda, the president and Republicans have other concerns, too.¶ Obama is looking ahead to top-level personnel changes in a second term, involving three powerful Cabinet portfolios at a minimum.¶ And Republicans are heading into a season of potentially painful reflection after losing the presidency in an economy that might have proved Obama’s political undoing. They also have fallen deeper into the Senate minority after the second election in a row in which they lost potentially winnable races by fielding candidates with views that voters evidently judged too extreme.

### AT: Doesn’t Require Congress

#### Obama is velcro and will only get blamed---no credit

**Nicholas & Hook 10** Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.¶** Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**.¶ Hoping to **better insulate Obama**, White House aides have sought to **give other Cabinet officials a higher profile** and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ **But Obama remains the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape¶ What's **not sticking to Obama** is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. **Political dividends** from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill **have been fleeting**.¶ Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."¶ Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration.¶ Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants.¶ Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole.¶ "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said.¶ But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish.¶ Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal."¶ Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise.¶ A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year.¶ At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways.¶ Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower.¶ Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize.¶ Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in.¶ "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit.¶ **Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible**. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. **Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss**.¶ But **the Obama administration is about one man**. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. **No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate**. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end.¶ So, **more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him**. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding.¶ Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times.¶ "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen."¶ A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions.¶ But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda.

### Link Debate

#### The link is unique and large---new nuclear loan guarantee money is deadly for Obama

Bendery 12 Jennifer is a writer for the Huffington Post. “Obama's Budget Nixes New Money For Program That Funded Solyndra,” 2/14, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/14/obama-budget-solyndra-program_n_1276605.html>

In a quiet shift from the past two years, President Barack Obama's 2013 budget includes no new money for the Department of Energy loan guarantee program, the same program that House Republicans have scrutinized for losing more than $500 million in taxpayer dollars to the now-defunct solar power company, Solyndra. Obama has regularly included huge increases to the program's loan guarantee authority in his budget, though Congress has not approved his proposals. He provided a $36 billion increase for nuclear reactors in his 2011 budget, and again in his 2012 budget. He also included $200 million in credit subsidies for renewable and energy efficiency projects in his 2012 budget. **This year, he provided nothing**. Meg Reilly, a spokeswoman for the Office of Management and Budget, said in an email that Obama opted not to put new money toward the loan guarantee program this time because the administration is waiting on the results of an evaluation of the Energy Department's loan portfolio. Reilly also said the program still has "a significant amount of remaining resources" from prior years and that the focus will be on putting those funds to use. There's about $10 billion in its reserves. The Energy Department "continues to conduct due diligence and is in active negotiations with a number of additional project sponsors," Reilly said. "It's important to point out here that, as of January 2012, over $24 billion in direct loans and loan guarantees have closed to support a diverse range of over 30 wind, solar, electric vehicles and other clean energy projects projected to fund more than 50,000 jobs." But some environmental groups say Obama's budgetary shift is hugely significant because it **means no** new **money for** building **nuclear** powerplants -- and they speculate that, at least in part, they have Solyndra to thank for the shift. "The entire loan program has fallen into some disrepute on Capitol Hill ... because of Solyndra and some of the other renewable programs getting in trouble," said Michael Mariotte, executive director of Nuclear Information and Resource Service, an information hub for organizations concerned with nuclear power. The administration "may have decided to cut their losses" and stop providing new funds to the program altogether.

#### **Nuclear loan guarantees are massively controversial---Solyndra**

Schor and Northey 11 Elana and Hannah are writers at Greenwire. “Will Solyndra Scandal Spill Over to Scald Nuclear Loan Guarantees?” Oct 7, http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2011/10/07/07greenwire-will-solyndra-scandal-spill-over-to-scald-nucle-3933.html?pagewanted=all

A nuclear-sector source who spoke on condition of anonymity gave voice to simmering concerns within the industry that the current controversy surrounding renewable loan guarantees, and a lack of understanding about how the program works, has misled lawmakers into thinking the entire DOE program could put taxpayers at risk.¶ A "**'throw the baby out with the bathwater'** mentality that seems to be pervading throughout Capitol Hill," the source said, "makes explaining the two different programs difficult."¶ Solyndra received its now-infamous $500 million-plus loan guarantee through DOE's Section 1705 program, created in 2009 economic stimulus law to foster renewable energy development, including biofuels, wind, geothermal and solar projects. Under Section 1705, the government covers a renewables company's debt obligation in the event the borrower defaults or the project fails, while also paying credit subsidy fees associated with the projects.¶ Those credit subsidies are "essentially loan loss reserve," then-DOE loan guarantee program director Jonathan Silver told lawmakers last month. Silver resigned his post yesterday amid mounting political pressure over the Solyndra bankruptcy, giving House Republicans a first scalp of sorts in their investigation (see related story).¶ Since the stimulus law was passed, DOE has paid $2.4 billion in credit subsidies for 28 projects under the 1705 program, an amount equivalent to provide loan guarantees of up to $25 billion, the agency said.¶ But fossil fuel and nuclear projects are only eligible for guarantees under a separate section of the program, numbered 1703, that requires companies to pay the credit subsidy fees and therefore share more risk. DOE has approved four conditional commitments worth $10.6 billion under 1703, including the Georgia nuclear reactor project and a $2 billion loan guarantee to support French nuclear giant Areva's uranium enrichment project in Idaho.¶ Because few on Capitol Hill are aware that 1703-funded companies must pay the credit subsidy fee as well as their equity stake in the project, nuclear companies are growing uneasy about the prospect that **divisiveness over renewable loan guarantees could lead to an elimination of the entire program**, according to the industry source.

#### Link turns the case---creates uncertainty that jacks nuclear investment

Thernstrom 10—Former Director of Communications, White House Council on Environmental Quality. Former Environmental Studies Fellow, Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy. (Samuel, The Greatest Danger Is Financial, [roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/02/16/a-comeback-for-nuclear-power/](http://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/02/16/a-comeback-for-nuclear-power/))

The greatest danger associated with these loan guarantees is not environmental but financial; the risk of default on these loans is high, given the **uncertain economic and regulatory** **environment** for these plants. **If construction costs soar because of** regulatory and political obstacles, **the administration could yet end up with little to show for these efforts.** There are no simple solutions to America’s energy challenges.

#### Even bipartisan renewable energy legislation is massively controversial

McEntee 8/15 Christine is the Executive Director and CEO at the American Geophysical Union. “Science, Politics and Public Opinion,” 2012, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php

We know that objective scientific knowledge is needed to inform good policy decisions---and that objective knowledge exists---but all too often we are allowing politics and ideology to take precedence over, or be pitted against, science. This not only risks the legitimacy of the science, but also the strength of the policy and its ability to protect the security, health and welfare of the American people, and support a healthy and thriving economy. The current rhetoric on climate change is a perfect example.¶ We also know that the biggest obstacles to passage of energy and environmental legislation are disagreements about the extent to which the federal government can and should regulate business, and reluctance to launch new initiatives that will add to the deficit. The science tells us that small initiatives that require only nominal investments can't begin to address the environmental and energy challenges we face; and legislation big enough to achieve significant results will cost more than Congress is willing to spend.¶ Environmental legislation is also held prisoner to partisan gridlock, with far less bipartisan support than many energy proposals. **Even environmental legislation that saves many times its cost** in medical and health care savings **cannot advance in the current Congress.** One recent example is the defeat of legislation to limit the release of airborne particulates proven to adversely affect the respiratory health of children and seniors.¶ Dissonance about the role of federal regulation, its cost-effectiveness, and potential to impose costs on private sector that might adversely impact economic recovery further complicate energy/environmental legislative calculus. For these reasons, it is difficult for Congress to pass new energy and/or environmental initiatives, **even where there is wide bipartisan support for a given bill**.¶ Lastly, we know that Congress is not likely to make much real progress on either energy or environmental issues until voters demand such action. Research shows that most voters, including Independents in swing states, do not list energy and environmental issues as a major determinant of how they vote, despite their significant impact on local, state and national economies, public health and national security. This needs to change.

### AT: Obama Doesn’t Push

#### Obama will push the plan---empirically proven

States News Service 10 “OBAMA PUTS ADMINISTRATION MUSCLE BEHIND CLIMATE AND ENERGY BILL IN MEETING WITH SENATORS,” June 29, Lexis

President Obamas call for Congress to pass comprehensive climate and energy legislation that includes a cap on carbon indicates that his administration is willing to expend political capital to secure a bill that would dramatically reduce emissions, according to the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS). The president made the request earlier today during a meeting with two dozen senators at the White House.¶ President Obama is showing that hes willing to put his weight behind the effort to pass comprehensive legislation, said UCS President Kevin Knobloch. He understands that putting us on the long-term path toward clean energy means putting a cap on carbon.

### AT: Obama No Push

#### Obama would have to push the plan for it to pass

Izadi 8/29 Elahe is a writer at the National Journal. “Former Sen. Trent Lott, Ex-Rep. Jim Davis Bemoan Partisanship on Energy Issues,” 2012, http://www.nationaljournal.com/2012-election/former-members-bemoan-partisanship-on-energy-issues-20120829

In a climate where everything from transportation issues to the farm bill have gotten caught in political gridlock, it will take serious willingness to compromise to get formerly bipartisan energy issues moving from the current partisan standstill. ¶ “If we get the right political leadership and the willingness to put everything on the table, I don’t think this has to be a partisan issue,” former Rep. Jim Davis, D-Fla., said during a Republican National Convention event on Wednesday in Tampa hosted by National Journal and the American Petroleum Institute. ¶ Former Senate Republican Leader Trent Lott of Mississippi said that “Republicans who want to produce more of everything have to also be willing to give a little on the conservation side.” ¶ The event focused on the future of energy issues and how they are playing out in the presidential and congressional races. Four years ago, the major presidential candidates both agreed that climate change needed to be addressed. However, since then, the science behind global warming has come into question by more and more Republicans. ¶ But casting energy as a defense or jobs issue, in the current political climate, will allow debates between lawmakers to gain some steam, Lott and Davis agreed. ¶ The export of coal and natural gas, hydraulic fracturing, and how tax reform will affect the energy industries are all issues that will have to be dealt with by the next president and Congress. ¶ “The job of the next president is critical on energy and many of these issues, and the job is very simple**: adult supervision of the Congress**,” Davis said. ¶ To that, Lott acknowledged that “Congress is gridlocked because of who is there.… The middle is gone.”

### AT: Winners Win---Top Level

#### Obama’s Velcro---only blame sticks to him---means winners lose---healthcare proves

Nicholas & Hook 10 Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro**.¶ Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**.¶ Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ But Obama remains **the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape.¶ **What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting.¶** Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."

#### Winners lose---PC’s not renewable, is zero-sum, and diminishes fast

Ryan 9 Selwyn, Professor Emeritus and former Director, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, “Obama and political capital,” 1/18 http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article\_opinion?id=161426968

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be **difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised**, let alone all of it. Reality will **force him to make many "u" turns** and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a **vast accumulation of political capital**, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and **fast diminishing asset** in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is **rarely ever renewable**. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who **did not know how to husband** the **political capital** with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, **some promises have to be deferred** beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that **American politics is not a winner-take-all system**. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting **anything done politically**, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, **requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading.** No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

#### PC is finite---fights on one issue make pushing others harder

Hayward 12 John is a writer at Human Events. “DON’T BE GLAD THE BUFFETT RULE IS DEAD, BE ANGRY IT EVER EXISTED,” 4/17, http://www.humanevents.com/2012/04/17/dont-be-glad-the-buffett-rule-is-dead-be-angry-it-ever-existed/

Toomey makes the excellent point that Obama’s class-warfare sideshow act is worse than useless, because it’s wasting America’s valuable time, even as the last fiscal sand runs through our hourglass. Politicians speak of “political capital” in selfish terms, as a pile of chips each party hoards on its side of the poker table, but in truth America has only a finite amount of political capital in total. When time and energy is wasted on pointless distractions, the capital expended---in the form of the public’s attention, and the debates they hold among themselves---cannot easily be regained. ¶ There is an “opportunity cost” associated with the debates we aren’t having, and the valid ideas we’re not considering, when our time is wasted upon nonsense that is useful only to political re-election campaigns. Health care reform is the paramount example of our time, as countless real, workable market-based reforms were obscured by the flaccid bulk of ObamaCare. The Buffett Rule, like all talk of tax increases in the shadow of outrageous government spending, likewise distracts us from the real issues.

#### Fights destroy momentum---stimulus proves

Harris and Lee 10 John and Carol are writers for Politico. “Obama's first year: What went wrong,” Jan 20, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9

• Obama believed that early success would be self-reinforcing, building a powerful momentum for bold government action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a big stimulus package would lead to success in passing health care, which in turn would clear the way for major cap-and-trade environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. ¶ This proved to be a radical misreading of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of the stimulus package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — meant that Obama spent the year bleeding momentum rather than steadily increasing public confidence in his larger governing vision. That vision was further obscured for many Americans by the smoke from the bitter and seemingly endless legislative battle on Capitol Hill over health care.

### PC Key

#### PC is key

Gotlieb and Kergin 11/7 Allan and Michael are writers for The Globe and Mail. “America’s cliff is Canada’s priority,” 2012, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/commentary/the-us-electorate-has-spoken-sort-of/article5032433/

President Barack Obama has eked out a slim popular vote majority. This slender margin is not reflected in his somewhat stronger numbers in the Electoral College, an 18th-century holdover that brought George W. Bush to power in 2000 despite Al Gore's 545,000 plurality.¶ Interesting to the political scientist, perhaps, but more worrying for Canadians seeking concerted governance from their southern neighbour is the split in Congress between the Senate and the House of Representatives. The narrow Democratic majority in the Senate mirrors the divide with the stronger Republican House majority that has bedevilled Washington over the past two years and prevented any progress toward confronting the crippling U.S. deficit overhang.¶ Which brings us to the edge of the Congress mandated "fiscal cliff": dramatic rises in taxes, accompanied by large cuts in expenditures, half of which come from national defence. Termed a "suicide pact," and never intended to be implemented, Congress passed legislation designed to force reluctant politicians to make tough budget choices. This fiscal “abyss” arrives Jan. 1, unless Mr. **Obama can use his replenished political capital to muscle a compromise with the lame-duck Congress.**

### Can Predict---Prefer Specific Ev

#### the agenda can be understood and is set by the President

Edwards and Barrett 99 George C. Edwards III is University Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University. He also holds the Jordan Chair in Presidential Studies and has served as the Olin Professor of American Government at Oxford and the John Adams Fellow at the University of London, and has held senior visiting appointments at Sciences Po-Paris, Peking University, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He is an Associate Member of Nuffield College at the University of Oxford and was the founder and from 1991-2001 the director of The Center for Presidential Studies. In 2012-13, he will be Winant Professor of American Government at Oxford. With Andrew Barrett. “Presidential Agenda Setting in Congress,” http://www-polisci.tamu.edu/upload\_images/9/SP13Agenda.pdf

For decades, scholars have maintained that the president has a significant - indeed, the most significant - role in setting the policymaking agenda in Washington (see, for example, Huntington 1973). John Kingdon’s careful study of the Washington agenda found that “no other single actor in the political system has quite the capability of the president to set agendas . . . the president can single handedly set the agendas, not only of people in the executive branch, but also of people in Congress and outside the government” (1995, 23). More recently, Baumgartner and Jones, in their broad examination of agenda setting, concluded that “no other single actor can focus attention as clearly, or change the motivations of such a great number of other actors, as the president” (1993, 241). Bond and Fleisher argue that “the president’s greatest influence over policy comes from the agenda he pursues and the way it is packaged” (1990, 230). Even scholars who have cautioned against acceptance of a presidency-centered view of government have recognized the importance of agenda setting to the presidency (Moe and Teel 1970). Edwards (1989), for example, argues that agenda setting has the potential to be one of the president’s most important strategic powers. Charles O. Jones, like Edwards, is skeptical of the president’s ability to set the policy agenda easily. Nevertheless, he concludes that the president has “significant influence” in agenda setting (1994, 181).

## Solvency

### 2NC Ext – Uranium Shortage

#### Uranium shortages inevitable now – global demand and low-grade ore

Matthew Wild, freelance journalist, 2010, “Its worse than you think,” Peak Generation, http://peakgeneration.blogspot.com/p/global-hydrocarbons-peak.html

Like the hydrocarbons mentioned above, uranium is a finite resource. It is used in nuclear fission – according to industry lobby group World Nuclear Association there are currently 436 commercial nuclear power reactors operating in 30 countries, which together provide around 15 per cent of the world’s electricity. Breeder reactors, which essentially convert uranium into plutonium, are more efficient, but they still rely on uranium inputs. (Which makes sense, when you think about it; you can’t create energy, after all.) Reprocessing is not enough to beat the growing gap between supply and demand for uranium. According to a 2006 report, despite an claimed four million tonnes of global uranium deposits, output cannot meet demand: Currently, global demand for uranium as fuel at nuclear power plants is estimated at 65,000 tons a year. But annual production is stuck at about 40,000 tons. Uranium retrieved from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons and stockpiles make up the gap. However, commercial stockpiles dropped 50% between 1985 and 2003 because mine output could not keep up with demand. How can it be that output cannot match demand when, we are constantly reminded, the world has such a wealth of uranium deposits? The answer is in the ore grades. The high grade deposits are largely gone, and what is left is difficult to reach and expensive to extract. If an ore contains 1 per cent uranium, it means 100kg of ore must be processed to yield 1 kg of uranium. If the ore is 0.01 per cent, you must process 10,000 kg to yield the 1 kg uranium. A 2006 report by the Energy Watch Group, Uranium Resources and Nuclear Energy, suggested that proved uranium reserves will be “exhausted within the next 30 years at current annual demand.” It states: Eleven countries have already exhausted their uranium reserves. In total, about 2.3 Mt of uranium have already been produced. At present only one country (Canada) is left having uranium deposits containing uranium with an ore grade of more than 1%, most of the remaining reserves in other countries have ore grades below 0.1% and two thirds of reserves have ore grades below 0.06%. This is important as the energy requirement for uranium mining is at best indirect proportional to the ore concentration and with concentrations below 0.01-0.02% the energy needed for uranium processing – over the whole fuel cycle – increases substantially. The proved reserves (=reasonably assured below 40 $/kgU extraction cost) and stocks will be exhausted within the next 30 years at current annual demand. Likewise, possible resources – which contain all estimated discovered resources with extraction costs of up to 130 $/kg – will be exhausted within 70 years. It concludes that “In the long term beyond 2030 uranium shortages will limit the expansion of nuclear power plants.” This is currently being reflected in the market. A March 2010 report in Bloomberg Businessweek, with the straight-talking headline Uranium May Have ‘Hyper’ Price Run, Uranium Energy Corp Says, interviews key personnel at Uranium Energy Corp: Prices may jump to $100 a pound from about $40 a pound now, Amir Adnani, president and chief executive officer of the U.S.- based company, said today in an interview in Hong Kong, without giving a timeframe for the target price. Prices may average about $75 a pound in the next 5 to 10 years, he said. About 200 gigawatts of atomic capacity are planned or under construction globally, and China, India, Russia and South Korea are set to be the main drivers of uranium demand growth, according to Nomura International. Atomic-power plants risk running short of fuel within a decade because suppliers can’t build enrichment facilities or recycle Soviet-era warheads fast enough, the World Nuclear Association said in a 2009 report.

#### Uranium shortages prevent nuclear expansion

Jim Harding, consultant, 6-15-2007, “Council on Foreign Relations Symposium: American Nuclear Energy in a Globalized Economy,” CFR, http://www.cfr.org/publication/13717/council\_on\_foreign\_relations\_symposium.html

On the uranium issue, this is a very peculiar commodity. Today, world consumption -- let me state it differently -- world production of uranium is about 60 percent of consumption. It doesn't happen in turkey, butter, milk or many other commodities. And the reason for that is that you

need to procure uranium quite a long ways in advance, and beginning sort of in the mid- to late 1970s, people had ordered a lot of reactors in the U.S., Western Europe and Russia, secured long- term contracts -- meaning seven to 10 years for uranium -- at a high price, and they cancelled the plan. So all that secondary supply came into the market, depressing the price. It was followed by privatization of centrifuge -- of enrichment in the United States. We also bought lots of surplus enriched uranium from Russia. And most recently, we are blending down or diluting surplus weapons uranium into U.S. fuel. So we're running the global nuclear industry on a secondary supply that pops pretty quick. And it's had the unfortunate impact that existing contracts have fixed prices for uranium; the same is generally true on the enrichment side. You need to procure the product about four years in advance of burning it. We're at a price of $135 a pound, pretty much a historical peak. Utilities for the most part run out of their existing supply by 2012, 2013. They've got to get back into this market. And it's hard to tell what the long- term price will be. This is not -- it's not a physical shortage of uranium, it's a shortage of milling capacity and also enrichment capacity. The enrichment issue was somewhat complicated, because when you go to a higher uranium price, you want to decrease the tails assay at the enrichment plant. Effectively, you reduce the output of that plant by 30 percent. We don't have the capacity to do that and meet demand. So utilities are also -- there are two possibilities. One is, utilities are going to pay -- are going to buy more uranium than they'd ideally like, or enrichers are going to use market power to the same extent that uranium miners are going to use -- based on this set of problems, we came up with significantly higher numbers in the Keystone report for future nuclear fuel. It's about three times current levels, at the low end, and about five times at the high end -- now, not a big number, but it is a -- for a utility thinking about a building a reactor today, they have to worry at little bit about whether or not there are sufficient fuel supply and enrichment capacity out there to meet their needs, because the mines may not exist to support that purchase. You could buy it, but we've got to double enrichment and mining capacity in the next few years to meet demand, even without significant growth in this industry

### Incentives Fail – Empirics

#### Loan guarantees empirically haven’t inspired nuclear power expansion

Christian Parenti, 4-24-2008, What Nuclear Renaissance?, The Nation, http://www.thenation.com/doc/20080512/parenti

In an effort to jump-start a "nuclear renaissance," the Bush Administration has pushed one package of subsidies after another. For the past two years a program of federal loan guarantees has sat waiting for utilities to build nukes. Last year's appropriations bill set the total amount on offer at $18.5 billion. And now the Lieberman-Warner climate change bill is gaining momentum and will likely accrue amendments that will offer yet more money. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) expects up to thirty applications to be filed to build atomic plants; five or six of those proposals are moving through the complicated multi-stage process. But no new atomic power stations have been fully licensed or have broken ground. And two newly proposed projects have just been shelved. The fact is, nuclear power has not recovered from the crisis that hit it three decades ago with the reactor fire at Browns Ferry, Alabama, in 1975 and the meltdown at Three Mile Island in 1979. Then came what seemed to be the coup de grâce: Chernobyl in 1986. The last nuclear power plant ordered by a US utility, the TVA's Watts Bar 1, began construction in 1973 and took twenty-three years to complete. Nuclear power has been in steady decline worldwide since 1984, with almost as many plants canceled as completed since then. All of which raises the question: why is the much-storied "nuclear renaissance" so slow to get rolling? Who is holding up the show? In a nutshell, blame Warren Buffett and the banks--they won't put up the cash. "Wall street doesn't like nuclear power," says Arjun Makhijani of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. The fundamental fact is that nuclear power is too expensive and risky to attract the necessary commercial investors. Even with vast government subsidies, it is difficult or almost impossible to get proper financing and insurance. The massive federal subsidies on offer will cover up to 80 percent of construction costs of several nuclear power plants in addition to generous production tax credits, as well as risk insurance. But consider this: the average two-reactor nuclear power plant is estimated to cost $10 billion to $18 billion to build. That's before cost overruns, and no US nuclear power plant has ever been delivered on time or on budget.

#### Increase in loan guarantees is inadequate- there are problems in how they are applied

John Schoen, Senior Producer, MSNBC, 2007, Does nuclear power now make financial sense?, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/16286304/>

Nukes for sale But it’s far from clear that this new round of plants will ever be built. Even if all goes as proponents hope, the first plants won’t come online before 2014 and will cost an estimated $4 billion each. Before ground is broken for the first new plant, the power industry will have to convince state regulators and investors that the numbers add up. To do that, they face several important hurdles. Most of these projects are expected to be financed by bonds. To help reassure investors that the bonds are a safe investment, Congress has provided loan guarantees for 80 percent of the financing for the first several projects to win NRC approval. But that critical guarantee has already hit a serious snag. Typically, these projects would be financed with 80 percent debt and 20 percent cash or equity put up by the owner of the plant. But federal officials in charge of loan guarantees have interpreted the law to mean that those guarantees apply only to the debt portion of the financing package. Using that math, the loan guarantee — 80 percent of 80 percent — will only cover about two-thirds of the total cost. That could be more risk than Wall Street is ready to assume — especially for the projects that go first.

#### Incentives won’t revive nuclear power – empirics

Bryan Walsh, 6-6-2008, “Is Nuclear Power Viable?,” http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1812540,00.html)

That's debatable, to say the least. There's no question that a nuclear plant, once it's up and running, produces comparatively little carbon dioxide — a British government report last year found that a nuclear plant emits just 2% to 6% of the CO2 per kilowatt-hour as natural gas, the cleanest fossil fuel — but nuclear energy still seems like the power of yesterday. After a burst of construction between the 1950s and late 1970s, a new nuclear power plant hasn't come on line in the U.S. since 1996, and some nations like Germany are looking to phase out existing atomic plants. That reverse is chiefly due to safety concerns — the lingering Chernobyl fears of nuclear meltdown, or the fact that we still have yet to devise a long-term method for the disposal of atomic waste. But to Amory Lovins — a veteran energy expert and chairman of the Rocky Mountain Institute — there's a much better green reason to be against nuclear power: economics. Lovins, an environmentalist who is unusually comfortable with numbers, argues in a report released last week that a massive new push for nuclear power doesn't make dollars or cents. In his study, titled "The Nuclear Illusion," he points out that while the red-hot renewable industry — including wind and solar — last year attracted $71 billion in private investment, the nuclear industry attracted nothing. "Wall Street has spoken — nuclear power isn't worth it," he says. More nuclear subsidies, which many on Capitol Hill are pushing for, won't do the trick either. Lovins notes that the U.S. nuclear industry has received $100 billion in government subsidies over the past half-century, and that federal subsidies now worth up to $13 billion a plant — roughly how much it now costs to build one — still haven't encouraged private industry to back the atomic revival. At the same time, the price of building a plant — all that concrete and steel — has risen dramatically in recent years, while the nuclear workforce has aged and shrunk. Nuclear supporters like Moore who argue that atomic plants are much cheaper than renewables tend to forget the sky-high capital costs, not to mention the huge liability risk of an accident — the insurance industry won't cover a nuclear plant, so it's up to government to do so. Conservatives like Republican presidential candidate John McCain tend to promote nuclear power because they don't think carbon-free alternatives like wind or solar could be scaled up sufficiently to meet rising power demand, but McCain's idea of a crash construction program to build hundreds of new nuclear plants in near future seems just as unrealistic.

## China Adv
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### Natural Gas CP

#### **Shale gas is the overwhelming reason nuclear is failing now – cheap prices doom all future nuclear projects and are causing shutdowns**

Reuters 10-22 – “UPDATE 4-US natural gas boom claims first nuclear plant" uk.reuters.com/article/2012/10/22/dominionresources-idUKL3E8LM6J420121022

Oct 22 (Reuters) - Dominion Resources Inc's plans to shut its Kewaunee plant in Wisconsin next year, the first U.S. nuclear plant to fall victim to growing competition from natural gas, **triggering expectations more reactors could be forced to shut down**.¶ After claiming hundreds of coal-fired plants, the surge in U.S. shale gas output is now starting to grind down the nuclear industry, with smaller, older plants like the 566-megawatt (MW) Kewaunee plant the first to be affected.¶ Power prices have followed the natural gas market to decade lows this year, as the market grapples with the shale gas boom and flagging demand due to the struggling economy.¶ For the nuclear industry, it means the Dominion plant -- which had been up for sale since April 2011 -- will be the first U.S. reactor to shut since the late 1990s when it closes in the second quarter of next year. See factbox¶ "**The abundance of cheap natural gas is putting operators with aging reactors in a difficult bind**," said Robert Alvarez, senior scholar at the Institute for Policy Studies, adding maintenance and operating costs are making some plants uncompetitive to gas.¶ The Kewaunee shutdown did not surprise many in the industry, having watched the fizzling out of the "nuclear renaissance" that a decade ago was expected to redefine the U.S. energy landscape by providing a cheaper alternative to rising fossil fuel prices and cutting greenhouse gas emissions.¶ The rush of cheap domestic gas has scuttled plans to build new reactors, and safety concerns following the Fukushima disaster in Japan damped public appetite for new nuclear power.¶ While reactors produce cheaper power than gas -- in general it cost about 2.2 cents per kilowatt hour in 2011 to produce power in a nuclear plant versus about 4.5 cents in a gas plant according to a Nuclear Energy Institute study -- costs associated with running a nuclear plant such as labor, security, regulatory oversight can make older reactors less competitive than new gas-fired stations.¶ NATGAS THREAT¶ The explosion in U.S. shale gas production has roiled the power market, not only hitting nuclear and coal plants but also the drive to boost reliance on renewable energy sources like wind and solar.¶ Natural gas' share of total U.S. generation has increased to 30 percent this year from about 20 percent in 2006, while the percentage from nuclear has held steady at about 20 percent.¶ Power prices in the PJM grid, the nation's biggest network, for the first nine months of 2012 were down almost 30 percent from the same period last year to levels not seen since 2002.¶ Generators have already announced the retirement or fuel conversion of more than 35,000 MW of coal-fired power plants, which is more than 10 percent of the nation's total coal-fired fleet.¶ For Virginia-based Dominion, the decision to decommission the plant next year was "based purely on economics," Thomas Farrell, Dominion chairman, president and chief executive said on Monday.¶ Analysts say future capital investments, which could run into the hundreds of millions or more at existing reactors, might prompt operators to shut units.¶ "A number of nuclear units won't run their 60-year licensed lives if current gas price forecasts prove accurate," said Peter Bradford, a former member of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and current professor of energy policy and law at the Vermont Law School.¶ "The determining factor is likely to come at the point at which they need to decide on a major capital investment."¶ Bradford pointed to Duke Energy Corp's Crystal River reactor in Florida, which may need a new containment dome that could cost more than $3 billion, and Edison International's San Onofre reactors in California, which may need new steam generators.¶ Especially vulnerable under this scenario would be small, old single reactor sites.¶ Other units that could be on the hit list because they fit the profile include Exelon Corp's Oyster Creek in New Jersey, Xcel Energy Inc's Monticello in Minnesota, and Entergy Corp's Palisades in Michigan, Vermont Yankee in Vermont and Pilgrim in Massachusetts.¶ "Future decisions will be made on a case by case basis determined by the circumstances unique to each facility, just as is the case for fossil-fueled power plants," said Steven Kerekes, a spokesman for the Nuclear Energy Institute, an industry trade group.¶ Kerekes noted that so far coal-fired plants had borne the brunt of the competition from cheap gas, as they collectively face billions of dollars worth of investment to upgrade systems to meet increasingly strict federal environmental regulations.¶ NO BUYER¶ Dominion's attempts to find a buyer for Kewaunee failed, even though the plant had a renewed license that did not expire until 2033. With natural gas prices expected to remain under pressure from rising shale output, the company decided to take a third-quarter after-tax charge of $281 million to decommission the plant.¶ "Dominion was not able to move forward with our plan to grow our nuclear fleet in the Midwest to take advantage of economies of scale," Farrell said.¶ The station will remain under the oversight of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) throughout the decommissioning process.¶ Following the station's shutdown, Dominion said it plans to meet its obligations to the two Wisconsin utilities -- Integrys Energy Group Inc's Wisconsin Public Service unit and Alliant Energy Corp's Wisconsin Power and Light unit --that buy power from Kewaunee under power purchase agreements expiring in December 2013.¶ "Kewaunee's power purchase agreements are ending at a time of projected low wholesale electricity prices in the region," said Farrell.¶ Kewaunee is located on Lake Michigan, about 35 miles (56 km) southeast of Green Bay. It began commercial operation in 1974 and has a Westinghouse pressurized water reactor.¶ Dominion, which serves 15 states and 6 million customers, is one of the top U.S. power generating companies, with about 27,400 MW of capacity. Shares of Dominion lost 55 cents or 1 percent to $52.96 on Monday, while shares of other power companies in the utility indexes declined just 0.5 percent.

#### Fracking makes natural gas cheap enough to out-compete nuclear

Reuters, 7-30-2012, “Nuclear power hard to justify in cheap gas world,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/30/us-energy-power-nuclear-shale-idUSBRE86T0AX20120730

Nuclear power has become hard to justify as the shale gas revolution creates an abundance of natural gas that makes it the fuel of choice to back up renewables, the chief executive of General Electric told the Financial Times on Monday. A sharp rise in shale gas production in North America in the past five years has pulled U.S. natural gas prices down close to 10-year lows and could turn the country into a gas exporter soon. Large conventional offshore gas findings in Europe and Africa in the past two years, vast existing reserves in Russia and Central Asia and increasing production in Australia also mean gas is abundant elsewhere as well. At the same time, nuclear power has come under pressure following the meltdown at Japan's Fukushima reactor during the March 2011 earthquake and tsunami, with countries such as Germany and Switzerland pulling out of nuclear power generation. "They're finding more gas all the time. It's just hard to justify nuclear. Gas is so cheap and at some point, economics rule," the newspaper quoted GE CEO Jeff Immelt as saying in an interview on Monday.

#### Natural gas prices are too low for nuclear to be competitive

Victor Gilinsky 12, 2-13-2012, “Fukushima Lessons Loom Large,” National Journal, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/is-america-poised-for-nuclear.php

You ask whether NRC approval of the two Georgia reactors signals the long awaited nuclear renaissance. There is no renaissance on the horizon and there is no chance of one so long as natural gas is available at reasonable prices--ask John Rowe. There are other reasons for the nuclear industry to restrain its enthusiasm. What we have here is two heavily subsidized units with federal loan guarantees whose details are secret and whose generosity is unlikely to be duplicated; a captive state commission is pushing construction costs onto the ratepayers; and the plant passed an NRC hearing process that is heavily stacked against the public. This is not a model for gaining the public confidence needed for a real national nuclear take-off.¶ It is also extremely significant that in what must be a first, the NRC chairman voted against the license. He said that last year's Fukushima accident was such an extraordinary event that he thought it essential to insert a license condition that the necessary safety upgrades coming from the lessons of the accident would be incorporated into the Georgia units before operation. The other four commissioners refused, opting to follow the existing NRC procedures and approve operation without any such condition. That the chairman took such a dramatic step, one that could be very costly to him politically, means that he does not have confidence that the agency will require the necessary safety measures without the license condition he supports. One cannot lightly dismiss the chairman's opinion on the need for a stronger nuclear safety commitment because in this his views are a lot closer to those of most people than are the views of the other four commissioners. That vote is not a plus for public confidence, either.

### States

#### USFG model is illogical---it’s not unitary and no one can control it in its entirety---if you’re an individual congressmember then your impact on plan passage is arbitrarily small to the same degree as a lobbying citizen

Howard 4 Peter Howard is an assistant professor in the School ofInternational Service at American University "The Growing Role of States in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the State Partnership Program" Mar 31 2004 International Studies Perspectives Volume 5, Issue 2, pages 179–196, May 2004 Wiley

Lenses of Analysis

But, the perception of a vanishing role for states in foreign affairs is largely a factor of the dominant decision-making lens of foreign policy analysis, not a reflection of actual state activity at the international level. Understanding how states' international activity remains overlooked requires a brief theoretical detour.

Foreign policy analysis has traditionally been concerned with identifying the sources of national behavior. To counter the dominant realist claim that systemic factors ultimately determine foreign policy behavior, the field of foreign policy analysis broke from traditional international politics to looks inside the nation-state (Kubalkova, 2001). The unitary rational actor model, classically explained as Allison's (1999) Model I, allows the analyst to treat a national government as a value-maximizing individual with well-ordered preferences over all possible situations. The government is unitary in that it acts as if it were one individual, speaking with one voice, and undertaking coordinated actions in complete concert with the chosen policy. The government is rational in that it is able to rank and then choose from a list of possible alternatives the course of action that maximizes its utility. Thus, when pressed to act, the rational actor model posits that a government can accurately assess the situation, determine the best response, and respond accordingly. Realism's reliance on a unitary rational actor model of decision making drove foreign policy analysts to examine the decision-making process itself, producing a wealth of scholarship documenting that national governments are neither unitary nor rational when making critical foreign policy choices (Neack, Hey, and Haney, 1995; Ikenberry, 2002; Neack, 2003).

The site of the foreign policy analysis challenge remains “the decision-making process where, it has been assumed, the most interesting analytical questions are located” (Clarke and Smith, 1989:164). Foreign policy analysts attempt to show that crucial decisions, especially in times of great security crises when time is short and the stakes are high, do not proceed according to nor produce results characteristic of a unitary rational actor model.16 Attacking the notion of a rationality, foreign policy scholars demonstrated that decision makers take short cuts (Steinbruner, 1974) and are hampered by group (Janis, 1982), cognitive (Jervis, 1976), and personality (Hermann, 1984) driven psychological factors. Attacking the assumption of unity, foreign policy analysts have revealed that the state is fractured horizontally, with various actors at the national level active and influential in shaping foreign policy in accordance with their respective agendas. Congress (Lindsay, 1994) and bureaucratic politics (Allison and Zelikow, 1999) both horizontally fracture the unity of the federal government—disputes between the administration and Congress or between the State Department and the Defense Department have played important roles in producing particular foreign policy outcomes.

#### Removing state barriers and increasing incentives solves

Goodman 09 (Josh, staff writer at GOVERNING, “Why States Are Saying No to Nuclear Plants”, 11/30, http://www.governing.com/topics/energy-env/Why-States-Are-Saying.html)

As climate-change legislation began winding its way through the U.S. Senate this fall, the outlines of a possible bipartisan deal came into focus. Republicans would accept limits on greenhouse-gas emissions, while Democrats would accept vast growth in the number of nuclear power plants. State governments, however, may stand in the way of such a compromise. New nuclear plants generally can't be built without permission from both federal and state government. And nuclear power hasn't been faring so well in the legislatures lately. This year, half a dozen states rebuffed efforts to overturn longstanding bans on new reactors. As Michael Mariotte, executive director of the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, puts it, "The opposition to nuclear power at the state level and the grassroots level is still very high and very effective."¶ Supporters of nuclear power aren't discouraged. They note that bills overturning nuclear bans in some states, such as Kentucky and Minnesota, went further in the legislature than they have in the past. Plus, a number of states, particularly in the Southeast, are openly receptive to the idea of having more nuclear power reactors. Mike McGarey, director of state outreach for the Nuclear Energy Institute, an industry group, says, "New nuclear is going to go where it's wanted."¶ For new nuclear to go anywhere, though, it will need more than just legal authorization. Nuclear power plants are so expensive that they're almost impossible to finance privately. So states must decide whether utilities can charge ratepayers for the cost of the plants while they're being built. The nuclear industry's biggest legislative victory this year was passage of a bill in Georgia to allow just that. Another state-level debate hinges on whether nuclear counts as renewable energy in states that mandate a certain percentage of electricity to come from clean sources. And what to do with nuclear waste is a question that continues to vex policy makers at both the federal and state levels.

#### Resolves start-up costs—most effective tool

NEI 11 (Nuclear Energy Institute, “Construction Work in Progress: An Effective Financial Tool to Lower the Cost of Electricity”, August, http://www.nei.org/filefolder/CWIP.pdf

New nuclear power plants are large, capital-intensive projects. They provide major long-term benefits, however—stable, competitive electricity prices and reliable, carbon-free power. These benefits lead many utilities and state regulators to favor new nucle-ar reactor construction as a strategic resource when planning to meet future electricity demand. To assist regulated utilities with the financing for these large projects and to provide the lowest cost to consumers, many states have policies in place to lower the cost of financing and expedite regulatory reviews.

For regulated utilities, the most effective tool to lower the cost of these large infrastructure projects is for state regulators to permit the collection of interest costs and return on equity during construction. Simi-lar rate treatment is allowed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to encourage the con-struction of new transmission lines. This mechanism is also known as “Construction Work in Progress,” or CWIP. The cost savings from CWIP, which will be passed on to consumers, can amount to billions of dollars over the life of a project.

#### States solve—reduce risk to investors

NEI 09 (Nuclear Energy Institute, “Policies That Support New Nuclear Power Plant Development”, http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/factsheet/policiessupportnewplantdevelopment/?print=true)

Why Incentives Are Needed to Support New Nuclear Plant Construction Federal and state government support for new nuclear plant construction is both necessary and appropriate to ensure equitable sharing of benefits and risks. Without that support, the benefits of nuclear power (large amounts of reliable, emission-free electricity; stable electricity prices; reduced pressure on natural gas supply and price) accrue to society at large and the economy as a whole, but the investment risk associated with building a new nuclear power plant rests entirely on the company building it. In addition, the cost of a new nuclear plant is high compared to the size and financing capability of the typical U.S. electric company. The U.S. electric power sector consists of many relatively small companies. The largest U.S. electric company has a market value of approximately $33 billion; most are much smaller. This compares with major oil companies like ExxonMobil and Chevron (with market values of approximately $332 billion and $146 billion, respectively). New nuclear power plants are expected to cost $6-8 billion each (in 2008 dollars). Although $6-8 billion projects are¶ not unique in the energy business, such projects are typically built by the major oil companies. The relatively small U.S. electric power companies do not have the financing capability or financial strength to finance new nuclear power¶ projects on their own. Finally, investors believe new nuclear plants face political and regulatory risks. The financial markets remember the experience during construction of today's operating plants -- longer-than-expected construction times and cost overruns caused by the licensing process and litigation. The financial markets are concerned that new nuclear plants could face similar political and regulatory risks. Although the risk may be low, the potential consequences of licensing delays (given the cost of new nuclear plants) are high. Although the federal government has created a more efficient and predictable licensing process, which should reduce licensing risk, investors remain concerned given the high cost and long development times for nuclear power plants. Since this licensing risk is a function of the federal government's regulatory process, only the federal government can offset that risk. For electric customers to receive the benefits associated with new nuclear power plants, the construction risk must be spread among the federal government, the states and shareholders.¶ Federal policymakers see the value of nuclear energy and have supported new nuclear plant construction by including¶ three incentives in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Policymakers in some states have also implemented legislation or regulations that support construction of new plants.

### Economyt

#### No conflicts resulted from the recession – disproves the impact

Barnett 9**—**senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC (Thomas, The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis, 25 August 2009, http://www.aprodex.com/the-new-rules--security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis-398-bl.aspx)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide **recession has had** virtually **no impact** whatsoever **on** the **international security** landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly **unrelated to** global **economic trends**. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: •No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); •The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); •Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); •No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); •A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and •No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.

#### History proves

Ferguson 6— Laurence A. Tisch prof of History at Harvard. William Ziegler of Business Administration at Harvard. MA and D.Phil from Glasgow and Oxford (Niall, “The Next War of the World,” September/October 2006, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\_next\_war\_of\_the\_world.html)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### Robust studies prove

Miller 2k – Professor of Management, Ottawa (Morris, Poverty As A Cause Of Wars?, http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac/pac256/WG4draft1.htm)

Thus, these armed conflicts can hardly be said to be caused by poverty as a principal factor when the greed and envy of leaders and their hegemonic ambitions provide sufficient cause. The poor would appear to be more the victims than the perpetrators of armed conflict. It might be alleged that some dramatic event or rapid sequence of those types of events that lead to the exacerbation of poverty might be the catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who might be tempted to seek a diversion by finding/fabricating an enemy and going to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since World War II they concluded that Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes. A more direct role was played by political variables such as ideological polarization, labor radicalism, guerilla insurgencies and an anti-Communist military... (In democratic states) such changes seldom lead to an outbreak of violence (while) in the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another.

#### Econ collapse saps resources from military aggression

Bennett 2k– PolSci Prof, Penn State (Scott and Timothy Nordstrom, Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Ebsco)

Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a “guns versus butter” world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended becausethe Unionof Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States.