#### CONFLICT IN THE SCS ESCALATES TO FULL-SCALE NUCLEAR WAR

STRAITS TIMES 1995

[staff, “Choose Your Own Style of Democracy”, May 21, p. ln// wyo-tjc]

In his speech, Dr Mahathir also painted three scenarios for Asia.

#### In the first -the worst possible scenario -Asian countries would go to war against each other, he said. It might start with clashes between Asian countries over the Spratly Islands because of China's insistence that the South China Sea belonged to it along with all the islands, reefs and seabed minerals. In this scenario, the United States would offer to help and would be welcomed by Asean, he said. The Pacific Fleet begins to patrol the South China Sea. Clashes occur between the Chinese navy and the US Navy. China declares war on the US and a full-scale war breaks out with both sides resorting to nuclear weapons.

#### Turns case-

#### Devastates environmental protection spending

Slesinger Oct. 18th

[Scott Slesinger, October 18th, 2012, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/sslesinger/when_congress_comes_back_from.html>, The Environment and the "Fiscal Cliff", uwyo//amp]

When Congress comes back from its “recess” the major issues on their plate will be taxes and spending. Without further action, i.e. Congress doing nothing, the Bush tax cuts for all Americans ends on December 31, 2012. On January 2, 2013, the failure of the budget “Supercommittee” will automatically require the Defense Department and domestic agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, to take an immediate 8.2% cut for the fiscal year that already started on October 1, 2012. The environmental and conservation communities have published an initial memorandum on the impacts of the additional cuts that you can read here. Throughout the country, impacts of these cuts are breaking into the press such as this piece from the Seattle Times. My colleague Jon Devine has blogged on the clear impact of additional cuts to local communities that will slow down drinking water and sewer infrastructure improvements. Since 2010 almost all the deficit reduction has come out of nondefense domestic discretionary spending, which is already at its lowest level in decades. For years now, the allocation for environmental programs has been insufficient to allow popular and effective programs and agencies to keep up with even basic costs and needs. Any new deal needs to recognize the cuts already suffered by the domestic discretionary programs. A deal will require revenues that are now at a historic low as a percentage of economic activity. Some of the revenue should come from tax subsidies that hurt the environment, such as tax-favored treatment of dirty fuels such as oil and gas. These issues need a more thorough discussion now as when Congress returns in November.

### AT Thumpers

#### First, Top of the docket- Sequester debate top priority

Montgomery & Kane Dec 31st

[Lori Montgomery & Paul Kane, December 31st, 2012, Obama, Republicans reach deal on fiscal cliff; Senate vote expected tonight, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/fiscal-cliff/biden-mcconnell-continue-cliff-talks-as-clock-winds-down/2012/12/31/66c044e2-534d-11e2-8b9e-dd8773594efc_story.html>, uwyo//amp]

McConnell said after Obama’s speech that he and Biden spoke multiple times Monday morning since their first 6:30 a.m. call and managed to resolve their differences on taxes. But he echoed Obama’s contention that the two sides had not yet resolved a dispute about whether to delay automatic spending cuts. McConnell urged Congress to pass the tax agreement — and debate replacing the so-called “sequester,” as the automatic spending cuts are known, in coming months.“We’ll continue to work on finding smarter ways to cut spending, but let’s not let that hold up protecting Americans from the tax hike that will take place” on New Year’s Day, he said. “We can do this. We must do this.”

#### Second, your Reuters evidence may cite 7 issues but it doesn’t make a sequencing claim- sequestration happens first that’s above, and your evidence doesn’t explain why those fights are contentious

#### Third, The debate is irrelevant- PC impacts are not perceived until the vote when legislation crosses Obama’s desk

Drum 10

[Kevin, Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming off the back-burner”, <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>, March]

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

#### Fourth, Obama won’t touch energy policy due to its potential for polarization

PIW 12

[Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, 1/9/12, Obama Plays Safe on Energy Policy, Lexis]

With less than a year to go until he faces re-election, US President Barack Obama is trying to avoid controversial energy policy decisions, postponing the finalization of restrictions on oil refinery and power plant emissions and delaying the approval of a major crude pipeline project. The president’s caution will prolong the status quo on issues where the industry both opposes and supports the administration’s plans, and also illustrates what's at stake for energy policy depending on whether or not Obama is given another four years in office. Most of Obama's original campaign pledges on promoting alternatives to fossil fuels and tackling climate change have not passed muster with Congress, most notably an ambitious plan for national carbon controls, a subsequent toned-down clean energy standard floated after the carbon legislation failed, and repeated efforts to repeal $30 billion-$40 billion worth of oil industry tax deductions over 10 years ( PIW May9'11 ). The one exception has been the passage of $90 billion in clean energy funding as part of an economic stimulus bill passed early in Obama's term, but the White House has been unable to repeat this success in other energy policy areas ( PIW Feb.23'09 ).

You say just a smokescreen- your Brodie evidence is terrible- 1. Your author has no credentials listed-

2. your evidence doesn’t cite an offensive or warranted reason for how sequestration is acting as a smokescreen- just says you can be blinded by bickering- doesn’t assume political fights over nuclear power

And 3. There’s no impact to this argument

### PC debate-

#### Obama’s PC key-

#### First, - congress put off the big battles in fiscal cliff and the debt ceiling/sequester is where Obama will have to flex his capital to get a deal done- that’s 1NC Star Ledger

#### Deal may be inevitable but it’s a question of what’s included in the edeal

#### First, Obama has leverage- your evidence doesn’t assume a world where Obama needs to take a hard stance on a deal-

#### PC key to broad sequestration deal

Bucci 1/2

[Steven P. Bucci, Ph.D. is a Director, Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation 1-2-2013 http://blog.heritage.org/2013/01/02/defending-defense-dont-just-delay-defense-sequestration-stop-it/]

By delaying defense sequestration two months, President Obama and Congress have shown their unambiguous recognition that sequestration’s automatic and indiscriminate cuts to the U.S. military pose clear dangers to national security. However, America’s leaders must now match their recognition of this reality with the resolve required to definitively stop defense sequestration. Otherwise, they will end up throwing the military’s servicemen and servicewomen off the fiscal cliff—and the nation off a strategic cliff.

Ferraro & Mason Dec. 31st

[Thomas Ferraro and Jeff Mason, Reuters journalists, December 31st, 2012, Senate "fiscal cliff" deal emerges, but not there yet, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/12/31/us-usa-fiscal-idUSBRE8A80WV20121231>, uwyo//amp]

Even as negotiations were continuing, Republicans already were putting Obama on notice that he faces another big battle over the next six weeks or so - the need to raise the government's borrowing authority. "The next round of this contest is the debt ceiling fight," said Republican Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina. Speaking to reporters, Graham said that when it comes time to raise the debt limit, probably around mid-February, Republicans would insist on major savings in the Social Security retirement and Medicare healthcare program for the elderly. Specifically, he called for changing the eligibility age for senior citizens' benefits, paring cost-of-living increases for these large programs and "means testing" retirement and health benefits so that the affluent do not get the same benefits as lower-income people. Meanwhile, Democratic Senator Sheldon Whitehouse of Rhode Island noted that in order for a bill to move quickly through the Senate, leapfrogging procedural hurdles, all 100 senators would have to cooperate. "It just takes one," Whitehouse said, holding up his index finger, to stop a bill in its tracks.

Debt ceiling will be next big battle

Helderman Jan 1st

[Rosalind S. Helderman, reporter, January 1st, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/after-a-fiscal-cliff-deal-what-next/2012/12/31/b9d9a452-5384-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f\_story.html uwyo//amp]

The next big deadline is likely to come around the end of February, when the Treasury Department will exhaust the measures now in place to extend the nation’s $16.4 trillion debt ceiling. At that point, the government will not be able to pay its bills unless Congress votes to raise the nation’s legal borrowing limit. Republicans hope to use that moment to force Obama and congressional Democrats to agree to major spending cuts in return for the increase — in what could be a sequel to the contentious face-off over the debt limit in the summer of 2011.

#### And has leverage- Economic groups tired of brinksmanship, the prospect of economic collapse, and a reasonable proposal marketed through the bully pulpit

Klein Jan. 2nd

[Ezra Klein, columnist, Jan. 2nd, 2013, Calm down, liberals. The White House won., <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/02/calm-down-liberals-the-white-house-got-a-good-deal-on-the-fiscal-cliff/?tid=pm_pop>, uwyo//amp]

Fourth, I don’t think the White House has a shred of credibility when they say they won’t negotiate over the debt ceiling. They may not call what they’re about to do negotiating over the debt ceiling, but that’ll be what they’re doing. That said, I’m quite convinced that they don’t intend to be held hostage over the debt ceiling. As a former constitutional law professor, the president sees himself as a steward of the executive branch and is deeply hostile to setting the precedent that congressional minorities can hold presidents hostage through the debt ceiling. At some point in the coming talks, Boehner or McConnell or both are going to realize that the White House really, seriously will not accept a bargain in which what they “got” was an increase in the debt limit, and so they’re going to have to decide at that point whether to crash the global economy. Fifth, the constellation of economic interest groups that converge on Washington understands the debt ceiling better than they did in 2011, are becoming more and more tired of congress’s tendency to negotiate by threatening to trigger economic catastrophes, and is getting better at knowing who to blame. It’s not a meaningless sign that John Engler, the former Republican Governor of Michigan who now leads the Business Roundtable, called for a five-year solution to the debt ceiling. It’s worth keeping this in perspective: All it means is that the White House can potentially demand a perfectly reasonable compromise of one dollar in revenue-generating tax reform for every dollar in spending cuts. When you add in the fiscal cliff deal, and the 2011 Budget Control Act, that’ll still mean that the total deficit reduction enacted over the last few years tilts heavily towards spending, particularly once you account for reduced war costs. But that is, arguably, another reason that the White House isn’t in such a bad position here: They’ve set up a definition of success that will sound reasonable to most people — a dollar in tax reform for a dollar in spending cuts — while the Republicans have a very unreasonable sounding definition, in which they get huge cuts to Medicare or they force the United States into default. So while it’s possible that the White House will crumble, rendering itself impotent in negotiations going forward, and while it’s possible that the we’ll breach the debt ceiling, both possibilities seem less likely than Republicans agreeing to a deal that pairs revenue-generating tax reform with spending cuts.

#### Second, defense cuts

Strong Jan. 2nd

[Jonathan Strong, Roll Call Staff, January 2nd, 2013, <http://www.rollcall.com/news/gop_democrats_gear_up_for_debt_ceiling_standoff-220486-1.html?pos=hln>, uwyo//amp]

The plan? According to Rep. Gene Green, D-Texas, Biden said the automatic spending cuts in the “sequester,” which are feared by many Republicans because of their impact on the Pentagon, could form leverage for Obama. “We still have the sequestration to negotiate, and that’ll be at the same time that we have the debt ceiling issue. So we kicked the can down the road for a couple months, so at the same time we’ll be dealing with that,” Green said. In a speech New Year’s Eve at the height of Senate talks over the fiscal cliff, Obama introduced a new demand for negotiations over replacing the automatic cuts in the sequester agreed to in the 2011 debt deal. Obama said any replacements for the cuts should comprise a “balance” of other cuts and tax increases. “I want to make clear that any agreement we have to deal with these automatic spending cuts that are being threatened for next month, those also have to be balanced — because remember, my principle has always been let’s do things in a balanced, responsible way. And that means that revenues have to be part of the equation in turning off the sequester, in eliminating these automatic spending cuts, as well as spending cuts,” Obama said.

#### Third, this claim is conservative politician hype

Cohn Jan. 2nd

[Alicia M. Cohn, Jan. 2nd, 2013, Sen. Toomey: GOP should risk shutdown to force spending cuts in debt-limit fight, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/275155-sen-toomey-calls-for-a-government-shutdown>, uwyo//amp]

Conservative RedState blogger Erick Erickson on Tuesday called out Toomey by name, along with his GOP colleagues Sen. Tom Coburn (Okla.) and Ron Johnson (Wis.), writing they should be "ashamed" of their votes for the bill, which was negotiated by Vice President Joe Biden and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.). Erickson added that any member of Congress who believes they have better leverage over Obama in the upcoming debt-ceiling debate "is fooling themselves to avoid having to realize what a fool they are."

#### Yes compromise- Republicans weakening in squo

Judis 1/3

[John B. Judis, Senior Editor, 1/3/2013, Obama Wasn't Rolled. He Won!, [http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/111573/obama-didnt-get-rolled-the-fiscal-cliff-in-fact-he-won#](http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/111573/obama-didnt-get-rolled-the-fiscal-cliff-in-fact-he-won), uwyo//amp]

These divisions don’t necessarily augur the kind of formal split that wrecked the Whig Party in the 1850s. Nor do they suggest widespread defection of Republicans into the Democratic Party as happened during the 1930s. There is still far too much distance between, say, McConnell and Democratic Majority Leader Harry Reid. But they do suggest that a process of erosion is under way that will weaken the Republicans’ ability to maintain a united front against Democratic initiatives. That could happen in the debates over the sequester and debt ceiling if Obama and the Democrats make the kind of public fuss that they did over fiscal cliff.

#### Second, His pc is key-

#### [a.] key to persuade Republicans over new revenue versus new cuts

Financial Times Jan. 2nd

[FinancialTimes.com, Jan 2, 2013, Obama trades one US cliff for another,http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/b983357c-54d8-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html#axzz2Gt9dH0xY, uwyo//amp]

Mr Obama has said consistently he will not negotiate with the Republicans over the debt ceiling. But it is difficult to see how he will be able to delink his request for a debt-ceiling increase from the parallel negotiations over the sequester. Republicans are demanding a dollar in spending cuts for every dollar they approve in higher borrowing limits. Mr Obama insists that any spending cuts must be matched equally by new taxes. Quite how, or whether, these divisions can be reconciled in time to avert a technical sovereign default is worryingly unclear. In the next eight weeks Mr Obama must persuade Republicans to avoid triggering a sovereign default. Given Mr Boehner’s tenuous position as Speaker, Mr Obama will need to make a serious offer of reforming entitlements, notably Medicare and Social Security. These are reasonable trade-offs, as the president’s own SimpsonBowles commission pointed out.

#### [b.] needs to use the bully pulpit-casts blame on Republicans

Shear & Calmes Jan. 2nd

[MICHAEL D. SHEAR, chief writer for The Caucus, the political blog for The New York Times., and JACKIE CALMES, Lawmakers Gird for Next Fiscal Clash, on the Debt Ceiling, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/03/us/politics/for-obama-no-clear-path-to-avoid-a-debt-ceiling-fight.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, uwyo//amp]

In saying he will refuse to bargain over the debt limit, Mr. Obama is counting on help from the business community, given its traditional ties to Republicans. Recently, for example, the head of the Business Roundtable, John Engler, a Republican and former governor of Michigan, called for extending the debt limit for five years. “You don’t put the full faith and credit of the United States’ finances at risk,” said David M. Cote, chairman of Honeywell and a Republican member of the 2010 Simpson-Bowles fiscal commission. “The whole idea of using debt ceiling that way or saying ‘I’ll do this horrible thing to all of us unless you give in’ just doesn’t make any sense for anybody. It makes me very nervous. It’s not a smart way to run the country.” Mr. Obama might also take to the road again, using the power of his office in an effort to convince the public that another fight over the debt ceiling risks another economic crisis. Public polls after the last debt ceiling fight suggested that more people blamed Republicans for the threat of a shutdown.

#### [c.] k2 get Democrats on board with spending reductions

Bigelow Jan. 3rd

[William Bigelow, Breitbart writer, Jan. 3rd, 2013, MCCONNELL: A DEBT-CEILING FIGHT WITH OBAMA WHETHER HE WANTS IT OR NOT, <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/01/03/McConnell-A-Debt-Ceiling-Fight-With-Obama-Whether-He-Wants-It-Or-Not?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+BreitbartFeed+(Breitbart+Feed)>, uwyo//amp]

Mitch McConnell is gearing up for a massive battle with Barack Obama over the debt limit. He wrote in a Yahoo op-ed that there is going to be a fight with Obama "whether he wants it or not." The present $16.4 trillion debt ceiling is the line in the sand for Republicans now; as McConnell wrote, The president may not want to have a fight about government spending over the next few months, but it’s the fight he is going to have, because it’s a debate the country needs … For the sake of our future, the president must show up to this debate early and convince his party to do something that neither he nor they have been willing to do until now. Over the next two months they need to deliver the same kind of bipartisan resolution to the spending problem we have now achieved on revenue — before the eleventh hour.

### Link Debate

#### Nuclear power incentives sap capital:

#### - Extend Freedman ’12 – nuclear industry faces new obstacles from congress and the public after Fukushima disaster and Solyndra raised stakes of government financing of energy production.

#### - Democrat opposition to nuclear power and tea party opposition to government incentives

Brent Franzel, Principal, Cardinal Point Partners LLC, “Debate Focuses on ‘Clean’ Rather than ‘Renewable’ Energy”, Solutions.bv.com, Issue No. 1, 2011

On one side, this debate has environmental groups and most Democrats, who are supporting a renewable energy standard that would require a percentage of the nation’s electricity to be generated from wind and solar and other renewable sources. Those on the other side of the debate want a clean energy standard, which would include nuclear and clean coal technologies. Significantly, a few days after Obama’s speech, Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) said he would be working to draft an energy bill that includes a clean energy standard. In the past, Bingaman has positioned himself on the other side of the debate – opposing the inclusion of nuclear and clean coal in the approved technologies. Of course, many Republicans – including many in key leadership positions – believe no national standard should be set and that decisions should be left to individual states to determine. Sen. Jim DeMint (R-SC), a key player in the Tea Party for example, criticized Obama for trying to pick winners and losers. Despite these positive developments, gaining approval of an energy bill this year will still be an uphill climb for congressional leaders. There is only a short window of time before the 2012 presidential and congressional elections overwhelm the congressional agenda. In addition, the primary focus in Congress will be on cutting spending in existing programs – not on enacting new ones. Whether a bill makes it to the president’s desk could be affected more by outside factors than by what happens in Congress. Developments in the Middle East and the resulting impact on oil prices will be the main factors determining whether Congress decides to act. The debate will be complicated by the huge number of Tea Party-affiliated members of Congress now in office. Despite their likely support for nuclear power, many are going to be hesitant to support new government incentives, such as loans and loan guarantees, to build new plants.

#### You say no tradeoff this is your Edwards compartmentalized evidence- but this evidence just asys memebrs of congress can’t make tradeoffs- doesn’t account for Obama’s leverage from- election, 2 econ doing well, and 3. Got fiscal cliff to not be catastrophe.

#### - Nuclear power controversial – waste, production dangers, and budget deficit concerns

Nina Netzer and Jochen Steinhilber, work for the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin, Germany. Jochen Steinhilber is Head of the Department for Global Policy and Development, Nina Netzer is in charge of International Energy and Climate Policy. “The End of Nuclear Energy? International Perspectives after Fukishima”, Freidrich Ebert Stiftung July 2011

Unfortunately, in the case of nuclear energy production, the risk of future disaster is inherently difficult to quantify because it is not known when or if a disaster will happen, and if one does happen, it is unclear what a worst-case scenario will look like . What is easier to quantify, is that more nuclear energy produced means more nuclear waste to be processed and stored, which places a strain on future generations, as they will have to deal with the costs associated with our current consumption . The fact remains that finding a place to store nuclear waste in a country with a decentralised governmental structure such as the United States remains extremely difficult, as was made evident by the political battle over the Yucca Mountain Repository site in Nevada .4 Many of the arguments for or against nuclear power centre around value-based judgments regarding the possible dangers associated with nuclear energy production . This is evidenced by the variety of opinions regarding nuclear power in the United States and the varying positions that different nations took in response to the nuclear disaster in Chernobyl and have taken in response to the more recent disaster in Japan . The situation regarding the future of nuclear energy production in the United States is complicated by political factors such as the perceived negative effect that a shift to renewables would have on the United States economy . Moving forward, the current debates over the budget, the deficit, and the fragile economic recovery will dominate the discussion and have profound impacts on the future of energy production in the United States . Whether this will lead to a shift to greater renewable energy production depends largely on the ability of the United States government to adopt forward-thinking policies that will wean its dependence from fossil fuels and nuclear power and towards a more sustainable energy future .

#### - Politically divisive

Nina Netzer and Jochen Steinhilber, work for the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin, Germany. Jochen Steinhilber is Head of the Department for Global Policy and Development, Nina Netzer is in charge of International Energy and Climate Policy. “The End of Nuclear Energy? International Perspectives after Fukishima”, Freidrich Ebert Stiftung July 2011

3.1 Political Discourse Representative Edward Markey (Democrat-Massachusetts), who was also a proponent of comprehensive climate change legislation in the past Congress, has led the charge for greater oversight of the nuclear industry, introducing House Resolution 1242, The Nuclear Power Plant Safety Act of 2011, which calls for an overhaul of US nuclear safety policy and imposes a moratorium on all new nuclear reactor licences or licence extensions until new safety requirements are in place that reflect the lessons learnt from the nuclear disaster in Japan . Other members of Congress such as Representative Joe Barton (Republican-Texas) have staunchly defended the US nuclear power industry . Recently, after visiting a nuclear power plant in Texas, Representative Barton said, »Nuclear power is very safe … Our new safety systems are passive in the sense that if the worst case happens, they don’t require human intervention .«Traditionally, nuclear energy production has been politically divisive along party lines, with Republicans favouring increased nuclear energy production and Democrats advising caution because of the high risks associated with the production and waste processing of nuclear power . Over the past few years, this line has blurred, with many Democrats coming to the side of the nuclear industry because of the perceived advantage of carbon-free production of energy as a way to combat climate change .

You say di

### AT: “Intrinsicness”

#### Interpretation: The negative should be able to test the opportunity costs of the plan

#### K2 neg ground- politics is a core generic disad- aff spectrum is so large on this topic we need to uniquely preserve our generics in order to give the neg a fair shot

#### K2 education-Politics tests a key opportunity cost

Saideman 11

[Steve Saideman, associate professor of political science - McGill University, 7/25/’11 “Key Constraint on Policy Relevance,” http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2011/07/key-constraint-on-policy-relevance.html]

Dan Drezner has a great post today about how the foreign policy smart set (his phrase) gets so frustrated by domestic politics that they tend to recommend domestic political changes that are never going to happen. I would go one step further and suggest that one of the key problems for scholars who want to be relevant for policy debates is that we tend to make recommendations that are "incentive incompatible." I love that phrase. What is best for policy may not be what is best for politics, and so we may think we have a good idea about what to recommend but get frustrated when our ideas do not get that far. Lots of folks talking about early warning about genocide, intervention into civil wars and the like blame "political will." That countries lack, for whatever reason, the compulsion to act. Well, that is another way of saying that domestic politics matters, but we don't want to think about it. Dan's piece contains an implication which is often false--that IR folks have little grasp of domestic politics. Many IR folks do tend to ignore or simplify the domestic side too much, but there is plenty of scholarship on the domestic determinants of foreign policy/grand strategy/war/trade/etc. Plenty of folks look at how domestic institutions and dynamics can cause countries to engage in sub-optimal foreign policies (hence the tradeoff implied in my second book--For Kin or Country). The challenge, then, is to figure out what would be a cool policy and how that cool policy could resonate with those who are relevant domestically. That is not easy, but it is what is necessary. To be policy relevant requires both parts--articulating a policy alternative that would improve things and some thought about how the alternative could be politically appealing. Otherwise, we can just dream about the right policy and gnash our teeth when it never happens.

#### Reject the argument, not the team

#### And the DOD doesn’t shield the link- even if it’s had bipartisan support the sequester demands cuts from all areas of spending including military and including SMRs- additionally- PC key to get dems on board.