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### 1

#### Financial incentives for production are different from policy incentives—the aff is the latter

Diehl 7 – Junior Staff Member, Journal of Land, Resources & Environmental Law; J.D candidate (Rustin P., “NOTE: Transitioning to a Clean Renewable Energy Network in the West”, 27 J. Land Resources & Envtl. L. 345, Lexis Law)

Many studies have considered the benefits and achieved results of the available renewable energy financial incentives. While studies agree that these incentives are effectively promoting business integration of renewable energies, it is questionable whether the incentives encourage private adoption of renewable energy technology.n55 The incentives for implementing clean renewable power generation fall into two main categories: financial incentives and policy  [\*354]  incentives. These incentives can be provided at federal, state, and municipal levels.

A laundry list of financial incentives include: corporate equipment rebates, energy efficient mortgages, accelerated corporate depreciation schedules, corporate tax credits, corporate **production incentives**, corporate and personal tax exemptions, personal tax credits, federal grant programs, USDA renewable energy systems and energy efficiency improvements loan programs, green power purchasing or aggregation, corporate tax incentive, industry recruitment incentives, property tax incentives, state public benefit funds, and state sales tax incentives. n56

Some of the **policy incentives** encouraging the use of renewable energies include: construction and design policies, contractor licensing, equipment **certifications**, generation disclosure rules, net metering rules, renewables portfolio set asides, required utility green power option, and solar and wind access laws. n57 In addition to these policy incentives, many states have adopted portfolio mandates or portfolio standards, which require certain percentages of energy come from renewable sources.n58

#### Loan guarantees are credit tools, not direct incentives

**Kubert and Sinclair, 11** - Clean Energy States Alliance – paper produced for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (Charles and Mark, “State Support for Clean Energy Deployment: Lessons Learned for Potential Future Policy” April, http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/49340.pdf) EE/RE = Energy Efficiency/Renewable Energy)

Align Tools with Program Goals: If the primary goal is to maximize GHG emission reductions per dollar invested, then credit enhancement tools (e.g., loan guarantees and interest rate buydowns) could be more effective than direct incentives because of the manner in which they leverage private capital markets. If the goal is to maximize near-term energy savings, then broad EE incentives could be preferable to RE support. Note that programs can have multiple goals and that optimizing design for certain goals can subordinate others, so program design will need to reflect overall priorities.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1. Ground—including the whole range of policy incentives inflates solvency and avoids the best mechanism CPs.

#### 2. Limits—different incentive schemes have different lit bases, blending them all together undermines conceptual coherence and makes thorough research impossible.

### 2

The 50 state governments should establish energy financing banks served with the task of substantially increasing loan guarantees for the expansion of nuclear power in the United States.

#### States can incentivize nuclear power -- solves the case.

**NEI, ‘8** [“Building Confidence in Licensing New U.S. Nuclear Plants,” Jan/Feb, http://nei.org/resourcesandstats/publicationsandmedia/newslettersandreports/nuclearpolicyoutlook/]

“The view is that when the federal government isn’t taking the lead, the legislatures need to step up to the plate,” said Melissa Savage, program director for the Agriculture, Energy and Environmental Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). States are “repealing moratoriums, holding committee session study hearings, looking at changing regulations, and just getting the conversation started in some cases,” she noted. “We’re facing a pretty critical energy crunch in the country. The issue is starting to bubble back up,” Savage said. “In some states, it never went away.” Ten states have passed policies instituting some form of cost recovery assurance for nuclear plant construction. Three states have introduced and one has passed legislation requiring that nuclear energy be included in some form of clean or alternative energy portfolio. Six of the 13 states with moratoriums preventing new nuclear plants are considering removing those bans. Two states have passed local tax incentives for nuclear plants.

### 3

#### Energy efficiency is coming now

**Lovins 10** \*Amory B. Lovins (&) is Chairman and Chief Scientist of Rocky Mountain Institute and Chairman Emeritus of Fiberforge Corporation, he advises governments and major firms worldwide on advanced energy and resource efficiency, In 2009, Time named him one of the 100 most influential people in the world, and Foreign Policy, one of the 100 top global thinkers [“Profitable Solutions to Climate, Oil, and Proliferation, Amory B. Lovins, June 10th 2010, PDF]

INTRODUCTION Fortunately, many companies understand this and are investing in energy efficiency. whether or not they are concerned about climate. IBM and STMicroelectronics have long cut their carbon emissions 6% yeaf with 2- to 3-year paybacks from making their factories more energy efficient. DuPont said it would cut its 2010 global green house emissions to 60% below 1990’s; by 2006, it had achieved an 80% reduction at a S3.000-million profit. Presentation at 15 June 2009 to 9th Royal Colloquium “Climate Action: Tuning in on energy, water and food security,” Bönliamn, Sweden. Dow’s $1,000-million investment in energy efficiency has so far returned $9,000 million in savings. BP met its operational carbon reduction goals 8 years early at a $2,000-million profit. United Technologies cut its energy use per dollar 45% during 2003–07. GE is cutting its energy intensity 30% during 2005–2012 to build shareholder value. Interface may hold the record with 1996– 2008 reductions of 71% in absolute greenhouse-gas emissions while offsetting the rest, growing the company twothirds, and doubling profits. Even these achievements just scratch the surface of what is possible and worthwhile: McKinsey&Company showed (McKinsey&Company 2009) how to cut forecast 2030 global greenhouse-gas emissions by 70% at an average cost of just $6 per tonne of CO2 equivalent. Including the newer technologies and integrative designs described below would have made that potential bigger and much cheaper (less than zero). If global energy intensity—primary energy used per dollar of real GDP—continued to drift down by just 1% year-1 under canonical long-term trends of population and economic growth and of decarbonizing fuels, then global CO2 emission rates would about triple by 2100, so we would all be toast. However, can we make toast, not be toast? If energy intensity fell not by 1% but by 2% year-1, emissions would stabilize, and if intensity fell by 3–4% year-1, climate could stabilize (to the extent irreversible changes aren’t already underway). Is this conceivable? Yes: the US has spontaneously cut its energy intensity by 2–4% year-1 for most of the past few decades, under both high and low energy prices. Denmark in 1980–2006 shrank its carbon intensity 2.7% year-1. China cut its energy intensity over 5% year-1 for a quarter century through 2001.2 Attentive Western firms are profitably cutting their energy intensity 6–16% year-1. Therefore, why should 3–4% year-1 be difficult—especially since most of the forecast growth is in countries like China and India that are building their infrastructure from scratch, and can more easily build it right than fix it later? And since virtually everyone who does energy efficiency makes money, why should this be costly? Detailed analyses cited below show how the US, for example, can save about half its oil and gas use at about one-fifth of their current price, and about three-fourths of its electricity use at about one-eighth the electricity’s price. Even Japan, with 2- to 3-fold lower energy intensity, has found ways to save two-thirds of the remaining energy (National Institute for Environmental Studies 2009). These opportunities are best described in two main themes: burning oil and producing electricity. These, respectively, cause 43 and 41% of US, and roughly 45 and 30% of global, fossil-fuel carbon emissions. Electricity generation is \*50% coal fired in the US, 42% in the world, so each unit of electricity saved displaces 3–4 units of especially carbon-intensive fuel—huge climate leverage.

#### Construction of new reactors trades off with energy efficiency

**Roche\* 7 – \***Site editor, no direct author given, but N02 Nuclear Power.org is a site created and run by Pete Roche who is an energy consultant based in Edinburgh and policy adviser to the Scottish Nuclear Free Local Authorities, and the National Steering Committee of [UK NFLA](http://nfznsc.gn.apc.org/). Pete was co-founder of the Scottish Campaign to Resist the Atomic Menace (SCRAM), he has represented Greenpeace at international meetings and is active in several other areas relating to environmental protection and nuclear power [http://www.no2nuclearpower.org.uk/reports/Opportunity\_Costs\_Nuclear.pdf, January 2007 “Opportunity Costs of Nuclear Power]

Introduction The opportunity cost of any investment is the cost of forgoing the alternative outcomes that could have been purchased with the same money. So, of course all investments will forego other opportunities, but this briefing looks at those potential investments, which would be foregone, if we invest in nuclear power. Many advocates of new nuclear construction call for a “balanced energy policy” and promote the idea that ‘we need every energy technology’ in order to successfully tackle the climate change problem. This idea suggests that we have infinite amounts of money to spend on energy projects, which is obviously nonsense. Resources are scarce, so we need to make choices. Because climate change is a serious and urgent problem then we must spend our limited resources as effectively and quickly as possible - best buys first, not the more the merrier. For each dollar we spend we need to buy the maximum amount of “solution” possible. (The “least cost” solution) On both criteria, cost and speed, nuclear power is probably the least effective climate-stabilizing option on offer. As well as being more expensive, and taking longer to implement, the problem with spending on nuclear power is that it will detract from spending on other more effective options. Not only does nuclear power drain resources away from other options, but it also distracts attention from important decisions that have to be made to support those other options. And because there are so many problems associated with getting new reactor construction off the ground, it might not work. So in the worst case we might find that efforts to tackle climate change are seriously damaged by a decision to go ahead with reactor construction. Although the nuclear industry likes to give the impression that it can now finance new reactors without taxpayer subsidies, there are still large uncertainties about how the waste and decommissioning liabilities will be financed in many countries. Thus building new reactors could be potentially storing up future opportunity costs for taxpayers which they will have to accept whether they like it or not. Catastrophic opportunity cost Since we do not have unlimited resources, we have to choose how we spend. If we buy more of one thing, then it will be necessary for us to have less of another. Because of the seriousness of the climate change threat, it is essential that we spend our limited resources on the fastest and most effective climate solutions. Nuclear power is just the opposite. Investment in more expensive nuclear power will, in effect, worsen climate change because each dollar we spend is buying less solution than it would do if we were to spend it on energy efficiency. (1) Amory Lovins, of the respected Rocky Mountain Institute, says investing in nuclear power would be the worst thing we could do for climate change, because efforts to ‘revive’ this moribund technology will divert investment from cheaper market winners – cogeneration, renewables, and efficiency. Standard studies tend to compare the cost of new reactors with alternative centralised fossil-fuelled plants. They conclude that it might be possible to revive nuclear power if construction and operation is heavily subsidised or if carbon is heavily taxed. Lovins says these efforts would be futile, because large centralised power stations are not the real competition. Neither fossil-fuel or nuclear can compete with windpower, some other renewables, combined heat and power (CHP) and energy efficiency. We should not allow fears of a looming energy gap, or the urgency of tackling climate change to stampede us into making irrational decisions. Diversification has its merits, but the strategic value of a diversified portfolio would not be enough to justify buying every technology on offer at whatever cost. Lovins calculates that one US dollar buys roughly:- • 10kWh of new nuclear electricity (at its 2004 subsidised level) • 12-17kWh of wind powered electricity • 9-17kWh of gas-fired industrial cogeneration (adjusted for carbon emissions) • 20-65kWh of residential building cogeneration (again adjusted for carbon) • anything up to 100kWh of savings from energy efficiency A portfolio of least-cost investments in energy efficiency and decentralised generation will beat nuclear power by a large and rising margin.

#### Efficiency is key to the plastics industry

**SPI and DOE 5** \*Society of the Plastics Industry, Department of Energy [http://www1.eere.energy.gov/manufacturing/tech\_deployment/pdfs/plastics\_report.pdf, Improving Energy Effi ciency at U.S. Plastics Manufacturing Plants]

U.S. plastics manufacturing companies stand to boost their competitiveness, productivity, and profits if they take steps now to make their industrial processes and equipment more energy efficient. This is the major finding of a series of assessments conducted in 2003 on the potential for greater energy effi ciency, less waste, and lower operating costs at several representative U.S. plastics plants. To date, 9 of 11 plants in the study have implemented at least one recommended improvement project. As a result, these 9 plants are reducing their energy costs an average of nearly 10% per year and saving thousands of dollars on energy bills annually. Rising energy prices are becoming a major concern in the plastics industry. This is especially true for small- and medium-sized companies that have little wiggle room when trying to balance operating expenses against profi tability. As adequate supplies of natural gas and other resources become more costly, many plastics manufacturing companies are realizing that they need to reduce the energy they use—and the energy they waste—to stay competitive in regional and global markets.

#### Plastics key space exploration and colonization

**SPI 1** (Society of the Plastics Industry, “Plastics in Aerospace: The Right Stuff,” <http://www.plasticsindustry.org/AboutPlastics/content.cfm?ItemNumber=633&navItemNumber=1118>

During the past 50 years, aeronautics technology has soared, with plastics playing a major role in both pragmatic improvements and dramatic advances. In aircraft, missiles, satellites and shuttles, plastics and plastic materials have enhanced and sped significant developments in civilian air travel, military air power and space exploration. For many of the same reasons that make them the materials of choice for such a variety of products that benefit our lives, plastics are the right stuff in aerospace. From Necessity to Invention World War II accelerated the entry of plastics into aerospace both because other materials were scarce and because the possibilities for the materials' use were already being envisioned. During the war years, vinyl resins became a major substitute for rubber in Air Corps applications such as fuel-tank linings and fliers' boots. Plastics also began to be appreciated as first-choice materials. Virtually transparent to electromagnetic waves, the plastic used in radomes, which housed radar installations, allowed the waves to pass through with minimal loss, maximizing transmission to night-flying bombers. Its introduction was hailed as having significantly advanced the technology of airborne radar. The development of plastics that literally could "take the heat" associated with many aerospace applications and the launching of the U.S. space program spurred additional interest and extensive research in plastics for flight. Soon, plastic materials were common in aerospace for everything from interior trim in airplanes to nose cones for missiles. New words became familiar as "solid fuel boosters" on rockets and "ablative shields" for reentry came to rely on plastic materials. And when man landed on the moon, so did plastics. Taking Off The diversity of plastics and plastic-composite materials provides the qualities needed for a wide variety of aerospace needs. Plastic materials can be flexible enough to withstand helicopter vibration but rigid enough to ensure safe cargo. They can be transparent for easy observation, shatter resistant and offer ballistic protection. And, significantly, they can be both lightweight and strong. In the 1970s, the oil crisis forced aerospace companies to design aircraft that used less fuel. This meant more efficient engines, improved aerodynamics and reduced aircraft weight. It also meant a role for plastics. Today, jet engine manufacturers increasingly use plastics for the same reasons: reliability, efficiency, fuel savings and improved performance. The heavier the vehicle, the more fuel it takes to power it. For jetliners, the weight-to-fuel impact is tremendous. Just a one-pound reduction in weight translates into $1,000 in lifetime fuel savings. As composite engines can offer weight reductions of some 300 pounds over other materials, savings can be enormous. Plastics also save fuel and money because their smooth contours improve aerodynamics. And plastics, which are less expensive to manufacture than heavier materials, produce parts that are more resistant to wear, require less upkeep and are easier to repair. In the structures, interiors and functional parts of air and space craft, new uses continue to be found for plastic materials, and new plastic materials continue to be created to meet aerospace needs. A Show of Force Plastic-composite materials are especially prevalent in today's sophisticated helicopters and other rotor craft. For these aircraft, the toughness, flexibility, crashworthiness and cost savings of plastic materials have motivated their large-scale use, both structurally and mechanically. These vehicles showcase how plastics can be tailored to fit a variety of needs, including opposing ones. Helicopters, which vibrate a great deal, can be called on to carry heavy payloads of equipment and personnel. The design of these vehicles calls for one set of materials that can compensate for the stresses caused by vibration and another that are stiff enough to hold up under a heavy payload. Plastics can do both, and more. In military applications of rotor craft, plastics have been on the front lines of innovation. A new entry into the field, the prototype X-wing craft, sports sophisticated plastic-composite wings that act as a rotor during takeoff and landing but lock into a set position once in the air. The stresses inflicted on such a craft are numerous and varied. Only stiff yet light composites can stand up to them. Though developed for military purposes, the X-wing is believed to have potential as a commercial shuttle and to be jet-powered. Other modern military rotor vehicles - including vertical takeoff aircraft, a gunship and a minesweeper - rely heavily on plastic materials to accomplish their specialized tasks. Plastics also are being, or are expected to be, used extensively for other innovative military craft. One material's near invisibility to radar makes it indispensable for "stealth" aircraft, which designers hope to make undetectable to infrared and optical spotters. And plastic fibers could play a significant role in a proposed blimp that would warn naval forces of surface-skimming missiles. Such vehicles are also being considered for nonmilitary use in fields such as forestry and scientific observation. Up to the Challenge The air and space craft of the next century increasingly will be made of plastics. Small composite planes will flourish, and commercial aircraft will soar with plastic wings and tails. The military will continue to depend on plastics to create ever lighter aircraft with fewer parts and the ability to evade detection. New aircraft designs with rear-mounted engines will rely on plastics to take the stress and better allocate weight. Still lighter materials will increase the crafts' capacities for more sophisticated avionics and other on-board systems. And plastics are expected to answer many of NASA's calls for materials to create and perfect high-performance supersonic/hypersonic aircraft, nuclear space power systems and space stations.

#### Extinction

**Oberg**, Space Writer and former Space Flight Engineer, **99**

(James, Space Power Theory, <http://www.jamesoberg.com/books/spt/new-CHAPTERSw_figs.pdf>)

We have the great gift of yet another period when our nation is not threatened; and our world is free from opposing coalitions with great global capabilities. We can use this period to take our nation and our fellow men into the greatest adventure that our species has ever embarked upon. The United States can lead, protect, and help the rest of mankind to move into space. It is particularly fitting that a country comprised of people from all over the globe assumes that role. This is a manifest destiny worthy of dreamers and poets, warriors and conquerors. In his last book, Pale Blue Dot, Carl Sagan presents an emotional argument that our species must venture into the vast realm of space to establish a spacefaring civilization. While acknowledging the very high costs that are involved in manned spaceflight, Sagan states that our very survival as a species depends on colonizing outer space. Astronomers have already identified dozens of asteroids that might someday smash into Earth. Undoubtedly, many more remain undetected. In Sagan’s opinion, the only way to avert inevitable catastrophe is for mankind to establish a permanent human presence in space. He compares humans to the planets that roam the night sky, as he says that humans will too wander through space. We will wander space because we possess a compulsion to explore, and space provides a truly infinite prospect of new directions to explore. Sagan’s vision is part science and part emotion. He hoped that the exploration of space would unify humankind. We propose that mankind follow the United States and our allies into this new sea, set with jeweled stars. If we lead, we can be both strong and caring. If we step back, it may be to the detriment of more than our country.

### 4

#### Obama pushing for sequestration deal now – key to avert economic collapse

Susa Crabtree (writer for the Washington Times) February 6, 2013 “Obama ramps up pressure to resolve sequester;¶ Sets up another partisan battle” Lexis

Warning of serious repercussions for the economy and the military if Congress fails to halt the next round of $85 billion in budget cuts next month, President Obama on Tuesday called for replacing the automatic spending "sequesters" with a vague mix of smaller cuts and more tax increases.¶ At a time when many top Republicans have said the cuts should take effect, Mr. Obama's call renews the battle over spending that has dominated Washington for the past two years, but which seemed to cool after the January deal that raised taxes across the board.¶ The president said he would like another big tax reform that targets the wealthy, cutting deductions and loopholes, but said at the very least Congress should avert the sequester, which he called an avoidable self-inflicted economic wound.¶ "If they can't get a bigger package done by the time the sequester is scheduled to go into effect, then I believe they should at least pass a smaller package," he said. "There is no reason that the jobs of thousands of Americans who work in national security or education or clean energy - not to mention the growth of the entire economy - should be put in jeopardy."¶ His offer is a rehash of proposals he has made to end tax breaks and lower projected increases in health care spending, though the White House has yet to lay out a full list of deductions it wants Congress to target.¶ Even before Mr. Obama spoke, Republicans were rejecting his offer.¶ House Speaker John A. Boehner, Ohio Republican, issued a statement saying it was the president who came up with the sequester idea. He also said House Republicans have passed two bills to avert the sequesters, so Mr. Obama must lay out his own specific plan.¶ Still smarting from his "fiscal cliff" deal with Democrats in which Republicans agreed to increase taxes without spending cuts, the speaker made it clear that he was ruling out any need to increase taxes further.¶ "President Obama first proposed the sequester and insisted it become law. Republicans have twice voted to replace these arbitrary cuts with common-sense cuts and reforms that protect our national defense," he said. "We believe there is a better way to reduce the deficit, but Americans do not support sacrificing real spending cuts for more tax hikes.¶ "The president's sequester should be replaced with spending cuts and reforms that will start us on the path to balancing the budget in 10 years," he said.¶ Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, Kentucky Republican, rebuked Mr. Obama for lecturing Congress about the need to avoid the cuts he proposed.¶ "If Democrats have ideas for smarter cuts, they should bring them up for debate," he said. "But the American people will not support more tax hikes in place of the meaningful spending reductions both parties already agreed to and the president signed into law."¶ Mr. McConnell also criticized Mr. Obama for failing to submit a budget by the statutory deadline this year.¶ "The clock is ticking. It's time to get serious," he added.¶ The White House first came up with the idea of the arbitrary, across-the-board spending cuts during budget talks in summer 2011 as a way to pressure Democrats and Republicans in Congress into coming up with their own spending cut plan to reduce the deficit over the next decade.¶ But partisan Washington gridlock quickly took hold and a supercommittee of lawmakers tasked with coming up with a plan to find alternative spending cuts to replace the sequester failed to reach a deal after negotiating for months.¶ As the country braced for the cuts to kick in and Washington to tumble off the fiscal cliff Jan. 1, lawmakers struck a last-minute deal that shifted the first two months of cuts into future spending bills and replaced the rest with an increase in the way retirement accounts are taxed. Still, the deal postponed another $85 billion in cuts to March 1 - a way to buy more time to find alternative sources of revenue.¶ The Pentagon in recent weeks has grown increasingly pessimistic about the chances of avoiding the cuts, and the branches of the military have issued memos outlining what programs and sections would be hit hardest.¶ Washington think tanks and policy centers have warned repeatedly of the havoc that the cuts could wreak on the economy. The Bipartisan Policy Center has estimated that 1 million jobs could be lost this year and next as a direct result of the spending cuts, and defense industry analysts say that number could rise to 2 million this year alone.¶ The president made his plea as Senate Democrats were meeting in Annapolis for their annual retreat. Mr. Obama is scheduled to address the group Wednesday.

#### The aff is politically toxic.

-plant cost

-fukushima

-insiders

**Wood, 9-13-12**

[Elisa, AOL, “What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy,” http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/]

Still, nuclear is unlikely to become a bigger slice of the energy pie in the US over the next two decades because of the high cost to build new plants, according the US Energy Information Administration. That may explain part of the campaign silence about nuclear. Another is lingering public worry about Fukushima, say industry observers. Even those who see nuclear as safe, say they understand why the candidates would want to steer clear of the discussion. Daniel Krueger, a managing director for Accenture's utilities generation and energy markets practice, described nuclear as politically "toxic," but added, "To me as an industry guy, in my view Fukushima proved the safety of nuclear energy. We had a major plant which was hit by an earthquake and tidal wave, and no one died as a direct result of radiation exposure. And the operator willingly sacrificed a plant worth tens of billions to protect the public. It was unimaginable what hit that plant."

#### Economy is at the top of the agenda – all of Obama’s PC is key

Wolf Blitzer and Gloria Borger (CNN political analysts) February 1, 2013 “Wall Street Soars; Senate Scandal; Super Bowl Advertising; Al Gore Defends Selling to Al Jazeera; The Most Expensive Election; Hillary Clinton Resigns; Kerry Arrives at Swearing in Ceremony; Geraldo Rivera for Senator?; New Jersey Senate Showdown; Once Powerful Cardinal Disciplined; $8M a Minute; Controversy Over Some Super Bowl Ads; New York Mourns Ed Koch” Lexis

BLITZER: So, there's more jobs created, another 150,000 last month. They revised figures for November and December, another 200,000 beyond those earlier announced.¶ So how is this going to impact his legislative agenda on some of these critically important issues?¶ BORGER: Before he gets to immigration and everything else, he has to go through all of the business speed bumps, the economic speed bumps.¶ BLITZER: And there are plenty of them.¶ BORGER: And there are plenty of them coming up.¶ And I think both sides can make the case, Wolf, and they will, that a dysfunctional Washington really hurts consumer confidence and hurts business hiring. Republicans will say you have got to decrease the deficit and the president will say, you know what, we have to perhaps think about spending a little bit of money to get out of this and to try and reduce that unemployment rate.¶ So they are going to come at it from different sides, Wolf. The big thing to think about here is the president's approval rating. It is now at 52 percent. That gives him an awful lot of leverage on these economic issues.¶ BLITZER: He's going to need that if he's going to get some of these agenda items through.¶ BORGER: He will need every bit of it. Yes.

#### Sequestration guarantees collapse of the economy and hegemony – causes Middle East war

Hutchison 9/21U.S. Senator from the great state of Texas, 9/21/2012

(Kay Bailey, “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis)

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk. According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and a potentially catastrophic blow to our national defense and security capabilities in a time of increasing violence and danger. All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve. The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship. Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year. The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings. In the absence of U.S. military leadership, upheaval in the Middle East would be worse. As any student of history can attest, instability does not confine itself to national borders. Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region. Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological research, development and advantage - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities. Sequestration can still be avoided. But that will require leadership from the President that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

#### Those escalate

James A. Russell (managing editor of Strategic Insights, senior lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs at NPS, From 1988-2001 held a variety of positions in the Office of the Assistant Secretary Defense for International Security Affairs, Near East South Asia, Department of Defense) Spring 2009 “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” <http://www.analyst-network.com/articles/141/StrategicStabilityReconsideredProspectsforEscalationandNuclearWarintheMiddleEast.pdf>

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

### 5

#### Plan’s coercive

**Rothbard, no date** (Murray Rothbard, former teacher, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, New Liberty – Involuntary Servitude, no date, p. <http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newliberty4a.asp>)

In a sense, the entire system of taxation is a form of involuntary servitude. Take, in particular, the income tax. The high levels of income tax mean that all of us work a large part of the year? several months? for nothing for Uncle Sam before being allowed to enjoy our incomes on the market. Part of the essence of slavery, after all, is forced work for someone at little or no pay. But the income tax means that we sweat and earn income, only to see the government extract a large chunk of it by coercion for its own purposes. What is this but forced labor at no pay? The withholding feature of the income tax is a still more clear-cut instance of involuntary servitude. For as the intrepid Connecticut indus­trialist Vivien Kellems argued years ago, the employer is forced to expend time, labor, and money in the business of deducting and transmit­ting his employees' taxes to the federal and state governments, yet the employer is not recompensed for this expenditure. What moral principle justifies the government's forcing employers to act as its unpaid tax collectors?

#### Decision rule

**Petro**, **74** (Sylvester, Professor of Law at Wake Forest University, University of Toledo Law Review, p.480)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway – “I believe in only one thing: liberty.” And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume’s observation: “It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once.” Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Djilas. In sum, if one believes in freedom as a supreme value and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

### 6

#### The Department of Energy should increase methane regulation standards and certification capacity, promote the creation of an International Framework for Nuclear Energy Cooperation, in which they provide assured supplies of fresh nuclear fuel from a United States-based reprocessing plant, and ban domestic commercial reprocessing. The Department of Education should initiate a program to substantially increase vocational education modeled on the German education track.

#### DOE regulations solve methane impacts

Friedman, 8/4 won the 2002 Pulitzer Prize for commentary, his third Pulitzer for The New York Times. He became the paper’s foreign-affairs Op-Ed columnist in 1995. Previously, he served as chief economic correspondent in the Washington bureau and before that he was the chief White House correspondent. In 2005, Mr. Friedman was elected as a member of the Pulitzer Prize Board (Thomas L. Friedman, NYT, 4 August 2012, “Get It Right on Gas,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/05/opinion/sunday/friedman-get-it-right-on-gas.html?\_r=1)//CC

Moreover, while natural gas is cleaner than coal, extracting it can be very dirty. We have to do this right. For instance, the carbon advantage can be undermined by leakage of uncombusted natural gas from wellheads and pipelines because methane -- the primary component of natural gas --- is an extremely powerful greenhouse gas, more powerful than carbon dioxide. The big oil companies can easily maintain high drilling standards, but a lot of fracking is done by mom-and-pop drillers that do not. The standards that can make fracking environmentally O.K. are not expensive, but the big drillers want to make sure that the little guys have to apply them, too, so everyone has the same cost basis. On July 19, Forbes interviewed George Phydias Mitchell, who, in the 1990s, pioneered the use of fracking to break natural gas free from impermeable shale. According to Forbes, Mitchell argued that fracking needs to be regulated by the Department of Energy, not just states: "Because if they don't do it right, there could be trouble," he says. There's no excuse not to get it right. "There are good techniques to make it safe that should be followed properly," he says. But, the smaller, independent drillers, "are wild." "It's tough to control these independents. If they do something wrong and dangerous, they should punish them." Adds Fred Krupp, the president of the Environmental Defense Fund who has been working with the government and companies on drilling standards: "The economic and national security advantages of natural gas are obvious, but if you tour some of these areas of intensive development the environmental impacts are equally obvious." We need nationally accepted standards for controlling methane leakage, for controlling water used in fracking - where you get it, how you treat the polluted water that comes out from the fracking process and how you protect aquifers - and for ensuring that communities have the right to say no to drilling. "The key message," says Krupp, "is you gotta get the rules right. States need real inspector capacity and compliance schemes where companies certify they have done it right and there are severe penalties if they perjure."

#### CP solves prolif

**Bunn and Harrell 12** – Associate Professor of Public Policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government AND Research Associate at the Project on Managing the Atom in the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard Kennedy School

(Matthew and Eben, “Consolidation: Thwarting Nuclear Theft”, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Consolidation_Thwarting_Nuclear_Theft_corrected.pdf>, dml)

GTRI estimates that there are still 29 HEU-fueled research reactors that it does not plan to help convert or shut down. The majority of these facilities are critical assemblies or pulse reactors in Russia, and the remainder are critical assemblies and pulse reactors in other countries; all these reactors would be addressed if the recommendations above were implemented. There are, however, a substantial number of HEU-fueled reactors that are so far beyond GTRI’s planning they do not make it onto the official lists. The largest global users of HEU every year are U.S. and Russian naval reactors (see “The Challenge of HEU Naval Fuel,” p. 32), and there is little prospect for their conversion. Similarly, there is one commercial and one experimental fast-neutron reactors that use HEU fuel today—though in the future, power reactors of this type are expected to use plutonium as their fuel. These include the BN-600 commercial reactor in Russia (which uses medium-enriched material in the 22-27% enrichment range), along with the BOR-60 experimental reactor in Russia and a new fast neutron research reactor being planned; the recently opened China Experimental Fast Reactor (CEFR), which uses 64% enriched material; and the experimental Joyo reactor in Japan. 61 Most other fast reactors use plutonium fuel. A large commercial fast reactor, the BN-800, is under construction in Russia, and is slated to use plutonium fuel. Most of these reactors have troubled operating histories, and might shut down (as the world’s other fast reactors have done in the past). Moreover, fast reactors to date have been uneconomic, and this is unlikely to change for decades to come. The United States should encourage countries to consider the full costs and risks before embarking on fast reactor programs. In any case, future fast reactors, to the extent they are built in the near term, are likely to be plutonium-fueled rather then HEU-fueled, though it is not clear that offers any significant proliferation advantage compared to the use of HEU in the 20-30% range, which itself would be difficult to use to make a nuclear bomb. Avoiding the Spread of Weapons-Usable Material Production The broad range of steps needed to reduce the danger of nuclear proliferation are beyond the scope of this paper. But one element that is clearly related to consolidation is to ensure that new states do not begin producing plutonium or HEU, creating new potential sources for nuclear theft. This includes addressing the nuclear programs of North Korea and Iran, and limiting the spread of enrichment and reprocessing facilities—the key technologies that make it possible to produce weaponsusable nuclear material. Recommendation: The United States should work with other countries to engage North Korea and Iran, putting together packages of incentives and disincentives that convince these governments that it is in their national interests not to have nuclear weapons or capabilities to manufacture them rapidly. Recommendation: The United States and other interested countries should continue to pursue multiple means to limit the spread of enrichment and reprocessing plants. 62 (See below for a discussion of plutonium reprocessing facilities in particular.) They should continue working to establish an International Framework for Nuclear Energy Cooperation that would provide assured supplies of fresh nuclear fuel and cooperative management of spent nuclear fuel, reducing incentives for states to build their own enrichment and reprocessing facilities (and heightening attention to the possible ulterior motives of those who nevertheless choose to do so). The United States and other interested countries should also explore options for international ownership, management, and staffing of fuel cycle facilities, seeking approaches that could reduce the proliferation and terrorism threats these facilities pose.

#### Vocational education solves – German model is key

**Stringfellow 12** – a PR and MarComm Consultant and Social Media Strategist offering full-circle marketing solutions to businesses (Angela, March 7th, <http://www.openforum.com/articles/challenges-facing-todays-manufacturing-industry>) Jacome

But, according to Paul Golden, founder and managing partner of [Schilling Ventures, LLC.](http://www.schillingventures.com/), the biggest obstacle facing the manufacturing sector today is the lack of [skilled training](http://www.openforum.com/employee-training). Schilling Ventures builds market-leading industrial companies through strategic counsel on lean operations. Employers are struggling to find individuals who are skilled and mechanically adept. “Workers don’t know enough trade skills. This is compounded by many school districts failing at the basics of education for individuals headed to the shop floor,” Golden says. The lack of skilled laborers, he says, hinders [productivity](http://www.openforum.com/keywords/productivity), creating a disadvantage against off-shore competitors. Additionally, many companies struggle to find employees with strong work ethics, instead finding those who opt for lower pay in exchange for less quality work.

“China and India can compensate for lack of skills by adding labor, as wages are comparatively low,” Golden says. However, in the U.S., manufacturers must rely on their employees to improve productivity and achieve higher revenues. And, in an already over-worked sector, this may be hard to achieve. “Without strong skills, shop floor workers won’t drive those benefits,” he adds.

Adding to the problem is the lack of quality engineers joining the manufacturing sector. According to Golden, many engineers are  
looking towards Web and software firms, leaving the industry hurting for creative talent for product development efforts. In addition, manufacturing is no longer viewed as “the” place to go for young, well-educated professionals. “Software, Wall Street and consulting have become the in places to be,” Golden says. “Without [innovation](http://www.openforum.com/topics/innovation), price becomes the competitive basis, and U.S. cost structures can’t match those from off-shore without exceptional productivity.”

The obstacles addressed by Golden are not without solutions. The industry needs to recreate a positive image of manufacturing that once enticed the brightest professionals to the sector. “We need to make manufacturing ‘in’ again, highlighting the fortunes created and the valuable contribution made from manufacturing so that we can attract our best and brightest.” He believes this can be done by creating a “Do it for America” type ethos which will help attract students to the engineering and science fields.

In addition, school districts must ramp up their vocational training programs. Although he has seen more specific training programs through partnerships between manufacturers and trade schools, Golden believes this is an effective “band-aid to the fundamental educational problems in the U.S.”  He suggests a program similar to Germany’s apprentice and trade education track that cultivates students interesting in joining the manufacturing sector. “We should be able to create a U.S. version that promotes the pride of a trade skill, opportunity to earn a great living and the ability to parlay that trade into a business ownership.”

### Solvency

#### Loan guarantees magnify uncertainty

**Spencer 10** [Domestic Policy Subcommittee Of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee Tuesday, April 20, 2010 Jack Spencer, Senior Research Fellow, Nuclear Energy Policy, Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, khirn]

Limited loan guarantees can help overcome some near-term financing obstacles, but they are subsidies. If not used prudently, **they will only act to prop up non-competitive industries.** Furthermore, **if they are not accompanied by policy reforms, they would simply magnify the uncertainty**, and thus the risk to taxpayers, caused by the underlying policies that make private financing difficult to attain in the first place. Tolerable to a Degree The clean energy loan guarantee program, under which the nuclear program resides, was created in 2005 to help move new clean energy sources toward market viability. A limited loan guarantee program that allowed industry and government to share risk while working through some remaining issues (such as waste disposal and unpredictable regulation) is appropriate. Expansive loan guarantee programs, however, are fraught with problems. At a minimum, they create taxpayer liabilities, give recipients preferential treatment, and distort capital markets. Further, depending on how they are structured, they can remove incentives to decrease costs, stifle innovation, suppress private-sector financing solutions, perpetuate regulatory inefficiency, and encourage government dependence. President Obama's expansion would transform the limited program into a much broader one that threatens to **institutionalize the inefficiencies** that subsidies create. Most basically, the program diminishes the incentive to reform problematic regulations and policies, such as the prolonged and unpredictable permitting process, because the loan guarantee protects investors against the risk posed by those policies. Instead of providing a near-term transition from an unstable past to a viable future during which policy reforms would take place, the expanded loan guarantee program would simply perpetuate the systemic inefficiencies and risk that gave rise to the need for the subsidy in the first place.

#### Lack of demand means no expansion

Wald, ’11 [Matthew L., NYT, 4-28, “Despite Bipartisan Support, Nuclear Reactor Projects Falter,” http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/29/business/energy-environment/29utility.html]

WASHINGTON — In an effort to encourage nuclear power, Congress voted in 2005 to authorize $17.5 billion in loan guarantees for new reactors. Now, six years later, with the industry stalled by poor market conditions and the Fukushima disaster, nearly half of the fund remains unclaimed. And yet Congress, at the request of the Obama administration, is preparing to add $36 billion in nuclear loan guarantees to next year’s budget. Even supporters of the technology doubt that new projects will surface any time soon to replace those that have been all but abandoned. “My gut feeling is that there is going to be a delay,” said Neil Wilmshurst, a vice president of the Electric Power Research Institute, a nonprofit utility consortium based in Palo Alto, Calif. News on Thursday that Exelon Corporation, the nation’s largest reactor operator, planned to buy a rival, the Constellation Energy Group, only reinforces the trend; until late last year, Constellation wanted to build, while Exelon was firmly against it. Mr. Wilmshurst said the continued depressed price of natural gas had clouded the economics of new reactors, and he predicted that construction activity would “go quiet” for two to five years. His group has shifted its efforts to helping figure out how existing plants can extend their licenses to 80 years from the current limit of 60. Of the four nuclear reactor construction projects that the Energy Department identified in 2009 as the most deserving for the loans, two have lost major partners and seem unlikely to recover soon. In addition to low prices for natural gas, the demand for electricity is down, and the March 11 earthquake and tsunami that damaged the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant could bring new rules. Only $8.8 billion of the 2005 guarantee has been allocated — to a twin reactor project in Georgia. Ground has been broken on the fourth candidate, a twin reactor project in South Carolina, but its sponsors may get a better deal in the commercial finance market.

#### Quick expansion impossible – laundry list

**Squassoni, ‘8** [Sharon, Senior Associate, Nonproliferation Program -- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3-12, “The Realities of Nuclear Expansion” Congressional Testimony: House Select Committee for Energy Independence and Global Warming, Washington, DC]

There are significant questions about whether nuclear expansion that could affect global climate change is even possible. In the United States, as the chief operating officer of Exelon recently told an industry conference, constraints include: the lack of any recent U.S. nuclear construction experience; the atrophy of U.S. nuclear manufacturing infrastructure; production bottlenecks created by an increase in worldwide demand; and an aging labor force. Lack of construction experience translates into delays, which translate into much higher construction costs. Although reactors typically take at least four years to build, delays can increase finance costs considerably. A recent example – the construction of Okiluoto-3 in Finland – demonstrates that an 18-month delay cost 700 million Euros in a project with a fixed cost of three billion Euros.18 In an analysis for a nuclear industry conference, the consulting firm Booz Allen Hamilton prioritized 15 different risks in new reactor construction. The most significant risks and those most likely to occur included engineering, procurement and construction performance, resource shortages and price escalation.19 The atrophy of nuclear manufacturing infrastructure is significant in the United States, but also worldwide. The ultra-heavy forgings for reactor pressure vessels and steam generators constitute the most significant chokepoint. Japan Steel Works (JSW) is currently the only company worldwide with the capacity to make ultra-large forgings (using 600-ton ingots) favored by new reactor designs. Other companies – such as Sfarsteel (formerly Creusot Forge) in France and Doosan Industry in South Korea – have smaller capacities. The purchase of Creusot Forge by AREVA in 2005 means that former customers of Creusot reportedly are shifting to Japan Steel Works, lengthening the two-year waiting list. According to JSW officials, it can now only produce 5.5 sets of forgings per year; this will expand to 8.5 sets in 2010. Even then, nuclear forgings at JSW compete with orders for forgings and assembly from other heavy industries, for example, oil and gas industries, which can be more profitable. China will open new plants, possibly this year, to produce ultra-heavy forgings. In the meantime, using smaller capacity forgings means more components, with more weld seams, and therefore will require more safety inspections, costing utilities more money when the reactors are shut down and not generating electricity. One AREVA estimate is that the daily cost of shutdowns (for inspections or other reasons) is $1 million. In the United States, a significant portion of supporting industries needs to be rebuilt or recertified. In the 1980s, the United States had 400 nuclear suppliers and 900 holders of N-stamp certificates from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.20 Today, there are just 80 suppliers and 200 N-stamp holders. The Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) notes that some of the decline in N-stamp holders is due to consolidation of companies, but nonetheless is encouraging firms to get recertified. In addition, certain commodities used in reactor construction may also present supply problems, such as alloy steel, concrete and nickel. The cost of these inputs, according to Moody’s, has risen dramatically in recent years. Competition from other electricity and construction projects According to a 2008 Bechtel estimate, if electricity demand grows in the United States 1.5% each year and the energy mix remains the same, the United States would have to build 50 nuclear reactors, 261 coal-fired plants, 279 natural-gas-fired plants and 73 renewables projects by 2025. All of these will require craft and construction labor. In addition, electricity generation projects will compete with oil infrastructure projects. In addition, nuclear power construction competes with other large investment projects for labor and resources. Rebuilding from Hurricane Katrina and big construction projects in Texas will continue to place pressure on construction labor forces. A Bechtel executive recently stated that the U.S. faced a skilled labor shortage of 5.3 million workers in 2010, which could rise to a shortage of 14 million by 2020. Adding to this is the retirement of baby boomers, and much slower growth in the number of college graduates.21 A typical nuclear power plant in the United States takes about 4 years to build, and requires 1400 to 2300 construction workers.

#### No investment – long-term payoff and waste

**Gray 12** [Feb 14, “A Strong Step, but Hurdles Remain” By Chuck Gray Executive Director, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, khirn]

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s approval of the new units at Plant Vogtle is an important development for both the nuclear industry and our country. With the issuances of these licenses, the industry knows what to expect moving forward, sending a strong signal to the critical stakeholders, including both the investment community and, significantly, the State regulators that NARUC represents. A predictable investment climate can lead to stable rates. At the end of the day, we hope the big winners are the consumers who pay for the bulk of building these plants. Still, the industry has several hurdles to clear before we can call this a full-blown “renaissance.” The biggest hurdle now is getting potential investors to look at the operating life of a nuclear plant—likely to be 60 years—and be confident that it will prove a good economic choice. With the current excitement over suddenly abundant shale gas, there may be a tendency to believe natural gas prices will remain a lower cost option. Another hurdle is that the nation’s nuclear-waste policy remains at an impasse. Despite the billions consumers have paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund for three decades, we are perhaps further from a solution than we were in 1982, when Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The recent report from the Blue Ribbon Commission of America’s Nuclear Future offered numerous positive recommendations. NARUC, in a resolution approved last week, supports many of them, particularly the proposals that reform the Nuclear Waste Fund. Many of the BRC’s solutions require congressional action, no sure bet in any political atmosphere, and certainly an unlikely one now. Sen. Lisa Murkowski, speaking to us at our Winter Committee Meetings last week, said she is working with Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chair Jeff Bingaman on legislation on the BRC recommendations.

#### Bureaucracy blocks licensing and exports

**NEI, ‘12**

[“Improved Policies for Commercial Nuclear Trade Will Create American Jobs,” June, http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/policybrief/improved-policies-for-commercial-nuclear-trade-will-create-american-jobs?page=1]

While U.S. firms offer some of the most innovative and safest nuclear energy technologies, they are hampered by cumbersome trade regulations, lack of coordination among the federal agencies involved, an inefficient export licensing process, limited options for financing nuclear exports and the absence of an international liability regime. These companies face intense competition from suppliers in nations with less restrictive policies and substantial government subsidies for their nuclear industries. To facilitate a greater U.S. role in the global commercial nuclear market, government support must be integrated into a seamless mechanism that includes coordination of nuclear trade policy, creation of bilateral agreements, export control reform and enhanced export financing. It also is vital that the United States pursue the international adoption of effective civil nuclear liability regimes.

### Prolif

#### Can’t solve prolif leadership – nuclear hypocrisy

Perkovich, ‘8

[George, vice president for studies and director of the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Abolishing Nuclear Weapons: Why the United States Should Lead,” October, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/abolishing\_nuclear\_weapons.pdf]

This Brief summarizes four security interests that would be served by making the longterm project of abolishing nuclear weapons a central purpose of U.S. policy: preventing proliferation; preventing nuclear terrorism; reducing toward zero the unique threat of nuclear annihilation; and fostering optimism regarding U.S. global leadership. Each of these objectives can be (and has been) pursued without the larger purpose of eliminating nuclear weapons. However, the chances of success will steadily diminish if the few nuclear-armed states try to perpetuate a discriminatory order based on haves and have-nots and if they enforce it firmly against some states and hollowly against others. Such inequity breeds noncooperation and resistance when what is needed now is cooperation to prevent proliferation, nuclear terrorism, and the failure of deterrence. Why should everyone cooperate in enforcing a system that looks like it was designed to favor just a few?

#### US won’t exert nonproliferation leadership

Cleary 12

Richard Cleary, American Enterprise Institute Research Assistant, 8/13/12, Richard Cleary: Persuading Countries to Forgo Nuclear Fuel-Making, npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1192&tid=30

The cases above offer a common lesson: The U.S., though constrained or empowered by circumstance, can exert considerable sway in nonproliferation matters, **but** often **elects not to apply the most powerful tools at its disposal for fear of jeopardizing other objectives**. The persistent dilemma of how much to emphasize nonproliferation goals, and at what cost, has contributed to cases of **nonproliferation failure**. The inconsistent or incomplete application of U.S. power in nonproliferation cases is most harmful when it gives the impression to a nation that either sharing sensitive technology or developing it is, or will become, acceptable to Washington. **U.S. reticence** historically, with some exceptions, **to prioritize nonproliferation**—and in so doing reduce the chance of success in these cases—**does not leave room for** great **optimism about future U.S. efforts at persuading countries to forgo nuclear fuel-making**.

#### Proliferation is not going to happen

**Alison 10** (Graham, Director, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Foreign Affairs volume 89, issue 1, pages 74-85, "Nuclear Disorder: Surveying Atomic Threats", <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/19819/nuclear_disorder.html>,)

After listening to a compelling briefing for a proposal or even in summarizing an argument presented by himself, Secretary of State George Marshall was known to pause and ask, "But how could we be wrong?" In that spirit, it is important to examine the reasons why the nonproliferation regime might actually be more robust than it appears. Start with the bottom line. There are no more nuclear weapons states now than there were at the end of the Cold War. Since then, one undeclared and largely unrecognized nuclear weapons state, South Africa, eliminated its arsenal, and one new state, North Korea, emerged as the sole self-declared but unrecognized nuclear weapons state.  One hundred and eighty-four nations have forsworn the acquisition of nuclear weapons and signed the NPT. At least 13 countries began down the path to developing nuclear weapons with serious intent, and were technologically capable of completing the journey, but stopped short of the finish line: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, Iraq, Italy, Libya, Romania, South Korea, Sweden, Taiwan, and Yugoslavia. Four countries had nuclear weapons but eliminated them: South Africa completed six nuclear weapons in the 1980s and then, prior to the transfer of power to the postapartheid government, dismantled them. Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine together inherited more than 4,000 strategic nuclear weapons when the Soviet Union dissolved in December 1991. As a result of negotiated agreements among Russia, the United States, and each of these states, all of these weapons were returned to Russia for dismantlement. Ukraine's 1,640 strategic nuclear warheads were dismantled, and the highly enriched uranium was blended down to produce low-enriched uranium, which was sold to the United States to fuel its nuclear power plants. Few Americans are aware that, thanks to the Megatons to Megawatts Program, half of all the electricity produced by nuclear power plants in the United States over the past decade has been fueled by enriched uranium blended down from the cores of nuclear warheads originally designed to destroy American cities. Although they do not minimize the consequences of North Korea's or Iran's becoming a nuclear weapons state, those confident in the stability of the nuclear order are dubious about the prospects of a cascade of proliferation occurring in Asia, the Middle East, or elsewhere. In Japan, nuclear neuralgia has deep roots. The Japanese people suffered the consequences of the only two nuclear weapons ever exploded in war. Despite their differences, successive Japanese governments have remained confident in the U.S. nuclear umbrella and in the cornerstone of the United States' national security strategy in Asia, the U.S.-Japanese security alliance. The South Koreans fear a nuclear-armed North Korea, but they are even more fearful of life without the U.S. nuclear umbrella and U.S. troops on the peninsula. Taiwan is so penetrated and seduced by China that the terror of getting caught cheating makes it a poor candidate to go nuclear. And although rumors of the purchase by Myanmar (also called Burma) of a Yongbyon-style nuclear reactor from North Korea cannot be ignored, questions have arisen about whether the country would be able to successfully operate it.  In the Middle East, it is important to separate abstract aspirations from realistic plans. Few countries in the region have the scientific and technical infrastructure to support a nuclear weapons program. Saudi Arabia is a plausible buyer, although the United States would certainly make a vigorous effort to persuade it that it would be more secure under a U.S. nuclear umbrella than with its own arsenal. Egypt's determination to acquire nuclear weapons, meanwhile, is limited by its weak scientific and technical infrastructure, unless it were able to rent foreign expertise. And a Turkish nuclear bomb would not only jeopardize Turkey's role in NATO but also undercut whatever chances the country has for acceding to the EU.  Looking elsewhere, Brazil is now operating an enrichment facility but has signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which outlaws nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean, and has accepted robust legal constraints, including those of the Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials. Other than South Africa, which retains the stockpile of 30 bombs' worth of highly enriched uranium that was once part of its nuclear program, it is difficult to identify other countries that might realistically become nuclear weapons states in the foreseeable future.

#### No prolif impact

Colby 07 – Adjunct Staff Member of the RAND Corporation, formerly a staff member in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and on the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction (Eldridge, “Restoring Deterrence,” Orbis, Vol. 51, No. 3, p. 413-428, <http://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/images/issues/200707u/Restoring%20Deterrence.pdf>)

This logic’s bottom line seems clear. If the proliferation of weapons technology is inevitable, then it hardly makes sense to embark on a quixotic crusade to prevent it. Better to accept the new reality and deal with it as best we can. Seen in this light, deterrence is quite appealing. Such a posture, accepting the inevitability of proliferation, would state as a policy only that the use (or allowance of use) of such weapons against the United States or its allies would provoke a devastating response. Countries could, if they wanted, develop these weapons, but the United States would take little strategic cognizance of them. There would be some strategic downside—regime change, for instance, would lose luster as a policy. But, overall, the weapons would have little effect if America maintained a basically status quo posture, defending its established interests and allies. If, for instance, Iran rattled its nuclear saber and insisted the United States withdraw from Saudi Arabia, we would have to play the brinksmanship game and not back down—but what would be new about that? And would Iran be so foolish as to do something to call down the wrath of the American retaliatory capability? Those who say so need do more than point to the rantings of Ahmadinejad. History has shown many enemies who poured scorn on a nuclear-armed United States, but none who were foolish enough actually to act on their bluster and thereby incur its full wrath. Further, Iran is hardly the Soviet Union of the Khrushchev era, bristling with nuclear and conventional weapons.

Indeed, a deterrent posture would, through not placing as much value on WMD, help the cause of disarmament by positively disincentivizing countries from developing them. If the U.S. took an agnostic position on the development of unconventional weapons, but maintained its same status quo red lines while demanding strict accountability for the use or loss of such weapons, why would countries want to build them? If North Korea’s nuclear weapons, in other words, will not affect the American commitment to South Korea (if the South Koreans don’t wreck it themselves in the meantime) and Japan, and if the United States holds the North Koreans responsible for whatever uses their nuclear weapons are put to, then is not the danger of possessing them greater than their beneﬁt? After all, these rogue states are not building these weapons to win a war against us. Instead, they are developing them either as last-ditch weapons—in which case we have no reason to push them into a corner anyway—or as cards to bluff with—in which case we simply need to call that bluff.

#### No motive—low odds of success deter and capabilities are underutilized

**Moodie 2** – president of the Chemical and Biological Arms Control Institute (Brad Roberts and Michael Moodie, Biological Weapons: Toward a Threat Reduction Strategy, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/DefHor/DH15/DH15.htm)

The argument about terrorist motivation is also important. Terrorists generally have not killed as many as they have been capable of killing. This restraint seems to derive from an **understanding of mass casualty attacks as** both unnecessary and **counterproductive**. They are unnecessary because terrorists, by and large, have succeeded by conventional means. Also, they are counterproductive because they might alienate key constituencies, whether among the public, state sponsors, or the terrorist leadership group. In Brian Jenkins’ famous words, terrorists want a lot of people watching, not a lot of people dead. Others have argued that the lack of mass casualty terrorism and effective exploitation of BW has been more a matter of accident and good fortune than capability or intent. Adherents of this view, including former Secretary of Defense William Cohen, argue that “it’s not a matter of if but when.”

The attacks of September 11 would seem to settle the debate about whether terrorists have both the motivation and sophistication to exploit weapons of mass destruction for their full lethal effect. After all, those were terrorist attacks of unprecedented sophistication that seemed clearly aimed at achieving mass casualties— had the World Trade Center towers collapsed as the 1993 bombers had intended, perhaps as many as 150,000 would have died. Moreover, Osama bin Laden’s constituency would appear to be not the “Arab street” or some other political entity but his god. And terrorists answerable only to their deity have proven historically to be among the most lethal.

But this debate cannot be considered settled. Bin Laden and his followers could have killed many more on September 11 if killing as many as possible had been their primary objective. They now face the core dilemma of asymmetric warfare: how to escalate without creating new interests for the stronger power and thus the incentive to exploit its power potential more fully. Asymmetric adversaries want their stronger enemies fearful, not fully engaged—militarily or otherwise. They seek to win by preventing the stronger partner from exploiting its full potential. To kill millions in America with biological or other weapons would only commit the United States—and much of the rest of the international community—to the annihilation of the perpetrators.

#### No retal

**Mueller 5** (John, Professor of Political Science – Ohio State University, Reactions and Overreactions to Terrorism, http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller/NB.PDF)

However, history clearly demonstrates that overreaction is not necessarily inevitable. Sometimes, in fact, leaders have been able to restrain their instinct to overreact. Even more important, restrained reaction--or even capitulation to terrorist acts--has often proved to be entirely acceptable politically. That is, there are many instances where leaders did nothing after a terrorist attack (or at least refrained from overreacting) and did not suffer politically or otherwise. Similarly, after an unacceptable loss of American lives in Somalia in 1993, Bill Clinton responded by withdrawing the troops without noticeable negative impact on his 1996 re-election bid. Although Clinton responded with (apparently counterproductive) military retaliations after the two U.S. embassies were bombed in Africa in 1998 as discussed earlier, his administration did not have a notable response to terrorist attacks on American targets in Saudi Arabia (Khobar Towers) in 1996 or to the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole in 2000, and these non-responses never caused it political pain. George W. Bush's response to the anthrax attacks of 2001 did include, as noted above, a costly and wasteful stocking-up of anthrax vaccine and enormous extra spending by the U.S. Post Office. However, beyond that, it was the same as Clinton's had been to the terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center in 1993 and in Oklahoma City in 1995 and the same as the one applied in Spain when terrorist bombed trains there in 2004 or in Britain after attacks in 2005: the dedicated application of police work to try to apprehend the perpetrators. This approach was politically acceptable even though the culprit in the anthrax case (unlike the other ones) has yet to be found. The demands for retaliation may be somewhat more problematic in the case of suicide terrorists since the direct perpetrators of the terrorist act are already dead, thus sometimes impelling a vengeful need to seek out other targets. Nonetheless, the attacks in Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Great Britain, and against the Cole were all suicidal, yet no direct retaliatory action was taken. Thus, despite short-term demands that some sort of action must be taken, experience suggests politicians can often successfully ride out this demand after the obligatory (and inexpensive) expressions of outrage are prominently issued.

### Natural Gas

#### No impact to methane

**Soon 7** (Willie, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Atmospheric and Ocean Physics, ?Quantitative implications of the secondary role of carbon dioxide climate forcing in the past glacial-interglacial cycles for the likely future climatic impacts of anthropogenic greenhouse-gas forcings?, arXiv:0707.1276v1)

At this stage, it may be also relevant to point out that the popular scenario for potential episodic releases of methane hydrates to act as a strong positive feedback commonly tied to seed atmospheric warming by CO2 may not be so straightforward. First, Milkov (2004) has cautiously lowered the previously accepted high-estimate of global hydrate- bound gas from 21 x 1015 m3 of methane (or about 10,000 Gt of methane carbon) to a much lower range between 1 to 5 x 1015 m3 of methane (or about 500-2500 Gt of methane carbon). Next , Cannariato and Stott (2005) have recently challenged the possibly incorrect interpretation of the large δ13C excursions in records of planktonic and benthic foraminifera as clathrate-derived methane release. A careful examination of the atmospheric methane carbon isotope ratio (δ13CH4) from western Greenland ice margin spanning the Younger Dryas-to-Preboreal transition by Schaefer et al. (2006) also could not find support for either catastrophic or gradual marine clathrate emissions. Finally, Bhaumik and Gupta (2007) have recently identified 5 major episodes of methane releases starting since 3.6 million years BP in their ODP 997A site located on the crest of the Blake Outer Ridge (about 200 km off the east coast of the United States from the shores of Georgia and South Carolina) to be probably linked to reduced hydrostatic pressure connected to lowered sea levels and intense glacial events roughly coinciding with increased glaciation in the northern hemisphere.

#### No methane leakage – prefer recent studies

Levi, 1/3/13 [Climate consequences of natural gas as a bridge fuel¶ Michael Levi, David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment and Director of the Program on Energy Security and Climate Change, Climate Consequences of Natural Gas As a Bridge Fuel, <http://www.cfr.org/energyenvironment/climate-consequences-natural-gas-bridge-fuel/p29772>]

4 Consequences of methane leakage¶ Several authors have recently suggested that methane emissions from natural gas production¶ and distribution will severely reduce or entirely negate the climate benefits of the lower CO2¶ emissions associated with a transition from coal to gas (Howarth et al. 2011). One recent¶ study (Wigley 2011) has argued in detail that substantial CH4 leakage could imply that a¶ transition from coal to gas would not be of much or any climate benefit. Others (Alvarez et¶ al. 2012) have come to more mixed conclusions. None of these, though, examine scenarios¶ in which natural gas use is eventually phased out, i.e. bridge scenarios.¶ We address this gap by refining our bridge scenarios to reflect CH4 emissions associated¶ with a range of assumptions (1 %, 2 %, and 5 % leakage) about CH4 leakage rates. Most¶ recent publications have indicated that leakage in the United States is likely to be 1–2 %, and¶ have all but rejected the possibility of leakage on the order of 5 % (e.g. Jiang et al. 2011;¶ Cathles et al. 2011). We include the 5 % case here for completeness, however, given the¶ existence of at least one outlier in the literature (Howarth et al. 2012), the possibility of¶ greater leakage overseas than in the United States, and continuing uncertainty given the¶ paucity of field observations.¶ Figure 4a–f show expected temperature rises for a range of bridge fuel scenarios¶ including different methane leakage rates along with traditional and delayed transition¶ scenarios for comparison. The bridge scenarios with 1–2 % methane leakage consistently¶ yield temperatures in 2100 that are much closer to those produced in the traditional stabilization scenarios than to those that result from a delayed transition from coal. The same¶ is true for those bridge scenarios that **feature 5 % leakage** and aim to stabilize near 450 ppm¶ CO2. **This contradicts recent suggestions that such leakage rates make natural gas worse for**¶ **climate change than coal.**¶The bridge scenarios with 5 % leakage that aim to stabilize CO2 concentrations around¶ 550 ppm yield more varied results. In all cases, they produce temperatures in 2100 that are¶ lower than those that result from a delayed transition from coal. In many of the cases,¶ though, the resulting temperatures in 2100 are closer to those generated by a delayed¶ transition from coal than to those produced by the traditional stabilization scenarios (which¶ emphasize a more rapid transition to zero-carbon energy). These are generally cases where¶ fossil fuel use of some sort will persist at a high level well into this century. (One should also¶ note, though, that even in these cases, temperatures in the delayed transition scenarios¶ remain on a steep upward trajectory in 2100, while temperatures in the bridge scenarios,¶ even with high leakage, have at least begun to plateau.) This last feature disappears if one assumes that natural gas combustion is substantially more¶ efficient than coal combustion, as recent studies often do (Wigley 2011; Cathles et al. 2011).¶ Figure 4g shows projected temperature pathways for several scenarios grounded in MERGE¶ that aim to stabilize concentrations near 550 ppm CO2, with methane leakage of 5 %, and¶ assuming that coal combustion is only 53%as efficient as gas combustion (Wigley 2011). (The¶ proper comparison here is between Fig. 4b and g; the only difference between them is the¶ relative efficiency of coal and gas combustion.) Now, even with 5 % methane leakage, the¶ bridge fuel scenarios yield substantially lower temperatures in 2100 than the delayed transition¶ scenarios do. (One should note, though, that the ratio of coal-to-gas efficiency used in this¶ sensitivity analysis may be lower than what is plausible given current and prospective coal and¶ natural gas combustion technologies.) The scenario grounded in MERGE that stabilized CO2¶ concentrations near 550 ppm previously produced the greatest projected temperature penalty¶ for methane leakage, and hence provides the most challenging case for natural gas.

#### Natural gas is the only alternative to coal

**Riley 8/13**—BA, LL.M., PhD, professor of energy law at The City Law School at City University London (Alan, 8/13/12, “Shale Gas to the Climate Rescue,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/14/opinion/shale-gas-to-the-climate-rescue.html, RBatra)

The battle against runaway climate change is being lost. The green movement and the energy industry — while engaged in a furious debate on issues from nuclear power to oil sands — are missing the bigger picture. There is little recognition by either side that current policies to reduce carbon dioxide emissions are inadequate for dealing with the threat that they pose. It is the coal-fueled growth of countries like China and India that generates much of these emissions. Unless a cheap, rapidly deployable substitute fuel is found for coal, then it will be **next to impossible** to safely rein in rising carbon dioxide levels around the world. Although the green movement might at first see shale gas as an enemy in this fight, it may in fact turn out to be a friend. Broad development of shale gas resources — with proper ecological safeguards — could be the best way to achieve the quick cuts in carbon dioxide emissions that we need **to maintain a habitable environment** on Earth. The International Energy Agency has made it clear that, under current energy policies, the door is closing on our attempts to contain the carbon-driven rise in global temperatures to within 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 Fahrenheit) by the middle of the century. In fact, worldwide carbon dioxide emissions from burning fossil fuels reached a record high of 31.6 gigatons in 2011. With emissions rising by one gigaton per year, it appears the temperature-increase target will most likely be missed. The shale gas revolution could be the means of blunting the rise of carbon dioxide emissions and give new hope for staying within the 2 degrees Celsius scenario. This resource is widely dispersed across the planet, cheap to develop and offers many of the same energy benefits as coal. If exploited properly, it could replace coal within a couple of decades as a primary fuel. By developing shale gas as a replacement fuel for coal we retrieve the prospect of blunting — and possibly reversing — the upward climb of carbon dioxide emissions. Shale gas emits 50 percent less carbon dioxide than coal, and so if countries like China and India made the switch on a large scale, then we have a chance to reset the trajectory of global carbon dioxide emissions. A widespread turn to the use of shale gas would give the planet precious time to develop other, renewable solutions to further lower our output of carbon dioxide. Current renewable energy sources cannot in any way deliver the same savings in carbon emissions that we can achieve by replacing coal with shale gas. One only has to look to China to see the strong potential of this solution. With the world’s largest shale gas resources, the country has set out a vast gas development program in its latest five-year economic plan. Output would rise from 6.5 billion cubic meters of shale gas by 2015 to 100 billion cubic meters by 2020. And if China can produce that much by 2020, is there any reason to think it cannot pump out 800 billion cubic meters by 2030? Such a development program would be similar in scale to that undertaken in the United States, which has seen shale gas rise from 1 percent of gas production in 2001 to 37 percent last year. China can surely achieve these goals, especially given all the new technology available to the shale gas industry, along with abundant state capital. That the government is focusing its efforts in this direction is another reason to believe that China can reach these production levels. An output of 800 billion cubic meters a year — combined with far-higher levels of energy efficiency — would allow China to slow, and then terminate, its coal-expansion plans and ultimately end its reliance on coal-fired energy altogether. The United States could play **a key role** in encouraging China and other developing nations to switch from coal to shale gas. The State Department has launched a Global Shale Gas Initiative to facilitate the transfer of technical expertise to other countries to ensure safe development of this new resource. The United States could also **lead the way** in creating a **credible, alternative climate change strategy** in which the use of shale gas becomes the driver of **radical cuts in carbon dioxide emissions** over the short and medium term.

#### Natural gas not key to manufacturing

Brad Plumer (The Washington Post, Former associate editor at The New Republic) May 2012 “ Will cheap shale gas revive U.S. manufacturing? Not so fast” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/will-cheap-natural-gas-revive-us-manufacturing/2012/05/21/gIQAOORZfU\_blog.html

That last claim comes via a recent report from PricewaterhouseCoopers. But over at the Council on Foreign Relations, Michael Levi casts a more skeptical eye on arguments that the age of cheap natural gas from shale will really lead to a dramatic revival of U.S. manufacturing. There are reasons to think the overall impact will be fairly muted. Energy costs are still a small factor for many manufacturers. Levi points to a 2009 paper (pdf) by Joseph Aldy and William Pizer finding that “only one tenth of U.S. manufacturing involved energy costs exceeding five percent of the total value of shipments.” Aldy and Pizer estimated that a carbon tax, which raises energy prices, would affect manufacturing employment slightly — less than 3 percent — in the most energy-intensive industries like aluminum, cement, glass, and steel. The flipside is that lower energy costs, thanks to cheap natural gas, would have a similarly marginal impact.

#### No price spikes – cooperation and exports

**Boman, ’11** (Karen Boman, Rigzone, 23 December 2011, “US Gas Exports to Feed Growing Global Gas Demand,” http://www.rigzone.com/news/article.asp?a\_id=113562)//CC

U.S. LNG exports are expected to have a modest impact on U.S. natural gas prices – with an even smaller impact on U.S. electricity prices -- according to recent analysis by Deloitte MarketPoint, a decision point solutions company focused on fundamental market analysis and price forecasting. Deloitte concluded that LNG exports of 6 Bcf/d from the U.S. will have a weight-averaged price impact of $.12/MMBtu on U.S. natural gas prices from 2016 to 2035. Deloitte's findings are based on its application of its integrated North American Power, Coal, and World Gas Model (WGM) to analyze the price and quantity impacts of LNG exports on the U.S. gas market. Study authors Roger Ihne and Tom Choi said the study's findings dispel concerns that LNG exports will cause U.S. gas prices to trade at global price levels, noting that the volume of LNG exports, as well as the high cost of LNG exports, is inadequate to cause U.S. prices to trade at global price levels. They also concluded that the relatively low volume of LNG exports from the U.S. is unlikely to cause significant change in U.S. price volatility. Ihne and Choi compared the WGM's existing model and assumptions, or Reference Case, with a second case, the LNG Export Case, which represents 6 Bcf/d of LNG exports, the same volume of the three LNG export applications at Sabine Pass, Freeport, and Lake Charles LNG terminals. "Since the WGM already represented these import LNG terminals, we only had to represent exports as incremental demands, each with a constant of 2 Bcf/d demand, near each of the terminals," the study authors said. Deloitte compared results of this second case to the Reference Case, and projected how much the exports would increase domestic prices and affect production and flows. This increase represents a 1.7 percent increase in the projected average U.S. citygate gas price of $7.09/MMBtu over this time period. The projected impact on Henry Hub price is $.22/MMBtu, significantly higher than the national average because of its close proximity to the prospective export terminals. However, Deloitte found that projected price impacts diminish for markets farther away from the U.S. Gulf Coast with project price impacts less than $.10/MMBtu for markets such as Chicago and New York. "Focusing solely on the Henry Hub or regional prices around the export terminals will greatly overstate the total impact on the U.S. consumers," Deloitte concluded. The findings show that the North American gas market is dynamic, Ihne and Choi said. While short-term markets have supply and demand that are largely fixed, both supply and demand are far more elastic in the long term outlook, with LNG export projects likely to be backed by long-term supply contracts as well as long-term contracts with buyers. "If exports can be anticipated, and clearly they can with the public application process and long lead time required to construct a LNG liquefaction plant, then producers, midstream players, and consumers can act to mitigate the price impact," Deloitte commented.

#### Manufacturing isn’t declining in ways that matter – increasing productivity preserves manufacturing leadership

Steve Chapman 3-8-2012; a member of the Chicago Tribune's editorial board “Manufacturing an economic myth Nostalgia is no guide to sound policy” <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-03-18/news/ct-oped-0318-chapman-20120318_1_manufacturing-sector-rick-santorum-products>

But if nostalgia were a sound guide to economic policy, we should be building Studebakers and rotary telephones. Neither Santorum nor Obama seems to grasp the realities of manufacturing in 21st-century America. The first is that it's not declining in the ways that matter. Compared with 1990, the total value of U.S. manufacturing output, adjusted for inflation, was up by 75 percent in 2010 — despite a drop caused by the Great Recession. It has declined as a share of gross domestic product only because other industries have expanded even more rapidly. Economist Mark J. Perry of the University of Michigan at Flint points out that in 2009, the total value of America's manufacturing output was nearly 46 percent greater than China's. Over the past two decades, our share of the world's manufacturing has been pretty stable. The decline in the number of manufacturing jobs is taken as evidence that the sector is sick or uncompetitive or the victim of unfair trade practices. In reality, the change indicates sound health. Our manufacturing workers have become so much more productive that they can churn out more goods with a far smaller workforce. The same pattern, by the way, is evident in American agriculture. In 1900, 39 percent of all Americans lived on farms. Today it's 1 percent. It's a good thing, not a bad thing, that we need fewer people to produce our food. Likewise with manufactured products. Manufacturing accounts for a shrinking slice of the total economy mainly because as we grow wealthier, we spend a smaller portion of our income on physical products, like cars and appliances, and a bigger one on services, from health care to cellphone contracts to restaurant meals. That phenomenon holds across the developed world. It's the result of the free market at work, endlessly shifting resources to accommodate changes in consumer demand. Politicians don't think they should tell Americans to eat at Burger King instead of Chipotle, or buy baseball bats instead of soccer balls. They didn't insist we keep our typewriters when personal computers came along. For the most part, our leaders take it as normal and sensible to defer to consumer demand, rather than try to dictate it. Given that, why do they think they ought to rig the tax code to push consumption dollars from services, which Americans want, to goods, which they don't want quite so much? Why should they divert investment from more popular businesses to less popular ones? That's what the measures offered by Santorum and Obama would do. The point is to ease the tax burden of manufacturers at the expense of other companies, on the superstition that the former are more valuable than the latter. It's hard to see the fairness or the economic logic. When the president unveiled his proposal, Jade West of the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors complained to The New York Times, "My guys are totally freaked out by manufacturing getting a different tax rate than we do. They're not more important in the economy than retail or distribution or anything else." In fact, manufacturing is bound to be a diminishing share of any advanced economy. Obama and Santorum can fling money into the teeth of that trend. But any time politicians want to resist powerful and beneficial economic forces, bet on the economic forces.

## 2nc efficiency

### Overview

#### Xt space col – xion – us key

#### Nuclear is dead now switch to energy efficiency means squo solves their prolif advantage

**Lovins 10** \*Amory B. Lovins (&) is Chairman and Chief Scientist of Rocky Mountain Institute and Chairman Emeritus of Fiberforge Corporation, he advises governments and major firms worldwide on advanced energy and resource efficiency, In 2009, Time named him one of the 100 most influential people in the world, and Foreign Policy, one of the 100 top global thinkers [“Profitable Solutions to Climate, Oil, and Proliferation”, Amory B. Lovins, June 10th 2010, PDF]

The market-driven and politically popular shift to micropower also speeds global development by freeing up attention and capital for better buys. For example, producing efficient lamps and windows in developing counties takes nearly a thousand times less capital, and repays it about 10-fold faster, than expanding the supply of electricity to provide more lighting and comfort by inefficient methods.25 The resulting four-orders-of-magnitude reduction in the capital needed by the power sector—the most capitalintensive sector, gobbling roughly one-fourth of the world’s development capital—may be the strongest macroeconomic lever for global development, though one not yet recognized by the development and financial communities. A best-buys-first strategy would also improve global security by smoking out the proliferators of nuclear weapons.26 Taking economics seriously would mean no longer providing, let alone subsidizing, do-it-yourself bomb kits wrapped in innocent-looking civilian disguise. Removing those bomb kits from ordinary commerce would make their ingredients harder, more conspicuous, and politically costlier to get, and would make timely detection more likely because intelligence resources could focus on needles, not haystacks. Politically, the obligation to provide secure and affordable energy under Article IV of the Non- Proliferation Treaty could be **satisfied better**—in light of modern technical knowledge and market experience—by freely providing the technologies of ‘‘negawatts’’ and micropower (before China sells them to everyone) (Lovins 2010c). This is precisely the demand of developing countries expressed in Copenhagen: financial help to get off fossil fuels and protect the climate. Incidental but important benefits of these more granular technologies would be to reduce procurement corruption, increase transparency, advance the role and education of women, strengthen the social periphery vis-a`-vis the center, and slow or reverse rural-to-urban migration.

#### Efficiency solves competitiveness and reinvestment

**Gies 10** – energy/environment writer for NYT and the Trust for Public Land (9/1, Erica, NYT, Special Report: Energy, “Doing More While Using Less Power”, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/02/business/global/02iht-rensave.html?\_r=1&sq=17%20percent&st=cse&scp=3&pagewanted=all, WEA)

\*NOTE: citing David Goldstein, PhD in physics from UC Berkeley, Fellow of the American Physical Society, MacArthur Fellow

“We spend about $1.1 trillion each year on our utility bills in this country,” said Ms. Zoi, of the Energy Department. “And let’s just say we could really easily reduce this by 20 percent. That’s an extra $200 billion you could put into productivity of other things like health care, schools, businesses that grow.”

Being more efficient would also make the U.S. economy more competitive. “There’s a tremendous amount of energy — and money — to be saved in the commercial and industrial sectors,” Mr. Lave said.

#### Efficiency straight up solves the economy—even under conservative studies

**Goldstein 2010** – PhD in physics from UC Berkeley, Fellow of the American Physical Society, MacArthur Fellow, helped developed efficiency policy standards in the United States, Russia, Kazakhstan, and China (6/11, David, Natural Resources Defense Council, Switchboard, “America's Future: Austerity or Invisible Energy?”, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dgoldstein/americas\_future\_austerity\_or\_i.html, WEA)

What is missing from this analysis is a key factor: the role energy efficiency could play in getting us away from the Hobson’s choice of spending money we don’t have or else allowing the economy to drift. I discuss this problem in my book [Invisible Energy](http://www.baytreepublish.com/invisible-energy-fr.html); which has the title that it does because **efficiency is invisible in** the **economic discussions** in America **despite its immense potential**. Invisible Energy shows how **efficiency could contribute** will **over a trillion dollars annually to** economic **growth**.

How can such an immense number be demonstrated? As Invisible Energy shows, **the National Academy of Sciences, along with other** scientific and business **organizations, has estimated** that efficiency could produce 30 percent of the energy America would otherwise need by 2030, even if we limit efficiency options to those where the technology is already available and where the costs are lower than business as usual. We spend about a trillion dollars annually on energy; a figure that without efficiency investment would grow to about $1.5 trillion a year, even if energy costs don’t grow. So a 30-percent savings is worth about $500 billion a year! And even better yet, the **costs** of efficiency investment **pay themselves back on average in just three years**. These facts mean that we could, as a nation, borrow the entire amount we needed to invest in efficiency from abroad and then pay back the entire amount with interest in three years. **The benefits would** continue to **accrue for decades**, however. **This would lead to a self-sustaining economic recovery**. But it gets better than this. **If we really reduce** the **demand** for energy by **this much, energy prices will come down.** The logic is simple: If OPEC can raise prices by a lot by restricting supply by a little, America can cut prices a lot by limiting demand by a little. And a 30-percent savings is not a little. There are immense environmental benefits in this course of action as well. To start with the most obvious—limiting the risk of oil spills—cutting demand, and therefore price, through efficiency will depress incentives to drill in dangerous, sensitive (and expensive) places either offshore or on-shore. Furthermore, the **30 percent** estimate of savings **is just the tip of the iceberg**. As you might expect, the [National Academy of Sciences study](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12621) and its **companions were extremely cautious in estimating the size of the efficiency resource**. This is not just my interpretation: the studies themselves say so explicitly.

How much difference would a realistic, as opposed to cautious, estimate make? In Invisible Energy, I show that **if we change just one assumption in the** Academy’s [**study**](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12621)—namely that efficiency is stagnant at 2008 levels—**the** efficiency **resource doubles or triples in size**. So the economic stimulus can be several trillions of dollars per year. It is time to break free of the dismal choices that dominate the economic dialogue. By looking at our problems in a bit more detail, making efficiency visible in the discussion, **we can dig our way out of the recession with a lot less pain and austerity**.

## 2nc states

### States solvency wall

#### Energy finance banks solve without new budgetary spending

**Muro and Berlin, 9/12**/12 – \*senior fellow and policy director of the Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings AND \*\* Senior Vice President for Policy and Planning, and General Counsel at the Coalition for Green Capital (Mark and Ken, “State Clean Energy Finance Banks: New Investment Facilities for Clean Energy Deployment”, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/9/12%20state%20energy%20investment%20muro/12%20state%20energy%20investment%20muro)

Given these challenges, states that want to realize the benefits of clean energy deployment should consider a new approach to funding clean energy programs. Specifically, they should investigate the possibility of developing state clean energy finance banks that use limited public dollars and leverage private capital to provide a combination of low-interest rate funding that makes clean energy projects competitive and low-cost 100-percent up-front loans for energy efficiency projects. Such an approach would address the deployment and diffusion challenges faced by clean energy technologies while recognizing that federal and state appropriations, tax credits, and other incentives and subsidies will be sharply diminished in the years ahead because of the budget crisis at all levels of government. Likewise, the development of such finance entities would address the need for states to develop a new paradigm for financing strong clean energy and energy efficiency projects as part of a push to develop strong regional industries. So-called “clean energy finance banks” or “green banks” are ideally suited to solve the present problems because they offer a practical way for states to make available leveraged, low-cost financing for project developers in their states. First, they can be developed out of existing state programs while bringing into the enterprise the equivalent of substantial new resources given their ability to leverage funds. Likewise, because the banks would provide debt financing, they would be repaid on their loans, putting them in the position to borrow funds and to establish revolving loan funds that would provide funds that could be reinvested without new sources of financing. Furthermore, clean energy finance banks, if established as independent institutions, would be able to issue revenue bonds without the full faith and credit of the state and **without the restrictions facing states, which have limited borrowing capacity**. Finally, clean energy finance banks could efficiently seek large investors with patient, longterm capital who are seeking a long-term, conservative rate of return, such as pension fund investors.

#### The underlying structure is already proven—CP scales it up for energy finance

**Muro and Berlin, 9/12**/12 – \*senior fellow and policy director of the Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings AND \*\*Senior Vice President for Policy and Planning, and General Counsel at the Coalition for Green Capital (Mark and Ken, “State Clean Energy Finance Banks: New Investment Facilities for Clean Energy Deployment”, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/9/12%20state%20energy%20investment%20muro/12%20state%20energy%20investment%20muro)

In sum, governors, legislators, NGOs, and regional private-sector leaders need not abandon all optimism as they survey the coming energy policy pull-back in Washington. Instead, state leaders should consider working to develop state-side clean energy finance banks as a source of lowcost, stabile finance for the deployment of clean energy projects in their regions. In this respect, the new banks represent a sound new strategy for continuing to widen the decarbonization of regional economies and the scale-up of fledgling clean energy and energy efficiency industries. Clean energy finance banks will apply proven financial techniques to a recognized market problem at a time of federal retrenchment. Clean energy finance banks can be financed from existing state funds and in the current fiscally strapped climate furnish an attractive tool for leveraging scarce public dollars with private capital. And for that matter clean energy finance banks—with their proximity to regional industries and deal flow— can bring important resources to bear in states wishing to foster local clean energy, energy efficiency, and energy technology clusters. What is more, state clean energy finance banks hold out the promise of serving as effective vehicles for leveraging and tuning to local needs such federal funding or finance programs as may emerge in the future. In this respect, the new entities could well contribute to the construction of an enduring platform on which to ground the delivery of tangible benefits to society with a guaranteed payback to taxpayers and ratepayers. In short, entrepreneurial states should innovate again. By employing their characteristic creativity and sophistication, enterprising states should begin now to stand up the next generation of needed clean energy finance solutions.

#### State governments can use financial incentives to spur nuclear power – empirically attracts private sector financing and captures their signal arguments

**NEI 9** (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.

State action gets modeled federally

**Lash, 7 –** head of the World Resources Institute, former Secretary of Natural Resources for Vermont (Jonathan, “Climate Policy in the State Laboratory: How States Influence Federal Regulation and the Implications for U.S. Policy,” World Resources Institute, September, <http://www.wri.org/publication/climate-policy-in-the-state-laboratory>)

America has a long and inspiring tradition of policy innovation and activism that is incubated at the state level. The states often take to the front lines of cutting-edge policy development, creating fresh and inventive programs to address the concerns and needs of their constituents.

From standards for organic agriculture, to removing asbestos from schools, to creating enterprise zones, and reducing acid rain pollution, the states have shown a path forward and provided both the problem-solving acumen as well as the pressure to induce the Federal government to act**.**

Of all the environmental problems now confronting this nation and the rest of the world, none holds greater potential for irrevocable and destructive disruption to our lives than climate change. Yet, up to now, our national government has failed to respond with initiatives appropriate to what looms ahead.

The most significant first steps designed to measure and control the emission of greenhouse gases have come from an impressive number of states in this country. Ten states in the Northeast, seven in the West, and several in the Midwest are in the process of implementing mandatory programs to measure and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

And not surprisingly, as well, is the fact that over 100 cities have gotten on board, to one degree or another, taking concrete steps to reduce their contribution to climate change or to add their political clout to efforts to spur the national commitment needed to help catalyze essential international compacts.

This timely report documents state efforts now underway to address the problem of climate change and our contribution to it. It puts them into the historical context of previous initiatives by states to lead our country in making difficult but necessary national decisions.

Just as there is no “silver-bullet” technology that will solve climate change, there is no “silver-bullet” policy either. The commitment to policy innovation by U.S. states may prove to be the wellspring from which we build the low-carbon economy of the future**.**

### 2nc at: 50 state fiat

#### Prefer process education—outweighs pointless energy impact debates on this topic

**Nolan, 11** - Associate Professor of Law and Dispute Resolution Program Director, Vermont Law School (Seth, “Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines” Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines, SSRN)

Despite demonstrated need and available technology, the promise of wind energy has yet to live up to its potential. As a society, we see the benefits of renewable sources of energy but struggle to implement our vision through siting of new facilities. In some instances, this gap results from opposition caused by applicants’ and regulators’ emphasis (read: overemphasis) on the substancerather than the process of decision-making. Applicants often enter an approval process expecting that doling out concessions will adequately address citizen opposition. The resulting opposition is often as much a product of what was proposed as how it was proposed.210 Attending to procedural needs as well as substantive needs can offer some solace to weary and suspicious citizens and provide the substrate on which a satisfactory solution can be reached.

#### Uniformity is real world—verbatim advocates are a pointless, subjective burden

**Greenberger 12** (James, Executive Director of the National Alliance for Advanced Technology Batteries, “Efforts to Promote Energy Storage Should Look to the States”, March 2, http://naatbatt.org/naatbatt-blog/efforts-to-promote-energy-storage-should-look-to-the-states/)

Many of the barriers to deploying distributed energy storage arise, not from a lack of federal policy, but from inconsistent and antiquated state regulations that restrict how storage and other assets located on the distribution portion of the grid can be owned and used. While local regulation of purely local electricity service makes sense, as technology increasingly permits assets located on local distribution systems to impact the larger, national electricity grid, the inconsistencies and antiquated nature of many local regulatory schemes becomes an increasingly critical issue. The storage industry should spend this period of impasse in Washington addressing that issue.¶ One possible model for modernizing and making more uniform state regulations which inhibit the deployment of energy storage and smart grid technology is the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL). In the late 19th Century, it became apparent that wide variations in laws between separate states created confusion and inhibited commerce. The solution was the creation of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL).¶ The NCCUSL consists of commissioners appointed by each state. It drafts model legislation, or uniform acts, which individual states can choose to adopt, and often do. The best known of these model acts is the Uniform Commercial Code, which has been adopted by all 50 states with only minor variations.

## 2nc nat gas

### A2 manufacturing

#### Manufacturing sector is seriously crushing

Mark Perry (professor of economics at the University of Michigan, Flint, is also a visiting scholar at the American Enterprise Institute) February 25, 2011 “The Truth About U.S. Manufacturing “ http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703652104576122353274221570.html.html

Is American manufacturing dead? You might think so reading most of the nation's editorial pages or watching the endless laments in the news that "nothing is made in America anymore," and that our manufacturing jobs have vanished to China, Mexico and South Korea. Yet the empirical evidence tells a different story—of a thriving and growing U.S. manufacturing sector, and a country that remains by far the world's largest manufacturer. This is a particularly sensitive topic in my hometown of Flint, Mich., where auto-plant closings have meant lost jobs and difficult transitions for the displaced. But while it's true that the U.S. has lost more than seven million manufacturing jobs since the late 1970s, our manufacturing output has continued to expand. International data compiled by the United Nations on global output from 1970-2009 show this success story. Excluding recession-related decreases in 2001 and 2008-09, America's manufacturing output has continued to increase since 1970. In every year since 2004, manufacturing output has exceeded $2 trillion (in constant 2005 dollars), twice the output produced in America's factories in the early 1970s. Taken on its own, U.S. manufacturing would rank today as the sixth largest economy in the world, just behind France and ahead of the United Kingdom, Italy and Brazil. In 2009, the most recent full year for which international data are available, our manufacturing output was $2.155 trillion (including mining and utilities). That's more than 45% higher than China's, the country we're supposedly losing ground to. Despite recent gains in China and elsewhere, the U.S. still produced more than 20% of global manufacturing output in 2009. The truth is that America still makes a lot of stuff, and we're making more of it than ever before. We're merely able to do it with a fraction of the workers needed in the past. Consider the incredible, increasing productivity of America's manufacturing workers: The average U.S. factory worker is responsible today for more than $180,000 of annual manufacturing output, triple the $60,000 in 1972. Increases in productivity are a direct result of capital investments in productivity-enhancing technology, such as GM's next generation Ecotec engine. These increases are a direct result of capital investments in productivity-enhancing technology, which last year helped boost output to record levels in industries like computers and semiconductors, medical equipment and supplies, pharmaceuticals and medicine, and oil and natural-gas equipment.

#### Manufacturing in the US comparatively more attractive now – Chinese constraints are rising faster than ours

Urban Lehner 2011 (Vice President of the Progressive Farmer) 2011 “Reports of American Manufacturing's Death Are Exaggerated” <http://www.dtnprogressivefarmer.com/dtnag/view/ag/printablePage.do?ID=BLOG_PRINTABLE_PAGE&bypassCache=true&pageLayout=v4&blogHandle=editorsnotebook&blogEntryId=8a82c0bc31d5e6e301336f3dd2381059&articleTitle=Reports+of+American+Manufacturing%27s+Death+Are+Exaggerated&editionName=DTNAgFreeSiteOnline>

Since 1972, America's manufacturing output more than doubled. Between 1997 and 2008, its dollar value rose by a third. In 2010, the U.S. accounted for 19.4% of global manufacturing value added, just shy of China's 19.8%. The BCG study is titled "Made in America, Again: Why Manufacturing Will Return to the U.S." In truth, though, manufacturing never went entirely away. It seemed to in part because our factories, like our farms, are so much more productive: Factories churn out 2.5 times as much they did in 1972 with a third fewer workers. It's the jobs that went away. What also departed was America's post-World War II dominance. Because the war had destroyed European and Japanese factories while ours went unscathed, the U.S. in the early 1950s accounted for 40% of the world's manufactured goods. Our share today is half that not because our output has shrunk but because the world's has expanded faster. The most interesting aspect of the study is its argument that the U.S. is in the early phases of becoming a more attractive place to locate factories. Within five years, BCG maintains, it will no longer be cheaper to manufacture some goods in China than in the U.S. Rising Chinese wages and land costs, a weakening dollar and superior U.S. factory productivity are among the reasons the cost gap will close. BCG urges American companies to reassess their China strategy. "China should no longer be treated as the default option," BCG says. It will remain the place to make products that require a lot of labor, especially those destined for Asian markets. But products turned out in modest volumes with relatively little labor may be best manufactured in the U.S.

### A2 emissions

#### No impact to methane emissions

Schrag 12—Sturgis Hooper Professor of Geology at Harvard University, Professor of Environmental Science and Engineering, and Director of the Harvard University Center for the Environment, Ph.D. in geology from UC Berkeley (Daniel P., *Daedalus*, 141.2 (Spring 2012, Is Shale Gas Good for Climate Change?, Academic OneFile, RBatra)

Cornell University scientists Robert Howarth, Renee Santoro, and Anthony Ingraffea question this calculation, focusing on the emissions of methane associated with natural gas production, distribution, and consumption. (4) In their analysis, shale gas production leaks methane at as much as twice the rate of conventional gas wells. Most of this extra leakage, they assert, comes during the well-completion phase, immediately after the fracking, when brine from the formation and water used in the fracking process come out of the well. They argue that this methane leakage, along with leakage during processing, transport, and distribution, results in shale gas having higher greenhouse gas emissions than coal due to the high warming potential of methane relative to carbon dioxide.

Even if one accepts the leakage rates proposed by Howarth and colleagues (and there is considerable uncertainty about their findings), there remains the question of the value of greenhouse gases other than carbon dioxide, particularly those like methane that have short atmospheric lifetimes. To compare the impact of different greenhouse gases, a physical metric called the Global Warming Potential (GWP) was adopted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in its First Assessment Report . (5) The GWP of a greenhouse gas is defined as the time-integrated global mean radiative forcing of a pulse emission of i kg of the gas relative to 1 kg of carbon dioxide over a specified time period, commonly one hundred years. This metric has persisted for the past twenty years despite many economic and technical criticisms. (6) The IPCC established the one hundred-year timescale as a standard for comparison between greenhouse gases, but it is an arbitrary designation. If one chooses a longer timescale--for example, five hundred years--the GWP for methane would be 8 rather than 25. If one chooses a shorter timescale--for example, twenty years--the GWP for methane would be 70.

In the analysis by Howarth and his colleagues, natural gas and coal for electricity are compared for both one hundred--year and twenty-year timescales, but the standard GWP values are amplified by roughly 50 percent based on a model calculation (7) that includes the inhibitory effect of methane emissions on the formation of sulfate aerosols, which cool the climate. Using this calculation raises the twenty-year and one hundred-year GWP values to 33 and 105, respectively. This is a controversial adjustment; sulfate aerosols come primarily from sulfur dioxide emissions associated with coal combustionand are a major contributor to respiratory illness. One might expect sulfur emissions to decrease in the future, even if greenhouse gases do not, and so it is difficult to know how to measure the future impact of methane on emissions of sulfate aerosols. Moreover, the analysis does not use similar accounting to evaluate coal combustion; if one used an identical approach and included coal combustion's impact on sulfate aerosols (as was done for methane), the sulfur emissions associated with coal can substantially offset the warming effects of coal's carbon emissions. (8) Of course, this would be absurd: the longer-term consequences of coal combustion are disastrous. Thus, one can see how Howarth and colleagues reached their conclusion **if they value a ton of methane at 105 times the value of a ton of carbon dioxide.**

Putting aside the issue of the relationship between methane and sulfate aerosols, the major problem with the comparison between natural gas and coal by Howarth and colleagues is that the GWP does not provide a good indication of the warming caused by different greenhouse gases. Rather, it considers only the time integral of the radiative forcing. A series of studies propose a better metric for comparing different greenhouse gases, the Global Temperature Potential (GTP), defined similarly to the GWP but using the global average temperature response to a pulse emission in a climate model instead of the radiative forcing. (9) The disadvantage of a GTP is that it is model-dependent, although the importance of climate sensitivity of any individual climate model is relatively minor, as one is looking not at the absolute temperature response but the response of the model for one greenhouse gas relative to carbon dioxide. The specific values for GTPS from different climate models are **systematically lower for short-lived gases like methane** than what are found with GWPs. For example, the GTP for methane for one hundred years is approximately 7. (10) This figure is **more than three times lower than the one hundred-year GWP value** used by the European Union and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to compare different greenhouse gases, and is fifteen times lower than the twenty-year GWP used by Howarth and colleagues. Thus, **even if shale gas production results in large methane emissions, burning natural gas is still much better for the climate system than burning coal.**

## 2nc prolif

### A2 prolif

#### The US can’t prevent proliferation.

Mez, ‘12

[Lutz, senior Associate Professor at the Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universität Berlin, and managing director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, “Nuclear energy – any solution for sustainability and climate protection?” Energy Policy, Science Direct]

Viewed in historical terms, military use of nuclear energy has gone hand in hand with the development of civil nuclear technology, because most countries attached first priority to the development of nuclear weapons and other military uses, with production of energy in nuclear power plants at first only being a waste product. This by-product developed its own momentum, however: nuclear power became an icon for clean, highly modern technology and technological progress. Moreover, it was a risk-free, highly profitable business for operators of plants because governments paid considerable sums in subsidies and producers could pass on costs to electrical power customers. Branches of the economy which are the most intensive users of electrical power profited from cheap nuclear power —as did the militaries in countries with nuclear weapons—because civil nuclear facilities offer many possibilities for military use.¶ The borderlines between military and civil nuclear technology and thus between war and peace are often hazy (Mez et al., 2010). In order to minimize the risks of military use, regulation of civil use of nuclear energy have been contemplated within a multilateral framework for some time. The idea of establishing an international atomic energy agency (IAEA), to which states are to transfer uranium stocks and other fissionable material, was proposed by former US President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his Atoms for Peace speech3 as far back as 1953 and during the first Geneva atomic conference in 1955. The purpose of the IAEA was to develop methods to ensure that fissionable nuclear material can be used by humankind in a peaceful manner—in agriculture, medicine and energy production for countries and regions of the world with limited energy resources. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, which went into effect in 1970, constituted an attempt to prevent nuclear beggarsfrom becoming nuclear powers through civil nuclear technology transfer. In reality, however, a series of countries including Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea have obtained nuclear weapons under the pretext of civil use of nuclear power, while other countries such as Iran are accused of having this same intention. This development shows that it is difficult to prevent nuclear weapons from being built and that there is a great likelihood that more and more countries will obtain nuclear capabilities in the future. When a nuclear infrastructure is in place and the basic material for weapons is being produced in facilities for enrichment or reprocessing—in military reactors, dual-purpose reactors or fast breeder-reactors—then it is merely a question of political will and willingness to invest in nuclear technology which decides whether a country develops nuclear weapons or not.

#### The US can’t influence global nuclear trade -- international actors will resist influence.

**Kerr et al, ‘11**

[Paul K, Analyst in Nonproliferation -- CRS, Mark Holt, Specialist in Energy Policy, Mary Beth Nikitin, Specialist in Nonproliferation, 8-10, “Nuclear Energy Cooperation with Foreign Countries: Issues for Congress,” <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/171374.pdf>]

The ability of the United States to influence regulations for international nuclear commerce have arguably diminished. As discussed above, the U.S. nuclear industry’s market power has declined and foreign competitors have been concluding nuclear supply agreements with other countries. Moreover, some influential governments have demonstrated limited enthusiasm for such regulations. For example, as noted, some members of the NSG displayed resistance to proposals that would restrict the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technology. Furthermore, the NSG decided in 2008 to exempt India from some of its export guidelines—a step which many observers argued would assist New Delhi’s nuclear weapons program. 85 Some suppliers may use the 2008 decision to justify supplying other states that do not meet NSG guidelines; indeed, China has agreed to supply Pakistan with two additional nuclear reactors. 86 It is also possible that Israel and Pakistan, which, like India, do not have full-scope safeguards and have not signed the NPT, may continue to ask for exemptions from NSG guidelines. For its part, Israel proposed export criteria in 2007 that would have had the effect of exempting Israel from the current NSG guidelines 87 and is widely believed to have sought a nuclear cooperation agreement with the United States.

#### Institutional inertia prevents any international leadership.

#### Wellen, ‘9

[Russ, a Scholars & Rogues blogger and a Foreign Policy In Focus contributor, 1-12, “Abdicating U.S. Nonproliferation Leadership,” Foreign Policy In Focus]

This is merely the last item in a list of leadership failures. Under the Bush administration, the United States has maintained much of its nuclear arsenal on hair-trigger alert, refused to renounce first-use, and sought to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons. Also, we've signed a preliminary deal to station interceptor missiles in Poland. Ostensibly intended as a defense against Iranian missiles, it's perceived as a threat by Russia, which reacted by moving missiles of its own to its border with Poland. It's natural to assume that the momentum behind these policies will decline with the Bush administration. But in reality, the engine of nuclear proliferation is a perpetual motion machine: Militaristic think tanks never stop generating strategies and networking. The think tank that's most active promoting nuclear weapons, as well as missile defense, is the National Institute of Public Policy. A product of the Reagan years, NIPP and its President, Keith Payne, later produced a study titled "Rationale and Requirements for Nuclear Forces and Arms Control," which served as a blueprint for the Bush administration's 2002 Nuclear Posture Review. But in the years between Reagan’s and George W. Bush’s presidencies, organizations like the Smith Richardson Foundation provided NIPP with grants that enabled it to continue its work advocating missile defense and withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. It still does. Following closely is the Center for Security Policy (CSP), headed by Frank Gaffney, the hard-right ideologue whose columns scorch the Web. During the last Democratic administration, it circulated a famous letter signed by neocons far and wide urging former President Bill Clinton to attack Iraq. It also played key roles in the two Rumsfeld Commissions (one promoted missile defense; the other, space weapons), and was instrumental in abolishing the government's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Meanwhile, the conservative Heritage Foundation is trying to generate buzz for a documentary it's releasing early in 2009 entitled 33 Minutes, which is intended to promote (or scare viewers into acquiescing to) missile defense. Finally, in a recent interview, William Kristol intimated that the Democrats' rise to power might call for a new PNAC. The original Project for a New American Century, founded by Kristol and Robert Kagan during the Clinton years, called for the United States, dominant since the demise of the Cold War, to become a "benevolent hegemony" via, when necessary, the preemptive use of force. Also, in a recurrent conservative theme, PNAC condemned arms controllers for concentrating on getting rid of weapons, rather than the regimes that possessed them. Disarmament in Name Alone The studies, papers, and articles militaristic think tanks and individuals produce are critical for their efforts to undermine arms control while advocating weapons systems. In a policy brief for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace entitled "Abolishing Nuclear Weapons: Why the United States Should Lead," George Perkovich wrote that, in recent years, U.S. officials "sometimes invoke lawyerly arguments either to dispute the nature of the disarmament obligation under the NPT or to argue that it is being met." A perfect example is a piece by Christopher Ford, the Bush administration's special representative for nuclear nonproliferation — until, that is, he recently resigned and himself joined a militaristic think tank, the Hudson Institute. Published by the Nonproliferation Review in November 2007 — oddly enough, the organ of an arms control organization — "Debating Disarmament: Interpreting Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" is basically a handbook of the objections conservatives have to the NPT and treaties in general, as well as their techniques for sabotaging them. With a new Democratic president, one might be inclined to dismiss such concerns. But the tricks conservatives use to defend a Republican president for dragging his feet on nonproliferation, as well as obstructing it, are the same they will use to cast an administration that dares to be sympathetic to the NPT as soft on security.

## 1nr politics

### Cyber

No ev china attacks

**Cyberterror unlikely – terrorists are not tech-savvy and doesn’t have shock value**

**Conway 11** – Lecturer in International Relations in the School of Law & Government at Dublin City University (Maura, “Against Cyberterrorism” Communications of the ACM, Vol. 54 No. 2, Pages 26-28, http://cacm.acm.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/magazines/2011/2/104396-against-cyberterrorism/fulltext)

In my opinion, the three most compelling arguments against cyberterrorism are: The argument of Technological Complexity; The argument regarding 9/11 and the Image Factor; and The argument regarding 9/11 and the Accident Issue. The first argument is treated in the academic literature; the second and third arguments are not, but ought to be. None of these are angles to which journalists appear to have devoted a lot of thought or given adequate consideration. In the speech mentioned earlier, FBI Director Mueller observed "Terrorists have shown a clear interest in pursuing hacking skills. And they will either train their own recruits or hire outsiders, with an eye toward combining physical attacks with cyber attacks." That may very well be true, but the argument from Technological Complexity underlines that 'wanting' to do something is quite different from having the ability to do the same. Here's why: Violent jihadis' IT knowledge is not superior. For example, in research carried out in 2007, it was found that of a random sampling of 404 members of violent Islamist groups, 196 (48.5%) had a higher education, with information about subject areas available for 178 individuals. Of these 178, some 8 (4.5%) had trained in computing, which means that out of the entire sample, less than 2% of the jihadis came from a computing background.3 And not even these few could be assumed to have mastery of the complex systems necessary to carry out a successful cyberterrorist attack. Real-world attacks are difficult enough. What are often viewed as relatively unsophisticated real-world attacks undertaken by highly educated individuals are routinely unsuccessful. One only has to consider the failed car bomb attacks planned and carried out by medical doctors in central London and at Glasgow airport in June 2007. Hiring hackers would compromise operational security. The only remaining option is to retain "outsiders" to undertake such an attack. This is very operationally risky. It would force the terrorists to operate outside their own circles and thus leave them ripe for infiltration. Even if they successfully got in contact with "real" hackers, they would be in no position to gauge their competency accurately; they would simply have to trust in same. This would be very risky. So on the basis of technical know-how alone cyberterror attack is not imminent, but this is not the only factor one must take into account. The events of Sept. 11, 2001 underscore that for a true terrorist event spectacular moving images are crucial. The attacks on the World Trade Center were a fantastic piece of performance violence; look back on any recent roundup of the decade and mention of 9/11 will not just be prominent, but pictures will always be provided. The problem with respect to cyber-terrorism is that many of the attack scenarios put forward, from shutting down the electric power grid to contaminating a major water supply, fail on this account: they are unlikely to have easily captured, spectacular (live, moving) images associated with them, something we—as an audience—have been primed for by the attack on the World Trade Center on 9/11. The only cyberterrorism scenario that would fall into this category is interfering with air traffic control systems to crash planes, but haven't we seen that planes can much more easily be employed in spectacular "real-world" terrorism? And besides, aren't all the infrastructures just mentioned much easier and more spectacular to simply blow up? It doesn't end there, however. For me, the third argument against cyberterrorism is perhaps the most compelling; yet it is very rarely mentioned.

### Overview

#### Extinction – nuke isn’t even with winter

**Ochs 02** – MA in Natural Resource Management from Rutgers University and Naturalist at Grand Teton National Park [Richard, “BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MUST BE ABOLISHED IMMEDIATELY,” Jun 9, http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html]

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE. Ironically, the Bush administration has just changed the U.S. nuclear doctrine to allow nuclear retaliation against threats upon allies by conventional weapons. The past doctrine allowed such use only as a last resort when our nation’s survival was at stake. Will the new policy also allow easier use of US bioweapons? How slippery is this slope? Against this tendency can be posed a rational alternative policy. To preclude possibilities of human extinction, "patriotism" needs to be redefined to make humanity’s survival primary and absolute. Even if we lose our cherished freedom, our sovereignty, our government or ourConstitution, where there is life, there is hope. What good is anything else if humanity is extinguished? This concept should be promoted to the center of national debate.. For example, for sake of argument, suppose the ancient Israelites developed defensive bioweapons of mass destruction when they were enslaved by Egypt. Then suppose these weapons were released by design or accident and wiped everybody out? As bad as slavery is, extinction is worse. Our generation, our century, our epoch needs to take the long view. We truly hold in our hands the precious gift of all future life. Empires may come and go, but who are the honored custodians of life on earth? Temporal politicians? Corporate competitors? Strategic brinksmen? Military gamers? Inflated egos dripping with testosterone? How can any sane person believe that national sovereignty is more important than survival of the species? Now that extinction is possible, our slogan should be "Where there is life, there is hope." No government, no economic system, no national pride, no religion, no political system can be placed above human survival. The egos of leaders must not blind us. The adrenaline and vengeance of a fight must not blind us. The game is over. If patriotism would extinguish humanity, then patriotism is the highest of all crimes.

#### Econ collapse turns prolif

**Burrows and Windrem 1994** – \*NYT journalist, professor of journalism at New York University and the founder and director of its graduate Science and Environmental Reporting Program, \*\*Senior Research Fellow at the NYU Center on Law and Security, former NBC producer (William and Robert, “Critical Mass: the dangerous race for superweapons in a fragmenting world”, p. 491-2, Google Books)

Economics is in many respects proliferation’s catalyst. As we have noted, economic desperation drives Russia and some of the former Warsaw Pact nations to peddle weapons and technology. The possibility of considerable profits or at least balanced international payments also prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, drive proliferation just as surely as do purely political motives. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, well-off, relatively secure societies like today’s Japan are less likely to buy or sell superweapon technology than those that are insecure, needy, or desperate. Ultimately, solving economic problems, especially as they are driven by population pressure, is the surest way to defuse proliferation and enhance true national security.

#### Nukes trump warming—[New York End Times is unqualified and wrong]

**Harrell 2009** – quoting Robock, Rutgers professor who uses NASA data (1/22, Eben, Time, “Regional nuclear war and the environment”, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1873164,00.html, WEA)

Some scientists, most notably Freeman Dyson of The Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, have stirred controversy by arguing that nuclear weapons are a more urgent environmental threat than global warming. Do you agree?

Yes. If India and Pakistan engaged in nuclear war, they would use about 0.3% of the global nuclear stockpile. And still the effects on the climate would be dramatic. Our calculations on nuclear winter from the early 1980s have been confirmed by modern climate models. And fundamentally the situation hasn't changed — even with reduced stockpiles there still exists enough weapons to cause nuclear winter. That's something that maybe people don't realize.

I think we have to solve the problem of the existence of all these weapons before we have the luxury of worrying about global warming.

#### Growth’s a prerequisite to environmental care

**Sagoff '97** (Mark, The Atlantic, "Do we consume too much?" http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/97jun/consume.htm)

Many have argued that economic activity, affluence, and growth automatically lead to resource depletion, environmental deterioration, and ecological collapse. Yet greater productivity and prosperity -- which is what economists mean by growth -- have become prerequisite for controlling urban pollution and protecting sensitive ecological systems such as rain forests. Otherwise, destitute people who are unable to acquire food and fuel will create pollution and destroy forests. Without economic growth, which also correlates with lower fertility, the environmental and population problems of the South will only get worse. For impoverished countries facing environmental disaster, economic growth may be the one thing that is sustainable.

### Link

**Nuclear energy debates cost capital -- tons of strong opposition.**

Szondy, ‘12

[David, freelance writer -- Gizmag, 2-16, “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” <http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/>]

The problem is that nuclear energy is the proverbial political hot potato - even in early days when the new energy source exploded onto the world scene. The tremendous amount of energy locked in the atom held the promise of a future like something out of a technological Arabian Nights. It would be a world where electricity was too cheap to meter, deserts would bloom, ships would circle the Earth on a lump of fuel the size of a baseball, planes would fly for months without landing, the sick would be healed and even cars would be atom powered. But though nuclear power did bring about incredible changes in our world, in its primary role, generating electricity for homes and industry, it ended up as less of a miracle and more of a very complicated way of boiling water.¶ Not only complicated, but expensive and potentially dangerous. Though hundreds of reactors were built all over the world and some countries, such as France, generate most of their electricity from it, nuclear power has faced continuing questions over cost, safety, waste disposal and proliferation. One hundred and four nuclear plants provide the United States with 20 percent of the nation's power, but a building permit hadn't been issued since 1978 with no new reactors coming on line since 1996 and after the uproar from the environmental movement after nuclear accidents at Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, it seemed unlikely that any more would ever be approved - until now. This fierce domestic opposition to nuclear power has caused many governments to take an almost schizophrenic stance regarding the atom.

#### Debates on expanding nuclear power will cost political capital

**Ackley, 08** (Kate, Roll Call, 6/9, “Nuclear Energy Poisons Legislative Environment”, lexis) //DH

In the end, it wasn't a skirmish over nuclear power that blew up a sweeping climate change bill in the Senate last week - it was instead partisan politics and bickering over judicial nominations.¶ But the nuclear debate remains a large and looming danger for any such measure. Business lobbyists and several academic studies conclude that the United States cannot cut carbon emissions without beefing up nuclear power plants. But many key environmental lobbyists say that tax subsidies for nuclear power could become a poison pill for any global warming bill and that if a carbon reduction bill required a substantial nuclear power subsidy, that might be too high a price to pay.¶ In addition, nuclear opponents say that even without a climate change bill this year, they will be keeping close watch on all legislation in case the nuclear industry tries to use any other bills to further its agenda. "The debate is just going to intensify," said Kevin Kamps, radioactive waste watchdog for anti-nuclear lobby Beyond Nuclear. "We see industry trying to attach its money grabs to any legislation. They really do try to hitch their wagon to whatever's moving. We will remain vigilant for the rest of this year."¶ Specifically, Kamps said he would work to block loan guarantee programs for nuclear plants and any tax incentives for the industry.

#### Dems oppose

**Entine, 06** – fellow on science and public policy at the American Enterprise Institute (Jon, Transcript of an AEI Conferency, 10/6, <http://www.aei.org/events/filter.all,eventID.1394/transcript.asp>) //DH

At this conference at least we will set aside the debate over the myriad possible causes of global warming and focus on what we might do to address it; we are going to look today at nuclear energy.  Traditionally political predilection has driven the debate over nuclear energy with exceptions, of course.  Conservatives have tended to be supportive of nuclear technology considering the risks acceptable and the Left has been instinctively hostile.  Political passions have often masqueraded as economics and environmental science.  The double threat of global warming and high energy prices may be challenging those once rock-hard positions.

Amie Parnes (writer for The Hill) January 16, 2013 “Obama runs afoul of Dem base” http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/277409-president-runs-afoul-of-dem-base

President Obama has angered his base on a wide range of issues over the last month, even as he rides a political high after his victory over congressional Republicans in the fiscal-cliff fight.¶ The nomination of former Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.) to head the Pentagon disappointed liberals and women’s groups hoping for the first female Defense secretary. ¶ It was also a double blow, of sorts, as Obama picked a fight with Republicans over Hagel after avoiding a row over the possible nomination to secretary of State of Susan Rice, an African-American woman who is the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations.¶ Gay-rights groups also felt they were poked in the eye with the Hagel nomination because of the senator’s late-1990s opposition to a gay ambassadorial nominee. ¶ Gay supporters of the president were further angered when evangelical pastor Louie Giglio, who in the 1990s said homosexuality offends God, was asked to perform Obama’s inauguration benediction. Giglio eventually pulled out of the ceremony. ¶ Both fights come as Obama faces criticism from the left for having a second-term Cabinet dominated by white men — another disappointment for a left hoping the Cabinet would be more representative of the voters who elected Obama.¶ Obama’s recent actions haven’t just offended those outside his administration. There’s also some resentment brewing on the inside.¶ “I work in this administration, and I have to admit that I’m slightly annoyed by the lack of women around him in those key meetings,” said one administration official. “I mean, c’mon, out of all those people, there’s one woman in the room?”¶ The official said the problem extended beyond the circle of his closest advisers and into the Cabinet.¶ “You mean to tell me there’s not one woman who [was] qualified enough to be secretary of State, secretary of Defense or even White House chief of staff?” the official added. ¶ In a New York Times column on Sunday titled “Democrats Behaving Badly,” writer Frank Bruni wrote that Obama and Democrats should be playing “error-free ball” since they have the upper hand going into the second term and because Republicans need a “pretty thorough image overhaul.” ¶ Instead, Obama has been offending the base, which helped catapult him to a second term.¶ The fights with the left don’t appear to be harming Obama for now — the president enjoyed record-high approval ratings in a Gallup poll taken last month. ¶ To an extent, the disagreements with the left also highlight Obama’s propensity to pick fights with partisans on both sides of the aisle. ¶ But politics can change quickly, particularly for an incumbent enjoying a second-term honeymoon and hoping to preserve political relevance for as long as possible. ¶ “While Obama has most of the cards,” said Tobe Berkovitz, a professor of communications who specializes in political communications and advertising, “he needs to be careful because the public these days is so fickle that his victory can evaporate fast.”

### AT: Hirsch

#### First, Political Capital Does Actually Matter

**A) Framing issue—judge the Hirsch evidence according to specificity—his argument is that the political landscape changed in response to events like Newtown, this doesn’t apply to the budget fight where people are always aware of the situation and it’s not a matter of the ‘mood of the country’ but rather political arm twisting—this is proven by the fact that Obama was able to use the expiring Bush tax credits to force the Republicans into a corner and raise the debt ceiling proves that influence does matter**

**Here’s evidence on that issue specific to the budget**

Mark Blumenthal (writer for the Huffington Post) January 21, 2013 “Barack Obama Rethinks The Bully Pulpit” www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/21/obama-bully-pulpit\_n\_2498852.html#slide=more261539

President Barack Obama begins his second term enjoying his strongest approval ratings in three years. Less clear is whether that newly gained popularity will power up Obama's bully pulpit, enabling him to break the political gridlock with a substantive agenda that includes economic recovery, gun violence prevention and immigration reform.¶ Political science studies suggest that presidents rarely change opinions with speeches, but they can influence debate by shining a spotlight on a policy that is more popular, but not widely appreciated as such.¶ In other words, presidents are trend-amplifiers, helping to push through Congress widely accepted measures -- like rigorous gun background checks and immigration reform with a path to citizenship.¶ Since the election, Obama's job approval rating, which had hovered in the mid-to-high 40 percent range for much of his first term, has surged to roughly 55 percent on the HuffPost Pollster average of all available national public polls.¶ Perhaps more important, Obama's popularity soars above that of his Republican opposition in Congress. As reported most recently by the Washington Post/ABC News poll, Obama's 55 percent approval rating is more than double that of "Republicans in Congress," who are earning just 24 percent approval.¶ As a series of HuffPost/YouGov online polls conducted in recent weeks reveal, large majorities of Americans believe a president can make at least a minor difference on a wide variety of issues, from reducing poverty and expanding the middle class, to improving education and preventing another financial crisis.¶ Yet while the contrast in approval ratings gives Obama "a clear upper hand over the deeply unpopular Congress," as ABC News put it, political scientists warn that little or no evidence exists to suggest that presidents can move public opinion on specific issues in their favor with speeches or other uses of the bully pulpit.¶ "Presidential speeches don't tend to persuade people on policy," wrote George Washington University professor John Sides. Sides cited the work of scholar George Edwards, who found that the "Great Communicator," President Ronald Reagan, failed to move opinion in his favor with nationally televised addresses on issues such as increased defense spending or aid to the Contra rebels in Nicaragua.¶ But Edwards didn't stop with Reagan. As Ezra Klein explained, Edwards "marshaled so much evidence" on the limits of the bully pulpit as used by presidents from Franklin Roosevelt to George W. Bush that his views have gained wide acceptance among other political scientists.¶ Still, Obama's team believe their experiences from the first term offer a formula to help break the legislative impasse on some issues. "Among the lessons we learned," a senior administration official told The Huffington Post, "is you can take an issue to the country and have some success, turn the dynamic around."¶ The official specifically cited last year's debate over extending low interest rates on subsidized student loans. In April, Obama took up the matter on the campaign trail, giving a series of speeches on college campuses. He even appeared on "Late Night With Jimmy Fallon," opening with a "slow jam the news" segment on the student loan issue.¶ Republicans initially resisted bringing the president's student loan proposal to a vote in the House. Under public pressure from Obama, however, GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney endorsed his proposal and Republicans ultimately brought the measure up for a vote. It passed both houses of Congress in July.¶ The student loan example is consistent with the findings of **Princeton political scientist Brandice Canes-Wrone, who examined televised presidential appeals on budget issues from 1957 to 2000. She found that presidents do "obtain significant legislative influence by promoting their proposals** in nationally televised speeches," but in a limited context: Their successful appeals tended to be on proposals that were already popular but that were stalled legislatively or otherwise unlikely to pass without the president's public sales pitch.¶ Canes-Wrone demonstrated that on budget issues, at least, the critical value of the bully pulpit is less about changing public opinion on policy measures and more about increasing awareness of lesser-known proposals that meet with approval. By loudly advocating on behalf of the latter policies, a president can show to opponents a willingness to use the proposals as campaign issues and thus change the legislative "dynamic."¶ While the subject of student loan interest rates had previously been "reserved for the deep weeds of Congressional committees," as The New York Times put it, a test of the issue in the spring of 2012 by the United Technologies/National Journal Congressional Connection Poll found popular support for the Obama administration's proposal.¶ Canes-Wrone was careful to emphasize the limits of her findings. "We do not argue that a president can achieve any policy goal by appealing to the public about it," she wrote.¶ Sides agrees. "It's really about the way in which the president's behavior changes the perceptions of other political leaders," he told HuffPost via email.

#### Hirsch concedes capital can act as a magnifier—Obama swayed GOP direction to pass immigration sooner

**Hirsch 2/7** Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal and former senior editor and columnist at Newsweek "There's no such thing as political capital", 2013

When he mounted his bully pulpit in Nevada, he delivered another new message as well: You Republicans don’t have to listen to what I say anymore. And don’t worry about who’s got the political capital. Just take a hard look at where I’m saying this: in a state you were supposed to have won but lost because of the rising Hispanic vote.

Obama was cleverly pointing the GOP toward conclusions that he knows it is already reaching on its own: If you, the Republicans, want to have any kind of a future in a vastly changed electoral map, you have no choice but to move. It’s your choice.

#### C) LBJ is the exception not the rule—history is replete with failures by Presidents to take advantage of momentum

Reagan – Iran-contra

Clinton – impeachment

Bush – social security

**All of Hirsch’s examples are too old—doesn’t assume a divided congress or shortened attention spans that collapse momentum, plan fractures whatever honeymoon potential exists**

**Cillizza 2/6**

Chris Cillizza (writer for the Washington Post) February 6, 2013 “President Obama is enjoying a second political honeymoon. But how long will it last?” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/06/president-obama-is-enjoying-a-second-political-honeymoon-but-how-long-will-it-last/

President Obama is enjoying a sort of second political honeymoon in the wake of his re-election victory last November with a series of national polls showing his job approval rating climbing from the middling territory where it lagged for much of the last several years.¶ In the latest Real Clear Politics rolling average of all national polling, Obama approval is at 52 percent while his disapproval is at 43 percent. That may not seem like much but it marks a significant improvement over where he was for much of 2010 and 2011.¶ Here’s a look at Obama’s job approval trend line in Washington Post-ABC News polling from January 2011 until now:¶ Judging from his actions of late — most notably his surprising confrontational (and liberal) inaugural address — President Obama is well aware of the fact that he is enjoying a polling boom at the moment. And, even Republicans are tacitly acknowledging that Obama is living in a second honeymoon period by backing down on major legislative fights like the fiscal cliff and the debt ceiling.¶ The pertinent question then is how long it will last — and what the president can get done between now and when the good times (for him, at least) stop rolling.¶ Gallup has done considerable work on the lengths of political honeymoons and has concluded that they ain’t what they used to be. Here’s their chart documenting the relative honeymoon lengths — as defined by a job approval rating above the 55 percent mark — of presidents in their first terms:¶ Screen shot 2013-02-06 at 10.37.25 AM¶ As Gallup’s Jeffrey Jones wrote:¶ “Only one of the last six presidents — George H.W. Bush — had a honeymoon that extended beyond his ninth month in office. Bush’s ratings actually climbed for much of his first year and a half in office as the economy remained strong, several communist regimes fell in Europe, and the U.S. military was able to capture Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega and remove him from power.”¶ The explanations for the shortening of presidential honeymoons vary.¶ One theory is that modern presidents operate in a hyper-partisan world where the opposition party never rallies (or comes close to rallying) behind them. (In Gallup polling, nine of the ten most polarizing years of a presidency – as defined by the gap between presidential job approval among Democrats and job approval among Republicans — have come during the presidencies of George W. Bush and Obama.)¶ Because of that partisan division, modern presidents’ approval ratings start at a lower high point; that means the pace at which they dip below the 56 percent “honeymoon” mark is significantly hastened.

#### Empirically wrong

**Clark 1/19**

Lesley Clark and Anita Kumar (writers for McClatchy Newspapers) January 19, 2013 “Obama's second term: Guns, immigration, taxes -- and warnings of hubris” Lexis

"People will say, 'If we're spending that much energy, we're not spending enough energy on immigration, we're not spending enough energy on the fiscal problem,'" Biden said. "Look folks, presidents don't get to choose what they deal with, they deal with what is before them."¶ The history books, however, are replete with second-term presidents tripped up by their own hubris, scandal or controversy. Ronald Reagan endured the Iran-Contra scandal, the dark mark of his otherwise successful presidency. Bill Clinton was impeached for lying to conceal an affair. George W. Bush tried to get Congress to overhaul Social Security and couldn't get his own party to even bring it to a vote.¶ Obama said he's "more than familiar with all the literature about presidential overreach in second terms," adding: "We are very cautious about that. On the other hand, I didn't get re-elected just to bask in re-election."

### 2NC – Obama Pushing

#### Obama push to delay sequestration now – will invest in protecting the military budget now

Antiwar.com February 6, 2013 “Obama Demands Delay to Avoid Military Spending Cuts” Lexis

The New Year dispute over sequestration and the possibility of actually cutting military spending ended with an agreement to punt the issue down the road until March 1, a date which is rapidly approaching. President Obama is demanding that Congress delay[1] the issue again, insisting it is vital to delay it for 'a few months.'¶ Much of the 'sequestration' cuts that were delayed were military spending cuts, which officials have been railing about ever since, insisting such cuts could never be allowed. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta even claimed the cuts, though minor, would turn the US into a 'second-rate power[2],' though still one with ten times the military budget of Russia.¶ The delay was nominally meant to provide more time to negotiate a deal, though President Obama made no specific proposal for such a deal and instead called for tax increases and spending cuts on something other than the military.¶ The issue splits broadly along partisan lines, with Democrats insisting no military spending cuts could ever be allowed and tax hikes are the only way, and Republicans insisting no military spending cuts could ever be allowed and that cutting other spending is the only way. Either way, despite Panetta et al. continuing to predict doom the bulk of Congress and the administration both seem to be pretty sure that the enormous military budget needs to be protected whatever the cost, and that if it isn't it will be someone else's fault.

#### Obama pushing GOP on sequestration now – will be a fight

Sam Stein and Sabrina Siddiqui (writers for The Huffington Post) February 5, 2013 “Obama Sequester Plan: Hope Republicans Blink First” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/05/obama-sequester-plan\_n\_2626100.html?utm\_hp\_ref=politics

Those concerns animated the White House role in end-of-the-year negotiations with Congress that averted across-the-board tax hikes and delayed, for two months, the mandatory spending cuts.¶ The White House concerns also emboldened Republicans, showing them the administration's potential vulnerability. With lawmakers once again gearing up for a debate over sequestration, House Republicans are calling Obama's bluff, adopting a posture of nonchalance about the prospect of the cuts being triggered.¶ The tactic has its risks. A report last week from the Bureau of Economic Analysis blamed massive reductions in defense spending for much of the U.S. economy's fourth quarter stagnation. It's also having a political impact. On Tuesday, Obama made an unexpected push for a short-term extension of the sequestration deadline in hopes that it would give Congress more time to pass a budget.¶ "Congress is already working towards a budget that would permanently replace the sequester," Obama said. "At the very least, we should give them the chance to come up with this budget instead of making indiscriminate cuts now that will cost us jobs and significantly slow down our recovery."¶ The president proposes a mix of ways to increase revenue and cut spending to buy a few month's time. Obama would even entertain reforming entitlement programs, including Social Security and Medicare, the White House said. An administration official later clarified that means revisiting the December 2012 discussions with House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio), rather than the July 2011 talks, which means far-reaching Medicare reforms remain off the table.¶ There were no immediate takers.¶ “President Obama first proposed the sequester and insisted it become law," said Boehner. "Republicans have twice voted to replace these arbitrary cuts with common-sense cuts and reforms that protect our national defense. We believe there is a better way to reduce the deficit, but Americans do not support sacrificing real spending cuts for more tax hikes.”¶ With sequestration on the horizon, conservatives believe they have political leverage. While the replacement bills that Boehner referenced would never pass the Democratic-run Senate (let alone get the signature of the president) they provide the GOP with a serviceable talking point. And since Congress just passed more than $600 billion in tax revenue increases as part of the fiscal cliff deal, the framing of the debt-reduction conversation has shifted back toward cuts and entitlement reforms, where the GOP is comfortable. Most importantly, the economic ripple effects of sequestration make Republicans less nervous than Democrats.¶ "They are not bluffing because bluffing implies having a strategy," said one senior Obama administration official. The official nevertheless took a shot at pinpointing GOP thinking. "The only reason it would happen is if Republicans choose for it to happen, and the reason they would choose it is because they are trying to use it as leverage to secure more cuts."¶ Republicans don't dispute that. They've offered to replace defense cuts with reductions in social programs. But, as they hold out for a deal along those lines, they run a risk. While GOP leadership ranks may seem calm about sequestration, others in the party have trouble suppressing their fears.¶ "I think any alternative is better than allowing the sequester to take effect," said Rep. Tom Rooney (R-Fla.) "I don't know what's happened with some people in our conference recently, but I'm one of the very few people I think that would agree that -- if you could say, 'Would you rather hollow out the Pentagon or increase taxes?' I would support the latter to make sure that we didn't lose our capability to maintain our superpower status.

### 2nc at: thumpers

Our uniqueness assumes thumpers—past issues didn’t drain enough capital, because Obama could stay above the fray. The plan pushes through a massive energy policy, that’s a whole different level of presidential involvement

Top of docket – 1nc blitzer evidence seperates it from immigration and gun control

#### Issues don’t cost capital till they are at the finish line, if they cant cite vote counts 0 weight

Drum, 10 (Kevin, Political Blogger, Mother Jones, http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-

coming-back-burner)

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.

#### Obama won’t spend PC – public opinion matters the most

**Klein 12-30** – Phillip, Senior Editorial Writer for the Examiner (Obama says gun control will be dictated by public opinion, Beltway Confidential, The Examiner, http://washingtonexaminer.com/obama-says-gun-control-will-be-dictated-by-public-opinion/article/2517132#.UOH5xYnjnKA)

President Obama has indicated that he won’t stick his neck out to push for gun control, but instead will let public opinion drive the debate.

In an interview with David Gregory on “Meet the Press,” Obama said he would await the recommendations of his gun control task force and present a package of gun control proposals. But he said, “We’re not going to get this done unless the American people decide it’s important and so this is not something that’s going to be a matter of me spending political capital.”

He continued, “One of the things that you learn, having now been in this office four years, is the old adage of Abraham Lincoln’s that with public opinion there’s nothing you can’t do, and without public opinion, there’s very little you can get done in this town.”

It was telling that when asked about his priorities, Obama didn’t mention gun control. He named immigration as his top priority, followed by more infrastructure spending and environmentally-friendly energy policies. Gregory is the one who brought up gun control.

This is an indication that Obama is afraid of over-extending himself on the issue. Though there has been a spike in support for some gun control measures in the wake of the Newtown shooting, it’s unclear where public opinion will be as more time passes.

#### No bill even until April

Rosalind S. Helderman and David Nakamura (writers for the Washington Post) January 25, 2013 “Senators nearing agreement on broad immigration reform proposal” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/senators-nearing-agreement-on-broad-immigration-reform-proposal/2013/01/25/950fb78a-6642-11e2-9e1b-07db1d2ccd5b\_story.html

Also included in the new Senate group are Schumer, who chairs the key Senate subcommittee where legislative action will begin; Graham; Robert Menendez (D-N.J.); and Marco Rubio (R-Fla.). Two others, Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) and Michael F. Bennet (D-Colo.), have also been involved in some talks.¶ Their timetable would aim for a bill to be written by March or April and potentially considered for final passage in the Senate as early as the summer. Proponents believe adoption in the GOP-held House would be made easier with a strong bipartisan vote in the Senate.

### 2nc military

**Failure to successfully negotiate over sequestration and continuing resolution guts the military – impact is extinction**

Sydney Freedberg and Colin Clark (writers for AOL Defense) January 17, 2013 “Sequester's A Nightmare But Year-Long CR Is Just As Bad: SecNav Mabus, Under Sec. Work” http://defense.aol.com/2013/01/17/sequesters-a-nightmare-but-year-long-cr-is-just-as-bad-secn/

The automatic budget cuts known as sequestration aren't the only nightmare scenario looming in March for the Department of Defense, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus said this morning. If Congress keeps on funding the federal government on the current ad hoc basis, by simply extending the current "continuing resolution" -- now set to expire March 27 -- instead of by finally passing proper appropriations bills, the impact would be equally bad.¶ "Most of the attention is put on sequestration because it was such a big deal leading up to the fiscal cliff," Mabus told reporters after his public remarks at the Surface Navy Association's annual conference. "We have an equal, equal concern about CR."¶ Asked about remarks earlier in the conference by uniformed leaders that the Navy was sailing for a readiness crisis -- the infamous "hollow force" -- Mabus said, "I agree with Adm. Gortney that if these things are triggered, in the sort of mindless automatic way they work, you do run a big risk of becoming hollow."¶ [Updated: Speaking later at the same conference, Mabus's Under Secretary, the gloriously outspoken Robert Work, said it was entirely possible that both disasters might strike at once. "We are planning as if sequestration occurs and a year-long CR occurs," he said. "If that happens, ladies and gentlemen, the world as we know it will end. There's just no way you can keep the Navy whole and keep the Marine Corps whole."¶ [If he had to guess, Work went on, "we're going to get some type of deal that take sequestration off the table, but we're going to have a year-long CR."]¶ Either disaster would have an equal financial impact on the Navy, but it would be distributed in different ways.¶ Sequestration "would be $4.6 billion hit for the Department of the Navy," said Mabus in his speech. "If that continuing resolution is extended for the rest of the fiscal year that's another -- exactly the same number -- $4.6 billion hit."¶ The second similarity is "the mindless way both those things operate," Mabus continued. "Under sequestration, you just whack a certain percentage off virtually every program. Continuing resolution says you stay at the levels you were at last year and no new starts."¶ A memo last week from Deputy Defense Secretary Ash Carter instructed the services to prepare for sequestration by economizing on readiness, including -- if sequester takes effect -- cancelling the "availabilities" of Navy warships for major maintenance in port. But a continuing resolution only allows the government to keep spending on existing programs, not to start new ones (unless Congress makes a specific exception), and each "availability" is technically a new program unto itself.¶ So the CR would have exactly the same crippling impact on maintenance as the sequester, Mabus explained to AOL Defense: "If you put a ship in for a shipyard availability, that may be considered a new start, and so we couldn't do that."¶ That said, the two disasters aren't identical. Sequestration has its own unique and nasty wrinkles for the Navy. For example, the sea service has pushed hard for multi-year procurement contracts, in which it guarantees contractors the same amount every year for several years running in return for a lower overall price. Such steady-state expenditures are allowed under a continuing resolution. But sequestration cuts multi-year payments by the same amount it does almost all other programs, about 8.8 percent, which means the Navy couldn't pay the whole sum. That, in turn, would violate the contract and send everyone back to the bargaining table. So, said Mabus to reporters, "if we can't pay under sequestration, we breach a multi-year and the price just goes through the roof."¶ The Navy Secretary wasn't the only senior defense official bemoaning the current budgetary state of the United States early today. The head of Air Force Space Command, Gen. William Shelton, told reporters that the absence of a 2013 appropriations bill adds to the uncertainty engendered by sequestration. "That affects the planning for 2014 and that affects the planning for 2015, which we are deep into," Shelton said at a breakfast put on by the Defense Writers Group. So far, the general said readiness has not been affected. "Day to day we are carrying on," but he made clear that the Air Force would soon have to pare back or forgo flying hours, purchases of information technology, office furniture and the like.¶ Mabus made clear that he understood that budget cuts are probably coming no matter what, even if Congress and the White House cut a deal to avert sequestration. But rather than sequestration's automatic cuts to every program or a continuing resolution's auto-pilot continuation of last year's spending levels, he begged political leaders to give the military discretion of how to apply the cuts: Give us a bill, he said, and let us figure out how to pay it so we can protect our priorities.¶ "Nobody likes budget cuts, but if Defense or the Navy has to be a part of some ... grand bargain," Mabus told the audience at the Surface Navy conference, "then give us the top line, let us manage how any cuts , how any reductions, are made. Let us put dollars against strategy instead of simply cutting the top line."¶ Beset just a few years ago by out-of-control shipbuilding costs on programs like the Littoral Combat Ship, the Navy has vastly improved its management, Mabus argued. "We have shown, I believe pretty decisively so, that we know how to manage the budget, that we know how to set some priorities, that we know how to get money into programs, that we know how to drive a hard bargain, that we know how to get the most money for the taxpayers' dollars," he said. "Instead of mindlessly cutting, give us that chance to manage to whatever the final number is."¶ "We've shown," he said, "that we're willing to make some pretty hard choices, that we're willing to cancel some stuff."¶ Mabus mentioned both shipbuilding and maintenance as priorities he wanted to protect. But what else is left to cut?¶ "I learned a long time ago," said the veteran politician in answer to AOL Defense, "I only get in trouble when I answer what-if questions."¶ [Updated: Under Secretary Work was far more direct, as is his wont: "Shipbuilding is the No. 1 priority in the Department of the Navy. If given a choice between an aviation program and a shipbuilding program, the Secretary will choose shipbuilding."]¶ Any specifics now would just inflame key programs' partisans in Congress. But there's the rub: Sequestration and the continuing resolution may be mindless, but precisely for that reason they save political leaders from making painful choices. The sequester law actually allows the President's Office of Management and Budget to submit an alternative proposal for how to achieve the required cuts, while Congress can exempt any program it wishes from the restrictions of the CR -- but either way requires sacrificing some constituency's favorite program to save another's, and it requires legislators to step up and vote to do so. America's political class may no longer have the courage -- and there's no one left to beat it into them.