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#### Loan guarantees are financial support not for energy production

Book 11 [Managing Director, ClearView Energy Partners, LLC]

Kevin, Testimony before U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

SUBCOMMITTEES ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES AND OVERSIGHT, SEPTEMBER 22, http://waysandmeans.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Booktestimony922.pdf

Incentive cost ratios, implied abatement costs and implied displacement costs offer three possible ways to measure the performance of **federal financial incentives for energy production** and consumption. Metrics of this sort could be used to prioritize spending – dynamically, perhaps through a reverse auction – or through legislated formulas **that balance incentives for high-yield, low-cost sources with high-potential, emerging sources.** Fuels or technologies that consistently fall short of established benchmarks may require a different type of government financial intervention (e**.g. manufacturing assistance or pre-competitive R&D** in place of production **tax credits**) or a different mode of financial support (e.g. loan guaranteesinstead of tax credits **or deductions)**.

#### The aff is a mechanism that is a loan guarantee- that is a different mode of support than financial incentives for energy production

#### This creates the best limit- ensures the negative gets to say that energy production is bad- their interp makes the topic bidirectional because you could build nuclear power and never turn the plants on- The aff should be restricted to production tax credits- creates a stable plan versus cp debate for the topic- even if their plan says its “for energy production” that is meaningless absent a discussion of what a loan guarantee is- vote neg on presumption

### Off

#### The affirmative props up the distinction between licit and illicit nuclear markets that is used to erase difference

Hecht 2010 [Gabrielle is associate professor of history at the University of Michigan, January Technology and Culture¶ Volume 51, Number 1, Project Muse]

The distinction between licit and illicit market activities depended on one's place in the geography of nuclear things. From the late 1970s onward, Namibian yellowcake played a central role in the (cold war, capitalist) uranium market. Its presence and its price helped keep conversion and enrichment plants in business; it fueled power reactors as well as bombs. When the liberation struggles in southern Africa threatened to render its uranium illicit, producers recruited these allies and their technopolitical mechanisms in an increasingly desperate (and ultimately successful) effort to remain in business. In this instance provenance, rather than nuclearity or markets, became reconfigured. The technopolitics of provenance not only served to materially intertwine licit trade and black markets; they also enacted a profound symbolic erasure of African things from Western nuclear systems.

#### Exceptionalism leads to extinction- produces a denial of death that demands constant causalities

Peterson ‘7 (Christopher, Lecturer @ University of Western Sidney, Kindred Specters: Death, Mourning, and American Affinity, pgs. 3-8)

While this study accords with the claim that American culture disavows mortality, 1 do not argue for any simple reversal of this interdiction with an aim toward affirming finitude per se. If death is beyond our experience (as Heidegger among others has observed), if I am ultimately absent from "my" own death, then strictly speaking there is nothing for me to recognize or avow. Yet dying is something that I do every day. Indeed, it might be more accurate to say that American culture disavows dying, understood as a process that extends from our birth to our biological demise." Even with such an amended formulation, however, it is not entirely clear whether dying can ever be fully affirmed or avowed. That "we live as if we were not going to die," as Zygmunt Bauman observes, "is a remarkable achievement," especially given the ease with which we disavow dying on a daily basis." Some degree of disavowal would seem both unavoidable and necessary for our survival. Any effort to prolong one's life, from simply eating well and exercising to taking medications to prevent or treat illness, evidences this disavowal. For Bauman, however, the disavowal of dying often has violent political and social consequences. Noting the wartime imperative "to limit our casualties" for instance, Bauman remarks that "the price of that limiting is multiplying the dead on the other side of the battleline" (34). Drawing from Freud's claim that, "at bottom no one believes in his own death," Bauman argues that death is "socially managed" by securing the "immortality" of the few through the mortalization of others (35, his emphasis).8 The belief in my self-presence, which is also always a belief in my immortality, is thus dialectically conditioned by the nonpresence of others. Scholars in race and sexuality studies have done much to bring our attention to the ways in which American culture represents racial and sexual minorities as dead - both figuratively and literally. Indeed, this gesture both accompanies and reinforces the larger cultural dissimulation of mortality by making racial and sexual others stand in for the death that haunts every life. The history of American slavery tells a familiar story of how American consciousness disavows and projects mortality onto its "others." Orlando Patterson has described the institution of slavery in terms of a process of kinship delegitimation that constructs slaves as "socially dead."? For Patterson, slavery - across its various historical forms - emerges as a substitute for death a forced bargain by which the slave retains his/her life only to enter into the liminal existence of the socially dead. As a substitution for death slavery does not "absolve or erase the prospect of death," for the specter of material death looms over the slave's existence as an irreducible remainder (5). This primary stage in the construction of the socially dead person is followed by what Patterson refers to as the slave's "natal alienation," his/her alienation from all rights or claims of birth: in short, a severing of all genealogical ties and claims both to the slave's living blood relatives, and to his/her remote ancestors and future descendants. Although Patterson does not approach the problem of social death through a psychoanalytic vocabulary of disavowal and projection, one might say that the presumptive ontology of slave-owning, legally recognized kinship, was dependent on a deontologization of slave kinship that worked to deny the death that each life bears within itself. Building on Patterson's argument, Toni Morrison observes in Playing in the Dark that, "for a people who made much of their 'newness' - their potential, freedom, and innocence - it is striking how dour, how troubled, how frightened and haunted our early and founding literature truly is." For Morrison, African-American slaves came to shoulder the burden of the darkness (both moral and racial) against which America defined itself. The shadow of a racialized blackness did not so much threaten the ostensible "newness" of American life as it conditioned the latter's appearance as new and free. Hence "freedom," she writes, "has no meaning ... without the specter of enslavement" (56). Echoing Morrison, Russ Castronovo asserts in Necro Citizenship that nineteenth-century American politics constructed the citizen in relation to a morbid fascination with ghosts, seances, spirit rappings, and mesmerism. Taking his point of departure from Patrick Henry's in-famous assertion, "give me liberty or give me death," Castronovo explores how admission into the domain of citizenship required a certain depoliticization and pacification of the subject: "The afterlife emancipates souls from passionate debates, everyday engagements, and earthly affairs that animate the political field."!' From Lincoln's rumored dabbling in spiritualism, to attempts by mediums to contact the departed souls of famous Americans, to a senator's introduction of a petition in 1854 asking Congress to investigate communications with the "other side" so numerous are Castronovo's examples of what he calls" spectral politics" that we would have a difficult time contesting his diagnosis that nineteenth-century American political discourse worked to produce politically and historically dead citizens. That these citizens were constructed in tandem with the production of large slave populations- noncitizens who were urged by slavery proponents and abolitionists alike to believe that emancipation existed in a promised afterlife - would lend still more credence to the argument that nineteenth-century America propagated a dematerialized politics. One wonders, however, how Castronovo's argument sits in relation to Aries's contention that American life tends toward an interdiction of death, and if Castronovo's rejection of necropolitics, moreover, is not finally symptomatic of this very disavowal. Castronovo maintains that, "for cultures that fear death ... necrophilia promotes fascination with and helps tame an unknowable terror:' (5). American necrophilia, according to Castronovo, responds to an overwhelming fear and denial of death. Castronovo thus aims 'to turn us away from such preoccupation with ghosts, spirits, and the afterlife toward "specific forms of corporeality," such as the laboring body, the slave body, and the mesmerized body, in order to avoid "reinscrib[ing] patterns of abstraction" (17). Yet, this move away from general to specific forms of embodiment still retains the notion of "the body," and therefore of a self-contained, sell-present entity. If nineteenth-century politics required that the citizen be disembodied and dematerialized, it does not follow that a move toward embodiment remedies such a spiritualized politics. Although Castronovo cautions that recourse to the body" does not automatically guarantee resistance," the overall tenor of his project pathologizes the spectral (18). Indeed, one has the sense that Castronovo would like to untether politics from death altogether - as if political life is not always haunted by finitude. Reversing the terms of political necrophilia, he offers something like a political necrophobia that sees every intrusion of the spectral as synonymous with depoliticization. If nineteenth-century spiritualism infused American political life with a familiar set of distinctions between spirit/matter, soul/body, that says nothing about how these binaries might be displaced rather than merely reversed. A binaristic approach to the subject of mortality is also legible in Sharon Holland's Raising the Dead, which asserts that "bringing back the dead (or saving the living from the shadow of death) is the ultimate queer act."11Drawing from the activist slogan "silence = death" from the early years of the AIDS epidemic, and extending this activist imperative to address the social death of sexual and racial minorities more generally, Holland observes that the deaths of queer and racial subjects serve "to ward off a nation's collective dread of the inevitable" (38). Yet, as in Castronovo's critique of necropolitics, this imperative to "raise the dead" reverses rather than displaces the logic through which dominant, white, heterosexual culture disavows and projects mortality onto racial and sexual minorities. While we must address the particular effects that social death has on racial and sexual minorities, this social reality must also be thought in relation to a more generalizable principle of mourning. For the "shadow of death" haunts all lives, not just queer ones. The "ultimate queer act," pace Holland, would be to deconstruct rather than reinscribe the binary between life and death, to resist the racist and heterosexist disavowal of finitude. That Americanist literary criticism on the subject of mortality remains implicated in the larger cultural disavowal of dying suggests that we ought to reassess our critical energies, particularly as these powers are enlisted to address how American political ideology produces the "death" of racial and sexual others. Indeed, I would argue that such criticism remains invested - despite all claims to the contrary - in an American exceptionalist project. American exceptionalism names, in part, a fetishization of novelty and futurity that initially defined America against an ostensibly decaying and moribund Europe. As David Noble has argued, the doctrine of exceptionalism excluded America from "the human experience of birth, death, and rebirth" by figuring Europe in terms of time and America in terms of timeless space." If, as George Berkeley put it, America is "time's noblest offspring," history gives birth to its final progeny in order that the latter might escape time altogether. America thus becomes eternally present while "Europe breeds in her decay." If the "new world" qua new must deny mortality, then reanimating the excluded from within the terms of a dialectical reversal renews rather than dismantles the American exceptionalist project. Challenging the ideology of American exceptionalism is particularly crucial for a post-9/11 politics that aims to resist the transformation of American exposure to injury and death into a newly reconsolidated sense of innocence and immortality. As Donald Pease has argued, 9/11 transformed "virgin land" into "ground zero," effecting an ideological shift from a "secured innocent nation to a wounded, insecure emergency state."16 Drawing from the work of Giorgio Agamben. Pease describes the emergency state as a nation that - by exempting itself from its own democratic rules of free speech, due process, and above all, the rules of war - marks a division between those whom the state protects from injury and those whom the state is free to injure and kill with impunity (13). The reduction of the Arab other to that which cannot be killed because it is already dead works to cover over the wound that ground zero opens up under the surface of virgin land. The emergency state (or what Agamben calls the "state of exception") thus also names a nation that attempts to except itself from the universal condition of mortality. As Bauman notes, "if mortality and transience are the norm among humans, durability may be attained only as an exception" (67, his emphasis).

#### The alternative is to reject the Affirmative-Questioning American exceptionalism is key to understanding our place in the world- rejection is key to more productive politics

Walt 2011[Stephen M. Walt, an FP contributing editor, is Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international affairs at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government NOVEMBER 2011, Foreign Policy, “The Myth of American Exceptionalism” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/10/11/the\_myth\_of\_american\_exceptionalism]

Most statements of "American exceptionalism" presume that America's values, political system, and history are unique and worthy of universal admiration. They also imply that the United States is both destined and entitled to play a distinct and positive role on the world stage.¶ The only thing wrong with this self-congratulatory portrait of America's global role is that it is mostly a myth. Although the United States possesses certain unique qualities -- from high levels of religiosity to a political culture that privileges individual freedom -- the conduct of U.S. foreign policy has been determined primarily by its relative power and by the inherently competitive nature of international politics. By focusing on their supposedly exceptional qualities, Americans blind themselves to the ways that they are a lot like everyone else.¶ This unchallenged faith in American exceptionalism makes it harder for Americans to understand why others are less enthusiastic about U.S. dominance, often alarmed by U.S. policies, and frequently irritated by what they see as U.S. hypocrisy, whether the subject is possession of nuclear weapons, conformity with international law, or America's tendency to condemn the conduct of others while ignoring its own failings. Ironically, U.S. foreign policy would probably be more effective if Americans were less convinced of their own unique virtues and less eager to proclaim them.¶ What we need, in short, is a more realistic and critical assessment of America's true character and contributions. In that spirit, I offer here the Top 5 Myths about American Exceptionalism.

### Off

#### Electricity prices are dropping and will stay low

Dallas Burtraw, one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector, and studies electricity restructuring, competition, and economic deregulation, “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom,” Common Resources, August 21, 2012, <http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency. For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

Mark Cooper, SENIOR FELLOW FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT¶ VERMONT LAW SCHOOL, "THE ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS: RENAISSANCE OR RELAPSE?," 2009, http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Cooper%20Report%20on%20Nuclear%20Economics%20FINAL%5B1%5D.pdf

Within the past year, estimates of the cost of nuclear power from a new generation of ¶ reactors have ranged from a low of 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) to a high of 30 cents. This ¶ paper tackles the debate over the cost of building new nuclear reactors, with the key findings as ¶ follows: ¶ • The initial cost projections put out early in today’s so-called “nuclear renaissance” were about ¶ one-third of what one would have expected, based on the nuclear reactors completed in the ¶ 1990s. ¶ • The most recent cost projections for new nuclear reactors are, on average, over four times as high as the initial “nuclear renaissance” projections. ¶ • There are numerous options available to meet the need for electricity in a carbon-constrained ¶ environment that are superior to building nuclear reactors. Indeed, nuclear reactors are the worst option from the point of view of the consumer and society. ¶ • The low carbon sources that are less costly than nuclear include efficiency, cogeneration, ¶ biomass, geothermal, wind, solar thermal and natural gas. Solar photovoltaics that are presently ¶ more costly than nuclear reactors are projected to decline dramatically in price in the next ¶ decade. Fossil fuels with carbon capture and storage, which are not presently available, are ¶ projected to be somewhat more costly than nuclear reactors. ¶ • Numerous studies by Wall Street and independent energy analysts estimate efficiency and ¶ renewable costs at an average of 6 cents per kilowatt hour, while the cost of electricity from ¶ nuclear reactors is estimated in the range of 12 to 20 cents per kWh. ¶ • The additional cost of building 100 new nuclear reactors, instead of pursuing a least cost ¶ efficiency-renewable strategy, would be in the range of $1.9-$4.4 trillion over the life the ¶ reactors. ¶ Whether the burden falls on ratepayers (in electricity bills) or taxpayers (in large subsidies), ¶ incurring excess costs of that magnitude would be a substantial burden on the national economy and ¶ add immensely to the cost of electricity and the cost of reducing carbon emissions.

#### Low electricity prices sustain U.S. manufacturing which is key to the economy – re-shoring, key industries

Perry 7/31/12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.¶ After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." ¶ The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: ¶ U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas.¶ Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025.¶ MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. ¶ Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### Global economic crisis causes war - strong statistical support - also causes great power transitions.

Jedediah Royal, 2010, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-14

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 10981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Polllins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium, and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996,2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectation of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases , as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002, p.89). Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to create a ‘rally round the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997) Miller (1999) and Kisanganie and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force.

### Off

#### Fiscal cliff deal now- insiders agree- PC is key to maintain compromise- failure collapses the economy

Hall and Lightman 11-8 [Kevin G. Hall and David Lightman 11-8-2012 Kansas City Star “Put up or shut up time for Congress, Obama on fiscal cliff” http://www.kansascity.com/2012/11/08/3907178/put-up-or-shut-up-time-for-congress.html]

Lawmakers sent mixed signals this week about serious negotiations vs. driving briefly off the cliff’s edge before settling.¶ Tuesday’s election results kept the same power players in place, the same group that went to that edge repeatedly during budget and debt ceiling negotiations over the last two years.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said Wednesday that he was ready to “find the common ground that has eluded us” and talk to Democrats, even about raising revenue.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., also talked conciliation, promising not to draw “any lines in the sand.”¶ The election’s status quo result – the same president, Republicans still controlling the House of Representatives and Democrats remaining in charge of the Senate – suggests the public “is obviously saying work together, meet halfway, come together,” said Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., usually a fierce partisan.¶ The rank and file may feel less sanguine. The election solidified conservatives’ hold on the House and liberals’ strength in the Senate, suggesting any deal could have a difficult time winning approval.¶ The key, said Republicans, is for President Barack Obama to take the lead and offer a detailed plan.¶ “The only thing that’s changed since the election is that the president is not campaigning,” said Don Stewart, spokesman for Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky.¶ Ultimately, say insiders, the doomsday alternative to inaction will force a deal. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said in a report Thursday that failing to act on the fiscal-cliff components could shave half a percentage point off of growth in the first half of 2013, raising the jobless rate to 9.1 percent and probably would trigger another recession. The CBO also said that addressing the components of the fiscal cliff results in a 3 or 4 percentage point swing between contraction and growth.

#### Energy spending costs capital

McEntee 2012 [Christine McEntee Executive Director and CEO, American Geophysical Union August 15, 2012 “Science, Politics and Public Opinion” National Journal http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php?comments=expandall~~%23comments-http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php?comments=expandall]

We also know that the biggest obstacles to passage of energy and environmental legislation are disagreements about the extent to which the federal government can and should regulate business, and reluctance to launch new initiatives that will add to the deficit. The science tells us that small initiatives that require only nominal investments can't begin to address the environmental and energy challenges we face; and legislation big enough to achieve significant results will cost more than Congress is willing to spend.

#### Fiscal Cliff failure destroys Middle East security – impact is 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.

### ANL Cred

#### Argonne has already received necessary funds for APS

Ted Gregory, “U.S. gives informal OK to $300 million Argonne upgrade,” Chicago Tribune, June 6, 2010, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2010-06-06/news/ct-met-argonne-upgrade-20100606_1_argonne-s-advanced-photon-source-argonne-national-laboratory-alternative-fuels>, accessed 10-22-2012.

Argonne National Laboratory has a baseball stadium-size, X-ray machine that enables scientists to examine a vast array of materials in slivers as tiny as several atoms wide, work that some believe is key to breakthrough research on everything from curing cancer to making the perfect fuel cell.¶ But, its advocates suggest, Argonne's Advanced Photon Source may be growing obsolete. The Department of Energy in late April gave preliminary approval to start designing a $300 million upgrade, which would enhance the brightness of Argonne's X-ray beams by 100 times and add more beams. That upgrade would substantially advance scientists' ability to examine materials at the atomic level and in shorter snatches of time, an improvement that is expected to lead to a greater understanding of how things work.

#### Structural limits labor- Security clearances, inconveniences

Harris 2012 (Chanlder Harris, May 22, 2012, “Nuclear Security Administration Faces Personnel Shortage, Puts Partial Blame on Lack of Social Media Access,” Clearance Jobs, http://www.clearancejobs.com/defense-news/655/nuclear-security-administration-faces-personnel-shortage-puts-partial-blame-on-lack-of-social-media-access)

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the contractors who operate the national lab sites for NNSA may soon face a workforce shortage of qualified candidates and faces challenges to recruit and retain new workers, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) revealed.¶ In its report, "Modernizing the Nuclear Security Enterprise: Strategies and Challenges in Sustaining Critical Skills in Federal and Contractor Workforces" the GAO said the NNSA has generally relied on recruiting young workers early in their careers and providing them with training and advancement opportunities. This has worked in the past and led to solid retention, especially since the competitive pay and advancement opportunities have been appealing.¶ However, NNSA staff are required to work in secure areas that prohibit the use of personal cell phones, e-mail, and social media, which “is a disadvantage in attracting younger skilled candidates.” Another primary problem is that the pool of qualified applicants from top science, technology, and engineering programs are not U.S. citizens and cannot obtain security clearances, says GAO.

#### No chance of grey goo.

C.M. Stewart 2012 “Our Grey Goo Future: Possibility and Probability” <http://www.singularityweblog.com/our-grey-goo-future-possibility-and-probability/>

Of course, grey goo wouldn’t pop into existence without some form of intelligence – biological or otherwise – first assembling and programming the nanobots. Molecular nanotechnology scientists and molecular manufacturing engineers continue to study the possibilities and implications of nanobots in medicinal and environmental applications. Drexler argues that self-replicators would be too complex and inefficient for any practical manufacturing scenario, and specific grey goo may be limited by what it is programmed to consume. Indeed, grey goo candidates must meet several criteria to achieve true grey goo status. The bots must be: Self-replicating. This would be the basic definition of a grey goo-bot. Hardy. The grey goo-bots must survive whatever environment they encounter to keep replicating. Mobile. Perhaps this criterion would be met simply by the new grey goo pushing old grey goo out of the way. Bonus criterion – Each grey goo-bot must also have a sufficiently-sized, self-contained computer to store the information to direct the ‘bot. A person reading this article in 2012 may conclude such a computer would be too large – and therefore too cumbersome – to practically be included in a grey goo-bot candidate. But given technological growth predictors such as Moore’s Law, this same person reading a few years in the future may conclude nanotechnology is sufficiently advanced for this criterion. So the fret-worthiness of grey goo may depend on whether one adheres to such trendy predictions. Furthermore, the Royal Society’s 2004 report on nanoscience declares that

the foreseeable future contains no grey goo.

#### No risk of accidental grey goo. The creators would have to be intentionally trying to destroy the universe.

Chris Phoenix and Eric Drexler 2004 “Safe exponential manufacturing” Nanotechnology, INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS PUBLISHING V. 15 (2004) 869-872 (Center for Responsible Nanotechnology and Foresight Institute)

The above considerations indicate that a molecular manufacturing system, even if autoproductive, would have little resemblance to a machine capable of runaway replication. The earliest MNT fabrication systems will bemicroscopic, but simplicity and efficiency will favour devices that use specialized feedstocks and are directed by a stream of instructions supplied by an external computer. These systems will not even be self-replicators, because they will lack self-descriptions. As manufacturing systems are scaled up, these same engineering considerations will favour immobile, macroscopic systems of fabricators that again use specialized feedstocks. An autoproductive manufacturing system would not have to gather or process random chemicals. A device capable of runaway replication would have to contain far more functionality in a very small package. Although the possibility of building such a device does not appear to contradict any physical law, a nanofactory simply would not have the functionality required. Thus, there appears to be no technological or economic motive for producing a self-contained manufacturing system with mobility, or a built-in self-description, or the chemical processing system that would be required to convert naturally occurring materials into feedstocks suitable for molecular manufacturing systems. In developing and using molecular manufacturing, avoiding runaway replication will not be a matter of avoiding accidents or mutations, but of avoiding the deliberate construction of something dangerous. Suggestions in fiction (Crichton 2002) and the popular science press (Smalley 2001) that autoproductive nanosystems would necessarily be microscopic, uncontrollable things are contradicted by this analysis. And a machine like a desktop printer is, to say the least, unlikely to go wild, replicate, selforganize into intelligent systems, and eat people.

### Prolif

#### We are already the prolif leader

Bigongiari 12 (U.S. assumes leadership of G8′s non-proliferation bodies Published on [January 25, 2012](http://www.bioprepwatch.com/us_bioterror_policy/u-s-assumes-leadership-of-g8s-non-proliferation-bodies/322874/) by [Jeffrey Bigongiari](http://www.bioprepwatch.com/author/jeffrey_bigongiari/) <http://www.bioprepwatch.com/us_bioterror_policy/u-s-assumes-leadership-of-g8s-non-proliferation-bodies/322874/>) JD

As the head of the G8 in 2012, the United States has assumed leadership of the organization’s three **non-proliferation bodies. The U**nited States now chairs the Non-proliferation Directors Group, the Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, and the Nuclear Safety and Security Group, which will meet throughout the year to develop international nonproliferation objectives among the group’s members. The GP, which was launched at the Kananaskis Summit in 2002, was created initially as a 10 year, $20 billion initiative to support non-proliferation projects in Russia and the former Soviet Union. It has since expanded into additional regions around the world and has extended its mission beyond 2012. It now includes projects aimed at enhancing biological and radiological security, scientific engagement and U.N. nonproliferation efforts.

#### No cascade of proliferation – its all alarmist rhetoric

Muthia Alagappa, pub. date: 2008, Distinguished Senior Fellow, East-West Center, “The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia,” accesed: 1-6-09, p. 521-2, Google Books

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventative action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India’s and Pakistan’s nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran’s quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country’s security concerns about the U ntiedStates and Tehran’s regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S.-Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in it’s political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country’s decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. Through appealing, the domino theory is not predictive; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that sub region (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

#### IFR’s cause prolif

Amory Lovins, American consultant, experimental physicist and 1993 MacArthur Fellow, has been active at the nexus of energy, resources, environment, development, and security in more than 50 countries for 35 years, including 14 years based in England. He is widely considered among the world’s leading authorities on energy, Cofounder, Chairman and Chief Scientist, After two years at Harvard, Mr. Lovins transferred to Oxford, and two years later became a don at 21, receiving in consequence an Oxford MA by Special Resolution (1971) and, later, 11 honorary doctorates of various U.S. and U.K. universities. He has been Regents’ Lecturer at the U. of California both in Energy and Resources and in Economics; Grauer Lecturer at UBC; Luce Visiting Professor at Dartmouth; Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Colorado; Oikos Visiting Professor of Business, U. of St. Gallen; an engineering visiting professor at Peking U.; and 2007 MAP/Ming Professor at Stanford’s School of Engineering., has briefed 21 heads of state, given expert testimony in eight countries and 20+ states, delivered thousands of lectures, and written 31 books and more than 450 papers, In 1980–81 he served on the U.S. Department of Energy’s senior advisory board, and in 1999–2001 and 2006–08, on Defense Science Board task forces on military energy strategy. In 1984 he was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science “for his book Soft Energy Paths and many other noteworthy contributions to energy policy,” in 1988, of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in 2001, of the World Business Academy, ““New” nuclear reactors, same old story,” Rocky Mountain Institute, March 21, 2009, http://www.rmi.org/Knowledge-Center/Library/2009-07\_NuclearSameOldStory

Reprocessing of any kind makes waste management more difficult and complex, increases the volume and diversity of waste streams, increases by several- to manyfold the cost of nuclear fueling, and separates bomb-usable material that can’t be adequately measured or protected. Mainly for this last reason, all Presidents since Gerald Ford in 1976 (except G.W. Bush in 2006– 08) discouraged it. An IFR/pyroprocessing system would give any country immediate access to over a thousand bombs’ worth of plutonium to fuel it, facilities to recover that plutonium, and experts to separate and fabricate it into bomb cores—hardly a path to a safer world.

#### While they may “burn up the material”- IFRs create other proliferation and terrorism risks

Amory Lovins, American consultant, experimental physicist and 1993 MacArthur Fellow, has been active at the nexus of energy, resources, environment, development, and security in more than 50 countries for 35 years, including 14 years based in England. He is widely considered among the world’s leading authorities on energy, Cofounder, Chairman and Chief Scientist, After two years at Harvard, Mr. Lovins transferred to Oxford, and two years later became a don at 21, receiving in consequence an Oxford MA by Special Resolution (1971) and, later, 11 honorary doctorates of various U.S. and U.K. universities. He has been Regents’ Lecturer at the U. of California both in Energy and Resources and in Economics; Grauer Lecturer at UBC; Luce Visiting Professor at Dartmouth; Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Colorado; Oikos Visiting Professor of Business, U. of St. Gallen; an engineering visiting professor at Peking U.; and 2007 MAP/Ming Professor at Stanford’s School of Engineering., has briefed 21 heads of state, given expert testimony in eight countries and 20+ states, delivered thousands of lectures, and written 31 books and more than 450 papers, In 1980–81 he served on the U.S. Department of Energy’s senior advisory board, and in 1999–2001 and 2006–08, on Defense Science Board task forces on military energy strategy. In 1984 he was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science “for his book Soft Energy Paths and many other noteworthy contributions to energy policy,” in 1988, of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in 2001, of the World Business Academy, ““New” nuclear reactors, same old story,” Rocky Mountain Institute, March 21, 2009, http://www.rmi.org/Knowledge-Center/Library/2009-07\_NuclearSameOldStory

IFRs are often claimed to “burn up nuclear waste” and make its “time of concern…less than 500 years” rather than 10,000–100,000 years or more. That’s wrong: most of the radioactivity comes from fission products, including very-long-lived isotopes like iodine-129 and technicium-99, and their mix is broadly similar in any nuclear fuel cycle. IFRs’ wastes may contain less transuranics, but at prohibitive cost and with worse occupational exposures, routine releases, accident and terrorism risks, proliferation, and disposal needs for intermediate- and low-level wastes. It’s simply a dishonest fantasy to claim, as a Wall Street Journal op-ed just did, that such hypothetical and uneconomic ways to recover energy or other value from spent LWR fuel mean “There is no such thing as nuclear waste.” Of course, the nuclear industry wishes this were true.

#### IFR’s won’t draw down fissile material- even if they could be used that way

Green 2009¶ [Jim B.Med.Sci. (Hons.), PhD, honors degree in public health and was awarded a PhD in science and technology studies for his analysis of the Lucas Heights research reactor debates, studies and speaks extensively on nuclear power, national nuclear campaigner, “Nuclear Weapons and 'Generation 4' Reactors,” Friends of Earth Australia, July 2009, http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power-weapons/g4nw/]

IFR advocates propose using them to draw down global stockpiles of fissile material, whether derived from nuclear research, power or WMD programs. However, IFRs have no need for outside sources of fissile material beyond their initial fuel load. Whether they are used to irradiate outside sources of fissile material to any significant extent would depend on a confluence of commercial, political and military interests. History shows that non-proliferation objectives receive low priority. Conventional reprocessing with the use of separated plutonium as fuel (in breeders or MOX reactors) has the same potential to drawn down fissile material stockpiles, but has increased rather than decreased proliferation risks. Very little plutonium has been used as reactor fuel in breeders or MOX reactors. But the separation of plutonium from spent fuel continues and stockpiles of separated 'civil' plutonium − which can be used directly in weapons − are increasing by about five tonnes annually and amount to over 270 tonnes, enough for 27,000 nuclear weapons.¶ IFR advocates demonstrate little or no understanding of the realpolitik imposed by the commercial, political and military interests responsible for, amongst other things, unnecessarily creating this problem of 270+ tonnes of separated civil plutonium and failing to take the simplest steps to address the problem − namely, suspending reprocessing or reducing the rate of reprocessing such that plutonium stockpiles are drawn down rather than continually increasing.

#### Not an existential threat – no overreaction

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p. 232

From this perspective, then, rhetorical declamations insisting that terrorism poses an existential threat are profoundly misguided. And so self-destructive overreactions (like the war in Iraq) which are also encouraging to the terrorists. As Osama bin Laden crowed in 2004: It is easy for us to provoke and bait .... All that we have to do is to send two mujahidin ... to raise a piece of cloth on which is wtitten al-Qaeda in order to make the generals race there to cause America to suffer human, economic, and political losses. Our policy is one -...... of bleeding America to the point of bankruptcy. The terrorist attacks cost al-Qaeda $500,000 while the attack and its aftermath .. inflicted a cost of more than $500 billion on the United States. .... Or perhaps, it is even worse. To the extent that we "portray the terrorist nuclear threat as the thing we fear most," notes Susan Martin, "we ow--. ture the idea that this is what terrorists must do if they want to be taka. ; seriously:'48 Existential bombast can be useful for scoring political points, selling. newspapers, or securing funding for pet projects or bureaucratic expansion. However, it does so by essentially suggesting that, if the terrorists really want to destroy us, all they have to do is hit us with a terrific punch, particularly a nuclear one. Although the attack may not in itself be remotely" enough to cause the nation to cease to exist, purveyors of bombast assure the terrorists that the target country will respond by obligingly destroying itself in anguished overreaction. The suggestion, then, is that it is not ' only the most feared terrorists who are suicidal. As Sageman points out, the United States hardly faces a threat to its existence, because even a nuclear strike by terrorists "will not destroy the nation:' As things stand now, he.. adds, "only the United States could obliterate the United States:'49 Atomic terrorism may indeed be the single most serious threat to the national security of the United States. Assessed in an appropriate context, however, the likelihood that such a calamity will come about seems breathtakingly small. Sensible, cost-effective policies designed to make that probability even lower may be justified, given the damage that can be inflicted by an atomic explosion. But unjustified, obsessive alarmism about the likelihood and imminence of atomic terrorism has had policy consequences that have been costly and unnecessary. Among them are the war in Iraq and the focus on WMD that seduced federal agencies away from due preparation 5o for disasters that have actually happened, such as Hurricane Katrina. Arch-demon Zawahiri once noted that the group only became aware of biological weapons "when the enemy drew our attention to them by repeatedly expressing concerns that they can be produced simply with easily available materials;'5! By constantly suggesting that the United States will destroy itself in response to an atomic explosion, the existential bombast about a terrorist bomb that follows so naturally from decades of atomic obsession encourages the most diabolical and murderous terrorists to investigate the possibility of obtaining one. Fortunately, however, would-be atomic terrorists are exceedingly unlikely to be successful in such a quest, however intense the inspiration and encouragement they receive from the unintentional cheerleaders among their distant enemies.

### Warming

#### IFRs have never been integrated into a power plant and benefits rest on flawed assumptions

Jim Green, B.Med.Sci. (Hons.), PhD, honors degree in public health and was awarded a PhD in science and technology studies for his analysis of the Lucas Heights research reactor debates, studies and speaks extensively on nuclear power, national nuclear campaigner, “Integral Fast Reactors,” Friends of Earth Australia, November 26, 2011, http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power/ifrs, accessed 7-7-2012.

Complete IFR systems don't exist. Blees cites five reactors with some IFR characteristics. Brook gives this summary of the state of development of IFR components: "IFRs are sodium-cooled fast spectrum nuclear power stations with on-site pyroprocessing to recycle spent fuel. Fast spectrum power reactors exist ... Indeed, even sodium-cooled fast reactors (a type of Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor, ALMR), the type an IFR facility would likely use, already exist (others include lead- or gas-cooled). Metallic alloy fuels (uranium-plutonium-zirconium), operating within a reactor, existed, in the Experimental Breeder Reactor II at the Argonne National Laboratory. Just because they are not currently used in any operating nuclear power plant doesn't mean they don't (haven't) existed). The only thing that doesn't currently exist is the full systems design of the integrated plant." In short: \* Fast neutron reactors (breeders) exist but experience is limited and they have had a troubled history (accidents, and their WMD proliferation potential). \* The pyroprocessing and transmutation technologies intended to operate as part of IFR systems are some considerable distance from being mature. See the references below for further discussion. \* South Korea is investigating IFRs but plans to spend the next 18-19 YEARS just to ASSESS their viability. For a properly functioning IFR system, the individual components would need to work and the components would need to be integrated, with potential technical and social obstacles. For example, there's no point having the capacity to irradiate significant quantities of fissile material from outside sources if states and/or nuclear utilities won't surrender fissile material or if IFR operators don't want to irradiate outside sources of fissile material. And its no good overcoming those potential social obstacles if the technology doesn't meet its proponents' expectations. The possibilities are endless, e.g.: \* Pyroprocessing is scrapped in favour of conventional reprocessing. \* IFRs are rolled out in the absence of rigorous international safeguards. \* The potential non-proliferation benefits of IFR are not realised because they are not used to irradiate outside sources of fissile material to any degree. \* IFR proponents envisage each IFR reactor having on-site pyroprocessing (thus minimising transportation of nuclear materials and the attendant risks of accidents, terrorism etc) but one can readily imagine centralised processing facilities being preferred on economic grounds. The MOX plant and the THORP reprocessing plant at Sellafield (UK) provide two recent examples of nuclear plants which have been conspicuous failures despite considerable historical experience with the basic technology, despite the UK's lengthy and extensive experience with many facets of nuclear technology, and despite the UK's relative economic strength and relative technological/industrial strength.

#### IFRs fail – logistics, cost, security issues, theoretically flawed

Amory Lovins, American consultant, experimental physicist and 1993 MacArthur Fellow, has been active at the nexus of energy, resources, environment, development, and security in more than 50 countries for 35 years, including 14 years based in England. He is widely considered among the world’s leading authorities on energy, Cofounder, Chairman and Chief Scientist, After two years at Harvard, Mr. Lovins transferred to Oxford, and two years later became a don at 21, receiving in consequence an Oxford MA by Special Resolution (1971) and, later, 11 honorary doctorates of various U.S. and U.K. universities. He has been Regents’ Lecturer at the U. of California both in Energy and Resources and in Economics; Grauer Lecturer at UBC; Luce Visiting Professor at Dartmouth; Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Colorado; Oikos Visiting Professor of Business, U. of St. Gallen; an engineering visiting professor at Peking U.; and 2007 MAP/Ming Professor at Stanford’s School of Engineering., has briefed 21 heads of state, given expert testimony in eight countries and 20+ states, delivered thousands of lectures, and written 31 books and more than 450 papers, In 1980–81 he served on the U.S. Department of Energy’s senior advisory board, and in 1999–2001 and 2006–08, on Defense Science Board task forces on military energy strategy. In 1984 he was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science “for his book Soft Energy Paths and many other noteworthy contributions to energy policy,” in 1988, of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in 2001, of the World Business Academy, ““New” nuclear reactors, same old story,” Rocky Mountain Institute, March 21, 2009, http://www.rmi.org/Knowledge-Center/Library/2009-07\_NuclearSameOldStory, accessed 7-7-2012.

As this becomes evident, other kinds of reactors are being proposed instead novel designs claimed to solve LWRs' problems of economics, proliferation, and waste. Even climate-protection pioneer Jim Hansen says these "Generation IV" reactors merit rapid R&D. But on closer examination, the two kinds most often promoted Integral Fast Reactors (IFRs) and thorium reactors reveal no economic, environmental, or security rationale, and the thesis is unsound for any nuclear reactor. Integrated Fast Reactors (IFRs) The IFR a pool-type, liquid-sodium cooled fast-neutron reactor plus an ambitious new nuclear fuel cycle was abandoned in 1994, and General Electric's S-PRISM design in 2003, due to both proliferation concerns and dismal economics. Federal funding for fast breeder reactors halted in 1983, but in the past few years, enthusiasts got renewed Bush Administration support by portraying the IFR as a solution to proliferation and nuclear waste. It's neither. Fast reactors were first offered as a way to make more plutonium to augment and ultimately replace scarce uranium. Now that uranium and enrichment are known to get cheaper while reprocessing, cleanup, and nonproliferation get costlier destroying the economic rationale IFRs have been reframed as a way to destroy the plutonium (and similar transuranic elements) in long-lived radioactive waste. Two or three redesigned IFRs could in principle fission the plutonium produced by each four LWRs without making more net plutonium. However, most LWRs will have retired before even one commercial-size IFR could be built; LWRs won't be replaced with more LWRs because they're grossly uncompetitive; and IFRs with their fuel cycle would cost even more and probably be less reliable. It's feasible today to "burn" plutonium in LWRs, but this isn't done much because it's very costly, makes each kg of spent fuel 7x hotter, enhances risks, and makes certain transuranic isotopes that complicate operation. IFRs could do the same thing with similar or greater problems, offering no advantage over LWRs in proliferation resistance, cost, or environment. IFRs' reprocessing plant, lately reframed a "recycling center," would be built at or near the reactors, coupling them so neither works without the other. Its novel technology, replacing solvents and aqueous chemistry with high-temperature pyrometallurgy and electro refining, would incur different but major challenges, greater technical risks and repair problems, and speculative but probably worse economics. (Argonne National Laboratory, the world's experts on it, contracted to pyroprocess spent fuel from the EBRII a small IFR-like test reactor shut down in 1994 by 2035, at a cost DOE estimated in 2006 at approximately 50× today's cost of fresh LWR fuel.)

#### Assign warming zero percent probability – flawed models and predictions

Craig D. Idso (founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) and Sherwood B. Idso (president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) February 2011 “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path” http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf

As presently constituted, earth’s atmosphere contains just slightly less than 400 ppm of the colorless and odorless gas we call carbon dioxide or CO2. That’s only four-hundredths of one percent. Consequently, even if the air's CO2 concentration was tripled, carbon dioxide would still comprise only a little over one tenth of one percent of the air we breathe, which is far less than what wafted through earth’s atmosphere eons ago, when the planet was a virtual garden place. Nevertheless, a small increase in this minuscule amount of CO2 is frequently predicted to produce a suite of dire environmental consequences, including dangerous global warming, catastrophic sea level rise, reduced agricultural output, and the destruction of many natural ecosystems, as well as dramatic increases in extreme weather phenomena, such as droughts, floods and hurricanes. As strange as it may seem, these frightening future scenarios are derived from a single source of information: the ever-evolving computer-driven climate models that presume to reduce the important physical, chemical and biological processes that combine to determine the state of earth’s climate into a set of mathematical equations out of which their forecasts are produced. But do we really know what all of those complex and interacting processes are? And even if we did -- which we don't -- could we correctly reduce them into manageable computer code so as to produce reliable forecasts 50 or 100 years into the future? Some people answer these questions in the affirmative. However, as may be seen in the body of this report, real-world observations fail to confirm essentially all of the alarming predictions of significant increases in the frequency and severity of droughts, floods and hurricanes that climate models suggest should occur in response to a global warming of the magnitude that was experienced by the earth over the past two centuries as it gradually recovered from the much-lower-than-present temperatures characteristic of the depths of the Little Ice Age. And other observations have shown that the rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations associated with the development of the Industrial Revolution have actually been good for the planet, as they have significantly enhanced the plant productivity and vegetative water use efficiency of earth's natural and agro-ecosystems, leading to a significant "greening of the earth." In the pages that follow, we present this oft-neglected evidence via a review of the pertinent scientific literature. In the case of the biospheric benefits of atmospheric CO2 enrichment, we find that with more CO2 in the air, plants grow bigger and better in almost every conceivable way, and that they do it more efficiently, with respect to their utilization of valuable natural resources, and more effectively, in the face of environmental constraints. And when plants benefit, so do all of the animals and people that depend upon them for their sustenance. Likewise, in the case of climate model inadequacies, we reveal their many shortcomings via a comparison of their "doom and gloom" predictions with real-world observations. And this exercise reveals that even though the world has warmed substantially over the past century or more -- at a rate that is claimed by many to have been unprecedented over the past one to two millennia -- this report demonstrates that none of the environmental catastrophes that are predicted by climate alarmists to be produced by such a warming has ever come to pass. And this fact -- that there have been no significant increases in either the frequency or severity of droughts, floods or hurricanes over the past two centuries or more of global warming -- poses an important question. What should be easier to predict: the effects of global warming on extreme weather events or the effects of elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations on global temperature? The first part of this question should, in principle, be answerable; for it is well defined in terms of the small number of known factors likely to play a role in linking the independent variable (global warming) with the specified weather phenomena (droughts, floods and hurricanes). The latter part of the question, on the other hand, is ill-defined and possibly even unanswerable; for there are many factors -- physical, chemical and biological -- that could well be involved in linking CO2 (or causing it not to be linked) to global temperature. If, then, today's climate models cannot correctly predict what should be relatively easy for them to correctly predict (the effect of global warming on extreme weather events), why should we believe what they say about something infinitely more complex (the effect of a rise in the air’s CO2 content on mean global air temperature)? Clearly, we should pay the models no heed in the matter of future climate -- especially in terms of predictions based on the behavior of a non-meteorological parameter (CO2) -- until they can reproduce the climate of the past, based on the behavior of one of the most basic of all true meteorological parameters (temperature). And even if the models eventually solve this part of the problem, we should still reserve judgment on their forecasts of global warming; for there will yet be a vast gulf between where they will be at that time and where they will have to go to be able to meet the much greater challenge to which they aspire

#### No resource wars

Idean Salehyan (Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas) May 2008 “From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet\*” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 45, no. 3 http://emergingsustainability.org/files/resolver%20climate%20change%20and%20conflict.pdf

First, the deterministic view has poor predictive power as to where and when conflicts will break out. For every potential example of an environmental catastrophe or resource shortfall that leads to violence, there are many more counter-examples in which conflict never occurs. But popular accounts typically do not look at the dogs that do not bark. Darfur is frequently cited as a case where desertification led to food scarcity, water scarcity, and famine, in turn leading to civil war and ethnic cleansing.5 Yet, food scarcity and hunger are problems endemic to many countries – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa – but similar problems elsewhere have not led to large-scale violence. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, food shortages and malnutrition affect more than a third of the population in Malawi, Zambia, the Comoros, North Korea, and Tanzania,6 although none of these countries have experienced fullblown civil war and state failure. Hurricanes, coastal flooding, and droughts – which are all likely to intensify as the climate warms – are frequent occurrences which rarely lead to violence. The Asian Tsunami of 2004, although caused by an oceanic earthquake, led to severe loss of life and property, flooding, population displacement, and resource scarcity, but it did not trigger new wars in Southeast Asia. Large-scale migration has the potential to provoke conflict in receiving areas (see Reuveny, 2007; Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006), yet most migration flows do not lead to conflict, and, in this regard, social integration and citizenship policies are particularly important (Gleditsch, Nordås & Salehyan, 2007). In short, resource scarcity, natural disasters, and long-term climatic shifts are ubiquitous, while armed conflict is rare; therefore, environmental conditions, by themselves, cannot predict violent outbreaks. Second, even if local skirmishes over access to resources arise, these do not always escalate to open warfare and state collapse. While interpersonal violence is more or less common and may intensify under resource pressures, sustained armed conflict on a massive scale is difficult to conduct. Meier, Bond & Bond (2007) show that, under certain circumstances, environmental conditions have led to cattle raiding among pastoralists in East Africa, but these conflicts rarely escalate to sustained violence. Martin (2005) presents evidence from Ethiopia that, while a large refugee influx and population pressures led to localized conflict over natural resources, effective resource management regimes were able to ameliorate these tensions. Both of these studies emphasize the role of local dispute-resolution regimes and institutions – not just the response of central governments – in preventing resource conflicts from spinning out of control. Martin’s analysis also points to the importance of international organizations, notably the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in implementing effective policies governing refugee camps. Therefore, local hostilities need not escalate to serious armed conflict and can be managed if there is the political will to do so. Third, states often bear responsibility for environmental degradation and resource shortfalls, either through their own projects and initiatives or through neglect of the environment. Clearly, climate change itself is an exogenous stressor beyond the control of individual governments. However, government policies and neglect can compound the effects of climate change. Nobel Prizewinning economist Amartya Sen finds that, even in the face of acute environmental scarcities, countries with democratic institutions and press freedoms work to prevent famine because such states are accountable to their citizens (Sen, 1999). Others have similarly shown a strong relationship between democracy and protection of the environment (Li & Reuveny, 2006). Faced with global warming, some states will take the necessary steps to conserve water and land, redistribute resources to those who need them most, and develop disaster-warning and -response systems. Others will do little to respond to this threat. While a state’s level of income and technological capacity are certainly important, democracy – or, more precisely, the accountability of political leaders to their publics – is likely to be a critical determinant of how states respond to the challenge. Fourth, violent conflict is an inefficient and sub-optimal reaction to changes in the environment and resource scarcities. As environmental conditions change, several possible responses are available, although many journalists and policymakers have focused on the potential for warfare. Individuals can migrate internally or across borders, or they can invest in technological improvements, develop conservation strategies, and shift to less climate-sensitive livelihoods, among other adaptation mechanisms. Engaging in armed rebellion is quite costly and risky and requires large-scale collective action. Individuals and households are more likely to engage in simpler, personal, or smallscale coping strategies. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the individual level. But, more importantly, armed violence against the state is used as a means to gain leverage over governments so as to gain some form of accommodation, namely, the redistribution of economic resources and political power. Organized armed violence rarely (if ever) arises spontaneously but is usually pursued when people perceive their government to be unwilling to listen to peaceful petitions. As mentioned above, rebellion does not distribute resources by itself, and protracted civil wars can have devastating effects on the economy and the natural environment, leaving fewer resources to bargain over. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the collective level. Responsive, accountable political leaders – at all levels of government – are more likely to listen to citizen demands for greater access to resources and the means to secure their livelihoods. Political sensitivity to peaceful action can immunize states from armed insurrection.

# 2NC

## T

### 2NC Grammar DA

#### ‘for energy production’ is an adjectival phrase- it must modify the financial incentive

Rozakis 2003 [Laurie E. Rozakis, Ph.D. Excerpted from The Complete Idiot's Guide to Grammar and Style © 2003 “Prepositional Phrases: The Big Daddy of Phrases” http://www.infoplease.com/cig/grammar-style/prepositional-phrases-big-daddy-phrases.html]

When a prepositional phrase serves as an adjective, it's called an adjectival phrase. (That was a no-brainer, eh? Who says you don't get a break in this English biz?)¶ An adjectival phrase, as with an adjective, describes a noun or a pronoun. Here are some examples:¶ The manager with the pink slips terrorized the employees.¶ The adjectival phrase “with the pink slips” describes the noun “manager.”¶ The price of the promotion was much too steep.¶ The adjectival phrase “of the promotion” describes the noun “price.”¶ Something in the corner of the desk was moving.¶ The adjectival phrase “in the corner” describes the noun “something”; the adjectival phrase “of the desk” describes the noun “corner.”

#### Grammar is a prerequisite to clash and creativity

**Leahy, 2005** (Anna Leahy, assistant professor at North Central College and award winning poet, Pedagogy; Vol. 5 Issue 2, p304-308, 5p, “Grammar Matters: A Creative Writer’s Argument” Spring, EBSCO)

Wallace Stegner (2002: 64–65), in On Teaching and Writing Fiction, notes, “Whether dismembered syntax has sprung from ignorance or from the lust after originality, I believe it should be questioned. After all, all a reader knows is the marks on the printed page. Those marks have to contribute meaning.” Like Stegner, I think commas matter, as do sentence structures that convey, support, or make ironic the meanings of the words themselves. Ursula Le Guin (1998: 33), in Steering the Craft, puts it slightly differently: our standards for writing, including for grammar and syntax, must be higher than in conversation, “because when we read, we don’t have the speaker’s voice and expression and intonation to make half-finished sentences and misused words clear. We only have the words. And, to be clear to as many readers as possible, they have to follow the agreed-upon rules, the shared rules, of grammar and usage.” When a student spells one word as another or misses a comma after an unwieldy clause, we can downplay its importance, having seen enough similar slips to surmise a larger idea. If pointed out to the student, she sometimes asserts, “But you know what I meant.” Do I? Does she want to relinquish control of meaning to me? I draw my references here from creative writers because I come to teaching as a creative writer. This position gives me a strange cachet in the grammar business. After all, if a poet supposedly exuding a spontaneous overfl ow of emotion cares about grammar and syntax, it mustn’t be all stifl ing regulations. So, I opt to quote to my students the likes of Tom Robbins and Stephen King instead of Strunk and White, whose work I appreciate more than I expect my students will. Grammar, according to Kim Addonizio and Dorianne Laux (1997: 171), “sounds stern, forbidding, and worst of all dull. It smacks of the elementary school classroom, of the meaningless dissection of sentences, of onerous burdens laid on the helpless shoulders of children. But if you are really interested in writing poetry, grammar can be something else: a door to rooms you might never otherwise discover, a way to realize and articulate your visions in language.” Knowing and talking about grammar, syntax, and style—recollecting in tranquillity, shall we say—is part of immersing oneself in language as a writer and is the student’s responsibility when using language to convey ideas. And I now see it more clearly as part of my responsibility as a teacher. The creative writer’s approach to grammar, syntax, and style allows me to bring import and enthusiasm to this teacherly responsibility, to assert its power and reward in writing. In Skinny Legs and All, novelist Robbins (1991: 172) includes a scene in which his characters discuss a word used sloppily, in this case neat. Can o’ Beans remarks, “Slang possesses an economy, an immediacy that’s attractive, all right, but it devalues experience by standardizing and fuzzing it. It hangs between humanity and the real world like a . . . a veil. Slang just makes people more stupid, that’s all, and stupidity eventually makes them crazy.” Fair or not, vague, confusing, or inaccurate sentences imply that those undesirable sentence qualities apply to the ideas and, in the world beyond the classroom, to the writer. Grammar and syntax indeed might allow people to articulate, as clearly as possible, the world and, perhaps, to see it clearly as well. As Le Guin notes (1998: 32), “Even with the best intentions, language misused, language used stupidly, carelessly, brutally, language used wrongly, breeds lies, half-truths, confusion.” To be lax with grammar and syntax might both reflect and cause confusion or ignorance.

### 2NC Limits Overview

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

#### Turns their offense—limits are vital to creativity and innovation

David Intrator (President of The Creative Organization) October 21, 2010 “Thinking Inside the Box,” http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities. What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution. This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally. Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

### A2: PTC Limits out Nuke Affs

#### You can make the Nuclear PTC escalate to offset construction costs

NEI, October 2009, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Policies That Support New Nuclear Power Plant Development,” <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/factsheet/policiessupportnewplantdevelopment/>

The production tax credit (PTC) for new nuclear generation (section 1306 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) allows 6,000 megawatts of new nuclear capacity to earn $18 per megawatt-hour for the first eight years of operation. The maximum tax credit for any one plant is capped at $125 million per year. In 2005, $18 per megawatt-hour was comparable to the PTC for renewable resources. However, unlike the renewable PTC, which increases annually with inflation, the nuclear PTC does not escalate. In 2006, the Internal Revenue Service published guidelines for implementing the nuclear PTC program. For a facility to be eligible for credits: The construction and operating license application must be submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Dec. 31, 2008. The plant must be under construction by January 1, 2014. The plant must be operating by January 1, 2021. The 6,000 megawatts of available credits will be divided among eligible facilities on a pro rata basis according to the facilities' nameplate capacities. Although the PTC reduces the cost of the power generated by these new plants once they are up and running, it does little to offset the construction and commissioning risk.

## DA

### Add On

#### Science diplomacy is high now and ineffective for reasons the plan doesn’t address

David **Dickson** Director, SciDev.Net 4 June **2009** The limits of science diplomacy http://www.scidev.net/en/editorials/the-limits-of-science-diplomacy.html

Recently, the Obama administration has given this field a new push, in its desire to pursue "soft diplomacy" in regions such as the Middle East. Scientific agreements have been at the forefront of the administration's activities in countries such as Iraq and Pakistan. But — as emerged from a meeting entitled New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy, held in London this week (1–2 June) — using science for diplomatic purposes is not as straightforward as it seems. Some scientific collaboration clearly demonstrates what countries can achieve by working together. For example, a new synchrotron under construction in Jordan is rapidly becoming a symbol of the potential for teamwork in the Middle East. But whether scientific cooperation can become a precursor for political collaboration is less evident. For example, despite hopes that the Middle East synchrotron would help bring peace to the region, several countries have been reluctant to support it until the Palestine problem is resolved. Indeed, one speaker at the London meeting (organised by the UK's Royal Society and the American Association for the Advancement of Science) even suggested that the changes scientific innovations bring inevitably lead to turbulence and upheaval. In such a context, viewing science as a driver for peace may be wishful thinking.

#### Realism means that science diplomacy fails- states will still prevent effective solutions

David **Dickson** Director, SciDev.Net 4 June **2009** The limits of science diplomacy http://www.scidev.net/en/editorials/the-limits-of-science-diplomacy.html

The truth is that science and politics make an uneasy alliance. Both need the other. Politicians need science to achieve their goals, whether social, economic or — unfortunately — military; scientists need political support to fund their research. But they also occupy different universes. Politics is, at root, about exercising power by one means or another. Science is — or should be — about pursuing robust knowledge that can be put to useful purposes. A strategy for promoting science diplomacy that respects these differences deserves support. Particularly so if it focuses on ways to leverage political and financial backing for science's more humanitarian goals, such as tackling climate change or reducing world poverty. But a commitment to science diplomacy that ignores the differences — acting for example as if science can substitute politics (or perhaps more worryingly, vice versa), is dangerous. The Obama administration's commitment to "soft power" is already faltering. It faces challenges ranging from North Korea's nuclear weapons test to domestic opposition to limits on oil consumption. A taste of reality may be no bad thing.

## Nano

### No solvency

#### Labs aren’t hiring

Brian Vastag, “U.S. pushes for more scientists, but the jobs aren’t there,” Washington Post, July 7, 2012, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/us-pushes-for-more-scientists-but-the-jobs-arent-there/2012/07/07/gJQAZJpQUW_story.html>, accessed 10-22-2012.

But it’s questionable whether those youths will be able to find work when they get a PhD. Although jobs in some high-tech areas, especially computer and petroleum engineering, seem to be booming, the market is much tighter for lab-bound scientists — those seeking new discoveries in biology, chemistry and medicine.¶ “There have been many predictions of [science] labor shortages and . . . robust job growth,” said Jim Austin, editor of the online magazine ScienceCareers . “And yet, it seems awfully hard for people to find a job. Anyone who goes into science expecting employers to clamor for their services will be deeply disappointed.”¶ One big driver of that trend: Traditional academic jobs are scarcer than ever. Once a primary career path, only 14 percent of those with a PhD in biology and the life sciences now land a coveted academic position within five years, according to a 2009 NSF survey . That figure has been steadily declining since the 1970s, said Paula Stephan , an economist at Georgia State University who studies the scientific workforce. The reason: The supply of scientists has grown far faster than the number of academic positions.

## Warming

### No Commercialization

#### Commercial breeder reactors have failed in multiple countries. Shutdowns have prevented any of them from being used at full capacity.

Thomas B. Cochran Ph.D. Senior Scientist, Nuclear Program, NRDC, et al. Harold A. Feiveson, Walt Patterson, Gennadi Pshakin, M.V. Ramana, Mycle Schneider, Tatsujiro Suzuki, Frank von Hippel “Fast Breeder Reactor Programs: History and Status” February 2010 <http://fissilematerials.org/library/rr08.pdf> A research report of the International Panel on Fissile Materials

The history of the world’s only commercial-sized breeder reactor, France’s ¶ Superphénix, is dominated by lengthy shutdowns for repairs (see chapter 2). ¶ Superphénix went critical and was connected to the grid in January 1986 but was ¶ shut down more than half of the time until operations ceased in December 1996. ¶ Its lifetime capacity factor — the ratio of the number of kilowatt-hours that it ¶ generated to the number it could have generated had it operated continually at full ¶ capacity — was less than 7 percent. The histories of Japan’s Monju and the U.K.’s ¶ Dounreay and Prototype Fast Reactors and the U.S. Enrico Fermi 1 demonstration ¶ breeder reactor power plants were similarly characterized by prolonged shutdowns ¶ (see chapters 4, 6 and 7). Russia’s BN-600 has experienced a respectable capacity ¶ factor but only because of the willingness of its operators to continue to operate ¶ it despite multiple sodium fires.

#### Several countries have abandoned commercialization of fast breeders because they have been unreliable.

Thomas B. Cochran Ph.D. Senior Scientist, Nuclear Program, NRDC, et al. Harold A. Feiveson, Walt Patterson, Gennadi Pshakin, M.V. Ramana, Mycle Schneider, Tatsujiro Suzuki, Frank von Hippel “Fast Breeder Reactor Programs: History and Status” February 2010 <http://fissilematerials.org/library/rr08.pdf> A research report of the International Panel on Fissile Materials

¶ Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States have abandoned their ¶ breeder reactor development programs. Despite the arguments by France’s nuclear ¶ conglomerate Areva, that fast-neutron reactors will ultimately fission all the¶ plutonium building up in France’s light-water reactor spent fuel,¶ 18¶ France’s only ¶ operating fast-neutron reactor, Phénix, was disconnected from the grid in March ¶ 2009 and scheduled for permanent shutdown by the end of that year.¶ 19¶ The ¶ Superphénix, the world’s first commercial-sized breeder reactor, was abandoned in ¶ 1998 and is being decommissioned. There is no follow-on breeder reactor planned ¶ in France for at least a decade.

### No Impact

#### No proof of tipping points – we’ve recovered from worse temp increases

Thomas Fuller July 6, 2010. “Global warming, uncertainty, tipping points and the precautionary principle” Environmental Policy Examiner. http://www.examiner.com/environmental-policy-in-national/global-warming-uncertainty-tipping-points-and-the-precautionary-principle

Others are more optimistic, and say that if we act right now, but really right now, we can avoid crossing the line and making permanent changes. They say that because we don't know where the tipping point really is and because we do not know the extent of damage that could be caused by a permanently warmer planet, the Precautionary Principle more or less compels us to take drastic action to fight climate change. There are opposing arguments to this. One of the best arguments against the Precautionary Principle is the error it led us into the last time it was used. Then Vice President Dick Cheney argued that if there was even a 1% chance that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, then it was important to us to invade Iraq, find the weapons and institute regime change. What's important to understand about that is that Cheney was wrong, not because Hussein didn't have WMD. He was wrong in his application of logic. The first step in dealing with this type of situation is reducing the uncertainty in your calculations. For Cheney, this would have meant first, quantifying the type and amounts of WMD Hussein might realistically possess, Hussein's realistic delivery options for WMD, and his propensity to use them. Second, in a Strangelovian way, Cheney would have used existing Pentagon scenarios to calculate the damage to life and the political framework of the Middle East if Husseing used these weapons and compared it very cold-bloodedly to the losses certain to result from our intervention. The problem is Cheney didn't do any of the math. He merely pronounced that Hussein's possible possession of WMD meant that a Tipping Point had already been reached, and that the Precautionary Principle mandated our intervention. But pronouncing it doesn't make it so. There are solid philosophical arguments against both the Tipping Point and the Precautionary Principle, and well-educated and intelligent people on both sides of the fence. And this argument extends to the application of both concepts to climate change. One argument from skeptics is that the Earth has warmed before without reaching a Tipping Point. It may have been warmer than today during Medieval Times, and it certainly has been warmer for most of the period since the end of the last Ice Age. And yet temperatures did eventually decline. In the more remote past, temperatures were dramatically warmer during several periods, but again, temperatures declined. Another argument is that if we rigorously applied the Precautionary Principle to poorly understood phenomena, we would halt all technological progress and innovation. If our society is paralysed by fear of the unknown, we may reject the next invention that might dramatically improve our lives.What disturbs me is that we are willing to discuss in endless detail with incredible amounts of name-calling the causes and effects of global warming, without discussing the validity of using Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle as guiding lights for how we should react. From what I have seen in the popular media, the use of those terms is very Cheney-esque. People mention the existence of Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle and assume that that closes the conversation.

### Resource Wars

#### Water doesn’t drive conflict

Masimba Biriwasha. "Will Water Fuel an Armageddon?" ECO Worldy. 9 July 2008. http://ecoworldly.com/2008/07/09/will-water-fuel-an-armageddon/

There is no consensus among water analysts on whether there will be global wars over water ownership. According to UNESCO, globally there are 262 international river basins: 59 in Africa, 52 in Asia, 73 in Europe, 61 in Latin America and the Caribbean and 17 in North America — overall, 145 countries have territories that include at least one shared river basin. UNESCO states that between 1948 and 1999, there have been 1,831 “international interactions” recorded, including 507 conflicts, 96 neutral or non-significant events and, most importantly, 1,228 instances of cooperation around water-related issues. As a result, some experts argue that the idea of water wars is rather farfetched given the precedent of water cooperation that has been exhibited by many of the countries around the world. “Despite the potential problem, history has demonstrated that cooperation, rather than conflict, is likely in shared basins,” says UNESCO. However, the fact remains that throughout the world water supplies are running dry and the situation is being compounded by inappropriate management of water resources that will likely unravel previous international cooperation around water.

## Prolif

### 2NC UQ

#### No nuclear rensaissance – fukishima

Cooper 11 (NUCLEAR SAFETY AND NUCLEAR ECONOMICS: HISTORICALLY, ACCIDENTS DIM THE PROSPECTS FOR NUCLEAR REACTOR CONSTRUCTION; FUKUSHIMA WILL HAVE A MAJOR IMPACT MARK COOPER, PHD Senior Fellow for Economic Analysis Institute for Energy and the Environment, Vermont Law School December 2011, <http://www.nirs.org/neconomics/Nuclear-Safety-and-Nuclear-Economics-Post-Fukushima.pdf>) JD

The increase in risk associated with the post-accident reviews and the history of cost escalation, before and after accidents will make investors and governments look less favorably on nuclear power. This inclination is compounded by the fact that the cost of new nuclear reactors was highly uncertain before Fukushima (as shown in Exhibit 5). Since the first estimates were put forward by nuclear "Enthusiasts" in an effort to create the impression of a “nuclear renaissance,” cost estimates have increased dramatically and the numbers that were originally hyped to kick off the “renaissance” proved to be far too low. Although the Enthusiasts have since raised their cost projections somewhat, Wall Street analysts still use construction cost projections that are at least 50 percent higher Fukushima will magnify the economic problems that the “nuclear renaissance” faced, which are the very problems that that have plagued nuclear power throughout its history. Nuclear power has always suffered from high cost and continuous cost escalation, high risk and uncertainty. With long lead-times and large sunk costs, nuclear is a very risky investment in an environment filled with ambiguities and competitive alternatives. Thus, new reactors are the antithesis of prudent investment. That is the reason that the “nuclear renaissance” never materialized. Hype and speculation of dozens of projects quickly gave way to a handful that became increasingly dependent on massive public subsidies to move forward. Before Fukushima, the Energy Information Administration, which had been one of the early Enthusiasts, had already conceded that only four reactors would be built over the next two decades. After Fukushima, even that number is in doubt.

### Link Turn

#### Positive prolif effects only happen in the long term- the turn is short term

Pearce 2012 [Fred, for Yale Environment 360, part of the Guardian Environment Network, The Guardian, July 30, “Are fast-breeder reactors the answer to our nuclear waste nightmare?” http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jul/30/fast-breeder-reactors-nuclear-waste-nightmare?newsfeed=true]

The argument about proliferation risk boils down to timescales. In the long term, burning up the plutonium obviously eliminates the risk. But in the short term, there would probably be greater security risks. Another criticism is the more general one that the nuclear industry has a track record of delivering late and wildly over budget — and often not delivering at all.

#### The nations that want to proliferate or sell to proliferators would never give up their stockpiles- the turn is most likely

Green 2009¶ [Jim B.Med.Sci. (Hons.), PhD, honors degree in public health and was awarded a PhD in science and technology studies for his analysis of the Lucas Heights research reactor debates, studies and speaks extensively on nuclear power, national nuclear campaigner, “Nuclear Weapons and 'Generation 4' Reactors,” Friends of Earth Australia, July 2009, http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power-weapons/g4nw/]

The proposed use of IFRs to irradiate fissile materials produced elsewhere faces the familiar problem that countries with the greatest interest in WMD production will be the least likely to forfeit fissile material stockpiles and vice versa. Whatever benefits arise from the potential consumption of outside sources of fissile material must be weighed against the problem that IFRs could themselves be used to produce fissile material for weapons. WMD proliferators won't use IFRs to draw down stockpiles of their own fissile material let alone anyone else's − they are more likely to use them to produce plutonium for nuclear weapons.

#### Reprocessing bad links- IFR’s would be used as an excuse to keep PUREX plants running

Green 2009¶ [Jim B.Med.Sci. (Hons.), PhD, honors degree in public health and was awarded a PhD in science and technology studies for his analysis of the Lucas Heights research reactor debates, studies and speaks extensively on nuclear power, national nuclear campaigner, “Nuclear Weapons and 'Generation 4' Reactors,” Friends of Earth Australia, July 2009, http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power-weapons/g4nw/]

As another example of the potential for attractive theories to turn into problematic outcomes, the fissile material required for the initial IFR fuel loading would ideally come from civil and military stockpiles or from other IFRs − but that fissile material requirement could be used to justify the ongoing operation of enrichment and PUREX reprocessing plants and to justify the construction of new ones.

#### And terrorism

Union of Concerned Scientists, “Nuclear Reprocessing: Dangerous, Dirty, and Expensive,” April 5, 2011, http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_risk/nuclear\_proliferation\_and\_terrorism/nuclear-reprocessing.html, accessed 7-5-2012.

Less than 20 pounds of plutonium is needed to make a simple nuclear weapon. If the plutonium remains bound in large, heavy, and highly radioactive spent fuel assemblies (the current U.S. practice), it is nearly impossible to steal. In contrast, separated plutonium is not highly radioactive and is stored in a concentrated powder form. Some claim that new reprocessing technologies that would leave the plutonium blended with other elements, such as neptunium, would result in a mixture that would be too radioactive to steal. This is incorrect; neither neptunium nor the other elements under consideration are radioactive enough to preclude theft. Most of these other elements are also weapon-usable. Moreover, commercial-scale reprocessing facilities handle so much of this material that it has proven impossible to keep track of it accurately in a timely manner, making it feasible that the theft of enough plutonium to build several bombs could go undetected for years. A U.S. reprocessing program would add to the worldwide stockpile of separated and vulnerable civil plutonium that sits in storage today, which totaled roughly 250 metric tons as of the end of 2009—enough for some 30,000 nuclear weapons. Reprocessing the U.S. spent fuel generated to date would increase this by more than 500 metric tons.

# 1NR

### Turns Case

#### Fiscal cliff key to R&D

Liberto 10-26 [Jennifer Liberto @CNNMoney 10-26-2012 “How Washington politics threatens my job” http://money.cnn.com/2012/10/26/news/economy/fiscal-cliff-science/index.html]

But Young's research could soon be put on ice from Washington politics and the so-called fiscal cliff. The jobs of six lab associates are also at risk.¶ Though the U.S. Department of Defense has promised to fund Young's research, the agency won't release money unless the fiscal cliff is resolved. Congress has to act by December to avoid triggering a massive government spending cuts and tax hikes totaling $7 trillion.¶ Young's story is a microcosm of the fears reverberating through the nation's laboratories, where breakthrough drugs are hatched.¶ "It has put this curtain of dread," said Young, an associate professor at Vanderbilt University Medical Center, who studies stem cells' role in repairing wounds and regeneration in heart disease and cancer. The grant would allow her to test the cell molecules on mice and pigs.¶ Fearing the massive cuts, some government agencies are holding back funding. That's led to a near standstill in research grants, according to scientists and medical lobbying groups.

### A2 No Impact

#### Sequestration wrecks military effectiveness- yellow

Eaglen and O’Hanlon 2012 [Mackenzie Eaglen is a fellow in national security at the American Enterprise Institute. Michael O’Hanlon is senior fellow at Brookings February 24th, 2012 CNN http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/02/24/the-specter-of-sequestration/]

This budget can cannot be kicked down the road. The two of us disagree about the advisability of the first round of budget cuts, as reflected in the new Obama budget. But there is widespread agreement among defense analysts that sequestration would be a nightmare. The implications of yet another round of 10 percent reductions in the military - coming on top of the 10 percent reductions resulting from the August stipulations of the Budget Control Act, yet another 8 to 10 percent that former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates had put in place during the first two years of the Obama administration, and another 20 percent resulting from the gradual winding down of the nation’s wars - would be enormous and dangerous.¶ Simply put, the cuts already baked into the cake and the sequestration that will happen without specific action to reverse it will make it nigh on impossible for the administration to maintain what it rightly considers irreducible strategic requirements for simultaneous military presence, crisis response and warfighting capability in both the Western Pacific/East Asia region as well as the broader Persian Gulf and Middle East.¶ But it’s worse than that. Sequestration will cause its greatest disruptions immediately in early 2013, when mechanistic and severe cuts have to be imposed overnight. The military can adapt to reductions that it sees coming; for all the inefficiencies of the Department of Defense, it is still one of the world’s most competent planning bureaucracies. But this is a whole different kettle of fish: Because spending would have to decline for 2013 based on cuts taking effect only in January, there would be no opportunity to use natural attrition in the force to cut personnel costs, no opportunity to use the natural annual cycle of working with defense industry to restructure contracts and keep alive those weapons programs that are needed and desired, no realistic way to scale back training carefully in a way that saves money yet keeps the military ready. And all this would happen at a time when the president’s new budget anticipates we will still have 68,000 troops in harm’s way in Afghanistan.¶ The military’s warfighting budgets would, in theory, remain untouched, but the entire institution that supports our fighting men and women would be left teetering on the brink of peril not seen since Vietnam and the immediate post-Vietnam years. The accomplishments of the last 30 years of building the world’s finest military would be at risk based on a law cobbled together in a few weeks one Washington summer that was never intended to take effect even by its proponents.¶ How do you slash 10 percent in an organization as large as the military overnight? The types of choices available are all ugly. The President could choose to cut military and civilian pay by up to 15 percent immediately (military health care costs will be hard to cut, so salaries must bear the costs disproportionately); he could chop retirement payouts; or he could cut funds for major weapons systems by up to 20 percent (as legal penalties for making unexpected cuts to contracts will cost money, too). Actually he may have to do all three.¶ Other options include nickel-and-diming combatant commanders, cutting back their training and operating budgets by up to a quarter since these are among the only accounts that can be easily accessed when immediate saving are needed. And of course, the President will be required to make these choices at just the moment we are supposedly trying to signal Iran, North Korea, and China that the United States remains as firmly committed to our interests and allies as ever.¶ Some will suggest that these choices are exaggerations or worst case scenarios to make a case. But the reality is there are no secret pots of money, trust funds, or bailout resources from which the savings can otherwise be found.

### A2 No ME War

#### War spread regionally – everything is so interconnected that conflicts explode

The Age 9/24/2007 “Tempers must remain cool as the Middle East heats up”, http://www.theage.com.au/news/editorial/tempers-must-remain-cool-as-the-middle-east-heats-up/2007/09/23/1190486129857.html

THE torturous road to peace in the Middle East becomes more excruciating every day and the cumulative effect of events in the region over the past week offer little hope for any reduction in what appear to be increasingly flammable tensions. If anything, the talk now is of war. The match that lights the flame may well be last Thursday's assassination of Lebanese MP Antoine Ghanem, a violent murder that pitched his divided nation further into turmoil. His death was the latest in a string of attacks against prominent critics of Lebanon's neighbour and former powerbroker Syria, the most notable being the 2005 killing of former prime minister Rafiq Hariri. Mr Ghanem's death introduces an unwelcome element of instability ahead of tomorrow's crucial presidential elections, especially if an anti-Syrian candidate is elected. More importantly, any instability could fan the flames of civil war in a country that has been a pivotal test-run for democracy in the region since September 11, 2001. The killing has been widely condemned by the international community and the finger pointed, once again, at Syria, and by implication its ally, Iran. Syria has, somewhat ingenuously, denied any involvement, as it has with the other high-profile assassinations of anti-Syrian leaders in Lebanon. Calls have been made for UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to launch an international probe into the bombing, and this should be carried out with haste. Talk of war further intensified after the deputy commander of Iran's air force, General Mohammad Alavi, announced that Iran had already prepared a plan to attack Israel if it bombed his country. This war of words was further escalated when a senior commander of Iran's Revolutionary Guard chose to outline the capability of his country's ballistic missiles, which he threatened to use on American targets in the Middle East. These threats coincide with growing international pressure on Iran to abandon what is regarded by the West, and particularly by the US, as its clandestine nuclear arms program. The French also added fuel to the fire when Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner warned the world to "prepare for the worst and the worst is war". The head of the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohamed ElBaradei, quickly entered the fray and warned against the use of force against Iran, a move UN officials described as an "out of control" drift to war. This pointed admonition coincides with a string of reports emanating from Washington that the Bush Administration is running out of patience with diplomacy and is intensifying its plans for air strikes against Iran. The events in Lebanon and the debate over Iran run parallel with Israel's declaration of the Gaza Strip as "hostile territory" and Israeli opposition leader Benjamin Netanyahu's confirmation that two weeks ago Israel carried out an air attack deep inside Syria, Iran's only Arab ally, on a site that it believed was being equipped for nuclear development by North Korea. Another suggestion is that the target was Iranian weapons destined for Lebanon's Hezbollah. There has also been speculation that the raid served as a "dry run" for a possible Israeli or US attack on Iran. Meanwhile, US efforts to ensure the success of a Middle East peace conference, planned for November, remain mired in political haggling over what is to be brought to the negotiating table. In the Middle East, every event, every tension, is connected to another, more so since the Iraq war, and it is this very mutuality that can make one act, such as the murder of a Lebanese MP, have dangerous consequences for the region as a whole. The Middle East is now overheated and potentially explosive, and Australia must impress upon its allies that, in a part of the world where every action can easily be met with a disproportionate reaction, there is more mileage in diplomacy than in any military solutio

#### Goes nuclear

Yair Evron, Professor of International Relations at Tel Aviv University, ISRAEL’S NUCLEAR DILLEMA, 1994, p. 123-4

The potential risks involved in the functioning of the superpowers’ C3 may recur in the Middle East and, in some cases, with apparently greater intensity. The probability of erroneous decisions is therefore higher. These factors center on technical failures of warning systems, or the combination of technical failure and human error, deriving from misperception of the enemy’s behavior. There also exist processes of escalation that are totally distinct from technical failure, and which derive exclusively from human error. The latter case is most often the function of the erroneous interpretation of various enemy actions. These factors are liable to yield disastrous outcomes. The outcomes can be divided into two major categories of events: misperception of an enemy action that is mistakenly understood as a conventional or nuclear attack on the state’s nuclear bases or on the state in its entirety. Such a misperception could cause a rapid escalation. The second category comprises the escalation from a conventional war to the use of nuclear weapons. The persistence of intense conflicts in the Middle East will of course contribute to the potential danger of misperceptions. Hence, for example, if the Arab-Israeli peace process fails to advance and in particular were the situation to return to the level of conflict that preceded the Egyptian-Israeli peace agreement, the intensity of the conflict could reinforce the potential for errors of perception among decision-makers. A high level of conflict tends to promote the tendency of decision-makers to view the other side’s actions with great concern.

### Uniqueness

#### Major deal will happen- Obama is bringing everyone together

Wall Street Journal 11-8 [Wall Street Journal 11-8-2012 “Focus Shifts to 'Fiscal Cliff'” NAFTALI BENDAVID, DAMIAN PALETTA and DAVID WESSEL http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323894704578105260044138592.html]

To tackle the fiscal cliff, Mr. Obama is expected to initiate a new round of talks with leaders of Congress. The goal would be a "grand bargain" combining higher taxes and money-saving changes to federal benefit programs.¶ "If there's a mandate in yesterday's results, it's a mandate to find a way for us to work together," House Speaker John Boehner said Wednesday. "My message today is not one of confrontation but of conviction."¶ The White House said Mr. Obama called all the four top congressional leaders late Tuesday night after he knew he had won—reaching two of them then, and connecting with the other two Wednesday morning—and asked them to "put aside their partisan interests and work with common purpose." In a post-midnight victory speech, the president identified "reducing our deficit" and "reforming our tax code" as among his top priorities.¶ Republicans noticed, approvingly, that neither he nor top congressional Democrats repeated Mr. Obama's campaign insistence on raising marginal-income tax rates on the top 2% of Americans, a proposal Republicans reject.¶ ¶ The president's Senate nemesis, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, also extended a hand. "The American people…gave President Obama a second chance to fix the problems that even he admits he failed to solve during his first four years," he said. "To the extent he wants to move to the political center…we'll be there to meet him half way."

#### Obama’s PC

Healey 11-9 [Jon Healey 11-9-2012 LA Times “President Obama talks tough on the fiscal cliff” http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-obama-talks-tough-on-fiscal-cliff-20121109,0,4421577.story]

Obama actually went a bit further than his Republican counterparts in trying to ratchet up the political pressure. He noted that everyone's taxes are slated to rise in January; the only disagreement between Republicans and Democrats is whether to raise rates for individuals earning more than $200,000 and couples earning more than $250,000.¶ "Now, fortunately, we shouldn’t need long negotiations or drama to solve that part of the problem," Obama said. Noting that the Senate has already passed a bill to continue the Bush-era tax cuts for everyone except those higher-income households and small businesses, Obama said, "All we need is action from the House. And I’ve got the pen ready to sign the bill right away. I'm ready to do it."¶ The president knows full well that Republicans aren't about to step into that trap; renewing the tax cuts for the middle class eliminates much of the negotiating leverage they might have for continuing the tax cuts for the upper incomes.¶ Boehner wasted little time putting a match to that proposal:¶ “The increased tax rates that would be allowed under the Senate-passed bill are part of the fiscal cliff that economists are warning us to avoid," the speaker said. "Those increased tax rates will destroy jobs in America by hurting small businesses across the country. Republicans are eager to get to work on an agreement that averts the entire fiscal cliff."¶ Still, Obama made clear Friday that he's not backing away from his campaign pledge to seek a "balanced" solution to the deficit that cuts spending and wrings more tax dollars from high-income Americans.¶ "That’s how we did it in the 1990s, when Bill Clinton was president," Obama said. "That’s how we can reduce the deficit while still making the investments we need to build a strong middle class and a strong economy. That’s the only way we can still afford to train our workers, or help our kids pay for college, or make sure that good jobs in clean energy or high-tech manufacturing don’t end up in countries like China....¶ "And I just want to point out this was a central question during the election. It was debated over and over again. And on Tuesday night, we found out that the majority of Americans agree with my approach."¶ Bear in mind that Boehner had doubled down Friday morning on his opposition to raising tax rates on anybody, including high-income "job creators." But these are just opening offers. Even with the government slated to reach the fiscal cliff on Jan. 1, it's too early for either side to make any real concessions.¶ And besides, the positions taken by each side, as far apart as they may seem, still have some overlap.¶ As The Times' editorial board observed Friday, the GOP's opening offer rules out only tax rate increases, not revenue increases achieved through tax "reform." In other words, Republicans explicitly left on the table the possibility of having high-income households pay more by eliminating some of the deductions, exemptions and other preferences that lower their tax bills.

#### Momentum

CBS Money Watch 11-8 [CBS Money Watch 11-8-2012 “Biden: Dems ready to compromise on 'fiscal cliff'” http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505245\_162-57546858/biden-dems-ready-to-compromise-on-fiscal-cliff/]

Biden's comments came as House Speaker John Boehner offered Wednesday to pursue a deal with Obama that would include increased revenues to help reduce the nation's staggering debt and put its finances in order. House Republicans want Obama to make good on a "balanced approach" that would including spending cuts and address government social benefit programs, Boehner said.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid also said he wants a quick solution to the so-called fiscal cliff, a one-two punch of expiring tax cuts and across-the-board spending cuts to the Pentagon and domestic programs that could total $800 billion next year.¶ With the election over, Biden said he is optimistic a deal can be reached. "I think we can do something on corporate taxes sooner than later. That would be positive, be a little confidence-building," he said.¶ While the president and Congress have been gridlocked for nearly two years, Biden said he thinks the election results mean that "the fever will break" in Washington. "And you know, Barack's re-elected, so this sort of (GOP) cause to keep a second term from happening" is over, Biden said. Obama "is there for four years."

### Thumpers

#### Fiscal cliff is before all that shit

Klein 11-8 [Ezra Klein 11-8-2012 “Wonkbook: The election is over. Now the fiscal cliff begins.” New York Times http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/11/08/wonkbook-the-election-is-over-now-the-fiscal-cliff-begins/]

25 problems for the second term: The postal service, the farm bill, cybersecurity, etc..

But the ‘fiscal cliff’ looks to be the first priority. ”The day after a hard-fought election that left Barack Obama in the White House and control of Congress divided between the two parties, the nation’s political leaders promised to try to avoid year-end spending cuts and tax increases that threaten to push the U.S. back into recession…But the pressure is on. Deep, automatic federal-spending cuts and tax increases—a combination widely known as the ‘fiscal clif’–will hit in January unless Mr. Obama and Congress agree to some other way to reduce the budget deficit….Going over the cliff, economists say, would not only risk another recession, but would intensify anxiety about the dysfunction of the U.S. political system…To tackle the fiscal cliff, Mr. Obama is expected to initiate a new round of talks with leaders of Congress. The goal would be a ‘grand bargain’ combining higher taxes and money-saving changes to federal benefit programs.” Naftali Bendavid, Damian Paletta, and David Wessel in The Wall Street Journal.

#### Hold their evidence to a high threshold- Issues don’t cost PC until the finish line- If they can’t cite a bill and a scheduled vote then discount them

**Drum 2010** (Kevin Drum, 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.

### A2 Stopgap

#### Punting fiscal cliff doesn’t solve economy

Lipschutz 2012 (Neal Lipschutz, August 22, 2012, “Even if ‘Fiscal Cliff’ Gets Resolved, Outlook Is Anemic,” Wall Street Journal, http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2012/08/22/even-if-fiscal-cliff-gets-resolved-outlook-is-anemic/)

The most distressing aspect of the Congressional Budget Office’s outlook for 2013 isn’t the fact that the U.S. economy will fall into recession if the ‘fiscal cliff’ of looming tax increases and spending cuts becomes reality.¶ Various worthies, including Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, already have told us there would be another recession if, as current law dictates, tax rates that have been in effect since the Bush administration ratchet up and are joined by about $100 billion in federal government spending reductions.¶ If allowed to transpire, at least we’d take a nice chunk out of the annual budget deficit. No, the most distressing aspect of the report by the nonpartisan CBO, released Wednesday, is that it forecasts that even if we don’t dive off the “fiscal cliff” — and optimists believe even a divided Congress won’t allow that to happen — we still will experience anemic growth in 2013.¶ CBO, in an “alternative fiscal scenario” took a stab at what the economy would look like if all the “fiscal cliff’ stuff doesn’t happen: Tax rates would generally stay the same, the $100 billion in cuts in defense and elsewhere would be sidestepped. It would be business as usual in Washington.¶ For one thing, of course, the budget deficit remains around $1 trillion in 2013, well above what would be the 2013 overspend if the economically constricting tax hikes and budget cuts kicked in.¶ More important, in the CBO’s view, avoiding the “fiscal cliff” results in real gross domestic product growth of only 1.7% between the fourth quarter of 2012 and the fourth quarter of 2013. And the unemployment rate would stand at an unhealthy 8% or so when 2013 comes to a close.¶ Wow.¶ Coincidentally Wednesday, the Fed released minutes of its latest monetary policy meeting, held July 31-Aug. 1.¶ In a quote that provides further indication that the central bank is fairly itching to add more monetary stimulus in a low growth, low inflation environment, the minutes state:¶ “Many members judged that additional monetary accommodation would likely be warranted fairly soon unless incoming information pointed to a substantial and sustainable strengthening in the pace of the economic recovery.”¶ With fiscal policy, at best, only capable of avoiding being a severe drag, the Fed remains the only economic policy player around. Under Mr. Bernanke, the Fed has shown an inclination toward action.¶ Trouble is, with short rates already essentially stuck at zero (since December 2008) and longer interest rates and mortgage rates already super low, further Fed action is unlikely to have a big positive impact on the economy.¶ On New Year’s Eve 2012, the realistic celebratory toast might be “1.7, here we come.”

### Nuclear Power 2NC Generic

#### Nuclear power investment throws off debt deals

Jim Snyder and Brian Wingfield, 2-13-12 reporters for Bloomberg News, “Obama Budget Would Cut $40 Billion In Fossil-Fuel Credits”, February 13th, 2012, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-13/obama-proposes-cutting-40-billion-in-u-s-fossil-fuel-credits.html

The budget would fund research in fossil-fuel energy, primarily for carbon capture and storage programs, at $421 million in 2013, a 21 percent reduction from current spending. Last year, the president requested authority for an additional $36 billion in loan guarantees for nuclear energy, which Congress denied. The budget for 2013 didn’t renew the request. “The 2013 budget does not include any additional loan authority or appropriated credit subsidy as the program will focus on deploying the significant amount of remaining resources appropriated in prior years,” according to the budget document. The coastal oil-producing states of Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, California and Alaska face a $200 million cut in an Interior Department conservation and preservation program to protect fish and wetlands. The six states failed to use about $540 million out of $1 billion provided in 2007-2010, according to the Obama’s budget plan. “States have been slow to obligate funding,” today’s budget proposal said. “In a period of severe fiscal restraint, leaving these unobligated funds in an account where they are not being deployed is no longer defensible.”

#### Post- Fukishima nuclear power is controversial

Economist 2011 [The Economist Mar 24th 2011 “When the steam clears” http://www.economist.com/node/18441163]

America, which leads the world in installed nuclear power, may lead the world in turning away from the technology, too. In 2007 Congress agreed to provide loan guarantees for nuclear power; some 28 applications for new stations have since been filed. Barack Obama pledged in his state-of-the-union address in January 2010 to build a “new generation of safe, clean nuclear power plants”. Even before Fukushima, though, this was looking increasingly unlikely. The recession hit demand. Ever-more-available shale gas brought a cheap and reliable alternative route to domestically fuelled electricity. And the lack of climate legislation meant there was no price on carbon, which would have favoured nuclear power.¶ There are just two new American reactors under construction, neither with full regulatory approval (a third, approved under an earlier system and then put on ice, is also under way). Few in the industry expect many more. Applications for around 20 plants to extend their licences are before the government and requests for 15 more are expected shortly. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already granted them to 64 plants, most recently on March 21st to Vermont Yankee, which is of the same design and vintage as the Fukushima reactors. This similarity has not been lost on the Vermonters trying with renewed vigour to shut it down. Expect more local opposition in years to come.

### Key

#### Obama is key to negotiations on fiscal cliff- he’s reaching out to create compromise now

Hirschfeld Davis and Dorning 11-7 [Julie Hirschfeld Davis and Mike Dorning 11-7-2012 Bloomberg Businessweek “Obama Success on Fiscal Cliff May Hinge on Congress Ties” http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-11-07/obama-success-on-fiscal-cliff-may-hinge-on-better-congress-ties#p1]

President Barack Obama, his re- election victory sealed, is reaching out to congressional leaders to revive bipartisan deficit-reduction negotiations whose failure was a defining disappointment of his first term.¶ His chances of success, say Republicans and Democrats, depend on Obama’s willingness in his second term to build a rapport he has lacked with lawmakers from both parties and take a stronger role than he has to date in steering negotiations on sweeping changes to entitlements, taxes and spending.¶ “He’s simply going to have to take a more active and forceful role,” said Democratic strategist Jim Manley, a former aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada. “He never got involved in the nitty-gritty of the legislative process. In light of the hyper-partisanship that still surrounds Capitol Hill, he’s going to have to change, and he’s going to have to take more of a lead in breaking the logjam.”¶ There are already indications that Obama is ready to do so. The president, who said in his Nov. 6 victory speech that he was “looking forward to reaching out and working with leaders of both parties to meet the challenges we can only solve together,” spoke yesterday by telephone with the top congressional Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate.

### A2: Winners Win

#### Only true for top agenda items.

**Mathews and Todd, 2009** (Chris and Todd, political director at NBC, Hardball, June 22, google)

MATTHEWS: What are the political stakes for Obama get health care passed this year? Does the success of Obama`s presidency ride on it? Chuck Todd is NBC News chief White House correspondent and NBC News political director, as well. Eugene Robinson‘s an MSNBC political analyst, and of course, lest we forget—I never will—Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist for “The Washington Post.” MATTHEWS: Gentlemen, let‘s start and I want to start with Chuck, our guy on the beat. One thing we`ve learned, it seems, from presidents is you better win that first year. Reagan won the first year. Bush won the first year. If you win the first year, you really get it going. If you don`t win on your big issue, your pet project, if you will -- and it`s more important than that -- you really set a standard for defeat and you go down to further losses down the road. Your thoughts on this. CHUCK TODD, NBC CORRESPONDENT/POLITICAL DIRECTOR: Well, no, you`re -- A, you`re absolutely right. And B, it`s, like, people that are familiar with the way Rahm Emanuel thinks on trying to strategize when it comes to a legislative agenda and getting these big things done, you know, this is the lessons he feels like he learned the hard way in that first two years of the Clinton administration, `93, `94, when a lot of their big things went down. Sure, they got their big stimulus package, but they never did get health care. And that is what defines those first two years when you look back on it.

#### Can’t win on energy – proves the link

Matthew N. Eisler, Research Fellow at the Center for Contemporary History and Policy at the Chemical Heritage Foundation, 12 [“Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” Science Progress, April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/]

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital from his energy policy from either the left or the right by the end of his first term. The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy,

but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

### Now

#### Obama has PC and it’s key to the negotiations on fiscal cliff

Keller 11-7 [Bill Keller is an Op-Ed columnist for The New York Times. Prior to this role he was the executive editor of The Times, a role he held since 2003 11-7-2012 “Mo’bama” New York Times http://keller.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/07/mobama/]

Second, Obama knows his only route to the large legacy he craves leads through the more temperate Republicans, and he knows (as a man who voraciously consumes his press reviews) that winning votes requires something he has neglected, working the room. It requires old-fashioned schmoozing and flattery and favors, accompanied by high-minded appeals to the public. My colleague Tim Egan wrote a wonderful blog post yesterday explaining how Obama won the outspoken admiration of New Jersey’s acerbically Republican governor, Chris Christie, not just by delivering flood relief, but by brokering a meet between Governor Christie and his idol, Bruce Springsteen. I’m not sure what this says about Chris Christie, but it suggests Obama is getting some political game.¶ Third, if conciliatory outreach and a few rounds of golf with the majority leader fail, there is that “fiscal cliff.” I’ve proposed before that Obama make it perfectly clear: if the Republicans continue to play stall and sabotage, if they do not respond to genuine offers of a fiscal bargain, he is prepared to let the tax cuts expire

and draconian spending cuts (including defense) kick in automatically at the beginning of the year. It would not take a lot of persuading for the public to blame Congress and – as Obama recently pointed out – voting is the best revenge. Let’s see how the Republicans, who have played their own game of chicken on the debt ceiling, respond when the president’s headlights are bearing down on them.