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#### We meet – their card says loan programs are financial incentives

#### Their card about renewables

#### CI Loan guarantees are financial incentives

Benjamin Boroughs et al, MA from George Washington University in International Affairs, 2012, “Assessing the Value of Loan Guarantees as an Instrument for Supporting the Deployment of New Clean Energy Technology,” Center for International Science and Technology Policy, <http://www.gwu.edu/~cistp/assets/docs/capstone/2012/Loan%20Guarantees%20Capstone%20Project%20Final.pdf>

Renewable energy technologies have the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, enhance energy security, and minimize environmental threats to public health. These technologies remain at a competitive disadvantage compared to mature fossil fuel technologies that enjoy a number of structural advantages which discourage widespread adoption of renewables in the energy market. In order to accelerate the deployment of clean and renewable sources of energy, policymakers have implemented a variety of financial incentives such as tax credits, subsidies, grants, and loan guarantees. Government loan guarantees can encourage private investors to provide capital to projects relying on risky or unproven technologies that may otherwise be unable to secure private funding on their own. However, recent setbacks in the U.S. Department of Energy‘s Loan Guarantee Program make a review of this policy instrument‘s role in the energy sector especially timely. This paper traces the historical development of the federal government‘s use of loan guarantees in general and specifically analyzes the efficacy of this policy tool for promoting the commercialization of new energy technologies. This analysis, based on a literature review and case studies of funded projects, provides a series of recommendations to improve the functionality of existing loan guarantee programs and advance the deployment of clean energy while minimizing financial risks.

#### Key to the topic – only large scale mech – key to 1/6 of the topic other than military smrs

#### Key to check neg generics on things like states

#### They read like 8 off – no ground loss

#### Eval T with reasonability – CI is a race to the bottom

### 2AC Grid Addon

#### Nuclear expansion key to grid stability

Margaret Harding, president of 4Factor Consulting. She has worked in the nuclear industry for more than 30 years and advises clients on quality, regulatory, technical, and business issues within the nuclear industry, 2-8-2012, “Role of nuclear energy in creating smarter US grid networks,” Nuclear Energy Insider, http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/operations-maintenance/role-nuclear-energy-creating-smarter-us-grid-networks

Nuclear consultant, Margaret Harding, offers her insights into how smart grid technologies can boost storage capacity on the already constrained US grid network. She also looks at how nuclear's demand response record could actually help solar projects and overall power stability across the US. By Margaret Harding The concept that smart grids are separate from, and conflict with, traditional grids has been discussed in recent times. A key fact that has to be understood is that the current electricity grid in the US is a demand system. That is, electricity is generated as it is demanded. Very little storage capacity is available on the grid today. This makes electricity generation, transmission and distribution among the most complex systems in the world. This relative inelasticity of the industry is at the heart of the issues of intermittent power supplies and demand response. In the past, electricity supply was generated through means that were fairly well controlled. Baseload was provided by coal, hydro, and nuclear with some natural gas and other sources. Natural gas and some of the older less efficient oil units were used to manage demand with highly responsive systems coming on line as demand increased. Stressed out grid However, with the advent of intermittent power suppliers like wind and solar, and changing load curves due to increasing electricity usage (electric cars, more electrical appliances and equipment), the traditional methods of managing the grid are being significantly stressed. In addition, there are significant losses of electricity occurring in the current US transmission and distribution (T&D) system as well as inflexibility for transmission of electricity across long distances required to use intermittent sources that are generally more available in the west at major population and industrial centers in the east. Voltage events, even minor reductions in voltage, have increasingly significant effects on society. With the increased use of computers and sensitive electronics both as stand- alone devices and as a part of equipment used both in industrial and residential applications, we need to find ways to assure the reliability of the grid is as high as possible. What is ‘smart grid’? Smart grid is really about improving the reliability of the overall electricity supply. This entails managing supply as well as demand, but most importantly, the T&D of electricity. By better sensing and prediction of potential issues, including intermittent sources like wind and solar, faults such as transformer failures, or voltage irregularities, and increasing demand, a “smarter grid” will allow various energy sources to work together more effectively with fewer issues reaching the industrial, commercial, and residential consumers of electricity. Where does nuclear fit in? How do nuclear energy facilities contribute to the overall reliability of energy supply? And how can they support some of the other initiatives on the grid? In the US, generation and T&D have been separated in many markets. This separation means that nuclear generators don’t have direct ability to improve the reliability and detection of grid events in the T&D. However, it does not mean that nuclear utilities do not contribute to grid reliability. Nuclear energy tends to be used as base load supply. The reasons for this are primarily economic, though technology does play a role. The economic reasons center around the fact that nuclear is a capital intensive energy source. Because the majority of costs are in the design and construction of the facility, the owners of these plants need to operate them as much as possible to maximize the return on their investments. Nuclear power plants can load follow, but at an efficiency cost in fuel use. Such load-following operation has to be planned for well in advance to assure safe operation of the plant at varying power conditions. Since most utilities want to maximize investment, they are reluctant to plan in advance of intentional operation at other than 100 per cent power. This drive to be base load makes current nuclear energy facilities less an ideal match with wind energy for daily interaction where intermittency is less predictable and peak availability tends to occur in early morning hours when demand is low. In a more seasonal evaluation, most nuclear plants target outages for spring and fall, both periods when wind is more reliably available and seasonal demand tends to be lower. Nuclear solar combo Nuclear and solar, however, can work together in some interesting and more optimal ways. Because solar is tied to hours of daylight and tends to peak at midday when demand is starting to rise to peak as well, nuclear and solar can work as baseload and peak demand response very effectively. In addition, nuclear load-following is best used when a predictable pattern of reduced power and increased power can be used. As solar tends to be more predictable in its cyclical availability, nuclear energy fuel planning can be designed to work in concert with these arrays, should the amount of solar power being generated exceed demand. Solid base of reliable power Aside from nuclear’s direct interaction with intermittent sources, nuclear power plants can have their own impact on grid reliability. Responding to a loss of 1000 MW or more of electricity during peak demand periods can risk cascading failures if unexpected plant trips occur during operation. Nuclear utilities have worked to continue to improve the reliability of these machines, with capacity factors moving into the 90% range and providing a solid base of reliable power. Unplanned reactor outages have become increasingly rare and allow grid operators to rely on nuclear energy for base load demand. In addition, nuclear utilities have increased the robustness of their facilities to withstand loss of power events. By ensuring that the facilities will be available even during severe weather events, or that they can get back online quickly in the event of grid damage, nuclear energy facilities serve as anchor points in regional grid structures that can keep power delivery to consumers.

#### Grid vulnerability allow China to launch cyberattacks and invade Taiwan

Derene 9

(Glenn – Defense Analyst @ Popular Mechanics, “How Vulnerable is U.S. Infrastructure to a Major Cyber Attack?” October 1, 2009, http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military/4307521)

The next world war might not start with a bang, but with a blackout. An enemy could send a few lines of code to control computers at key power plants, causing equipment to overheat and melt down, plunging sectors of the U.S. and Canadian grid into darkness. Trains could roll to a stop on their tracks, while airport landing lights wink out and the few traffic lights that remain active blink at random. In the silence and darkness, citizens may panic, or they may just sit tight and wait for it all to reboot. Either way, much of the country would be blind and unresponsive to outside events. And that might be the enemy's objective: Divert America's attention while mounting an offensive against another country. Pentagon planners have long understood the danger of cyber attacks on U.S. military networks. Indeed, the Defense Department's Global Information Grid is one of the most frequently targeted computer networks on Earth. But the cat-and-mouse game of information espionage on military networks is not the only digital threat that keeps national-security experts up at night. There is a growing concern over the vulnerability of far more tangible assets essential to the economy and well-being of American citizens. Much of the critical infrastructure that keeps the country humming--water-treatment facilities, refineries, pipelines, dams, the electrical grid--is operated using a hodgepodge of technologies known as industrial control systems. Like banks and telecommunications networks, which are also generally considered critical infrastructure, these industrial facilities and utilities are owned by private companies that are responsible for maintaining their own security. But many of the control systems in the industrial world were installed years ago with few or no cyber-security features. That wasn't a big problem when these systems were self-contained. But in the past two decades, many of these controls have been patched into company computer networks, which are themselves linked to the Internet. And when it comes to computer security, a good rule of thumb is that any device that is computer-controlled and networked is vulnerable to hacking. Bad-guy hackers pulling the plug on public utilities is a common theme of Hollywood films, including 2007's Live Free or Die Hard, but such scenarios present more than a mere fictional scare to U.S. intelligence officials. According to Melissa Hathaway, cyber-coordination executive for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the list of potential adversaries in a cyber attack is long, ranging from disgruntled employees to criminals to hostile nations. Most experts agree that China and Russia routinely probe our industrial networks, looking for information and vulnerabilities to use as leverage in any potential dispute. James Lewis, a cyber-security expert for the policy think tank Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), says that although cyber warfare couldn't cripple the U.S., it could serve as an effective military tactic. "If I were China, and I were going to invade Taiwan," he says, "and I needed to complete the conquest in seven days, then it's an attractive option to turn off all the electricity, screw up the banks and so on." Could the entire U.S. grid be taken down in such an attack? "The honest answer is that we don't know," Lewis says. "And I don't like that answer."

#### Extinction

Straits Times (Singapore), June 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable.Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.

### 2AC Sequester

#### No link – no controversy

Brad Plumer, writer for Ezra Klein’s Wonkblog at Washington Post, 9-20-2011, “The pseudo-debate over Solyndra ,” Wonkblog, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/post/the-pseudo-debate-over-solyndra/2011/09/20/gIQAyN2hiK\_blog.html

Ever since Solyndra went bankrupt in August, there’s been a pseudo-debate in Washington over loan guarantees for energy projects. It’s a pseudo-debate because neither party really believes that energy should be left to the whims of the free market. The GOP has long backed loan guarantees for nuclear power plants, and, as the New York Times reports today, key Republicans such as Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) have been begging the Energy Department for loans for clean-energy projects in their own districts. In practice, the Solyndra squabble is more about scoring a political hit on the Obama administration than a genuine policy dispute. Still, it’s worth revisiting the underlying question: Why should the federal government back risky energy projects?

#### Winners win

Michael Hirsh, chief correspondent for National Journal, 2-7-2013, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Disads not intrinsic – logical policy maker could do both

#### Obama wont spend PC and he won’t be effective if he does

Jay Cost, staff writer, 2-11-2013, “Obama the Bargainer,” The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/obama-bargainer\_699205.html?page=1

Thus, with the festivities finished and the glow of the inauguration fading, it is fair to ask: Just how powerful will President Obama be in his second term? In other words, how successful will he be at persuading the diverse agents of our government to do what he wants them to do? If the lessons of his first term guide our expectations for the second, then the most likely answer is: not very. At first blush, this assertion might sound absurd. A weak President Obama? Proof of the contrary is in the pudding: The massive stimulus, the health care bill, and financial reform were all epic in their scope and ambition. Surely both left and right agree—whether they celebrate or bemoan the fact—that Obama is a very strong, liberal president. But presidential power—the ability to persuade—has many sources, some external, some internal. The external sources are all reducible to “the political context.” How many seats does the president’s party control in Congress? What is the status of the opposition party? What was the relative strength of the president and his party in the last election? What is his job approval rating? And so on. All of these factors set the boundaries for how easily the president can persuade others. In 2009 and 2010, President Obama enjoyed a very favorable political context. Today, the political context is more favorable to him than it was in 2011, but markedly diminished from the heady days of 2009. So, for instance, President Obama can call for action on “climate change” until he is blue (or, perhaps, green) in the face, but the political environment—including arguably the most conservative House of Representatives since the 1920s—means he lacks the power to make it happen. The internal sources of strength are the president’s political skills, which he deploys in particular circumstances. So the question becomes: How good is he at persuading others, given the political context? If political context is the science of presidential power, quantifiable in electoral results and congressional voting scores, persuasive skill is the art. Here, we must put down the American Political Science Review and pick up Machiavelli’s Prince. As for President Obama’s first term, no other incoming president in recent history had such a surplus of political capital and misused it so terribly. The reason? He lacks important skills that are integral in the exercise of presidential power. All presidents are unique, each possessing or lacking skills useful to a chief executive. Obama is notable in that he has mastered some vital skills better than any recent predecessor, but he exhibits virtually no facility with others. His strengths have been enumerated extensively by a fawning press corps. His favorable coverage is due not only to the media’s ideological commitment to his policy goals, but also to his natural gifts. He awes the press, and many other groups in society, by his very presence. Moreover, he knows he has this power over them. This ability, more than any other, made him president and remains his single greatest source of power. Yet though he affects some people intensely, he himself seems largely unaffected by others. This helps explain why he has used his speaking ability so unevenly: He is wont to misread people, and therefore situations. His Tucson speech, for instance, after the shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, was a political stroke of genius. He intuited what the moment called for and delivered it perfectly. By contrast, his 2009 speech to the International Olympic Committee pitching Chicago was a waste of time and made him look small. Similarly, he has time and again left business leaders feeling nonplussed, inviting them to the White House mainly to serve as window dressing for another teleprompter performance. It is on Capitol Hill that Obama seems most out of touch with his audience. In particular, he does not understand what the key players in Congress expect, yet he is convinced he knows them better than they know themselves. What’s more, he gives little and inconsistent guidance as to what he expects from them. That goes for both Republicans and Democrats. For Republicans, the warning signs appeared early, on the stimulus bill passed in the president’s first month in office. Obama and his team were supremely confident that they could get a $900 billion package through Congress with solid Republican support, so much so that when House minority whip Eric Cantor warned that they would receive no backing from House Republicans, they told him not to embarrass himself with such an absurd prediction. Team Obama failed to anticipate how turned off the congressional GOP would be by the spending side of the package: Democratic appropriators were unloading a wish list that had accumulated during more than a decade of Republican governance. The White House also thought the Republicans would be attracted to the tax cuts that constituted roughly one-third of the package. But the White House did not understand how Republicans view taxes—specifically, the difference between tax credits, which the stimulus favored heavily, and rate cuts, which Republicans prefer. None of this should have come as a surprise to anyone who had done any homework on the congressional GOP. After all, Republicans killed a 1993 stimulus bill that was qualitatively similar, but less than a tenth the size of the 2009 package. What did Team Obama surmise when its predictions fell flat? It certainly did not take time to gauge the congressional GOP more carefully, to build a more nuanced picture of Republicans’ motives and expectations. Instead, it adopted the cartoonish caricature one finds in a Paul Krugman column: Republicans are contemptible knaves, willing to let the economy go down the drain to embarrass the president. The stimulus also featured another theme of presidential-congressional relations under Obama: mixed messages from the White House. Early in the negotiations over the bill, President Obama told House minority leader John Boehner and Cantor that he was interested in their ideas. He did not want to play partisan games; he just wanted to jump-start the economy. Yet when Cantor presented the president a list of suggestions, Obama brought the dialogue to an icy conclusion by infamously declaring, “I won, so I think I trump you on that.” During the deliberations on the bill, the president’s chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, was known to respond to other GOP suggestions by shouting, “We have the votes. F— ’em!” For the first two years of Obama’s tenure, congressional Republicans did not register with the White House at all. Contact was so sparse that when the GOP took control of the House of Representatives, the White House did not even have Boehner’s cell phone number so the president could place a congratulatory call. The case of Michigan Republican Dave Camp is illustrative. According to Bob Woodward in The Price of Politics, The administration’s approach to Congress was different from what he was used to. He had first come to Washington as a congressional staffer during the Reagan administration. Reagan had deployed administration liaisons all over Congress. Camp could remember Reagan getting on the phone with a lowly freshman congressman to discuss legislation. .  .  . During Obama’s first two years in office, Camp was the ranking Republican on the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee. He was one of the more politically moderate House Republicans. Yet the administration’s Hill staff didn’t even seem to know who he was. He never saw them. During the debt ceiling battle of 2011, the president again exhibited cluelessness about the motivations of congressional Republicans. Precious time during the month of July was wasted as Obama insisted again and again on decoupling the Bush-era tax cuts, making permanent the cuts for those making under $250,000, and letting the cuts in the high-end rates expire. His argument was that the congressional GOP could avoid the wrath of Grover Norquist because it would not actually have to vote to increase taxes. It seemed never to cross his mind that tax rate increases such as he was proposing were anathema to congressional Republicans. The bigger problem during the debt ceiling fight, and probably the biggest contributor to the near-default of the country that summer, was Obama’s failure to heed Boehner’s warning that $800 billion in additional tax revenue was his “red line,” above which he could not go. The justification for that figure was that it was all that could be squeezed out of tax reform (and even that was optimistic according to many analysts); beyond that, tax rates would have to be raised in order to bring in more revenue. In late July, after Boehner had made a “grand bargain” offer that included $800 billion in new revenue, Obama asked for another $400 billion. Memories diverge on exactly who said what—Boehner is convinced Obama said he had to have the extra money, while Obama believes he only suggested it. This ambiguity might have been avoided if Obama had not made the rookie mistake of making such a big request over the phone instead of in person. And, anyway, he should have known not to ask, given Boehner’s previous warnings about his red line. Unsurprisingly, the deal blew up shortly afterwards. It boils down to the difference between listening and waiting to talk. With congressional Republicans, Obama always seems to do the latter. So, once again, he was left disappointed, and once again he assumed the worst of his negotiating partners. He surmised that there were simply too many extreme Tea Party Republicans who were prepared to breach the debt ceiling, and that Boehner lacked control of his caucus. Again, a basic understanding of Republican history would have corrected this notion. Like Newt Gingrich and Denny Hastert before him, Boehner is responsible to a majority of the Republican caucus, which for generations has opposed the kinds of rate increases that $1.2 trillion in new revenue would have required. Not only did Obama fail to listen during the debt ceiling struggle, he consistently sent the other side mixed messages. A case in point: Obama’s demagogic April 2011 speech blasted Paul Ryan’s budget as “leaving seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry” and abandoning “the fundamental commitment this country has kept for generations.” In private, however, Obama had praised Ryan for offering a serious proposal and emphasized that both sides had to avoid scaring the elderly for political points. Worse, he had held a bipartisan summit that very day to encourage the two sides to come together on a plan. Obama’s problems communicating with Congress are not limited to the right side of the aisle. Although Democrats need not worry about White House demagoguery or fret that Obama fails to understand their concerns, he has nevertheless done a poor job of engaging them in dialogue. In particular, the White House has often cut congressional Democrats out of the loop, inhibiting interbranch coordination and angering leaders by what they feel is trampling on their institutional rights. Indeed, the president’s signature achievement—Obamacare—almost did not happen because of this. The process by which the health care bill was written was chaotic, to say the least. At one point five bills were circulating on Capitol Hill, three in the House and two in the Senate. Each differed, sometimes dramatically, in how to expand coverage and how to pay for it. And yet the White House did virtually nothing in 2009 to coordinate these efforts. In fact, White House aides privately thought the final House bill was a liberal fantasy, and they had worked out a deal with medical providers that did not include the so-called public option. Yet the president never came out against that proposal, or any other, for that matter. After multiple calls over the summer of 2009 for President Obama to set some ground rules on what he expected, he gave a speech in early September that, though his aides promised specificity, was once again vague. Finally, in early January, when the two chambers had passed their bills and it came time to work out the finer points, President Obama actually stormed out of a meeting after Nancy Pelosi tartly expressed her frustration with his lack of leadership. It was left to Emanuel to finish the negotiations. Worse, the needless delays due to the lack of presidential leadership sapped public support for the reform effort, led to Scott Brown’s victory in the Senate race in Massachusetts that January, and eventually forced Democrats to pass a gratuitously slipshod and ill-conceived bill that otherwise never would have become law. After the 2010 midterms, House Democrats lost their majority, but not all of their clout. It would have been virtually impossible for Boehner to pass a compromise debt ceiling plan through the House in 2011 without at least some Democratic support, so it was appropriate for Pelosi and her leadership team to be kept in the loop. For a while, they were, but as Boehner and Obama approached a grand bargain, House Democrats were excluded. Amazingly, so was Harry Reid. Any deal would obviously have to bear the imprimatur of the Senate majority leader, yet he was cut out of the final talks. It was only after the New York Times scooped the Boehner-Obama grand bargain that the White House brought Senate Democrats into the loop. Unsurprisingly, they were apoplectic, believing that the deal extracted too little from the congressional GOP, and feeling that they had been ignored. In fact, it was the outrage of the Senate Democrats that prompted the White House to go back to Boehner at the last minute to ask for more tax revenue, scuttling the big deal once and for all. All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure. There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill. In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president’s job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: The reason people put me in this office is people felt that I had connected our current predicaments with the broader arc of American history and where we might go as a diverse and forward-looking nation. And that narrative thread we just lost, in the day-to-day problem solving that was going on. .  .  . What the president can do, that nobody else can do, is tell a story to the American people about where we are and where we need to go. While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices. The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one “actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood.” President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one “in the arena.” What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi’s power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side.

#### Sequestration will happen and Obama wont spend PC

Chris Cillizza, White house reporter, 2-5-2013, “How the sequester became politically inevitable,” WP, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/05/how-the-sequester-became-politically-inevitable/

What does the sequester’s move from close-to-unimaginable to close-to-unavoidable prove? That most basic rule of Washington: The politically easiest path is the one politicians prefer to take. The theory of the sequester was a simple one: By combining the threat of large-scale defense cuts, which Republicans abhor, with large-scale domestic program cuts, which Democrats abhor, Congress and the White House could spur itself into action to addressing the nation’s long term debt and spending issues since the alternative was politically unpalatable. In the third presidential general election debate last October, President Obama, under attack from Mitt Romney about the possibility of the sequester going into effect, stated bluntly: “It will not happen.” Obama was breaking no new ground with that statement. There was almost no one who thought that any Member of Congress would let the sequester go into effect. Then came the fiscal cliff fight in late 2012. While there were all sorts of political machinations and maneuvers during that time, the most important one was that House Speaker John Boehner proved unable to round up the votes to pass a proposal that would have exempted all but those making $1 million or more a year from a tax increase. What the failure of Boehner’s “Plan B” proved is that not voting on something – particularly something that contains a series of politically unpopular things like raising taxes or cutting programs — is a whole heck of a lot easier than voting on it. (The motto of Congress is, to quote Paul Rudd in “Forgetting Sarah Marshall”: “Do less.”) And, all of a sudden, the prospect of the sequester, which requires Congress to — you guessed it — do nothing, didn’t seem all that bad. For Republicans, the sequester accomplished two things simultaneously: 1) it allowed them to avoid voting on (and, therefore, owning) a package that included tax reforms/increases as well as spending cuts and 2) it ensured more than $1 trillion in federal spending. While some elements of the party — John McCain being the most prominent — argued that the sequester would do considerable damage to the military, there seemed (and seems) to be a tacit understanding that letting it simply happen wouldn’t be the worst thing ever. And so, it wasn’t terribly surprising that Boehner pooh-poohed the idea of a short term fix almost as soon as Obama proposed it. “President Obama first proposed the sequester and insisted it become law,” Boehner said in a statement Tuesday. “Republicans have twice voted to replace these arbitrary cuts with common-sense cuts and reforms that protect our national defense…..The president’s sequester should be replaced with spending cuts and reforms that will start us on the path to balancing the budget in 10 years.” It remains to be seen whether Boehner moves off of that negotiating position or if Obama is willing to compromise on what sorts of tax changes would be in his short term proposal. But, make no mistake — the sequester allows politicians to do what comes naturally to them: Blame the other guy for the problem and keep their hands clean(ish). Which is why it still very well may happen.

#### Obama’s pushing gun control – it’s a heavy lift – drains PC

Joan Walsh, writer for Salon, 2-5-2013, “Obama’s gutsy gun control push” http://www.salon.com/2013/02/05/obamas\_gutsy\_gun\_control\_push/

Second-term Barack Obama continues to show us he’s wiser and tougher than the guy who took office four years ago. The latest sign is his stance on his gun control agenda. In Minneapolis on Monday, he laid out everything he intends to push for, not merely pushing criminal background checks and tougher penalties for gun trafficking, but also the part of his plan that will be the heaviest lifting: an assault weapons ban. This is what many liberals have hoped to see since his earliest political battles in 2009, going all the way back to the initial stimulus skirmishes: a president who tells the American people what he thinks will solve our problems, and who fights for those solutions, who demands congressional votes even on the most controversial agenda items – and who may, down the road, be forced to compromise on some of those priorities, only to fight for them another day. Obama’s speech came in the wake of the NRA’s Wayne LaPierre’s unpantsing by Chris Wallace on “Fox News Sunday.” It was one of the most astonishing political confrontations in memory. Wallace called LaPierre “ridiculous” for suggesting the president’s daughters don’t deserve more protection than other children. He derided him for alleging with no evidence that background checks are a first step to a national registry that would allow the president to take away Americans’ guns. He called the NRA’s claim that the Obama daughters’ school has armed guards “nonsense,” since his children also went there and he knows Sidwell Friends, a Quaker school, doesn’t arm its security. Finally, he mocked LaPierre for suggesting that only the “elite” have protection, pointing out that the NRA head traveled to the Fox interview with his own bodyguards. He reduced the NRA bully to a sputtering wreck. Just four years ago, LaPierre was treated very differently on Fox, when Glenn Beck invited him to come on his show and warn his paranoid viewers of Obama’s gun grab. Admittedly Wallace is less a partisan than the loony Beck, but it’s significant that Fox’s Sunday morning viewers heard a host debunk the claim that Obama’s coming for their guns rather than spread it. Against that backdrop, Obama’s decision to stand before a cadre of law enforcement officers for his Minneapolis speech made great political theater. It served as a reminder that the NRA’s “enemies list” includes the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Association of School Safety and Law Enforcement Officers, and the Police Foundation. (Really, it does. The list is here.) Obama sold the assault weapons ban, in part, as a measure to protect the police. “Weapons of war have no place on our streets, or in our schools, or threatening our law enforcement officers,” he said. ‘Our law enforcement officers should never be out-gunned on the streets.” Salon’s Jillian Rayfield laid out the tough sledding that’s ahead of assault-ban supporters, including the skepticism of purple state Democrats like Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. Reid, rather lordly and ineptly, said on “Meet the Press” that he didn’t know if he supported Sen. Dianne Feinstein’s assault-weapons ban because he hadn’t read it yet. I know the majority leader is a busy guy, but c’mon, Harry. Maybe get someone to read it to you. I’m tired of red- and purple-state Democrats getting a pass on gun issues because hunting, say, is popular in their states. Who could be more valuable than a red-state Democrat in telling hunters that Obama’s agenda won’t take away their hunting rifles? So I’m glad Obama’s demanding that Congress vote on an assault-weapons ban rather than letting leaders table it, as he did with other first-term priorities, even if that means conservative Democrats must take some tough votes. Of course, letting conservative Democrats crush an assault ban may also serve to protect them from the NRA. That’s allegedly why Reid is open to a vote on the issue. But it could have the unintended consequence of letting those newly motivated by Newtown single out Democrats who deserve criticism, or even a primary challenge, on the issue of guns. Dianne Feinstein insists that she will push for her assault weapons ban bill, and Connecticut Sen. Chris Murphy, who used to represent Newtown as a congressman, derided those who’ve declared that push futile. “Too many people in Washington want to eulogize specific pieces of gun reform legislation before the debate has even started,” Murphy told “The Rachel Maddow Show.” The time to act is now. Let me be clear: I think compromise is crucial to getting new policy crafted, and if it turns out legislators can find common ground on a limited package of reforms, chief among them universal criminal background checks, I’d support that. Greg Sargent featured a fascinating interview with crucial GOP House Rep. Scott Rigell of Virginia, who represents a purple district that went for Obama in 2012. Rigell is teaming up with another Republican, Rep. Scott Meehan, along with Democrats Elijah Cummings and Carolyn McCarthy, to push legislation to crack down on gun trafficking designed to evade background checks. Rigell also says he is open to universal background checks, though he is undecided. “I certainly see the merits of that,” he told Sargent. Still, being open to compromise is different from suggesting that Democrats should stick to supporting only measures that they know have broad support. The point of leadership is to lead, and as we saw with gay marriage, when the president stakes out a forward-looking stance on a divisive issue, he can help bring people along with him. I’m glad he’s continuing to push for the assault weapon and large magazine ban, even as the serious sensible people of the Beltway insist it will never pass. Maybe he’ll surprise them. Because of Newtown, we’re in a new era for gun control legislation, which doesn’t mean we’ll get everything we want. But it requires a new approach to political leadership and negotiation, and the president is providing it.

#### Obama’s dumps PC into immigration

Michael Shear, staff writer, 1-30-2013, “On Immigration, Obama Assumes Upper Hand,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/31/us/politics/on-immigration-obama-acts-as-if-he-has-the-upper-hand.html?\_r=0

As the specifics of immigration legislation take shape on Capitol Hill, President Obama is making it clear that he wants the overhaul on his terms.¶ Officials in the West Wing are convinced that the politics of the immigration issue have firmly shifted in their direction. That belief is fueling the president’s push for quick action and broad changes that go beyond what Republicans are signaling would be acceptable if they are to back legislation that allows a path to citizenship for millions of illegal immigrants.¶ The administration’s confidence — which was communicated to immigration advocates in a series of conference calls and meetings last week — is rooted in the sense among the president’s political advisers that Republicans are eager to embrace broad immigration changes as a way of improving their electoral appeal among Hispanic voters.¶ “We’re giving them some space,” said Dan Pfeiffer, a senior adviser to the president. But in the meantime, he said, “we’re going to continue to make the case to the country about why immigration reform should be done and to put pressure on Republicans that they need to do it.”¶ While aides say Mr. Obama is open to some negotiation over the contours of the immigration changes he laid out Tuesday in Las Vegas, senior administration officials are convinced that there is little risk in pushing hard for Mr. Obama’s immigration priorities, betting that Republicans will think twice about voting down a bill championed by a president who is highly popular among the very voters they covet.¶ The principles Mr. Obama embraced this week differ in some central ways from the effort under way in the Senate, where Marco Rubio, Republican of Florida, and Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York, and six other senators are working toward a bill that could be debated and voted on as early as this summer.¶ Mr. Rubio and the other senators have said illegal immigrants would not be given a pathway to citizenship until the government had taken certain measures — so far unspecified — to secure the border. The White House fears that could become a source of endless delays for immigrants eager to become citizens. The Senate outline also includes a guest worker program for low-income workers, something Mr. Obama and his allies have been concerned about in the past.¶ In legislative fights over health care and stimulus spending in his first term, the president and his team earned scorn from their own supporters for being too willing to compromise. Liberal activists who helped Mr. Obama get elected in 2008 criticized him for trading away a public insurance option to secure passage of the Affordable Care Act.¶ But immigration advocates and White House officials say the dynamic is different now. With his re-election secured and the Republican electoral problems obvious, the president is more likely to stand his ground, they say.¶ “They know that the political momentum is on their side,” said an immigrant advocate whose group participated in conference calls with White House officials last week. “They are pretty confident that they have a broad cross section of civil society behind him on this.”¶ Asked whether White House officials seemed willing to compromise with Republicans to ensure passage, the advocate said, “That is not the message we heard at all.”¶ Mr. Obama, in an interview Wednesday with the Spanish-language network Univision, rejected Mr. Rubio’s criticism that he was not paying enough attention to border security.¶ “We have done more on border security in the last four years than we have done in the previous 20,” the president said. “We’ve actually done almost everything that Republicans asked to be done several years ago as a precondition to move forward on comprehensive immigration reform.”¶ The president’s aides said he would welcome legislation that met his principles but that could also earn broad, bipartisan support in the Senate. They believe that a vote of 80 or more senators from both parties would put more pressure on Republican lawmakers who control the House. But the White House is also willing to fight for a more partisan immigration measure if need be, advisers said. Already there is evidence that Mr. Obama may end up with a messy political fight in spite of the show of bipartisan spirit on display in the Senate this week.

#### No impact to the sequester – won’t affect troops, procurement, or DOD operations – cuts can be held off until the DOD can plan for them

Gordon Adams, Professor of International Relations at the School of International Service at American University and Distinguished Fellow at the Stimson Center, 10-17-2012, “The Fiscal Slide” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/17/the\_fiscal\_slide?page=full

But does this mean the end of our national security (and domestic well-being), as the political debate suggests? A little careful noodling about the impact of a sequester on the Defense Department suggests it might not be the end of the world. In fact, it might be exactly the fiscal discipline DOD needs. Let me get technical for a moment, so we can actually see what might go on. First, the law made it clear that the administration could exempt funding for troops and their benefits (including retiree benefits) from the fiscal cliff. The administration has done that, so the troops will be okay. (Their number is coming down anyway as a result of the end of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.) Then, there is the matter of procurement and what some see as the almost cataclysmic level of devastation that such harsh cuts would impose on the defense industry. Except they won't. It turns out the industry is pretty healthy, it has been for a decade, and it is working on contracts that have been funded in prior budget years, which are exempt from sequestration. As the director of defense procurement put it: "The vast majority of our contracts are fully funded, so there's no need to terminate existing contracts unless the product is no longer needed." Lockheed treasurer Ken Possenriede agreed that sequestration was not a near-term problem: "If sequestration happens, just based on our normal business rhythm, we're comfortable from a cash-on-hand standpoint that we'll endure that." How about military operations, including the war? Well, the war budget, which has never really been separate from the non-war budget -- that's a political fiction the executive branch and Congress set up, but the funds are, in reality, mixed -- is included in a sequester, which might sound terrible for the troops in Afghanistan. But, the reality is that the funds for DOD operations (war and much else) are very "fungible," as we budget wonks like to put it, meaning the funds can be moved around among programs pretty flexibly -- from training to education to base operations to the costs of operating troops in the field. And OMB and the Pentagon agree that "PPAs," in operations land, means "accounts." And accounts are things like Army Operations and Maintenance, which can cover all of the above activities. So, the service managers would have 9.4 percent fewer funds than the Congress gave them, but significant flexibility to move them around, setting priorities and making choices. Let's say they have a scalpel to work with, not a bludgeon. So what about research -- the investments in the future of defense technology? Well, here, too, there would be 9.4 percent fewer dollars than appropriated. But R&D is what they call a "level of effort" area of funding -- you buy as much R&D as the money allows, but you don't have to cut items out of a production contract. And the Pentagon would have some flexibility as well, since most R&D "program elements" cover a variety of R&D projects, so fewer resources means setting priorities and making choices. Beyond these technical flexibilities, DOD, like other departments, would also have recourse to reprogramming funds and using its general transfer authority. The flexibility here is pretty great; over the past decades some reprogram and transfer totals have been in the tens of billions of dollars. What it takes is making the same tough choices, many of them internal. A few, the transfers, would have to be communicated to Congress, where the senior leadership of the key authorizing and appropriating committees (who don't want to devastate defense) would be likely to agree, especially as they were the most anxious to protect defense. And OMB could alleviate the short-term urgency by agreeing to hold off on taking the cuts until later in the year, by approving overall funding ("apportionment") at a higher level early in the year, and delaying the cuts until later, when planning in DOD was complete.

#### No escalation

Christopher Fettweis, Asst Prof Poli Sci – Tulane, Asst Prof National Security Affairs – US Naval War College, December 2007, “On the Consequences of Failure in Iraq,” Survival, Vol. 49, Iss. 4, December, p. 83 – 98.

No matter what the outcome in Iraq, the region is not likely to devolve into chaos. Although it might seem counter-intuitive, by most traditional measures the Middle East is very stable. Continuous, uninterrupted governance is the norm, not the exception; most Middle East regimes have been in power for decades. Its monarchies, from Morocco to Jordan to every Gulf state, have generally been in power since these countries gained independence. In Egypt Hosni Mubarak has ruled for almost three decades, and Muammar Gadhafi in Libya for almost four. The region’s autocrats have been more likely to die quiet, natural deaths than meet the hangman or post-coup firing squads. Saddam’s rather unpredictable regime, which attacked its neighbours twice, was one of the few exceptions to this pattern of stability, and he met an end unusual for the modern Middle East. Its regimes have survived potentially destabilising shocks before, and they would be likely to do so again. The region actually experiences very little cross-border warfare, and even less since the end of the Cold War. Saddam again provided an exception, as did the Israelis, with their adventures in Lebanon. Israel fought four wars with neighbouring states in the first 25 years of its existence, but none in the 34 years since. Vicious civil wars that once engulfed Lebanon and Algeria have gone quiet, and its ethnic conflicts do not make the region particularly unique. The biggest risk of an American withdrawal is intensified civil war in Iraq rather than regional conflagration. Iraq’s neighbours will likely not prove eager to fight each other to determine who gets to be the next country to spend itself into penury propping up an unpopular puppet regime next door. As much as the Saudis and Iranians may threaten to intervene on behalf of their co- religionists, they have shown no eagerness to replace the counter-insurgency role that American troops play today. If the United States, with its remarkable military and unlimited resources, could not bring about its desired solutions in Iraq, why would any other country think it could do so?17 Common interest, not the presence of the US military, provides the ultimate foundation for stability. All ruling regimes in the Middle East share a common (and understandable) fear of instability. It is the interest of every actor – the Iraqis, their neighbours and the rest of the world – to see a stable, functioning government emerge in Iraq. If the United States were to withdraw, increased regional cooperation to address that common interest is far more likely than outright warfare.

#### Manufacturing is bigger il to heg – qualititative superiority

#### Manufacturing’s bigger internal to the economy

Michael Ettlinger, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute, and Kate Gordon, the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress, April 2011, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf)

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private-sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### Nominations thump

Tom Thurlow, staff writer, 2-5-2013, “Obama’s Political Capital,” Red State, http://www.redstate.com/tfthurlow/2013/02/05/obamas-political-capital/

President Obama blows through his own political capital just as fast as he blows through America’s financial capital. Neither case of over-spending is sustainable, and we will just have to wait to see which spending spree is forced to end first. But this further confirms my suspicion that President Obama’s brains are the most over-rated to occupy the Oval Office in generations. Take his recent nominations, which are a mess. Last week’s Senate hearings on Senator Hagel’s confirmation as defense secretary were a disaster. Senator McCain pressed Senator Hagel to confirm or deny Hagel’s earlier statement that the Surge in Iraq was “the greatest foreign policy blunder since the Vietnam War.” Senator Ted Cruz pointed out that Senator Hegal, during an interview with the Al Jazeera English network in 2009 had agreed with a questioner who said that the United States appeared and acted like the world’s bully. As Paul Mirengoff at the Powerline Blog wrote, “if he were a Broadway play, Hagel would close after one performance.” There were also a number of past anti-Semitic, or at least anti-Israel statements about which Senator Hagel was questioned. About the only thing about the hearing that was reassuring to those who take national defense seriously was that Hagel bumbled so much he sounded like he may have dementia. Let’s face it, a demented defense secretary may not be as bad as an anti-American defense secretary who is purposefully soft on defense and unconcerned about looming problems with Iran’s nuclear program. Senator Lindsey Graham has threatened a hold on the Hagel nomination, and he should. Not only is a defense secretary an important policy position, but as has been pointed out by Republican critics that in any given foreign crisis, the defense secretary will be one of the few advisors in the room, advising the president. Next up: a nomination battle for a Treasury secretary nominee, Jacob Lew, who has never worked in a bank except as an attorney for Citibank, and has held many different government jobs, most recently President Obama’s chief of staff. Definitely a financial industry lightweight. Lew has also been accused of misleading the public on deficits. About the only thing that stands out about Jacob Lew as Treasury secretary is the fact that his signature — which will appear on all of our currency – looks like a bunch of circles. Oddly enough, it doesn’t appear as if Lew has had any medical training. After that, brace yourself for President Obama’s nominee for director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), Todd Jones. Jones is the current acting director of ATF and has been criticized by a local Democratic FBI office director as being politically well-connected but incompetent and soft on gun and violent crime prosecutions. Past presidents have had difficult times in their second terms, but the difficulty is usually with big proposals. President George W. Bush unsuccessfully tried to pass privatization of Social Security and immigration reform in his second term. President Reagan spent his second term solidifying his victory in the Cold War and simplified the tax code, lowering the top marginal tax rate to 28%. Meanwhile, President Obama is trying to get Charles Hagel approved as defense secretary, Jacob Lew at Treasury secretary, and Todd Jones as ATF director, not grand plans by any means. President Obama may get these nominees approved by a majority of senators. But the question is: why is he fighting these particular battles? He could have easily found better qualified nominees for these positions and fought bigger battles on some substantive legislative proposals. Why spend what remaining political capital he has on these problematic appointments? I have a theory, and here goes. As liberal as he is, President Obama prefers to settle scores with his political adversaries even more than getting big liberal proposals passed. There were some clues dropped in the recent campaign. In one speech President Obama told his audience, who booed after Gov. Romney was mentioned, “don’t boo … voting is the best revenge.” This follows a slip he made a couple years earlier when he encouraged Latinos to punish their “enemies,” and when he warned African Americans that a Republican take-over of Congress would mean “hand-to-hand combat up here on Capitol Hill.” These Freudian slips and others show the resentment that President Obama feels towards anyone who opposes him. Opposing ideas are not to be argued against; their proponents are to be personally defeated and the victory noted. Somewhere in his brain the president is keeping score, and he relishes announcing to his opponents, as he did in his first term, “I won.” It is a pettiness that may work out well for the conservative cause. After all, the best way to block any future liberal proposals is to not have them proposed in the first place. The Hagel, Lew and Jones nominations, and the spending of President Obama’s political capital needed to advance these nominations, may be just the ticket to stall any future liberal proposals.

### States

#### Perm do both – shields the link

#### Perm do the counterplan

#### Federal action is key to getting skin in the game – that’s Ben-Moshe – reassures investors prohibitive regulations won’t get slapped on – only feds solve because they regulate nuclear

#### More ev

Rod Adams, Publisher of Atomic insights. Was in the Navy for 33 years. Spent time at the Naval Academy. Has experience designing and running small nuclear plants, 1-29-2010, “Concrete Action to Follow Strongly Supportive Words On Building New Nuclear Power Plants,” Atomic Insights, http://atomicinsights.com/2010/01/concrete-action-to-follow-strongly-supportive-words-on-building-new-nuclear-power-plants.html

Loan guarantees are important to the nuclear industry because the currently available models are large, capital intensive projects that need a stable regulatory and financial environment. The projects can be financed because they will produce a regular stream of income that can service the debt and still provide a profit, but that is only true if the banks are assured that the government will not step in at an inopportune time to halt progress and slow down the revenue generation part of the project. Bankers do not forget history or losses very easily; they want to make sure that government decisions like those that halted Shoreham, Barnwell’s recycling facility or the Clinch River Breeder Reactor program are not going to be repeated this time around. For the multi-billion dollar projects being proposed, bankers demand the reassurance that comes when the government is officially supportive and has some “skin in the game” that makes frivolous bureaucratic decisions to erect barriers very expensive for the agency that makes that decision. I have reviewed the conditions established for the guarantee programs pretty carefully – at one time, my company (Adams Atomic Engines, Inc.) was considering filing an application. The loan conditions are strict and do a good job of protecting government interests. They were not appropriate for a tiny company, but I can see where a large company would have less trouble complying with the rules and conditions. The conditions do allow low or no cost intervention in the case of negligence or safety issues, but they put the government on the hook for delays that come from bad bureaucratic decision making.

#### Evaluate small solvency deficits as large impacts – investors are cautious

#### Federal credit is key to keep loans low-risk

Karl Smith, Assistant Professor of Public Economics at University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, 4-12-2012, “In Praise of Federal Loan Guarantees (Yep, Just Like Solyndra's)” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/04/in-praise-of-federal-loan-guarantees-yep-just-like-solyndras/255721/

We may or may not question the wisdom of the federal government attempting to shape the future of US energy, rigging the game in favor of US manufactures, or pushing marginal college students to load up on debt. However, if we are going to do these things, it's important to recognize that loan guarantees are among the cheapest ways to do them. Why? Well, for one the United States has an incredibly low cost of credit. Lower in fact than any private organization on earth. If there were some way to handle the inevitable political corruption, it would make sense for the US government to act as a giant bank. Indeed, by using ever-rising debt to support unusually low tax rates, the US government does to a degree act as a bank. By offering its good name to guarantee other lending ventures the government forgoes the revenues of a bank but provides much of the same service. It allows projects to be entered into which the principals could not afford alone. This does expose taxpayers to risk. However, because of very unique features of the US government, it's especially low risk. For most lending institutions, the hardest risks to cover are high-beta risks. These are risks which swing wildly with the economy. For example, I might loan money to a natural gas generator manufacturer and to a solar power manufacturer. One of these two technologies is likely to dominate but I am not sure which one. However, because I have loaned to both I have protected myself somewhat. Yet, if the entire economy tanks and no power companies can raise money to add generation capacity of any kind, then I am screwed on both fronts. I can limit my exposure to the specific sector risks, but I can't limit my exposure to the entire economy. The Federal Government is a bit different. The cost of borrowing money for the Federal government tanks exactly when the economy tanks. It is a negative beta borrower. That implies that precisely when things are at their worst, government credit is at its best. So rather than facing terrible losses and the possibility of bankruptcy, as would a normal lending institution, the Federal Government has an easier time than ever.

#### 50 state fiat is a voting issue – the damage has been done

#### Multiple actors make it impossible to generate offense

#### It’s utopian – 50 states have never operated together – that kills T spec edu

#### Single-state CPs solve all their offense

#### Feds have to take the lead – boosts our expertise and means countries consult us on their nuclear decisions – that’s Belagalova

### 2AC Adv CP

#### Perm do both

#### Perm do the plan and each combination of each plank

#### Doesn’t solve –

#### Nat gas -

#### Most drilling is done by small companies – they evade good techniques

Thomas Friedman, staff writer, 8-4-2012, “Get It Right on Gas,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/05/opinion/sunday/friedman-get-it-right-on-gas.html?\_r=2

Moreover, while natural gas is cleaner than coal, extracting it can be very dirty. We have to do this right. For instance, the carbon advantage can be undermined by leakage of uncombusted natural gas from wellheads and pipelines because methane — the primary component of natural gas — is an extremely powerful greenhouse gas, more powerful than carbon dioxide. The big oil companies can easily maintain high drilling standards, but a lot of fracking is done by mom-and-pop drillers that do not. The standards that can make fracking environmentally O.K. are not expensive, but the big drillers want to make sure that the little guys have to apply them, too, so everyone has the same cost basis.¶ On July 19, Forbes interviewed George Phydias Mitchell, who, in the 1990s, pioneered the use of fracking to break natural gas free from impermeable shale. According to Forbes, Mitchell argued that fracking needs to be regulated by the Department of Energy, not just states: “Because if they don’t do it right, there could be trouble,” he says. There’s no excuse not to get it right. “There are good techniques to make it safe that should be followed properly,” he says. But, the smaller, independent drillers, “are wild.” “It’s tough to control these independents. If they do something wrong and dangerous, they should punish them.”

#### Prolif –

#### Controlling supply key –t hat’s Domenici and mililer and Wallace and WIliams ev – demand is inevitable – access to tech is key

#### Manufacturing

#### Doesn’t solve price spikes – can’t be planed for – slow labor shortage not key

### 2AC Efficiency

#### Nuclear trades off with nat gas – that’s the 1AC

#### Low price nat gas means the trade off would happen there

#### Give low priority to colonization – it’s impossible, low risk of natural threats causing extinction, and doesn’t solve.

Hard SF, articles focusing on delineating science from science fiction, 5-10-2007, “Can Space Colonization Guarantee Human Survival?” http://www.hardsf.org/IssuSpac.htm

There are many current and potential threats to the human race. However, considering the human source of many of the threats and the time-scales involved, I'm not sure that space colonization should be the top priority in preempting those threats. Timescales To consider how well space colonization is likely to solve our problems we need to ask what the time-scales of sustainable, independent space colonies are. If, after disaster strikes Earth, Earth is still able to supplement the needs of space colonies, then those space colonies aren't necessarily essential to continuing the human race. We have to ask when space colonies would be functioning without need of any assistance from Earth. Truly independent space colonies must not simply provide bare nutrition, air, heat, and habitat repair for 100 years. They should have a non-traumatizing environment with enough people to protect against dangerous levels of inbreeding – able to last and progress indefinitely. There will also be a minimum number of people required for any space colony in order to provide needed manpower in various occupations (one person with multiple occupations doesn’t help if you need two of those occupations in different places at the same time). How does that compare to the time-scales of threats from climate change, environmental crisis, nuclear / bio weapons and accidents, possible nanotech weapons or accidents, overpopulation, etc.? We also have to consider threats to the global economy, since an economic collapse would presumably at least interrupt efforts towards establishing space colonies. Economic crises also increase risks of war, which could have apocalyptic consequences. Even assuming the ultimate solution of human survival is space colonization, we may need to find a way to extend the lifespan of human civilization and economy on Earth in order to have time to accomplish sustainable space colonization. Consider the possible habitats. Space stations in orbit around Earth or at L5 have little natural resources at their location other than solar energy. The Moon has no atmosphere, a limited amount of water at best, which part of the Moon has access to solar energy varies during the month, and it's not considered one of the solar system's better sources of minerals. Venus is extremely hot, the atmosphere is dangerous and with the cloud cover I'm not sure how practical solar energy would be at the surface. Mars has too little atmosphere and accessible water is questionable, etc. Some of the outer planets' moons may have enough ice and raw materials, but are very cold, lack usable atmospheres and get limited solar energy. And so on. We may be able to establish bases at some of these places in a realistically short amount of time, but not independent ones. Any colony that wants to get resources from post-apocalyptic Earth will need to have spaceships that can land on Earth and later achieve escape velocity from Earth while carrying cargo without help from Earth. Otherwise, the needed resources may not be available from a single astronomical body. That could require longer-distance travel between bodies - whether that's between asteroids, between moons, between planets or some other combination. Significant space travel ability may be essential. A colony would need an industrial base capable of extracting and refining raw materials, and making useful things from them. Interstellar colonies and terraforming of planets in our solar system are longer-range goals. Colonies in any place other than an Earth-like planet will require a substantial infrastructure to allow humans to exist in an otherwise deadly environment. The colony needs to be able to maintain and repair that infrastructure... There is a significant difference between an enormous disaster on Earth and one at any space colony we can expect for at least a century. Even something on the scale of a "dinosaur killer" asteroid impact won't necessarily kill all humans on Earth. (However, if the world economy / technology is set back too much it may not be possible to re-achieve a hi-tech civilization. We've extracted most minerals / fossil fuels that can be gotten without hi-tech, a post-disaster society may be left unable to get these.) It will be a long time before an independent space colony could grow to the point some of its people could survive after a major disaster. Meanwhile, we have not yet solved the physical and psychological problems that develop during months of low gravity. Most of the physical issues may not be significant for those who never intend to return to Earth-type gravities. Psychological issues remain. Some physical issues may arise when dealing with years and decades in low gravity. Even in shorter spans of time, weakening bones may have serious consequences in low gravity situations. Weakened hip bones may be a problem for women giving birth in low gravity. Other stressful activities may also be problematic. We need to find out how low gravity will effect a fetus during pregnancy and child growth afterwards. Identifying and resolving all the issues is likely to take many years. Currently, our society is not inclined to invest that much in either stopping global warming (and other threats) or space habitats. It strikes me as improbable that we will see a heavy investment in both of them at the same time in the next period of time. My impression is the best chance for human survival is focusing as much as possible on one or the other of the two paths, and that space colonization will not solve the problem within the limited time-frame. Of course, if governments refuse to fund solutions to the environmental crisis, but budget money for space habitats we should use that money. Hopefully, governments will respond to the crisis before it’s too late and the problems will be brought under control and within safe limits. Then there will be no reason not to expand out into the universe. Postscript For those who still believe space colonization should be the priority, I would like to suggest one piece of advice. The known threats to human survival in the next century or so are not vast earthquakes and volcanoes, asteroid impacts, supernovas or other natural disasters. Most of them are at least partly (hu)man-made. If the same problems are not to threaten survival of humans on space colonies, we either have to make humans on Earth act more responsibly to ensure survival before we colonize, or we need to know how to insure that those people who colonize are not so prone to make the same mistakes their Earthly brothers do. If space colonization ends up amounting to running away from our problems, we will not have changed the odds of human survival by much. Space colonies would need to be planned in a way to avoid this fate.

#### No risk of colonization – bodies degenerate too quickly in space

Theunis Piersma, professor of animal ecology at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and senior research scientist at the Royal Netherlands Institute, 11-16-2010, “Why space is the impossible frontier,” New Scientist, http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20827860.100-why-space-is-the-impossible-frontier.html

Hawking, Obama and other proponents of long-term space travel are making a grave error. Humans cannot leave Earth for the several years that it takes to travel to Mars and back, for the simple reason that our biology is intimately connected to Earth. To function properly, we need gravity. Without it, the environment is less demanding on the human body in several ways, and this shows upon the return to Earth. Remember the sight of weakened astronauts emerging after the Apollo missions? That is as nothing compared with what would happen to astronauts returning from Mars. One of the first things to be affected is the heart, which shrinks by as much as a quarter after just one week in orbit (The New England Journal of Medicine, vol 358, p 1370). Heart atrophy leads to decreases in blood pressure and the amount of blood pushed out by the heart. In this way heart atrophy leads to reduced exercise capacity. Astronauts returning to Earth after several months in the International Space Station experience dizziness and blackouts because blood does not reach their brains in sufficient quantities. Six weeks in bed leads to about as much atrophy of the heart as one week in space, suggesting that the atrophy is caused by both weightlessness and the concomitant reduction in exercise. Other muscle tissue suffers too. The effects of weightlessness on the muscles of the limbs are easy to verify experimentally. Because they bear the body's weight, the "anti-gravity" muscles of the thighs and calves degenerate significantly when they are made redundant during space flight. Despite the best attempts to give replacement exercise to crew members on the International Space Station, after six months they had still lost 13 per cent of their calf muscle volume and 32 per cent of the maximum power that their leg muscles could deliver (Journal of Applied Physiology, vol 106, p 1159). Various metabolic changes also occur, including a decreased capacity for fat oxidation, which can lead to the build-up of fat in atrophied muscle. Space travellers also suffer deterioration of immune function both during and after their missions (Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine, vol 79, p 835). Arguably the most fearsome effect on bodies is bone loss (The Lancet, vol 355, p 1569). Although the hardness and strength of bone, and the relative ease with which it fossilises, give it an appearance of permanence, bone is actually a living and remarkably flexible tissue. In the late 19th century, the German anatomist Julius Wolff discovered that bones adjust to the loads that they are placed under. A decrease in load leads to the loss of bone material, while an increase leads to thicker bone. It is no surprise, then, that in the microgravity of space bones demineralise, especially those which normally bear the greatest load. Cosmonauts who spent half a year in space lost up to a quarter of the material in their shin bones, despite intensive exercise (The Lancet, vol 355, p 1607). Although experiments on chicken embryos on the International Space Station have established that bone formation does continue in microgravity, formation rates are overtaken by bone loss. What is of greatest concern here is that, unlike muscle loss which levels off with time, bone loss seems to continue at a steady rate of 1 to 2 per cent for every month of weightlessness. During a three-year mission to Mars, space travellers could lose around 50 per cent of their bone material, which would make it extremely difficult to return to Earth and its gravitational forces. Bone loss during space travel certainly brings home the maxim "use it or lose it". Bone loss is not permanent. Within six months of their return to Earth, those cosmonauts who spent half a year in space did show partial recovery of bone mass. However, even after a year of recovery, men who had been experimentally exposed to three months of total bed rest had not fully regained all the lost bone, though their calf muscles had recovered much earlier (Bone, vol 44, p 214). Space agencies will have to become very creative in addressing the issue of bone loss during flights to Mars. There are concepts in development for spacecraft with artificial gravity, but nobody even knows what gravitational force is needed to avoid the problems. So far, boneless creatures such as jellyfish are much more likely than people to be able to return safely to Earth after multi-year space trips. For humans, gravity is a Mars bar. The impossibility of an escape to space is just one of many examples of how our bodies, and those of our fellow organisms, are inseparable from the environments in which we live. In our futuristic ambitions we should not forget that our minds and bodies are connected to Earth as by an umbilical cord.

#### Low risk – newest surveys

Nell Greenfieldboyce, staff writer, 9-30-2011, “Asteroids Pose Less Risk To Earth Than Thought,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/2011/09/30/140934293/asteroids-pose-less-risk-to-earth-than-thought

Our planet's risk of being hit by a dangerous outer space rock may be smaller than scientists previously thought. That's according to a survey of the sky that NASA is calling the most accurate census yet of near-Earth asteroids. A NASA space telescope called the Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer, or WISE, recently went searching for asteroids lurking nearby — and found far fewer than astronomers had expected. "Our understanding of the near-Earth asteroid population has been significantly improved, and we believe that the hazard to the Earth may be somewhat less," says Amy Mainzer of NASA's Jet Propulsion Lab in California, who led the new study. The Earth has been whacked by big space rocks in the past. One, about six miles across, is thought to have wiped out the dinosaurs. Scientists would like to prevent something like that from happening in the future, but it would take time to figure out how to best knock an incoming asteroid off its collision course. Our understanding of the near-Earth asteroid population has been significantly improved, and we believe that the hazard to the Earth may be somewhat less. - Amy Mainzer , NASA Jet Propulsion Lab "As one of my colleagues at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory likes to say, the best three ways of dealing with the potential of an asteroid impact are to find them early, find them early and find them early," Mainzer says. Most of the known near-Earth asteroids have been discovered with ground-based telescopes, but these can't see everything. To get a better sense of how many potentially dangerous asteroids might actually be out there, Mainzer and her colleagues did a new survey with the WISE telescope, launched in 2009. They used it to get a representative sample of these asteroids that orbit the sun and have a risk of crossing Earth's orbit. The study reassuringly suggests that astronomers already know the location of more than 90 percent of the very largest asteroids — the huge planet-busters that could cause mass extinctions. "By virtue of the fact that we know these objects and we know their orbits, we can predict that they are no longer hazardous to Earth, in the sense that we can follow them and we know that there are none that pose any imminent risk of an impact," Mainzer says. Fewer Midsize Asteroids There's also some good news when it comes to midsize asteroids, between 330 and 3,300 feet wide. The survey suggests there are only about 19,500 of them — far fewer than the 35,000 or so that scientists had expected.

### 2AC Coercion

#### Our interpretation is that plan focus is good

#### Aff choice – other frameworks moot the 1AC

#### Topic education – only focusing on the resolution ensures different ground from year to year

#### Reject non-policy alts and links not based on the plan text

#### Perm do both – double bind – either the alt can’t overcome the status quo or it can overcome residual link to the plan

#### Perm do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative

#### It’s not coercive – companies have a choice to take loan guarantees and they aren’t direct spending means no taxation

#### Other taxes prove alt causes

#### Evaluating consequences key to ethics

Jeffrey Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University, Bloomington, Spring 2002, Dissent, vol. 49, no. 2

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness. WHAT WOULD IT mean for the American left right now to take seriously the centrality of means in politics? First, it would mean taking seriously the specific means employed by the September 11 attackers--terrorism. There is a tendency in some quarters of the left to assimilate the death and destruction of September 11 to more ordinary (and still deplorable) injustices of the world system--the starvation of children in Africa, or the repression of peasants in Mexico, or the continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. But this assimilation is only possible by ignoring the specific modalities of September 11. It is true that in Mexico, Palestine, and elsewhere, too many innocent people suffer, and that is wrong. It may even be true that the experience of suffering is equally terrible in each case. But neither the Mexican nor the Israeli government has ever hijacked civilian airliners and deliberately flown them into crowded office buildings in the middle of cities where innocent civilians work and live, with the intention of killing thousands of people. Al-Qaeda did precisely this. That does not make the other injustices unimportant. It simply makes them different. It makes the September 11 hijackings distinctive, in their defining and malevolent purpose--to kill people and to create terror and havoc. This was not an ordinary injustice. It was an extraordinary injustice. The premise of terrorism is the sheer superfluousness of human life. This premise is inconsistent with civilized living anywhere. It threatens people of every race and class, every ethnicity and religion. Because it threatens everyone, and threatens values central to any decent conception of a good society, it must be fought. And it must be fought in a way commensurate with its malevolence. Ordinary injustice can be remedied. Terrorism can only be stopped. Second, it would mean frankly acknowledging something well understood, often too eagerly embraced, by the twentieth century Marxist left--that it is often politically necessary to employ morally troubling means in the name of morally valid ends. A just or even a better society can only be realized in and through political practice; in our complex and bloody world, it will sometimes be necessary to respond to barbarous tyrants or criminals, with whom moral suasion won't work. In such situations our choice is not between the wrong that confronts us and our ideal vision of a world beyond wrong. It is between the wrong that confronts us and the means--perhaps the dangerous means--we have to employ in order to oppose it. In such situations there is a danger that "realism" can become a rationale for the Machiavellian worship of power. But equally great is the danger of a righteousness that translates, in effect, into a refusal to act in the face of wrong. What is one to do? Proceed with caution. Avoid casting oneself as the incarnation of pure goodness locked in a Manichean struggle with evil. Be wary of violence. Look for alternative means when they are available, and support the development of such means when they are not. And never sacrifice democratic freedoms and open debate. Above all, ask the hard questions about the situation at hand, the means available, and the likely effectiveness of different strategies. Most striking about the campus left's response to September 11 was its refusal to ask these questions. Its appeals to "international law" were naive. It exaggerated the likely negative consequences of a military response, but failed to consider the consequences of failing to act decisively against terrorism. In the best of all imaginable worlds, it might be possible to defeat al-Qaeda without using force and without dealing with corrupt regimes and political forces like the Northern Alliance. But in this world it is not possible. And this, alas, is the only world that exists. To be politically responsible is to engage this world and to consider the choices that it presents. To refuse to do this is to evade responsibility. Such a stance may indicate a sincere refusal of unsavory choices. But it should never be mistaken for a serious political commitment.

#### Having life is key to freedom

L. Shwartz “A Value to Life: Who Decides and How?” Medical ethics: a case-based approach 2002 www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf)

Those who choose to reason on this basis hope that if the quality of a life can be measured then the answer to whether that life has value to the individual can be determined easily. This raises special problems, however, because the idea of quality involves a value judgement, and value judgements are, by their essence, subject to indeterminate relative factors such as preferences and dislikes. Hence, quality of life is difficult to measure and will vary according to individual tastes, preferences and aspirations. As a result, no general rules or principles can be asserted that would simplify decisions about the value of a life based on its quality. Nevertheless, quality is still an essential criterion in making such decisions because it gives legitimacy to the possibility that rational, autonomous persons can decide for themselves that their own lives either are worth, or are no longer worth, living. To disregard this possibility would be to imply that no individuals can legitimately make such value judgements about their own lives and, if nothing else, that would be counterintuitive. 2 In our case, Katherine Lewis had spent 10 months considering her decision before concluding that her life was no longer of a tolerable quality. She put a great deal of effort into the decision and she was competent when she made it. Who would be better placed to make this judgement for her than Katherine herself? And yet, a doctor faced with her request would most likely be uncertain about whether Katherine’s choice is truly in her best interest, and feel trepidation about assisting her. We need to know which considerations can be used to protect the patient’s interests.

### 2AC India DA

#### India isn’t leading – Wallace and Williams indicate they’re in fourth behind China, Russia, and the US

#### K1 team also doesn’t indicate a lead it just says they’re doing well in a niche – still possible an order led overall by the US

#### Nuclear leadership isn’t key to Indian leadership

#### Trade solves leadership

Devashish Mitra, Professor of Economics at Syracuse University, 2-5-2013, “A poor trade-off,” http://www.indianexpress.com/news/a-poor-tradeoff/1069304/0

Until the 1980s, India followed a virtually autarkic policy. Over the last two decades, it has liberalised its trade regime, with the average tariff rate on manufacturing imports falling from over 100 per cent in 1991 to between 5 and 10 per cent today. This reform has been unilateral and not based on reciprocity from its trading partners. The reform period has experienced high rates of growth, giving India economic heft and making it an important player in multilateral trade negotiations, fighting its own cause as well as exercising leadership on behalf of the developing world.

#### India leadership has no effect on global security

Kanwal Sibal, staff writer, 10-30-2012, “SOFT POWER counts for very little!” India Defense Review, http://www.indiandefencereview.com/news/soft-power-counts-for-very-little/

Much is sometimes made of India’s “soft power” as a diplomatic force multiplier. This kind of power is defined as the ability to attract and co-opt rather than coerce, use force or give money as a mean of persuasion.¶ Through this power a country can supposedly obtain the outcomes it wants because other countries admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its levels of prosperity, openness and availability of individual opportunities, want to follow it. Those who believe in the reality of such “soft power” in international relations think that Bollywood, yoga, Indian music, dance and cuisine, our practice of democracy and pluralism amidst huge diversity give India added diplomatic weight internationally. Is this true?¶ US. The concept of soft power may have gained wide international currency in political and academic circles but that does not mean it is unquestionable. The concept is very American, developed from the perspective of the world’s dominant political, economic and military power. One can do the academic exercise of separating the various components of US power and establish a new category of “soft power” on the assumption that American democracy, culture, values, Hollywood et al exert draw the rest of the world voluntarily into the American orbit.¶ In India’s case, its putative soft power as a democracy has failed to exert much co-opting influence even in its neighbourhood.¶ The US, supposedly, attracts others through this kind of soft power to follow its lead, without the need to use force. This is a debatable proposition. If the US lacked the overwhelming “hard power” it has, if global institutions were not dominated by it, if it did not actively propagate its political,economic and societal values world-wide, if it did not control significantly the flow of information across the globe, its “soft power” would be ineffectual. Switzerland has many of the elements of American “soft power”- a veritable grass root democracy, respect for citizen rights, individual opportunities, high levels of prosperity, quality production etc. Yet no one talks of neutral, non-military oriented Switzerland’s “soft power”.¶ Furthermore, have countries at large progressively embraced democracy because of the American example? On the contrary, one now talks of the attractiveness of the Chinese model of governance for developing countries. Russia resists US ideas of democracy and the methods used to promote it in Russia itself and in its neighbourhood. Despite decades of US global domination, consolidated by the demise of the Soviet Union, no democracy wave has engulfed the world, except in areas liberated from Soviet domination in eastern Europe.¶ The Arab world is seeing political convulsions that have been inspired not by US democracy but by local anger against protracted dictatorships, with power transferred to muslim groups averse to western style democracy. Moreover, American democratic freedoms and cultural values have hardly wrought change in the Gulf monarchies despite their long asociation with the US. Its “soft power” hasn’t prevented the US from being deeply unpopular in the Islamic world at large.¶ Bollywood, which is loved by the Pakistani public, hasn’t reduced Pakistan’s hostility towards India¶ The claim that US soft power draws strength from its commitment to human rights would need to be reconciled with American military intervention in Iraq that has exacted an enormous human toll. Regime changes of the kind enforced in Libya and being currently promoted in Syria, with Iran to perhaps follow later, are exceedingly costly in human terms as whole societies are destabilized. In Afghanistan, and even in Pakistan where the US has become deeply unpopular, radical forces like the Taliban are unimpressed by US soft power, even with regard to basic human values such as proper treatment of women and the right girls have to education etc.¶ India. It is important also not to confuse entertainment with power of any kind. There is no relationship between enjoyment of Hollywood movies and political support for US policies across the globe. Because of the highly unequal quality of these films, in some ways the picture they convey of US society can be actually unflattering.¶ In India’s case, its putative soft power as a democracy has failed to exert much co-opting influence even in its neighbourhood. Countries like Nepal have actually viewed Indian democracy in the past as a threat. Governance issues have tarnished the image of our democracy, with the spread of corruption in all walks of life eroding further its prestige. With China racing ahead in economic development and pulling millions out of poverty, India’s failure to eradicate abysmal levels of poverty still prevalent in the country, besides wide-spread malnutrition and poor sanitation and hygiene, corrodes the attractiveness of its model, which some have begun to see as increasingly dysfunctional. In some areas the human development indices in India are lower than in sub-saharan Africa. It is ironical that the democracy argument has to be offered by apologists to explain the shortfalls in India’s performance.¶ Culture. Bollywood, which is loved by the Pakistani public, hasn’t reduced Pakistan’s hostility towards India, just as the fondness of some here for Pakistani plays and affection for sufi music does not change negative thinking about Pakistan in India. Our secularism and pluralism is hardly viewed with admiration in the Islamic world, where the more conservative regimes actually see secularism as a form of heresy and minorities are denied equal status in law. Our other cultural attributes, however attractive, haven’t persuaded countries to be on India’s side against dictatorships and military regimes that inflict violence or make teritorial demands on us. Across the world people can love Indian food and enjoy Indian art forms, but that does not lessen political differences on key bilateral or international issues, just as the popularity of Chinese food in India does not alter our thinking about Chinese claims on Arunachal Pradesh or its strategic alliance with Pakistan.

#### Too many alt causes to leadership – their author

Kamdar ‘7 (Mira Kamdar, World Policy Institute, 2007, Planet India: How the fastest growing democracy is transforming America and the world, p. 3-5)

No other country matters more to the future of our planet than India. There is no challenge we face, no opportunity we covet where India does not have critical relevance. From combating global terror to finding cures for dangerous pandemics, from dealing with the energy crisis to averting the worst scenarios of global warming, from rebalancing stark global inequalities to spurring the vital innovation needed to create jobs and improve lives—India is now a pivotal player. The world is undergoing a process of profound recalibration in which the rise of Asia is the most important factor. India holds the key to this new world. India is at once an ancient Asian civilization, a modern nation grounded in Enlightenment values and democratic institutions, and a rising twenty-first-century power. With a population of 1.2 billion, India is the world’s largest democracy. It is an open, vibrant society. India’s diverse population includes Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhists, Jains, Zoroastrians, Jews, and animists. There are twenty-two official languages in India. Three hundred fifty million Indians speak English. India is the world in microcosm. Its geography encompasses every climate, from snowcapped Himalayas to palm-fringed beaches to deserts where nomads and camels roam. A developing country, India is divided among a tiny affluent minority, a rising middle class, and 800 million people who live on less than $2 per day. India faces all the critical problems of our time—extreme social inequality, employment insecurity, a growing energy crisis, severe water shortages, a degraded environment, global warming, a galloping HIV/AIDS epidemic, terrorist attacks—on a scale that defies the imagination. India’s goal is breathtaking in scope: transform a developing country of more than 1 billion people into a developed nation and global leader by 2020, and do this as a democracy in an era of resource scarcity and environmental degradation. The world has to cheer India on. If India fails, there is a real risk that our world will become hostage to political chaos, war over dwindling resources, a poisoned environment, and galloping disease. Wealthy enclaves will employ private companies to supply their needs and private militias to protect them from the poor massing at their gates. But, if India succeeds, it will demonstrate that it is possible to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty.  It will prove that multiethnic, multireligious democracy is not a luxury for rich societies.  It will show us how to save our environment, and how to manage in a fractious, multipolar world.  India’s gambit is truly the venture of the century.

#### Nuclear is just 2% of Indian electricity

BBC 12

Puneet Pal Singh, 31 July 2012, “India's energy crisis threatens its economic growth,” http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-19059213

As India's economy expands and the population increases, the country will need to generate even more power to meet the growing demand.¶ India currently generates more than 65% of its total electricity from non-renewable sources of energy such as coal, gas and oil.¶ About 19% comes from hydro power, just over 2% from nuclear energy and 12% from other renewable sources.

#### India will maintain a lead in SMRS

Charles D. Ferguson 10, President, Federation of American Scientists, 5/19/10, Statement before the House Committee on Science and Technology for the hearing on Charting the Course for American Nuclear Technology: Evaluating the Department of Energy’s Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap, http://gop.science.house.gov/Media/hearings/full10/may19/Ferguson.pdf

What are the implications for the United States of Chinese and Indian efforts to sell small and medium power reactors? Because China and India already have the manufacturing and marketing capability for these reactors, the United States faces an economically competitive disadvantage. Because the United States has yet to license such reactors for domestic use, it has placed itself at an additional market disadvantage. By the time the United States has licensed such reactors, China and India as well as other competitors may have established a strong hold on this emerging market. ¶ The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission cautioned on December 15, 2008 that the “licensing of new, small modular reactors is not just around the corner. The NRC’s attention and resources now are focused on the large-scale reactors being proposed to serve millions of Americans, rather than smaller devices with both limited power production and possible industrial process applications.” The NRC’s statement further underscored that “examining proposals for radically different technology will likely require an exhaustive review” … before “such time as there is a formal proposal, the NRC will, as directed by Congress, continue to devote the majority of its resources to addressing the current technology base.” 6 Earlier this year, the NRC devoted consideration to presentations on small modular reactors from the Nuclear Energy Institute, the Department of Energy, and the Rural Electric Cooperative Association among other stakeholders. 7 At least seven vendors have proposed that their designs receive attention from the NRC.8

## 1AR

### Sequester

### AT MPX – Econ

#### No economic impact to defense sequestration

Veronique de Rugy, writer for the National Review Online, 9-17-2012, “Fears Over Sequestration Are Overblown,” http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/321658/fears-over-sequestration-are-overblown-veronique-de-rugy#

This is nothing new. For weeks now, we have heard how cutting defense spending would mean fewer jobs for defense contractors, weaken the economy, and threaten the safety of Americans (no questions asked about whether this weaponized Keynesianism holds any water), or how cutting Medicare would mean that seniors will die. But these claims are sheer exaggeration.¶ Sequestration isn’t an ideal way to address our spending problems, because it doesn’t allow an agency to think strategically about what to cut. However, when you actually look at what sequestration means, you find that it is mainly a cut to the growth of spending. As I explained in my Washington Examiner piece on Friday, this is certainly true for defense spending. ¶ The following chart is is based on the Office of Management and Budget, Congressional Research Service, and the Department of Defense. Also the projected budget authority with and without defense cuts are from the Congressional Budget Office. The chart is inspired by the August 4 Congressional Quarterly piece, ”Wiggle Room for Cuts?,” by Frank Oliveri.¶ As you can see, with a few exceptions, after sequestration, the non-war defense spending is still growing. One important factor in weighing the effect of sequestration is that war spending is not capped to meet certain spending levels outlined in the BCA. In other words, Congress can set the level of war spending above and beyond what is needed, if they wanted to do so to offset the impact of the sequester and BCA caps. So while there is uncertainty about the application of the sequester on war spending (see this article in the Hill), it is guaranteed that there are preemptive measures policymakers can take to limit sequestration’s effect, including propping up war spending to make up for losses in non-war accounts.¶ Of course, defense spending is a legitimate role of the federal government and America needs a strong military to defend itself. But that doesn’t mean every dollar spent on defense increases our security and that every cut in defense spending leads to a reduction in security.¶ As for defense cuts supposedly causing job losses, I would say the following. First, this morning National Review Online has a great piece by Robert Bryce on wind energy. The subtitle of his piece is “The ‘our industry creates jobs’ argument is the last refuge of a subsidy seeker.” That applies to defense contractors — the Department of Defense is not a jobs program. Its role isn’t to sustain defense contractors’ profits independently of the security they are actually meant to provide. Private-sector profit margins or even private-contractor job losses shouldn’t prevent sensible reductions in federal spending.¶ Second, there is little doubt that some defense jobs will be lost as a result of sequestration, but it won’t be as many as claimed. The job-loss estimates come from incredibly faulty reports such as this one. I understand that catastrophic job losses make a convenient case against sequestration but that doesn’t make them true. The above report in particular is packed full of mistakes, arbitrarily high multipliers (I just finished a review of the literature on defense-spending multipliers, to which I’ll link when it is up), and obscure methodology and exaggerations. It is also paid for by the defense contractors that have a lot to lose from the potential cuts.¶ Moreover, in a recent research paper for the Cato Institute, the American Enterprise Institute’s Benjamin Zycher reminds us that even in the worst-case scenario where contractor jobs would be lost, this reduction in employment in defense jobs is not a cost to the economy as a whole. It certainly represents a cost to the newly unemployed person, but it may not be a cost for the economy as a whole, since the public resources freed by the cuts may yield higher returns employed differently.¶ While sequester may pose a management challenge in the first year of implementation, all the alarmist projections exaggerate the impacts of the defense cuts (the same is true for non-defense cuts). Even after sequestration, and adjusted for inflation, defense spending would only revert to its 2007 level in real terms. In fact, after a near doubling in the defense spending in the last decade, it seems that at the core problem the Department of Defense may have is not lack of funding but inability to prioritize.

### AT MPX – Military

#### No impact to sequestration

Lawrence Korb, former assistant secretary of defense in the Reagan administration, is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, 9-9-2012, “Cuts Would Not Affect Security,” http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/09/09/how-big-should-the-defense-budget-be/cuts-would-not-affect-security

But the United States can afford defense cuts, without undermining national security, for four reasons:¶ First, the United States has just gone through an enormous defense buildup. The budget increased, in real terms, for an unprecedented 13 straight years between 1998 and 2012. Even during the Reagan buildup, defense spending grew for only four years before dropping back to more sustainable levels.¶ Second, the cuts being discussed are smaller than they seem. The first $500 billion come from projected growth, so the budget will fall by just $6 billion next year and then grow at about the same pace as inflation. Even with sequestration, defense spending would be brought back only to its 2006 level in real terms -- more than we spent on average under Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush.¶ Third, ending this indiscriminate growth will force the Pentagon to manage its funds more carefully. Over the past decade, the Pentagon squandered $46 billion on weapons it later canceled, and let half its procurement programs balloon beyond their original budgets.¶ Finally, we face a world with relatively few major threats. And even with sequestration-size cuts, we would still account for more than 40 percent of the world’s defense spending, and our allies would account for about half of the rest.

### WW

#### Winners win

Michael Hirsh, chief correspondent for National Journal, 2-7-2013, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction. Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

#### No tradeoffs – pushing more items doesn’t slow Obama down

Nancy Benac, writer for the Huffington Post, 1-20-2013, “Optimistic Obama faces tough to-do list” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20130120/us-obama-inauguration-analysis/?utm\_hp\_ref=sports&ir=sports

Plouffe argued that the president's big agenda gives him "the sort of focus and energy you need. And I think his intention is to run through the tape all the way." Obama can take heart from any number of things he's got going for him. He has a can-do attitude, growing public support for action on some of his chosen issues and better approval ratings. Democrats gained seats in both houses of Congress in the November election and Republican poll numbers are weak. With the war in Iraq over and U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan winding down, he has more time to focus on domestic priorities. He also doesn't have to worry as much about ruffling feathers because he doesn't have to run for re-election again. "People shouldn't underestimate how much we can get done," the president said in a pre-election interview for Rolling Stone.

#### Empirics prove – wins cause bandwaggoning

David Michael **Green**, professor of political science at Hofstra University, 6-11-**2010**, “The Do-Nothing 44th President,” <http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html>

Moreover, **there is a** continuously evolving and **reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement**. In the same way that **nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving** his or **her next goal better than succeeding** dramatically on the last go around. **This is** absolutely **a matter of perception**, and **you can see it** best **in the way** that **Congress** and especially the Washington press corps **fawn over bold** and intimidating **presidents** **like** **Reagan** and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously **creating a steamroller effect** and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, **they could leave such hapless hangers-on** **with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities**. **By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion** of being next to power, **of** **being part of the winning team**. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

### No Spend PC

#### Obama stays out and congress wont do anything

Eleanor Clift, staff writer, 2-6-2013, “Sequester Looms as Democrats and GOP Make Little Effort to Resolve Impasse,” Newsweek, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/02/06/sequester-looms-as-democrats-and-gop-make-little-effort-to-resolve-impasse.html

What’s most striking about the looming sequester is the lack of any real activity on either side, Democrat or Republican, to resolve the impasse. Instead, both parties seem to be sleepwalking their way to sequester, calming themselves with the rationale that letting it happen might not be that big a disaster. And they’re right—up to a point. “Sequestration is a disgrace, a congressionally made disgrace,” says Jim Kessler, of Third Way, a centrist Democratic group. “But it’s not the fiscal cliff—it can happen and life goes on."¶ Going over the fiscal cliff would have meant the U.S. defaulting on its debts and precipitating a global financial meltdown. Sequester takes a chunk out of defense spending and a chunk out of discretionary domestic spending, but it spares Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, and Pell grants. Republicans would rather accept deep cuts in defense spending than give Obama any more tax revenue, and with Democratic priorities protected, how bad can it be? Obama seems to be taking the same approach he did on the debt ceiling, leaving it up to Congress to figure a way out, but Congress so far is punting.

#### Obama won’t get involved in sequester fight

Stephen Stromberg, staff writer, 2-4-2013, “Impending cuts are going to hurt. So where’s President Obama?” WP, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2013/02/04/obama-interview-sequestration-spending-cuts/

Unless Congress and President Obama act before March 1, the country will endure a wholly gratuitous national nightmare. That’s when budget cuts known as “sequestration” begin to phase in, demanding untargeted, across-the-board reductions in nearly every category of federal spending. The cuts will hurt every American, not just those who might lose federal services, because they will sap economic growth, erode military effectiveness and bolster the impression that the United States can’t govern itself sensibly. That, the Bipartisan Policy Center estimates, will result in the loss of over a million jobs in the year after its implementation (h/t Matthew Yglesias). So, why isn’t President Obama doing more about it? Chuck Todd put that question to outgoing Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Martin Dempsey on “Meet the Press” on Sunday. Obama, Todd said, has been holding events on immigration reform and gun control, neither of which must be dealt with over the next few weeks. What about the sequestration insanity scheduled for less than a month from now? “The president of the United States has indicated the concern about the sequester,” Panetta said. “And he has proposed a solution to this.” “Indicated”? Did Panetta mean to damn the president with weak praise? That’s one of the wobbliest words he could have used to describe Obama’s expressions of concern. It often describes the act of communicating through implications, rhetorical feints or mild verbalizations, not strong declarations. It’s the word journalists use to characterize that very Washington practice of hinting at a public stand. The president has not been silent on the matter. When prompted in a pre-Super Bowl interview CBS aired on Sunday, Obama said that “Washington cannot continually operate under the cloud of crisis,” and he warned that a drastic, pre-sequestration reduction in defense spending has already hurt economic growth. Beyond that he, well, indicated that he wants to see some specific money-raising tax reforms in any bargain to cancel the sequestration cuts. Which is to say, as Panetta did on Sunday, that “the ball is in Congress’s court.” How discouraging. Yes, Congress should be working on this. And, yes, if the sequester kicks in, the House GOP would rightly bear more of the blame than Obama for refusing to consider raising more revenue to offset the cuts. But that doesn’t mean he gets a pass to focus on other topics. The president’s activity — or lack thereof — is a variable that always affects the policy equation. Over the course of his presidency, Obama has repeatedly thrown responsibility for following through on big policy to lawmakers — on health care, climate change, even the fiscal cliff. At this point, he’s clearly also weary of negotiating with Republicans under the duress of national catastrophe, and he’d rather get on with the rest of his agenda. But this is the most pressing issue facing the country right now; the nation needs someone to step out front, strongly. It’s hard to imagine what Americans elected Obama to do if not that.

### Thumpers

#### Sequestration will happen---budget deal won’t be finalized for months---proves the thumpers come first

Josh Hicks, a writer @ The Washington Post, 1-24-2013, “Party leaders predict temporary sequestration cuts are likely,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/federal-eye/wp/2013/01/24/party-leaders-predict-temporary-sequestration-cuts-are-likely-2/

Leaders from both political parties predicted Wednesday that sequestration would take place at least temporarily while lawmakers try to come up with a longer-term plan for reining in the national debt, according to an article by Lori Montgomery and Rosalind S. Helderman in Thursday’s Washington Post.¶ Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) reportedly said, “I think we are committed to some form of sequestration spending cut.” He added that the White House is considering options for blunting the impacts on government services and the federal workforce, according to Thursday’s article.¶ So what does that mean for federal agencies?¶ A Jan. 10 report from the Congressional Research Service said sequestration would entail “largely across-the-board spending reductions.” The operative word there is “largely,” meaning some programs — but not the federal workforce — would be shielded.¶ A host of so-called “mandatory” programs would be exempt from cuts, including Social Security, the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Additional Child Tax Credit, and low-income programs such as Medicaid, the Children’s Health Insurance Program and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance, according to the report.¶ Federal agencies would see across-the-board budget cuts of between 8 percent and 10 percent.¶ The government would have until Sept. 30 to make the required reductions, giving lawmakers time to forge a deal for less-painful cuts. In the meantime, agencies would absorb the impacts slowly, which is what Durbin was referring to when he said “I think we are committed to some form of sequestration spending cut.”¶ The idea is that lawmakers might be willing to let sequestration run its course for awhile to reduce spending without having to choose where the trimming occurs.

#### Gun control this month

Meredith Shiner, roll call staff, 2-4-2013, “Leahy Wields Influence Over Guns, Immigration” RollCall, http://www.rollcall.com/news/leahy\_wields\_influence\_over\_guns\_immigration-222144-1.html?pg=2

Of the two biggest pending issues, however, gun control seems to be much more complicated. Reid long has had ties to the National Rifle Association, and it’s widely believed that stricter measures, such as the assault weapons ban championed by Judiciary member Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., face long, if not impossible, odds for passage.¶ But the assault weapons ban is a perfect example of the political and policy balance Leahy must maintain in committee: Does he facilitate its inclusion to give it a leg up on the floor, but possibly imperiling the bill on the floor? Or does he try to force the amendment fight onto the floor, where the provision is almost certain to die?¶ Reid has said he will allow a floor vote on Feinstein’s assault weapons ban, but neither Reid nor Leahy appears especially committed to expending political capital to help it pass.¶ Moreover, Democratic leaders and Leahy have not laid out a path forward on gun control, opting to hold a series of hearings first before beginning their work on legislative language, which sources say the panel would like to finish by month’s end. That would set up the month of March for action on immigration.

#### Obama will push gun control hard – poe: not from December

Alexander Bolton, staff writer, 2-6-2013, “Obama schmoozes Dems at retreat,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/281603-obama-schmoozes-dems

Obama cajoled Democrats to support new gun-control measures despite strong reservations from centrists running for reelection in rural states, such as Sens. Mark Begich (Alaska), Tim Johnson (S.D.) and Mark Pryor (Ark.). “He understands that these issues are difficult, that achieving them will not be easy, but he is committed to pressing forward on them and to enlisting the support of lawmakers in both the House and the Senate of both parties in the effort,” Carney said.

### States CP

### Skin in Game

#### Skin in the game is key – gives necessary certainty

Gale et al., Sony Ben-Moshe, Jason J. Crowell, Kelley M. Gale,\* Breton A. Peace, Brett P. Rosenblatt, and Kelly D. Thomason\*\* \* Kelley Michael Gale is the Finance Department Chair of Latham & Watkins‘ San Diego office and serves as global Co-Chair for the firm‘s Climate Change and Cleantech Practice Groups. He has thirty years of experience representing private and public sector clients in the development, regulation, and financing of alternative energy projects and capital intensive infrastructure projects. \*\* The co-authors are attorneys in the Project Finance Practice Group in the San Diego office of Latham & Watkins LLP. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not reflect the views of Latham & Watkins LLP or its clients, 2009 “FINANCING THE NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE: THE BENEFITS AND POTENTIAL PITFALLS OF FEDERAL & STATE GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES AND THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN CALIFORNIA,” 498 ENERGY LAW JOURNAL Vol. 30:497

Similar to this political risk, **investors in new domestic nuclear reactors will likely face substantial regulatory and permitting risks, such as the risk of litigation** by residents or environmentalists desiring to thwart any large scale development of new reactors in the United States **and** the risk that **a** largely **untested** **regulatory approval process** may not operate as anticipated, and **those** challenges **can result in significant delays** in construction of a nuclear power project. Although they are different in kind, the substance of sovereign and other risks facing large overseas infrastructure projects is similar in the sense that worst case scenarios of delay or inability to make commercial use of the projects and the magnitude of the potential losses are roughly equivalent. As a risk mitigation measure in the case of financings for natural gas liquefaction facilities and other large overseas infrastructure projects, the Export-Import Bank of the United States may approve loan guarantees and offer credit enhancements and/or direct loans to support the sale of United States exports to emerging markets throughout the world. Its loan guarantees to support the construction of large overseas infrastructure projects increase the comfort of private institutional investors because these investors believe there is a substantially lower risk that an overseas political regime will change the rules in a manner adverse to creditors if the United States government is one of those creditors.34 In a similar fashion, regulatory risk insurance and loan guarantees provided by **the federal government should encourage** private financing of domestic nuclear power projects **because the government** providing the guarantees **also** **controls many of the risk factors which could give rise to regulatory delays** in commencing commercial operation of a new nuclear project. Further, in the nuclear power industry, **the federal government is reviewing** development **applications and reactor designs**, and is equipped with a **team of experts** in nuclear technologies, so that **if the federal government has skin in the game,** so to speak, **private lenders may take** additional **comfort** that **the government has performed a** certain level of **due diligence** **on a particular project and determined that there are no major flaws from its vantage point**. Section II.D.3 below discusses the risks covered by federally provided regulatory risk insurance and the ways in which it can be adapted to best encourage private sector financing for nuclear energy.

#### Investors say no to the CP – federal funding is NECESSARY and SUFFICIENT to hedge risk

NEI, Nuclear Energy Institute, September 2011, “Issues in Focus Loan Guarantees For Clean Energy Development,” NEI, http://www.nei.org/corporatesite/media/filefolder/loanguaranteefastfacts.pdf

Investors believe new nuclear plants face political and regulatory risks. The loan guarantee program offsets these risks. — The capital markets remember the experience during construction of today’s operating plants – longer-than-expected construction times and cost overruns caused partly by the licensing process and litigation. — The capital markets are concerned that new nuclear plants could face similar political and regulatory risks. Although the risk may be low, the potential consequences of licensing delays (given the cost of new nuclear plants) are high. Although the federal government has created a more efficient and predictable licensing process, which should reduce licensing risk, investors remain concerned given the high cost and long development times for nuclear power plants. — Since this licensing risk is a function of the federal government’s regulatory process, only the federal government – through the loan guarantee program – can offset that risk.

### Case

### AT NG Crowd out

#### Low prices not sustainable

Richard Myers, Vice President of Policy Development, Planning, and Supplier Programs at the Nuclear Energy Institute, 1-30-2013, “NEI's Richard Myers on the Wall Street Journal Story on Natural Gas and Nuclear Energy,” NEI Nuclear Notes, http://neinuclearnotes.blogspot.com/2013/01/neis-richard-myers-on-wall-street.html

It also bears noting that extremely low natural gas prices in the United States are not sustainable. Low natural gas prices are caused by a combination of reduced demand for natural gas (due to subpar economic growth), abnormally mild weather for the past several winters and a major increase in supply (due to improved drilling techniques that have unlocked vast reserves of shale gas). As the result of low gas prices, producers of natural gas have already slowed drilling: the number of rigs drilling for natural gas in the United States has dropped approximately 50 percent in the past 12 months. At the same time, the historic volatility of natural gas prices continues to be seen in the spot market. Just last week, natural gas prices in New England and New York City topped $30 per million BTUs, the highest level seen this winter, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. For New England, this was actually the highest level seen since January 2004.

#### Squo nat gas prices are irrelevant – companies prefer long term trends

Rod Adams, better than Monbiot, 2-2-2013, “Should customers allow natural gas to push nuclear out of market?” Atomic Insights, Should customers allow natural gas to push nuclear out of market?

Making long term energy decisions based on today’s North American natural gas prices is a bit like swinging a hockey stick under the assumption that pucks don’t move, even when they are placed on slick ice. The Great One (Wayne Gretzky) would remind anyone guided by that false notion that skating to where the puck is going to be in five years is likely to be more rewarding than swinging your stick at the place where the puck was reported to be last month. Here is an important graph to keep in mind when asking if nuclear energy can compete with natural gas. It is also worth keeping this graph of prices for natural gas sold to electricity producers near the top of your decision support material. Everyone who is interested in energy decisions should either know or learn that it takes roughly 5 years from the time that a combined license is issued for a new nuclear plant until that plant enters commercial operation. The license application process requires an additional 42-48 months with a steady investment in both personnel and money in order to keep it moving on that schedule. It is therefore short-sighted to make any decisions about whether or not to pursue a nuclear power project based on today’s market prices. Take any point on the above graph, draw the local slope and see how close it comes to predicting the price of natural gas nine years later. Companies that are building nuclear plants today are benefitting from the low prices that their future competitors are offering and from our rather sluggish economy. The material and labor inputs to the construction process are cheaper in times of low energy prices, low inflation and and low interest costs.

### AT Engineer Shortage

#### Plenty of engineers in the pipeline

Masahiro Kawaji and Sanjoy Banerjee, The Energy Institute at the City University of New York, “Renaissance of Nuclear Energy in the USA: Opportunities, Challenges and Future Research Needs,” 2010, Zero-Carbon Energy Kyoto, http://www.springer.com/978-4-431-99778-8

The US NRC has estimated that the nuclear industry as a whole will need an influx of 90,000 new workers within 10 years. Fortunately, increasing public recognition of the value of nuclear energy as a clean, reliable electricity source is leading more young people to identify nuclear energy as a career path. The number of nuclear engineering programs at US institutions dropped from about 50 programs in 1990 to fewer than 30 in the late 1990s, but bounced back to more than 30 programs currently. A recent Department of Energy study also found that enrollments in undergraduate nuclear energy programs have grown to more than 1,900 in the 2006–2007 academic year, compared to fewer than 500 eight years ago. Graduate enrollments also have jumped to more than 1,100 in the 2006–2007 year vs. just 220 in 1998–1999. The numbers of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded in nuclear engineering and health physics programs between 2000 and 2008 are shown in Table 4 [8].
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## 2AC

### 2AC Grid Add On

#### Nuclear expansion key to grid stability

Margaret Harding, president of 4Factor Consulting. She has worked in the nuclear industry for more than 30 years and advises clients on quality, regulatory, technical, and business issues within the nuclear industry, 2-8-2012, “Role of nuclear energy in creating smarter US grid networks,” Nuclear Energy Insider, http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/operations-maintenance/role-nuclear-energy-creating-smarter-us-grid-networks

Nuclear consultant, Margaret Harding, offers her insights into how smart grid technologies can boost storage capacity on the already constrained US grid network. She also looks at how nuclear's demand response record could actually help solar projects and overall power stability across the US. By Margaret Harding The concept that smart grids are separate from, and conflict with, traditional grids has been discussed in recent times. A key fact that has to be understood is that the current electricity grid in the US is a demand system. That is, electricity is generated as it is demanded. Very little storage capacity is available on the grid today. This makes electricity generation, transmission and distribution among the most complex systems in the world. This relative inelasticity of the industry is at the heart of the issues of intermittent power supplies and demand response. In the past, electricity supply was generated through means that were fairly well controlled. Baseload was provided by coal, hydro, and nuclear with some natural gas and other sources. Natural gas and some of the older less efficient oil units were used to manage demand with highly responsive systems coming on line as demand increased. Stressed out grid However, with the advent of intermittent power suppliers like wind and solar, and changing load curves due to increasing electricity usage (electric cars, more electrical appliances and equipment), the traditional methods of managing the grid are being significantly stressed. In addition, there are significant losses of electricity occurring in the current US transmission and distribution (T&D) system as well as inflexibility for transmission of electricity across long distances required to use intermittent sources that are generally more available in the west at major population and industrial centers in the east. Voltage events, even minor reductions in voltage, have increasingly significant effects on society. With the increased use of computers and sensitive electronics both as stand- alone devices and as a part of equipment used both in industrial and residential applications, we need to find ways to assure the reliability of the grid is as high as possible. What is ‘smart grid’? Smart grid is really about improving the reliability of the overall electricity supply. This entails managing supply as well as demand, but most importantly, the T&D of electricity. By better sensing and prediction of potential issues, including intermittent sources like wind and solar, faults such as transformer failures, or voltage irregularities, and increasing demand, a “smarter grid” will allow various energy sources to work together more effectively with fewer issues reaching the industrial, commercial, and residential consumers of electricity. Where does nuclear fit in? How do nuclear energy facilities contribute to the overall reliability of energy supply? And how can they support some of the other initiatives on the grid? In the US, generation and T&D have been separated in many markets. This separation means that nuclear generators don’t have direct ability to improve the reliability and detection of grid events in the T&D. However, it does not mean that nuclear utilities do not contribute to grid reliability. Nuclear energy tends to be used as base load supply. The reasons for this are primarily economic, though technology does play a role. The economic reasons center around the fact that nuclear is a capital intensive energy source. Because the majority of costs are in the design and construction of the facility, the owners of these plants need to operate them as much as possible to maximize the return on their investments. Nuclear power plants can load follow, but at an efficiency cost in fuel use. Such load-following operation has to be planned for well in advance to assure safe operation of the plant at varying power conditions. Since most utilities want to maximize investment, they are reluctant to plan in advance of intentional operation at other than 100 per cent power. This drive to be base load makes current nuclear energy facilities less an ideal match with wind energy for daily interaction where intermittency is less predictable and peak availability tends to occur in early morning hours when demand is low. In a more seasonal evaluation, most nuclear plants target outages for spring and fall, both periods when wind is more reliably available and seasonal demand tends to be lower. Nuclear solar combo Nuclear and solar, however, can work together in some interesting and more optimal ways. Because solar is tied to hours of daylight and tends to peak at midday when demand is starting to rise to peak as well, nuclear and solar can work as baseload and peak demand response very effectively. In addition, nuclear load-following is best used when a predictable pattern of reduced power and increased power can be used. As solar tends to be more predictable in its cyclical availability, nuclear energy fuel planning can be designed to work in concert with these arrays, should the amount of solar power being generated exceed demand. Solid base of reliable power Aside from nuclear’s direct interaction with intermittent sources, nuclear power plants can have their own impact on grid reliability. Responding to a loss of 1000 MW or more of electricity during peak demand periods can risk cascading failures if unexpected plant trips occur during operation. Nuclear utilities have worked to continue to improve the reliability of these machines, with capacity factors moving into the 90% range and providing a solid base of reliable power. Unplanned reactor outages have become increasingly rare and allow grid operators to rely on nuclear energy for base load demand. In addition, nuclear utilities have increased the robustness of their facilities to withstand loss of power events. By ensuring that the facilities will be available even during severe weather events, or that they can get back online quickly in the event of grid damage, nuclear energy facilities serve as anchor points in regional grid structures that can keep power delivery to consumers.

#### Grid vulnerability allow China to launch cyberattacks and invade Taiwan

Derene 9

(Glenn – Defense Analyst @ Popular Mechanics, “How Vulnerable is U.S. Infrastructure to a Major Cyber Attack?” October 1, 2009, http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military/4307521)

The next world war might not start with a bang, but with a blackout. An enemy could send a few lines of code to control computers at key power plants, causing equipment to overheat and melt down, plunging sectors of the U.S. and Canadian grid into darkness. Trains could roll to a stop on their tracks, while airport landing lights wink out and the few traffic lights that remain active blink at random. In the silence and darkness, citizens may panic, or they may just sit tight and wait for it all to reboot. Either way, much of the country would be blind and unresponsive to outside events. And that might be the enemy's objective: Divert America's attention while mounting an offensive against another country. Pentagon planners have long understood the danger of cyber attacks on U.S. military networks. Indeed, the Defense Department's Global Information Grid is one of the most frequently targeted computer networks on Earth. But the cat-and-mouse game of information espionage on military networks is not the only digital threat that keeps national-security experts up at night. There is a growing concern over the vulnerability of far more tangible assets essential to the economy and well-being of American citizens. Much of the critical infrastructure that keeps the country humming--water-treatment facilities, refineries, pipelines, dams, the electrical grid--is operated using a hodgepodge of technologies known as industrial control systems. Like banks and telecommunications networks, which are also generally considered critical infrastructure, these industrial facilities and utilities are owned by private companies that are responsible for maintaining their own security. But many of the control systems in the industrial world were installed years ago with few or no cyber-security features. That wasn't a big problem when these systems were self-contained. But in the past two decades, many of these controls have been patched into company computer networks, which are themselves linked to the Internet. And when it comes to computer security, a good rule of thumb is that any device that is computer-controlled and networked is vulnerable to hacking. Bad-guy hackers pulling the plug on public utilities is a common theme of Hollywood films, including 2007's Live Free or Die Hard, but such scenarios present more than a mere fictional scare to U.S. intelligence officials. According to Melissa Hathaway, cyber-coordination executive for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the list of potential adversaries in a cyber attack is long, ranging from disgruntled employees to criminals to hostile nations. Most experts agree that China and Russia routinely probe our industrial networks, looking for information and vulnerabilities to use as leverage in any potential dispute. James Lewis, a cyber-security expert for the policy think tank Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), says that although cyber warfare couldn't cripple the U.S., it could serve as an effective military tactic. "If I were China, and I were going to invade Taiwan," he says, "and I needed to complete the conquest in seven days, then it's an attractive option to turn off all the electricity, screw up the banks and so on." Could the entire U.S. grid be taken down in such an attack? "The honest answer is that we don't know," Lewis says. "And I don't like that answer."

#### Extinction

Straits Times (Singapore), June 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable.Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.

### 2AC Aerospace Add On

#### Collapse in manufacturing kills US tech leadership – ends aerospace

Michael Lind, policy director of New America’s Economic Growth Program and a co-founder of the New America Foundation, and Joshua Freedman, program associate in New America’s Economic Growth Program, April 2012, "Value Added: America’s Manufacturing Future" http://growth.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Lind,%20Michael%20and%20Freedman,%20Joshua%20-%20NAF%20-%20Value%20Added%20America%27s%20Manufacturing%20Future.pdf-http://growth.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Lind, Michael and Freedman,

Manufacturing, R&D and the U.S. Innovation Ecosystem Perhaps the greatest contribution of manufacturing to the U.S. economy as a whole involves the disproportionate role of the manufacturing sector in R&D. The expansion in the global market for high-value-added services has allowed the U.S. to play to its strengths by expanding its trade surplus in services, many of them linked to manufacturing, including R&D, engineering, software production and finance. Of these services, by far the most important is R&D. The United States has long led the world in R&D. In 1981, U.S. gross domestic expenditure on R&D was more than three times as large as that of any other country in the world. And the U.S. still leads: in 2009, the most recent year for which there is available data, the United States spent more than 400 billion dollars. European countries spent just under 300 billion dollars combined, while China spent about 150 billion dollars.14 In the United States, private sector manufacturing is the largest source of R&D. The private sector itself accounts for 71 percent of total R&D in the United States, and although U.S. manufacturing accounts for only 11.7 percent of GDP in 2012, the manufacturing sector accounts for 70 percent of all R&D spending by the private sector in the U.S.15 And R&D and innovation are inextricably connected: a National Science Foundation survey found that 22 percent of manufacturers had introduced product innovations and the same percentage introduced process innovations in the period 2006-2008, while only 8 percent of nonmanufacturers reported innovations of either kind.16 Even as the manufacturing industry in the United States underwent major changes and suffered severe job losses during the last decade, R&D spending continued to follow a general upward growth path. A disproportionate share of workers involved in R&D are employed directly or indirectly by manufacturing companies; for example, the US manufacturing sector employs more than a third of U.S. engineers.17 This means that manufacturing provides much of the demand for the U.S. innovation ecosystem, supporting large numbers of scientists and engineers who might not find employment if R&D were offshored along with production. Why America Needs the Industrial Commons Manufacturing creates an industrial commons, which spurs growth in multiple sectors of the economy through linked industries. An “industrial commons” is a base of shared physical facilities and intangible knowledge shared by a number of firms. The term “commons” comes from communally- shared pastures or fields in premodern Britain. The industrial commons in particular in the manufacturing sector includes not only large companies but also small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), which employ 41 percent of the American manufacturing workforce and account for 86 percent of all manufacturing establishments in the U.S. Suppliers of materials, component parts, tools, and more are all interconnected; most of the time, Harvard Business School professors Gary Pisano and Willy Shih point out, these linkages are geographic because of the ease of interaction and knowledge transfer between firms.18 Examples of industrial commons surrounding manufacturing are evident in the United States, including the I-85 corridor from Alabama to Virginia and upstate New York.19 Modern economic scholarship emphasizes the importance of geographic agglomeration effects and co-location synergies. 20 Manufacturers and researchers alike have long noted the symbiotic relationship that occurs when manufacturing and R&D are located near each other: the manufacturer benefits from the innovation, and the researchers are better positioned to understand where innovation can be found and to test new ideas. While some forms of knowledge can be easily recorded and transferred, much “know-how” in industry is tacit knowledge. This valuable tacit knowledge base can be damaged or destroyed by the erosion of geographic linkages, which in turn shrinks the pool of scientists and engineers in the national innovation ecosystem. If an advanced manufacturing core is not retained, then the economy stands to lose not only the manufacturing industry itself but also the geographic synergies of the industrial commons, including R&D. Some have warned that this is already the case: a growing share of R&D by U.S. multinational corporations is taking place outside of the United States.21 In particular, a number of large U.S. manufacturers have opened up or expanded R&D facilities in China over the last few years.22 Next Generation Manufacturing A dynamic manufacturing sector in the U.S. is as important as ever. But thanks to advanced manufacturing technology and technology-enabled integration of manufacturing and services, the very nature of manufacturing is changing, often in radical ways. What will the next generation of manufacturing look like? In 1942, the economist Joseph Schumpeter declared that “the process of creative destruction is the essential fact about capitalism.” By creative destruction, Schumpeter did not mean the rise and fall of firms competing in a technologically-static marketplace. He referred to a “process of industrial mutation— if I may use that biological term—that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating the new one.” He noted that “these revolutions are not strictly incessant; they occurred in discrete rushes that are separated from each other by spaces of comparative quiet. The process as a whole works incessantly, however, in the sense that there is always either revolution or absorption of the results of revolution.”23 As Schumpeter and others have observed, technological innovation tends to be clustered in bursts or waves, each dominated by one or a few transformative technologies that are sometimes called “general purpose technologies.” Among the most world-transforming general pur- pose technologies of recent centuries have been the steam engine, electricity, the internal combustion engine, and information technology.24 As epochal as these earlier technology-driven innovations in manufacturing processes and business models proved to be, they are rapidly being superseded by new technology- driven changes as part of the never-ending process of Schumpeterian industrial mutation. The latest wave of innovation in industrial technology has been termed “advanced manufacturing.” The National Science and Technology Council of the Executive Office of the President defines advanced manufacturing as “a family of activities that (a) depend on the use and coordination of information, automation, computation, software, sensing, and networking, and/or (b) make use of cutting edge materials and emerging capabilities enabled by the physical and biological sciences, for example, nanotechnology, chemistry, and biology. It involves both new ways to manufacture existing products and the manufacture of new products emerging from new advanced technologies.”25 Already computer-aided design (CAD) and computer-aided manufacturing (CAM) programs, combined with computer numerical control (CNC), allow precision manufacturing from complex designs, eliminating many wasteful trials and steps in finishing. CNC is now ubiquitous in the manufacturing sector and much of the employment growth occurring in the sector requires CNC skills or training. Information technology has allowed for enterprise resource planning (ERP) and other forms of enterprise software to connect parts of the production process (both between and within a firm), track systems, and limit waste when dealing with limited resources. Other areas in which advanced manufacturing will play a role in creating new products and sectors and changing current ones are: Supercomputing. America’s global leadership in technology depends in part on whether the U.S. can compete with Europe and Asia in the race to develop “exascale computing,” a massive augmentation of computer calculating power that has the potential to revolutionize predictive sci- ences from meteorology to economics. According to the Advanced Scientific Computing Advisory Committee (ASCAC), “If the U.S. chooses to be a follower rather than a leader in exascale computing, we must be willing to cede leadership” in industries including aerospace, automobiles, energy, health care, novel material development, and information technology.

#### Aerospace decline spills over, collapsing U.S. air power

David Thompson, President, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 12-10-2009, “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, Lexis.

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth. However, the U.S. aerospace workforce is now facing the most serious demographic challenge in his 100-year history. Simply put, today, many more older, experienced professionals are retiring from or otherwise leaving our industrial and governmental aerospace workforce than early career professionals are entering it. This imbalance is expected to become even more severe over the next five years as the final members of the Apollo-era generation of engineers and scientists complete 40- or 45-year careers and transition to well-deserved retirements. In fact, around 50 percent of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within just the next five years. Meanwhile, the supply of younger aerospace engineers and scientists entering the industry is woefully insufficient to replace the mounting wave of retirements and other departures that we see in the near future. In part, this is the result of broader technical career trends as engineering and science graduates from our country's universities continue a multi-decade decline, even as the demand for their knowledge and skills in aerospace and other industries keeps increasing. Today, only about 15 percent of U.S. students earn their first college degree in engineering or science, well behind the 40 or 50 percent levels seen in many European and Asian countries. Due to the dual-use nature of aerospace technology and the limited supply of visas available to highly-qualified non-U.S. citizens, our industry's ability to hire the best and brightest graduates from overseas is also severely constrained. As a result, unless effective action is taken to reverse current trends, the U.S. aerospace sector is expected to experience a dramatic decrease in its technical workforce over the next decade. Your second question concerns the implications of a cutback in human spaceflight programs. AIAA's view on this is as follows. While U.S. human spaceflight programs directly employ somewhat less than 10 percent of our country's aerospace workers, its influence on attracting and motivating tomorrow's aerospace professionals is much greater than its immediate employment contribution. For nearly 50 years the excitement and challenge of human spaceflight have been tremendously important factors in the decisions of generations of young people to prepare for and to pursue careers in the aerospace sector. This remains true today, as indicated by hundreds of testimonies AIAA members have recorded over the past two years, a few of which I'll show in brief video interviews at the end of my statement. Further evidence of the catalytic role of human space missions is found in a recent study conducted earlier this year by MIT which found that 40 percent of current aerospace engineering undergraduates cited human space programs as the main reason they chose this field of study. Therefore, I think it can be predicted with high confidence that a major cutback in U.S. human space programs would be substantially detrimental to the future of the aerospace workforce. Such a cutback would put even greater stress on an already weakened strategic sector of our domestic high-technology workforce. Your final question centers on other issues that should be considered as decisions are made on the funding and direction for NASA, particularly in the human spaceflight area. In conclusion, AIAA offers the following suggestions in this regard. Beyond the previously noted critical influence on the future supply of aerospace professionals, administration and congressional leaders should also consider the collateral damage to the space industrial base if human space programs were substantially curtailed. Due to low annual production rates and highly-specialized product requirements, the domestic supply chain for space systems is relatively fragile. Many second- and third-tier suppliers in particular operate at marginal volumes today, so even a small reduction in their business could force some critical suppliers to exit this sector. Human space programs represent around 20 percent of the $47 billion in total U.S. space and missile systems sales from 2008. Accordingly, a major cutback in human space spending could have large and highly adverse ripple effects throughout commercial, defense, and scientific space programs as well, potentially triggering a series of disruptive changes in the common industrial supply base that our entire space sector relies on.

#### WMD Conflict

Ashley Tellis, Senior Political Scientist, RAND, 1998, “Sources of Conflict in the 21st Century”, http://www.rand. org/publications/MR/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf

This subsection attempts to synthesize some of the key operational implications distilled from the analyses relating to the rise of Asia and the potential for conflict in each of its constituent regions. The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The Korean peninsula, China, and the Indian subcontinent are already arenas of WMD proliferation. While emergent nuclear capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, chemical and biological warfare threats will progressively become future problems. The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

### 2AC Politics

#### No link – no controversy – they failed to read a card on this

Brad Plumer, writer for Ezra Klein’s Wonkblog at Washington Post, 9-20-2011, “The pseudo-debate over Solyndra ,” Wonkblog, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/post/the-pseudo-debate-over-solyndra/2011/09/20/gIQAyN2hiK\_blog.html

Ever since Solyndra went bankrupt in August, there’s been a pseudo-debate in Washington over loan guarantees for energy projects. It’s a pseudo-debate because neither party really believes that energy should be left to the whims of the free market. The GOP has long backed loan guarantees for nuclear power plants, and, as the New York Times reports today, key Republicans such as Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) have been begging the Energy Department for loans for clean-energy projects in their own districts. In practice, the Solyndra squabble is more about scoring a political hit on the Obama administration than a genuine policy dispute. Still, it’s worth revisiting the underlying question: Why should the federal government back risky energy projects?

#### LGs for SMRs now – they’re small scale but equally controversial

#### Winners win

Michael Hirsh, chief correspondent for National Journal, 2-7-2013, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Disads not intrinsic – logical policy maker could do both

#### Obama wont spend PC and he won’t be effective if he does

Jay Cost, staff writer, 2-11-2013, “Obama the Bargainer,” The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/obama-bargainer\_699205.html?page=1

Thus, with the festivities finished and the glow of the inauguration fading, it is fair to ask: Just how powerful will President Obama be in his second term? In other words, how successful will he be at persuading the diverse agents of our government to do what he wants them to do? If the lessons of his first term guide our expectations for the second, then the most likely answer is: not very. At first blush, this assertion might sound absurd. A weak President Obama? Proof of the contrary is in the pudding: The massive stimulus, the health care bill, and financial reform were all epic in their scope and ambition. Surely both left and right agree—whether they celebrate or bemoan the fact—that Obama is a very strong, liberal president. But presidential power—the ability to persuade—has many sources, some external, some internal. The external sources are all reducible to “the political context.” How many seats does the president’s party control in Congress? What is the status of the opposition party? What was the relative strength of the president and his party in the last election? What is his job approval rating? And so on. All of these factors set the boundaries for how easily the president can persuade others. In 2009 and 2010, President Obama enjoyed a very favorable political context. Today, the political context is more favorable to him than it was in 2011, but markedly diminished from the heady days of 2009. So, for instance, President Obama can call for action on “climate change” until he is blue (or, perhaps, green) in the face, but the political environment—including arguably the most conservative House of Representatives since the 1920s—means he lacks the power to make it happen. The internal sources of strength are the president’s political skills, which he deploys in particular circumstances. So the question becomes: How good is he at persuading others, given the political context? If political context is the science of presidential power, quantifiable in electoral results and congressional voting scores, persuasive skill is the art. Here, we must put down the American Political Science Review and pick up Machiavelli’s Prince. As for President Obama’s first term, no other incoming president in recent history had such a surplus of political capital and misused it so terribly. The reason? He lacks important skills that are integral in the exercise of presidential power. All presidents are unique, each possessing or lacking skills useful to a chief executive. Obama is notable in that he has mastered some vital skills better than any recent predecessor, but he exhibits virtually no facility with others. His strengths have been enumerated extensively by a fawning press corps. His favorable coverage is due not only to the media’s ideological commitment to his policy goals, but also to his natural gifts. He awes the press, and many other groups in society, by his very presence. Moreover, he knows he has this power over them. This ability, more than any other, made him president and remains his single greatest source of power. Yet though he affects some people intensely, he himself seems largely unaffected by others. This helps explain why he has used his speaking ability so unevenly: He is wont to misread people, and therefore situations. His Tucson speech, for instance, after the shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, was a political stroke of genius. He intuited what the moment called for and delivered it perfectly. By contrast, his 2009 speech to the International Olympic Committee pitching Chicago was a waste of time and made him look small. Similarly, he has time and again left business leaders feeling nonplussed, inviting them to the White House mainly to serve as window dressing for another teleprompter performance. It is on Capitol Hill that Obama seems most out of touch with his audience. In particular, he does not understand what the key players in Congress expect, yet he is convinced he knows them better than they know themselves. What’s more, he gives little and inconsistent guidance as to what he expects from them. That goes for both Republicans and Democrats. For Republicans, the warning signs appeared early, on the stimulus bill passed in the president’s first month in office. Obama and his team were supremely confident that they could get a $900 billion package through Congress with solid Republican support, so much so that when House minority whip Eric Cantor warned that they would receive no backing from House Republicans, they told him not to embarrass himself with such an absurd prediction. Team Obama failed to anticipate how turned off the congressional GOP would be by the spending side of the package: Democratic appropriators were unloading a wish list that had accumulated during more than a decade of Republican governance. The White House also thought the Republicans would be attracted to the tax cuts that constituted roughly one-third of the package. But the White House did not understand how Republicans view taxes—specifically, the difference between tax credits, which the stimulus favored heavily, and rate cuts, which Republicans prefer. None of this should have come as a surprise to anyone who had done any homework on the congressional GOP. After all, Republicans killed a 1993 stimulus bill that was qualitatively similar, but less than a tenth the size of the 2009 package. What did Team Obama surmise when its predictions fell flat? It certainly did not take time to gauge the congressional GOP more carefully, to build a more nuanced picture of Republicans’ motives and expectations. Instead, it adopted the cartoonish caricature one finds in a Paul Krugman column: Republicans are contemptible knaves, willing to let the economy go down the drain to embarrass the president. The stimulus also featured another theme of presidential-congressional relations under Obama: mixed messages from the White House. Early in the negotiations over the bill, President Obama told House minority leader John Boehner and Cantor that he was interested in their ideas. He did not want to play partisan games; he just wanted to jump-start the economy. Yet when Cantor presented the president a list of suggestions, Obama brought the dialogue to an icy conclusion by infamously declaring, “I won, so I think I trump you on that.” During the deliberations on the bill, the president’s chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, was known to respond to other GOP suggestions by shouting, “We have the votes. F— ’em!” For the first two years of Obama’s tenure, congressional Republicans did not register with the White House at all. Contact was so sparse that when the GOP took control of the House of Representatives, the White House did not even have Boehner’s cell phone number so the president could place a congratulatory call. The case of Michigan Republican Dave Camp is illustrative. According to Bob Woodward in The Price of Politics, The administration’s approach to Congress was different from what he was used to. He had first come to Washington as a congressional staffer during the Reagan administration. Reagan had deployed administration liaisons all over Congress. Camp could remember Reagan getting on the phone with a lowly freshman congressman to discuss legislation. .  .  . During Obama’s first two years in office, Camp was the ranking Republican on the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee. He was one of the more politically moderate House Republicans. Yet the administration’s Hill staff didn’t even seem to know who he was. He never saw them. During the debt ceiling battle of 2011, the president again exhibited cluelessness about the motivations of congressional Republicans. Precious time during the month of July was wasted as Obama insisted again and again on decoupling the Bush-era tax cuts, making permanent the cuts for those making under $250,000, and letting the cuts in the high-end rates expire. His argument was that the congressional GOP could avoid the wrath of Grover Norquist because it would not actually have to vote to increase taxes. It seemed never to cross his mind that tax rate increases such as he was proposing were anathema to congressional Republicans. The bigger problem during the debt ceiling fight, and probably the biggest contributor to the near-default of the country that summer, was Obama’s failure to heed Boehner’s warning that $800 billion in additional tax revenue was his “red line,” above which he could not go. The justification for that figure was that it was all that could be squeezed out of tax reform (and even that was optimistic according to many analysts); beyond that, tax rates would have to be raised in order to bring in more revenue. In late July, after Boehner had made a “grand bargain” offer that included $800 billion in new revenue, Obama asked for another $400 billion. Memories diverge on exactly who said what—Boehner is convinced Obama said he had to have the extra money, while Obama believes he only suggested it. This ambiguity might have been avoided if Obama had not made the rookie mistake of making such a big request over the phone instead of in person. And, anyway, he should have known not to ask, given Boehner’s previous warnings about his red line. Unsurprisingly, the deal blew up shortly afterwards. It boils down to the difference between listening and waiting to talk. With congressional Republicans, Obama always seems to do the latter. So, once again, he was left disappointed, and once again he assumed the worst of his negotiating partners. He surmised that there were simply too many extreme Tea Party Republicans who were prepared to breach the debt ceiling, and that Boehner lacked control of his caucus. Again, a basic understanding of Republican history would have corrected this notion. Like Newt Gingrich and Denny Hastert before him, Boehner is responsible to a majority of the Republican caucus, which for generations has opposed the kinds of rate increases that $1.2 trillion in new revenue would have required. Not only did Obama fail to listen during the debt ceiling struggle, he consistently sent the other side mixed messages. A case in point: Obama’s demagogic April 2011 speech blasted Paul Ryan’s budget as “leaving seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry” and abandoning “the fundamental commitment this country has kept for generations.” In private, however, Obama had praised Ryan for offering a serious proposal and emphasized that both sides had to avoid scaring the elderly for political points. Worse, he had held a bipartisan summit that very day to encourage the two sides to come together on a plan. Obama’s problems communicating with Congress are not limited to the right side of the aisle. Although Democrats need not worry about White House demagoguery or fret that Obama fails to understand their concerns, he has nevertheless done a poor job of engaging them in dialogue. In particular, the White House has often cut congressional Democrats out of the loop, inhibiting interbranch coordination and angering leaders by what they feel is trampling on their institutional rights. Indeed, the president’s signature achievement—Obamacare—almost did not happen because of this. The process by which the health care bill was written was chaotic, to say the least. At one point five bills were circulating on Capitol Hill, three in the House and two in the Senate. Each differed, sometimes dramatically, in how to expand coverage and how to pay for it. And yet the White House did virtually nothing in 2009 to coordinate these efforts. In fact, White House aides privately thought the final House bill was a liberal fantasy, and they had worked out a deal with medical providers that did not include the so-called public option. Yet the president never came out against that proposal, or any other, for that matter. After multiple calls over the summer of 2009 for President Obama to set some ground rules on what he expected, he gave a speech in early September that, though his aides promised specificity, was once again vague. Finally, in early January, when the two chambers had passed their bills and it came time to work out the finer points, President Obama actually stormed out of a meeting after Nancy Pelosi tartly expressed her frustration with his lack of leadership. It was left to Emanuel to finish the negotiations. Worse, the needless delays due to the lack of presidential leadership sapped public support for the reform effort, led to Scott Brown’s victory in the Senate race in Massachusetts that January, and eventually forced Democrats to pass a gratuitously slipshod and ill-conceived bill that otherwise never would have become law. After the 2010 midterms, House Democrats lost their majority, but not all of their clout. It would have been virtually impossible for Boehner to pass a compromise debt ceiling plan through the House in 2011 without at least some Democratic support, so it was appropriate for Pelosi and her leadership team to be kept in the loop. For a while, they were, but as Boehner and Obama approached a grand bargain, House Democrats were excluded. Amazingly, so was Harry Reid. Any deal would obviously have to bear the imprimatur of the Senate majority leader, yet he was cut out of the final talks. It was only after the New York Times scooped the Boehner-Obama grand bargain that the White House brought Senate Democrats into the loop. Unsurprisingly, they were apoplectic, believing that the deal extracted too little from the congressional GOP, and feeling that they had been ignored. In fact, it was the outrage of the Senate Democrats that prompted the White House to go back to Boehner at the last minute to ask for more tax revenue, scuttling the big deal once and for all. All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure. There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill. In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president’s job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: The reason people put me in this office is people felt that I had connected our current predicaments with the broader arc of American history and where we might go as a diverse and forward-looking nation. And that narrative thread we just lost, in the day-to-day problem solving that was going on. .  .  . What the president can do, that nobody else can do, is tell a story to the American people about where we are and where we need to go. While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices. The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one “actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood.” President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one “in the arena.” What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi’s power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side.

#### Davenport ev says he’s already pushing tax reform and gun control – CX is pretty embarrassing here – no articulation of distinction

#### Guns are a heavy lift – drains PC

Joan Walsh, writer for Salon, 2-5-2013, “Obama’s gutsy gun control push” http://www.salon.com/2013/02/05/obamas\_gutsy\_gun\_control\_push/

Second-term Barack Obama continues to show us he’s wiser and tougher than the guy who took office four years ago. The latest sign is his stance on his gun control agenda. In Minneapolis on Monday, he laid out everything he intends to push for, not merely pushing criminal background checks and tougher penalties for gun trafficking, but also the part of his plan that will be the heaviest lifting: an assault weapons ban. This is what many liberals have hoped to see since his earliest political battles in 2009, going all the way back to the initial stimulus skirmishes: a president who tells the American people what he thinks will solve our problems, and who fights for those solutions, who demands congressional votes even on the most controversial agenda items – and who may, down the road, be forced to compromise on some of those priorities, only to fight for them another day. Obama’s speech came in the wake of the NRA’s Wayne LaPierre’s unpantsing by Chris Wallace on “Fox News Sunday.” It was one of the most astonishing political confrontations in memory. Wallace called LaPierre “ridiculous” for suggesting the president’s daughters don’t deserve more protection than other children. He derided him for alleging with no evidence that background checks are a first step to a national registry that would allow the president to take away Americans’ guns. He called the NRA’s claim that the Obama daughters’ school has armed guards “nonsense,” since his children also went there and he knows Sidwell Friends, a Quaker school, doesn’t arm its security. Finally, he mocked LaPierre for suggesting that only the “elite” have protection, pointing out that the NRA head traveled to the Fox interview with his own bodyguards. He reduced the NRA bully to a sputtering wreck. Just four years ago, LaPierre was treated very differently on Fox, when Glenn Beck invited him to come on his show and warn his paranoid viewers of Obama’s gun grab. Admittedly Wallace is less a partisan than the loony Beck, but it’s significant that Fox’s Sunday morning viewers heard a host debunk the claim that Obama’s coming for their guns rather than spread it. Against that backdrop, Obama’s decision to stand before a cadre of law enforcement officers for his Minneapolis speech made great political theater. It served as a reminder that the NRA’s “enemies list” includes the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Association of School Safety and Law Enforcement Officers, and the Police Foundation. (Really, it does. The list is here.) Obama sold the assault weapons ban, in part, as a measure to protect the police. “Weapons of war have no place on our streets, or in our schools, or threatening our law enforcement officers,” he said. ‘Our law enforcement officers should never be out-gunned on the streets.” Salon’s Jillian Rayfield laid out the tough sledding that’s ahead of assault-ban supporters, including the skepticism of purple state Democrats like Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. Reid, rather lordly and ineptly, said on “Meet the Press” that he didn’t know if he supported Sen. Dianne Feinstein’s assault-weapons ban because he hadn’t read it yet. I know the majority leader is a busy guy, but c’mon, Harry. Maybe get someone to read it to you. I’m tired of red- and purple-state Democrats getting a pass on gun issues because hunting, say, is popular in their states. Who could be more valuable than a red-state Democrat in telling hunters that Obama’s agenda won’t take away their hunting rifles? So I’m glad Obama’s demanding that Congress vote on an assault-weapons ban rather than letting leaders table it, as he did with other first-term priorities, even if that means conservative Democrats must take some tough votes. Of course, letting conservative Democrats crush an assault ban may also serve to protect them from the NRA. That’s allegedly why Reid is open to a vote on the issue. But it could have the unintended consequence of letting those newly motivated by Newtown single out Democrats who deserve criticism, or even a primary challenge, on the issue of guns. Dianne Feinstein insists that she will push for her assault weapons ban bill, and Connecticut Sen. Chris Murphy, who used to represent Newtown as a congressman, derided those who’ve declared that push futile. “Too many people in Washington want to eulogize specific pieces of gun reform legislation before the debate has even started,” Murphy told “The Rachel Maddow Show.” The time to act is now. Let me be clear: I think compromise is crucial to getting new policy crafted, and if it turns out legislators can find common ground on a limited package of reforms, chief among them universal criminal background checks, I’d support that. Greg Sargent featured a fascinating interview with crucial GOP House Rep. Scott Rigell of Virginia, who represents a purple district that went for Obama in 2012. Rigell is teaming up with another Republican, Rep. Scott Meehan, along with Democrats Elijah Cummings and Carolyn McCarthy, to push legislation to crack down on gun trafficking designed to evade background checks. Rigell also says he is open to universal background checks, though he is undecided. “I certainly see the merits of that,” he told Sargent. Still, being open to compromise is different from suggesting that Democrats should stick to supporting only measures that they know have broad support. The point of leadership is to lead, and as we saw with gay marriage, when the president stakes out a forward-looking stance on a divisive issue, he can help bring people along with him. I’m glad he’s continuing to push for the assault weapon and large magazine ban, even as the serious sensible people of the Beltway insist it will never pass. Maybe he’ll surprise them. Because of Newtown, we’re in a new era for gun control legislation, which doesn’t mean we’ll get everything we want. But it requires a new approach to political leadership and negotiation, and the president is providing it.

#### The GOP will bail on immigration at the last moment – they only care about scoring points for trying

Alex Pareene, writes about politics for Salon, published author, 1-30-2013, “GOP prepares to blame Obama for immigration deal collapse,” Salon, http://www.salon.com/2013/01/30/gop\_prepares\_to\_blame\_obama\_for\_immigration\_deal\_collapse/

While much of Washington seems very confident that a major immigration reform bill will pass this year, I remain skeptical. As I wrote yesterday, there are still some major obstacles, like “the Republican Party” and “the conservative movement.” But Rush Limbaugh, no friend to the undocumented, recently gave reform supporter Marco Rubio a very generous and non-confrontational interview. This is a big deal, because Limbaugh is going to either give Republican lawmakers cover to support reform without incurring the wrath of their constituents, or he is going to kill the entire thing. The fact that Limbaugh went out of his way to be respectful to Rubio is a sign that Rubio’s got breathing room to actually push for real reform. But Rubio also repeatedly made it plain that he is leaving himself the option of walking away from the whole thing and blaming Obama. Conservatives have convinced themselves that Barack Obama intentionally blew up the possibility of an immigration reform bill in his first term, by forcing them to not support reform. (The theory doesn’t really make sense.) “I think he wants to destroy the Republican Party, particularly in the eyes of Hispanic American voters,” Bill O’Reilly told Marco Rubio. “So he’s going to make it as hard as possible to get anything done and demonize you guys.” The idea is that Barack Obama used his cunning and guile to trick the entire Republican Party into seeking and then relying on the white nativist vote for a generation. So Republicans are preparing the groundwork for the P.R. campaign to blame Obama for this deal’s collapse. Here’s Rubio with Limbaugh: Responding to challenges from Limbaugh that Obama would demand reforms with fewer border security measures, Rubio emphasized his willingness to walk away from a bill if he didn’t get what he wanted on that front. In particular, he said including enforcement measures as a “trigger” for undocumented immigrants to seek permanent residency was key. “Unless there’s real enforcement triggers we are not going to have a bill that moves on the opportunity to apply for a green card,” Rubio said. He added: “I’m not going to be part of a bidding war to see who can put the most lenient path forward” if Obama demands a smoother path to citizenship. The Southwest border commission is the bill’s poison pill — if its support is mandatory for the path to citizenship to proceed, as Rubio seems to be demanding, there will be no path to citizenship. Here’s Lindsey Graham, an old pro when it comes to blowing up immigration reform deals: Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) told reporters on Tuesday that it’s a mistake for the president to push for same-sex couples to be included in immigration reform, if he wants Republicans to support the bill. “Why don’t we just put legalized abortion in there and round it all out,” Graham said to reporters. One might be tempted to explain to Sen. Graham that “legalized abortion” has very little to do with immigration policy, while same-sex couples are in fact regularly and tragically affected by immigration policy, but Sen. Graham wouldn’t care. Sen. Graham is constantly negotiating just how much negotiation he can possibly get, and nothing else. He does not negotiate for the purpose of passing legislation. One important difference between President Obama and Republican congressional leaders is that Obama wants legislation designed to solve problems while Republicans see legislation mainly as a means of scoring political points. If your primary concern is that a problem be solved, the idea of blowing up the entire deal rather than settling for less than you want is absurd. That’s how we ended up with a healthcare reform package with no public option. If your primary concern is purely political, you spend most of your time, as the House GOP does, passing imaginary budgets. This has played out over and over again so far during the Obama presidency. In 2011, Barack Obama proposed a “Jobs Act” that was full of things that he reasonably believed would help ease unemployment. Republicans countered by scotch taping a balanced budget amendment to a pile of corporate tax cuts and calling that a “jobs bill.” The point was to have something to point to and call a “jobs bill,” not to actually propose anything that would help anyone find work. This is why I’m still pretty sure Republicans will play along on reform for a month or two before scuttling the entire deal over some exaggerated bit of Democratic “overreach.” Republicans want to be seen as supporting immigration reform more than they want actual immigration reform. If the end result here is that they get no immigration reform, but they do get points for trying, they will consider that a success.

#### Sets up immigration for March

Meredith Shiner, roll call staff, 2-4-2013, “Leahy Wields Influence Over Guns, Immigration” RollCall, http://www.rollcall.com/news/leahy\_wields\_influence\_over\_guns\_immigration-222144-1.html?pg=2

Of the two biggest pending issues, however, gun control seems to be much more complicated. Reid long has had ties to the National Rifle Association, and it’s widely believed that stricter measures, such as the assault weapons ban championed by Judiciary member Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., face long, if not impossible, odds for passage.¶ But the assault weapons ban is a perfect example of the political and policy balance Leahy must maintain in committee: Does he facilitate its inclusion to give it a leg up on the floor, but possibly imperiling the bill on the floor? Or does he try to force the amendment fight onto the floor, where the provision is almost certain to die?¶ Reid has said he will allow a floor vote on Feinstein’s assault weapons ban, but neither Reid nor Leahy appears especially committed to expending political capital to help it pass.¶ Moreover, Democratic leaders and Leahy have not laid out a path forward on gun control, opting to hold a series of hearings first before beginning their work on legislative language, which sources say the panel would like to finish by month’s end. That would set up the month of March for action on immigration.

#### Gay marriage thumps

Karoun Demirjian, white house correspondent, 2-7-2013, “Obama’s push for gay rights in immigration reform prompts GOP opposition,” Las Vegas Sun, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2013/feb/07/obamas-push-gay-rights-immigration-reform-couple-p/

When President Barack Obama unveiled his blueprint for immigration reform last week, he largely endorsed the Senate’s approach, with a slight twist: Under Obama’s plan, same-sex couples would be entitled to the same immigration rights as heterosexual couples. The difference caught many social conservatives off-guard, some of whom are now openly wondering why, just when the stars were aligning for comprehensive immigration reform, Obama would throw a monkey wrench into the mix. “He is basically pandering to the community,” said Tibi Ellis, a conservative Nevada lobbyist and advocate for immigration reform. “The argument is not about gender, marriage, or anything. The argument is about how do we revise our current immigration system.”   Since the 2012 election, the immigration reform movement has unprecedented support, thanks to Latino voter turnout. The growing cohort pays close attention to where lawmakers stand on immigration — and in 2012, overwhelmingly supported liberal Democrats over conservative Republicans. Republican lawmakers such as Nevada Sen. Dean Heller, who in the past had exclusively favored enforcement as a solution to illegal immigration, are now vocal in their support for a pathway to citizenship for immigrants who entered the country, unauthorized, as children. Even House Majority Leader Eric Cantor is on board.   But those same Republicans are not leaping to endorse the idea of extending immigration benefits to same-sex couples. “It’s interesting,” Heller said when asked about the provision, adding that he was looking forward to a detailed discussion on many specific points of the immigration reform bill as it was drafted. Where Heller is non-committal, other Republicans say the same-sex marriage provision would be a deal-breaker. “Which is more important, LGBT or border security?” Sen. John McCain, one of four Republican members of a bipartisan group of Senators who unveiled their own immigration framework last week, at a Politico breakfast. “If you’re going to load (immigration reform) up with social issues, that is the best way to derail it, in my view.” Republicans working toward an immigration framework do not seem amenable to the idea either. “I would hope that if the president does try to insert himself (into the immigration discussion), he does so with the purpose of trying to reach a bipartisan solution,” said Republican Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, who is working with the House bipartisan group on immigration. “I’ve yet to see anything that the president has put forward that has been, frankly, constructive.” The idea that Obama, who oversaw the end of the military’s Don’t Ask Don’t Tell policy, and declared himself to be in favor of legalizing gay marriage in the run-up to the 2012 campaign, is relatively unsurprising.   In the past several months, the Department of Homeland Security has also taken steps to recognize same-sex couples as “family relationships” when determining whether to deport or use administrative discretion in deportation cases. Obama’s immigration would make same-sex relationships equal to heterosexual relationships for family-based visas as well.   But social conservatives who have resisted legalizing gay marriage say giving legal recognition to same-sex couples in the immigration context would be just as incendiary. Several conservative, pro-immigration religious groups — which have sway with social conservatives in Congress — object to Obama’s inclusion of same-sex couples as beneficiaries under immigration reform law.   “It’s like adding fuel to a fire. Immigration itself can be divisive and emotional; you add another national issue that is equally emotional and divisive and it’s a combustible mix,” said Kevin Appleby, director of immigration and refugee policy for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, one of several religious groups that sent a letter to the White House declaring their opposition last week. “We want an immigration bill, and this will make it harder if not impossible to get an immigration bill.”

#### Visas aren’t key – immigrants prefer their home country or won’t stay long enough to innovate

Vivek Wadhwa et al. Prof @ Duke, Senior Research Assoc @ Labor Program @ Harvard, 3-30-2009,   
“The American Brain Drain and Asia,” http://www.japanfocus.org/-Alex-Salkever/3112

Surprisingly, visa status was not the most important factor determining their decision to return home. Three of four indicated that considerations regarding their visa or residency permit status did not contribute to their decision to return to their home country. In fact, 27% of Indian respondents and 34% of Chinese held permanent resident status or were U.S. citizens. However, respondents overwhelmingly favored their home location with regard to social situations, such as closeness to friends and ability to care for aging parents. The rationale for returnees moving home was echoed by responses of surveyed foreign nationals currently enrolled in U.S. universities. These groups have traditionally represented a disproportionate percentage per capita of advanced degree students. During the 2004–2005 academic year, roughly 60% of engineering Ph.D. students and 40% of Master’s students were foreign nationals, and foreign nationals make up a significant share of the U.S. graduate student population in all STEM disciplines. In the past, the overwhelming majority of these students worked in the United States after graduation. The five-year stay rate for Chinese Ph.D.s was 92% and for Indians 85%. A significant percentage chose to remain permanently. The research team used the social networking site Facebook to recruit 1,224 foreign nationals who are currently studying at U.S. universities or who graduated in 2008. The respondents included 229 students from China and Hong Kong, 117 from Western Europe, and 878 from India. Again, this is not a rigorously scientific sample, but the group is large and random enough to make the results worth considering. The overall consensus among respondents was that the United States was no longer the destination of choice for professional careers§ Marked 17:42 § . Most students in the sample wanted to stay in the United States, but only for short periods. Among respondents 58% of Indian, 54% of Chinese, and 40% of European students said that they would stay in the United States for at least a few years after graduation if given the chance. However, only 6% of Indian, 10% of Chinese, and 15% of European students said they want to stay permanently. The largest group of respondents— 55% of Indian, 40% of Chinese, and 30% of European students—wants to return home within five years. [6] This is a fairly short tenure considering that the average founding technology entrepreneur from China or India lived in the United States an average of 14 years before launching a company in the United States.

#### Brains aren’t key.

Adam Segal, Senior fellow @ CFR, 1-27-2011, “The Great Invention Race,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/27/the\_great\_invention\_race?page=full

U.S. President Barack Obama's plan to "win the future" by out-innovating the rest of the world was a ringing climax of his State of the Union address this week. Obama suggested increasing U.S. investment in research and development, a good and welcome step. But what will really determine U.S. competitiveness in the global ideas market isn't the money we can pour into the system. It's the strength of the system itself -- the social, political, and cultural institutions that shape ideas from start to finish. There is no doubt that China and India are catching up with the United States when it comes to hardware -- the raw materials for innovation. They are increasing their spending on science and technology, training more engineers and scientists, applying for more patents, and churning out more research papers. But the actual system for generating useful ideas in these places remains underdeveloped. Yes, more scientists are being trained, but that doesn't mean they're producing good science. Plagiarism and data fraud are rampant. In a survey of 180 graduates with doctorates quoted in China Daily, 60 percent admitted to paying for their work to be published in academic journals. Sixty percent also said that they had copied someone else's work. Even as a large number of Chinese and Indian scientific stars have returned to their native countries from abroad, they have been unable to transform a research culture characterized by strong bureaucratic control and deference toward age and seniority. In the words of Anita Mehta, a physicist at the S. N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences in India, "Diversity of research or personality is often frowned upon, those who don't match stereotypes or work on subjects that have been hammered to death are labelled 'too independent.'" In the Indian and Chinese private sectors, there are very real bursts of entrepreneurial activity. But government incentives, especially in China, are focused on making Chinese versions of international products such as cell phones and semiconductors rather than on sparking bold, local innovation. In both countries, new companies must maneuver through an opaque legal system, unpredictable regulations, and volatile capital markets. And though policymakers in Beijing and Delhi are aware of these challenges, addressing them will require political and social change, and so progress will be slow and uneven. America can't win the hardware race. There are simply too many people -- 2.3 billion people in India and China -- for the United States to compete when it comes to materials and labor§ Marked 17:42 § . Given respective population size, China and India will one day have more skilled engineers than the United States, even if their quality doesn't match up now. Total U.S. spending on R&D ($395 billion in 2010) is currently more than two and a half times larger than Chinese expenditures ($141 billion), but that gap is rapidly shrinking. But America can compete when it comes to software -- i.e., the ideas and innovation that are still out of reach for China's and India's more hidebound scientific and business communities. An important first step will be helping small start-ups. Small companies (those with fewer than 500 employees) generate about half of total employment in the United States; according to the Small Business Technology Council, they also employ more scientists and engineers than do large businesses and more than universities and federal labs combined. Specifically, as a recent study by the Kauffman Foundation shows, new small businesses are the ones creating these jobs. Since 1980 nearly all net job creation in the United States occurred in firms less than five years old; over the last four years, these young start-ups created two-thirds of all new jobs. To help small businesses, the U.S. government needs what William Miller, former vice president and provost of Stanford University and a venture capitalist, describes as "people and place" policies -- policies that support research, training, and collaboration. The Clinic Program at Harvey Mudd College, for example, involves students in solving real-world problems that have immediate commercial or scientific applications. The locus of innovation isn't in individual entities anymore -- universities, for example, or corporate labs -- but in broader ecosystems that combine these more traditional bodies with smaller networked groups. Another transformative example is in Maine, where the North Star Alliance Initiative -- a partnership involving small companies, the University of Maine, community colleges, and the state government -- is leveraging local research to spur the development of a wide range of other industries, including marine and waterfront infrastructure and ballistic armor. A more holistic model of education will also be crucial. So far, unfortunately, the dominant U.S. policy response to this perceived global competition has been a single-minded focus on increasing the absolute number of scientists. Instead, the United States must think more broadly about the range of skills a scientist develops. Many future breakthroughs are likely to emerge from multidisciplinary work at the nexus of biology, physics, computer science, and mathematics. As a result, young entrepreneurs must be familiar with several different branches of the sciences, as well as be able to draw insights from design, psychology, economics, and anthropology. Finally, the United States still retains the immense advantage of its connections with global innovation networks. A vast web of collaborative research, corporate alliances, foundation grants, personal ties, alumni groups, and government-to-government contacts tie the United States to established and emerging centers of scientific excellence. In 2005, for example, scientists in the United States were the most popular partners for Chinese and Japanese scientists in every field -- chemistry, physics, engineering, environmental technology, and biology -- but one: material science. And in that field, they were the second most popular choice for both their Japanese and their Chinese colleagues. The goal, then, is to make sure the United States does not become complacent about these relationships. As the president noted in his State of the Union address, the United States must improve visa regulations, welcome highly skilled immigrants, and create clear paths to citizenship. Those who excel in school or start their own businesses should be encouraged to stay in the United States. At the same time, the United States will have to do more to reach out into the world. The National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, and the National Institutes of Health, for example, should develop programs that provide more international experiences for U.S. scientists -- and not just short trips, but extended sojourns in foreign labs. Inevitably, more science and scientific discovery will occur abroad in the coming years. But as long as the United States maintains its comparative advantage -- an open and flexible culture and a web of institutions, attitudes, and relationships that move ideas from the lab to the marketplace -- there's no reason why the future isn't in its grasp.

#### Tech innovation isn’t zero sum – the US benefits regardless of the origin of ideas

Amar Bhidé, Glaubinger Professor of Business at Columbia University, Winter 2009, “The Venturesome Economy: How Innovation Sustains Prosperity in a More Connected World,” Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, Vol. 2, No. 1

Any catch-up, even if it takes place gradually and in the normal course of development, will to some degree reduce the U.S. “lead.” Furthermore, the global influence of techno-nationalism could accelerate this process. As alarmists in the U.S. continue to remind us, governments in “emerging” countries such as China and India—also in the thrall of techno-nationalist thinking—are making a determined effort to leap ahead in cutting-edge science and technology. But I am skeptical that these efforts are going to do any more good for China’s and India’s economy than similar efforts in Europe and Japan in the 1970s and 1980s.21 But putting aside the issue of whether investing in cutting-edge research represents a good use of Chinese and Indian resources, does whatever erosion of U.S. primacy in developing high-level know-how this might cause really threaten U.S. prosperity? Should the U.S. government respond in kind by putting even more money into research? Nobel laureate Paul Krugman has long decried what he refers to as the “dangerous obsession” with “national competitiveness.” As Krugman wrote in a 1994 article in Foreign Affairs, the widespread tendency to think that “the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi” is “flatly, completely and demonstrably wrong.” Although “competitive problems could arise in principle, as a practical, empirical matter,” Krugman goes on to say, “the major nations of the world are not to any significant degree in economic competition with each other.”22 The techno-nationalist claim that U.S. prosperity requires that the country “maintain its scientific and technological lead” is particularly dubious: the argument fails to recognize that the development of scientific knowledge or cutting-edge technology is not a zero-sum competition. The results of scientific research are available at no charge to anyone anywhere in the world. Most arguments for the public funding of scientific research are in fact based on the unwillingness of private investors to undertake research that cannot yield a profit. Cutting-edge technology (as opposed to scientific research) has commercial value because it can be patented; but patent owners generally don’t charge higher fees to foreign licensors. The then tiny Japanese company Sony was one of the first licensors of Bell Labs’ transistor patent. Sony paid all of $50,000—and only after first obtaining special permission from the Japanese Ministry of Finance—for the license that started it on the road to becoming a household name in consumer electronics. Moreover, if patent holders choose not to grant licenses but to exploit their inventions on their own, this does not mean that the country of origin secures most of the benefit at the expense of other countries. Suppose IBM chooses to exploit internally, instead of licensing, a breakthrough from its China Research Laboratory (employing 150 research staff in Beijing). This does not help China and hurt everyone else. Rather, as I discuss at length later, the benefits go to IBM’s stockholders, to employees who make or market the product that embodies the invention, and—above all—to customers, who secure the lion’s share of the benefit from most innovations. These stockholders, employees, and customers, who number in the tens of millions, are located all over the world. In a world where breakthrough ideas easily cross national borders, the origin of ideas is inconsequential. Contrary to Thomas Friedman’s assertion, it does not matter that Google’s search algorithm was invented in California. After all, a Briton invented the protocols of the World Wide Web—in a lab in Switzerland. A Swede and a Dane in Tallinn, Estonia, started Skype, the leading provider of peer-to-peer Internet telephony. How did the foreign origins of these innovations harm the U.S. economy?

#### The global economy is resilient – global economic institutions check collapse and US isn’t key

Daniel W. Drezner, Professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked” http://www.cfr.org/international-organizations/irony-global-economic-governance-system-worked/p29101

The 2008 financial crisis posed the biggest challenge to the global economy since the Great Depression and provided a severe "stress test" for global economic governance. States rely on a bevy of institutions—the International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization, and the Group of Twenty—to coordinate action on the global scale. Since the Great Recession began, there has been no shortage of scorn for the state of global economic governance among pundits and scholars. However, in this International Institutions and Global Governance program Working Paper, Daniel Drezner concludes that, despite initial shocks that were more severe than the 1929 financial crisis, the evidence suggests that these structures responded to the financial crisis robustly. Global trade and investment levels have recovered from the plunge that occurred in late 2008. Existing global governance structures, particularly in finance, have revamped themselves to accommodate shifts in the distribution of power. The World Economic Forum's survey of global experts shows rising confidence in global governance and global cooperation. In short, international financial institutions passed the stress test.

#### ( ) No wars from econ collapse.

Morris Miller, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” V. 25, Iss. 4, p pq

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### Manufacturing’s bigger internal to the economy

Michael Ettlinger, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute, and Kate Gordon, the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress, April 2011, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf)

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private-sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### Boomer retirement doesn’t hurt the economy – we’ve got plenty of people and supply and demand will fill in

Kevin Wheeler, Pres. Global Learning Resources, 7-31-2008, “The Myth of a Talent Shortage,” ERE, http://www.ere.net/2008/07/31/the-myth-of-a-talent-shortage/

We have been bombarded for a decade with news reports, articles, stories, and books about the looming talent shortage about to overwhelm our industries, businesses, and economies. Taken at face value and looking at traditional work styles and jobs, there is some validity to these stories. Human resources people, recruiters, and some business people will affirm the shortage anecdotally. But it’s hard to find real examples and real numbers. Certainly, anyone trying to hire a surgeon in North Dakota, a Starbucks barista in Oklahoma, or a stock broker in Alaska may have to look long and hard. But if you are looking for these folks in urban areas or places with significant populations, the number of qualified applicants increases substantially. After all, it has never been easy to attract skilled professionals to rural areas, and it has become even more difficult as people leave the country for large cities. Rural parts of the world are emptying into cities — especially those located in coastal areas or those with significant educational and cultural activities. Richard Florida’s books on the Creative Class point out in stark numbers and colorful graphs and charts the shifts in population away from some less desirable (and often semi-rural) cities and toward others that offer the lifestyle and engaging employment desired by the emerging creative class. Sure, thousands of baby boomers are poised to retire over the next decade or two and, yes, there are somewhat fewer young folks behind them; but is that really going to be a problem? And will the number of boomers who choose to retire reach the predicted numbers? Studies I have seen indicate that boomers will most likely defer retirement for some time because they have not saved enough to make retirement possible or because they remain healthy and want to continue working. We will most likely also need fewer people to reach the same productivity levels of today. The nature of work has changed dramatically. Today only about 2% of Americans grow food or work on farms. This is truly amazing considering the amount of food produced and exported. Farms have grown much larger and are more automated. Completely automated, GPS-guided tractors cultivate fields that used to take a dozen men and several dozen horses to plow. I was recently at a copper mine in Chile where GPS-guided ore trucks will soon obsolete the need for drivers. The widespread adoption of the Internet and its associated applications has simplified many work processes and will continue to reduce the number of people needed in many areas of the economy. Manufacturing, too, has moved to automation or outsourcing. It was the 20th century’s economic backbone and required a huge supply of raw manpower. For the most part, workers needed to be equipped with little more than a high school education and a willingness to do hard physical labor. But today only about 11% of workers remain employed in manufacturing and those workers are more skilled and experienced than at any other time in our history. Automation and outsourcing have replaced thousands of semiskilled jobs and the need for raw [person]manpower has reached very close to zero. So it is unlikely that there is any broad-based shortage of traditional talent or any need for drastic measures. Any shortages that may exist can be attributed to geographical location, the nature of the work, and the pay scale. I am a believer that when the time is right, the solution appears. If organizations were really feeling the pain of shortages, they would have started training programs, raised wages, and lobbied educational institutions to change curricula. None of those things have happened on a wide scale.

### 2AC China

#### Aff outweighs – Heg controls all flashpoints for escalation – solves all the same issues china model solves – that’s the conceded Brooks Wonhforth and Ikenberry ev

#### China soft power is impossible – crackdowns

Zachary Keck, assistant editor of The Diplomat, 1-7-2013, “ Destined To Fail: China’s Soft Power Push,” The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2013/01/07/destined-to-fail-chinas-soft-power-offensive/?all=true

Yet even as China inaugurated its first organization dedicated to enhancing Beijing’s soft power, a number of disparate events in China were illustrating why the CCP’s charm offensive is doomed to fail. For example, in recent weeks the Chinese government has redoubled its efforts to censor the internet. After social media users in China exposed a series of scandals involving low-level government officials, the CCP adopted new regulations that require internet service providers to quickly delete “illegal” posts and turn over the evidence to government officials. Additionally, after trying to require citizens to use their real names on social media sites like Weibo, the new regulations require citizens to use their real identities when signing up with an internet provider. More secretly, according to many inside China, authorities have been strengthening the great firewall to prevent users from employing various methods in order to gain access to a growing number of sites that are banned. China is hardly the only government concerned about the political instability unfettered internet access can generate. In fact, last month China joined 89 countries in supporting a United Nations telecommunications treaty that over 20 nations opposed over fears that it would open the door to greater government control over cyberspace. But while China’s suppression of information may resonate with political elites in authoritarian states, the world is living in the information age and attempts to restrict the flow of information for political reasons will not endear China to the global masses that soft power seeks to attract. China’s internet policies also conflict with the stated goals of its soft power offensive in more concrete ways as well. For example, one of the primary goals of the CPDA is to increase the number of people-to-people exchanges with other countries. However, if the CCP is successful in preventing users from accessing popular sites like Facebook, Twitter, You Tube, and the New York Times, it is likely to discourage foreigners from living or studying abroad in China. Similarly, blocking access to these sites inhibits communication between Chinese and foreigners over cyberspace.

#### Can’t gain soft power – no cultural ambassadors

Zachary Keck, assistant editor of The Diplomat, 1-7-2013, “ Destined To Fail: China’s Soft Power Push,” The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2013/01/07/destined-to-fail-chinas-soft-power-offensive/?all=true

Finally, the CCP’s soft power offensive is doomed to fail because of its ability to tolerate (much less cultivate) “cultural ambassadors.” In the realm of soft power, a county’s entertainers, artists, and intellectuals are some of its strongest assets. One needs only to look to South Korean rapper Psy, and the “flash mobs” he’s inspired in places as varied as Jakarta, Bangkok, Sydney, Dhaka, Mumbai, Dubai, American college campuses and shopping malls, Taipei, Hong Kong, and, yes, the Chinese mainland. A country as large and dynamic as China undoubtedly has many potential worldwide celebrities. And yet, as a China Daily op-ed points out, China “is still far from making a product like Gangnam Style. China does export a large amount of cultural products every year, but few of them become popular abroad.” The major reason China fails to export its cultural products, as Peng Kan, the author of the op-ed rightly notes, is that “Government organizations and enterprises are the main force behind the exports….But these organizations and enterprises… cannot promote satires like Gangnam Style through official communication channel. But cultural products without entertainment value rarely become popular in overseas markets.” Indeed, it’s telling that China’s most popular non-governmental figures abroad are all opponents of the CCP. One such individual is democracy advocate Liu Xiaobo, who celebrated his 57th birthday on December 28th and the 3rd anniversary of being sentenced to an 11-year prison term on December 25th. This sentence only increased Liu’s international stature where he has been celebrated widely and awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2010 (which the CCP responded to by placing his wife under house arrest). Indeed Liu’s international renowned was on display last month when 134 Nobel laureates sent Xi Jinping a letter urging him to release Liu. Eclipsing Liu in popularity at least in the West, however, is Ai Weiwei, the famous Chinese artist and dissident. Ai Weiwei’s remarkable artistic talent made him famous in some circles, initially including the CCP and across the globe before his turn to social activism. It is undeniable, however, that much of his popularity has come from his courageous and witty challenge to Communist Party rule in China. It is this charismatic political dissent that explains why documentaries of him win at Sundance, Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times interviews him while visiting China, and his “Gangam Style” parody becomes an instant You Tube sensation, despite the fact that its underlying political message is lost on almost all its viewers. China is hardly alone in making dissidents it persecutes famous internationally. In fact, this problem is practically inherent in authoritarian states (just ask Vladimir Putin). There’s a nearly universal tendency for people to sympathize with an “underdog” who is courageously battling a powerful force like a government, which is why a Tunisian street vendor setting himself on fire can spark uprisings throughout the Arab world, and David and Goliath is one of the most recognizable stories from Jewish and Christian religious texts. But this fact does not make Liu and Ai Weiwei any less damaging to the CCP’s ability to project soft power. Symbolic figures like Liu and Ai Weiwei ingrain into people’s minds the perception that the CCP is synonymous with injustice. And hardly any emotion is as universally held as the righteousness of justice, however one defines it. On a more primeval basis, people are attracted to confidence, and attempts to suppress information and dissidents creates the perception that, despite all its power and remarkable achievements, the CCP remains at its core fearful and paranoid. Few people are attracted to, much less want to emulate, those they consider fearful or paranoid. Which is why, despite China’s ancient history of soft power, and the soft power individuals like Ai Weiwei command, modern China’s soft power will remain limited under the current political leadership.

#### No Chinese nuclear leadership – they don’t export and their designs are old

Steve Thomas, staff writer, 2-6-2013, “China unlikely to be shining light for nuclear,” China Dialogue, http://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/5683-China-unlikely-to-be-shining-light-for-nuclear

China has yet to win a foreign order (except for two small reactors for Pakistan) but is constantly spoken of as a major new presence in the market. This seems to be on the basis, with no evidence to support it, that because the reactors were from China, they would be cheap but good quality.¶ The situation in China is more complex than often imagined.¶ There are three competing nuclear vendors: Chinese Guangdong Nuclear (CGN), Chinese National Nuclear Company (CNNC) and State Nuclear Power Technology Corp (SNPTC). Most of the recent 18 orders have been supplied by CGN using their CPR1000 design – fundamentally a 40-year-old model, long pre-dating the 1978 Three Mile Island nuclear accident in the US.¶ There was some evidence, even before Fukushima, that the ordering rate in China of up to 10 reactors per year was putting unsustainable strain on the Chinese nuclear supply chain, while the designs being used were acknowledged to be old. So the halt to new reactor construction starts following Fukushima may have been a blessing.¶ It was also clear to China that it needed to move to more modern designs and it ordered six Gen III+ reactors in 2007 to 2008, four from Westinghouse and two from Areva. This was a major plus for the western vendors because it was expected to provide a shop-window for the new designs and, because it was China, the reactors would be built to time and apparently to cost.¶ But as the estimated price-tag of these designs escalated, there was an increasing perception that they were too expensive for China. There are also reports of construction delays and cost overruns of about a year with the AP1000s, prompting all three Chinese vendors to talk of developing their own Gen III+ designs. As these are all some way from being orderable, when China lifted its moratorium on new reactor construction projects in November last year, the two projects approved used old technology.¶ China’s uncertain nuclear future¶ China is in a difficult position: if it wants to keep its nuclear reactor supply industry busy, it needs a flow of orders. But its new designs are probably several years away from being buildable so it needs to keep ordering the old designs. To secure a place in the world market for nuclear power plants, China will need to go through the lengthy – perhaps five year – process of getting a credible western safety regulator to carry out a comprehensive design review.¶ Meanwhile, it is exploring alternatives, finally starting the long-delayed Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR) demonstration plant. PBMR, developed in Germany, has for more than 50 years been seen by devotees as the ideal nuclear technology. But attempts to commercialise it in Germany and more recently in South Africa have come to nothing. Whether China will be more successful in turning its theoretical attractions into a commercial design remains to be seen.¶ While China is by far the most important market worldwide for nuclear-power plants, nuclear is not important to China and even if it continued to build large numbers of reactors, nuclear power would still supply less than 10% of China’s electricity. The hope from Areva and Westinghouse that China would be a showcase is now fading.

#### China decline now

Minxin Pei, professor of government at Claremont McKenna College and a nonresident senior fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States, 8-29-2012, “Everything You Think You Know About China Is Wrong,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/29/everything\_you\_think\_you\_know\_about\_china\_is\_wrong

For the last 40 years, Americans have lagged in recognizing the declining fortunes of their foreign rivals. In the 1970s they thought the Soviet Union was 10 feet tall -- ascendant even though corruption and inefficiency were destroying the vital organs of a decaying communist regime. In the late 1980s, they feared that Japan was going to economically overtake the United States, yet the crony capitalism, speculative madness, and political corruption evident throughout the 1980s led to the collapse of the Japanese economy in 1991. Could the same malady have struck Americans when it comes to China? The latest news from Beijing is indicative of Chinese weakness: a persistent slowdown of economic growth, a glut of unsold goods, rising bad bank loans, a bursting real estate bubble, and a vicious power struggle at the top, coupled with unending political scandals. Many factors that have powered China's rise, such as the demographic dividend, disregard for the environment, supercheap labor, and virtually unlimited access to external markets, are either receding or disappearing.

#### Zhang ev is from a PRC member just boosting China

#### Blank ev doesn’t say it’s necessary or sufficient – zero internal link between nuclear leadership and overall soft power to solve things like pvoerty

### 2AC Coercion

#### Our interpretation is that plan focus is good

#### Aff choice – other frameworks moot the 1AC

#### Topic education – only focusing on the resolution ensures different ground from year to year

#### Reject non-policy alts and links not based on the plan text

#### Perm do both – double bind – either the alt can’t overcome the status quo or it can overcome residual link to the plan

#### Perm do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative

#### It’s not coercive – companies have a choice to take loan guarantees and they aren’t direct spending means no taxation

#### Other taxes prove alt causes

#### Evaluating consequences key to ethics

Jeffrey Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University, Bloomington, Spring 2002, Dissent, vol. 49, no. 2

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness. WHAT WOULD IT mean for the American left right now to take seriously the centrality of means in politics? First, it would mean taking seriously the specific means employed by the September 11 attackers--terrorism. There is a tendency in some quarters of the left to assimilate the death and destruction of September 11 to more ordinary (and still deplorable) injustices of the world system--the starvation of children in Africa, or the repression of peasants in Mexico, or the continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. But this assimilation is only possible by ignoring the specific modalities of September 11. It is true that in Mexico, Palestine, and elsewhere, too many innocent people suffer, and that is wrong. It may even be true that the experience of suffering is equally terrible in each case. But neither the Mexican nor the Israeli government has ever hijacked civilian airliners and deliberately flown them into crowded office buildings in the middle of cities where innocent civilians work and live, with the intention of killing thousands of people. Al-Qaeda did precisely this. That does not make the other injustices unimportant. It simply makes them different. It makes the September 11 hijackings distinctive, in their defining and malevolent purpose--to kill people and to create terror and havoc. This was not an ordinary injustice. It was an extraordinary injustice. The premise of terrorism is the sheer superfluousness of human life. This premise is inconsistent with civilized living anywhere. It threatens people of every race and class, every ethnicity and religion. Because it threatens everyone, and threatens values central to any decent conception of a good society, it must be fought. And it must be fought in a way commensurate with its malevolence. Ordinary injustice can be remedied. Terrorism can only be stopped. Second, it would mean frankly acknowledging something well understood, often too eagerly embraced, by the twentieth century Marxist left--that it is often politically necessary to employ morally troubling means in the name of morally valid ends. A just or even a better society can only be realized in and through political practice; in our complex and bloody world, it will sometimes be necessary to respond to barbarous tyrants or criminals, with whom moral suasion won't work. In such situations our choice is not between the wrong that confronts us and our ideal vision of a world beyond wrong. It is between the wrong that confronts us and the means--perhaps the dangerous means--we have to employ in order to oppose it. In such situations there is a danger that "realism" can become a rationale for the Machiavellian worship of power. But equally great is the danger of a righteousness that translates, in effect, into a refusal to act in the face of wrong. What is one to do? Proceed with caution. Avoid casting oneself as the incarnation of pure goodness locked in a Manichean struggle with evil. Be wary of violence. Look for alternative means when they are available, and support the development of such means when they are not. And never sacrifice democratic freedoms and open debate. Above all, ask the hard questions about the situation at hand, the means available, and the likely effectiveness of different strategies. Most striking about the campus left's response to September 11 was its refusal to ask these questions. Its appeals to "international law" were naive. It exaggerated the likely negative consequences of a military response, but failed to consider the consequences of failing to act decisively against terrorism. In the best of all imaginable worlds, it might be possible to defeat al-Qaeda without using force and without dealing with corrupt regimes and political forces like the Northern Alliance. But in this world it is not possible. And this, alas, is the only world that exists. To be politically responsible is to engage this world and to consider the choices that it presents. To refuse to do this is to evade responsibility. Such a stance may indicate a sincere refusal of unsavory choices. But it should never be mistaken for a serious political commitment.

#### Having life is key to freedom

L. Shwartz “A Value to Life: Who Decides and How?” Medical ethics: a case-based approach 2002 www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf)

Those who choose to reason on this basis hope that if the quality of a life can be measured then the answer to whether that life has value to the individual can be determined easily. This raises special problems, however, because the idea of quality involves a value judgement, and value judgements are, by their essence, subject to indeterminate relative factors such as preferences and dislikes. Hence, quality of life is difficult to measure and will vary according to individual tastes, preferences and aspirations. As a result, no general rules or principles can be asserted that would simplify decisions about the value of a life based on its quality. Nevertheless, quality is still an essential criterion in making such decisions because it gives legitimacy to the possibility that rational, autonomous persons can decide for themselves that their own lives either are worth, or are no longer worth, living. To disregard this possibility would be to imply that no individuals can legitimately make such value judgements about their own lives and, if nothing else, that would be counterintuitive. 2 In our case, Katherine Lewis had spent 10 months considering her decision before concluding that her life was no longer of a tolerable quality. She put a great deal of effort into the decision and she was competent when she made it. Who would be better placed to make this judgement for her than Katherine herself? And yet, a doctor faced with her request would most likely be uncertain about whether Katherine’s choice is truly in her best interest, and feel trepidation about assisting her. We need to know which considerations can be used to protect the patient’s interests.

## 1AR

### Yes Warming True

#### Total consensus – it’s as established as gravity

Donald R. Prothero, Professor of Geology at Occidental College and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology, 3-1-2012, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused,” Skeptic, vol 17 no 2, EBSCO

Thanks to all the noise and confusion over climate change, the general public has only a vague idea of what the debate is really about, and only about half of Americans think global warming is real or that we are to blame.[ 23] As in the evolution/creationism debate, the scientific community is virtually unanimous on what the data demonstrate about anthropogenic global warming. This has been true for over a decade. When science historian Naomi Oreskes[ 24] surveyed all peer-reviewed papers on climate change published between 1993 and 2003 in the world's leading scientific journal, Science, she found that there were 980 supporting the idea of human-induced global warming and none opposing it. In 2009, Doran and Kendall Zimmerman[ 25] surveyed all the climate scientists who were familiar with the data. They found that 95-99% agreed that global warming is real and human caused. In 2010, the prestigious Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences published a study that showed that 98% of the scientists who actually do research in climate change are in agreement over anthropogenic global warming.[ 26] Every major scientific organization in the world has endorsed the conclusion of anthropogenic climate change as well. This is a rare degree of agreement within such an independent and cantankerous group as the world's top scientists. This is the same degree of scientific consensus that scientists have achieved over most major ideas, including gravity, evolution, and relativity. These and only a few other topics in science can claim this degree of agreement among nearly all the world's leading scientists, especially among everyone who is close to the scientific data and knows the problem intimately. If it were not such a controversial topic politically, there would be almost no interest in debating it since the evidence is so clear-cut.

### AT: Policymakers

#### The US is locked into hegemonic strategy

Brad Nelson, PHD, expert on international politics, security, and policymaking, 1-19-2013, “American Grand Strategy in the Obama Era,” Center for World Conflict and Peace, http://centerforworldconflictandpeace.blogspot.com/2013/01/american-grand-strategy-in-obama-era.html

But let's look at the big picture. Is Obama pulling the U.S. away from the world? In short, no, that's not the case. The problem is that critics view U.S. foreign policy solely through the use of force, that deploying military power and fighting wars are the main signposts of America's leadership and footprint in the world. But that's nonsense. Countries, including the U.S., do more than fight conflicts and wars, and there are other ways to engage with the international community. For instance, during America's age of hegemony, among other things, the U.S. has consistently engaged in diplomacy, trade, humanitarian and peacekeeper missions; protected its allies; patrolled the seas to ensure trade is conducted safely and that oil gets to consumers; defended its values; taken the lead in creating international institutions and multilateral pacts; and served as the primary power broker and the most influential state in the world. How does this different from present-day American policy? To me, the verdict is clear: the U.S. today still does all of these things. And in some ways, Obama has expanded, not limited, America's reach around the world. Consider this: Obama has scored diplomatic victories in Myanmar and India, and now makes military moves in Pakistan with little regard for the government in Islamabad or the Pakistani army. But even if the critics are right, that the use of force is the main gauge of American grand strategy, there's scant evidence that the U.S. is now significantly less inclined to flexing its military muscles. Under Obama, yes, there's an emphasis on "burden sharing" and collaboration in international endeavors, which sounds a bit soft, yet militarism still dominates thinking in Washington. Keep in mind the U.S. played a decisive role in the Libyan civil war. It lobs drones in Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia on an almost daily basis. It has significantly upped its security and military presence in Asia. It's also apparent that Obama will keep troops, in some undetermined number, in Afghanistan after the so-called 2014 deadline. At bottom, my take is that Obama's foreign policies has much more in common with "selective engagement" than retrenchment. For Obama, "select" issues and areas of the world are more important than others. Specifically, it is the great powers and emerging great powers that are the primary movers and shakers in the world. These actors have the kind of military power, economic heft, political influence, and soft power to be both major problem solvers and catastrophic forces of destruction and violence in the world. Relations with these great powers must be carefully managed.

# Round 6 – Weber SS

## 2AC

#### I basically read as many answers to the K as possible without answering the specific K.

## 1AR

#### Jonathan read some that I didn’t get to.
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## 2AC

### T

#### We meet. – CX proves we’ll defend a substantial increase – means not minor

#### We’ll defend a substantial increase – sufficient for their links – no abuse

#### Their standards are specific to a non-increase – plan text is explicit

#### You should have a high threshold on T – voting at the drop of a hat ensures substance crowd out which terminates education

David Arkush, JD Harvard, Winter 2002, “Preserving ‘Catalyst’ Attorney’s Fees,” 37 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 131, ln

Plaintiffs should argue that the term "substantially prevail" is not a term of art because if considered a term of art, resort to Black's 7th produces a definition of "prevail" that could be interpreted adversely to plaintiffs. n99 It is commonly accepted that words that are not legal terms of art should be accorded their ordinary, not their legal, meaning, n100 and ordinary-usage dictionaries provide FOIA fee claimants with helpful arguments. The Supreme Court has already found favorable, temporally relevant definitions of the word "substantially" in ordinary dictionaries: "Substantially" suggests "considerable" or "specified to a large degree." See Webster's Third New International Dictionary 2280 (1976) (defining "substantially" as "in a substantial manner" and "substantial" as "considerable in amount, value, or worth" and "being that specified to a large degree or in the main"); see also 17 Oxford English Dictionary 66-67 (2d ed. 1989) ("substantial": "relating to or proceeding from the essence of a thing; essential"; "of ample or considerable amount, quantity or dimensions"). n101

#### And they’re arbitrary – substantially is subjective

Bruce R. Hopkins, Senior Partner Polsinelli Shughart, 2009, Starting and Managing a Nonprofit Organization: A Legal Guide, google books

The\* true\* measure of substantiality remains elusive. In reports accompanying tax legislation over the years, the Senate Finance Committee has characterized the state of affairs well. In 1969, the Committee wrote that the "standards as to the permissible level of (legislative) activities under the present law are so vague as to encourage subjective application of the sanction." Liter, in iy7t>, the Finance Committee portrayed the dilemma Litis way: "Many believe that tine standards as to the permissible level of (legislative] activities under present law are too vague and thereby tend to encourage subjective and selective enforcement."

### Case

### 2AC Aerospace Add On

#### Collapse in manufacturing kills US tech leadership – ends aerospace

Michael Lind, policy director of New America’s Economic Growth Program and a co-founder of the New America Foundation, and Joshua Freedman, program associate in New America’s Economic Growth Program, April 2012, "Value Added: America’s Manufacturing Future" http://growth.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Lind,%20Michael%20and%20Freedman,%20Joshua%20-%20NAF%20-%20Value%20Added%20America%27s%20Manufacturing%20Future.pdf-http://growth.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Lind, Michael and Freedman,

Manufacturing, R&D and the U.S. Innovation Ecosystem Perhaps the greatest contribution of manufacturing to the U.S. economy as a whole involves the disproportionate role of the manufacturing sector in R&D. The expansion in the global market for high-value-added services has allowed the U.S. to play to its strengths by expanding its trade surplus in services, many of them linked to manufacturing, including R&D, engineering, software production and finance. Of these services, by far the most important is R&D. The United States has long led the world in R&D. In 1981, U.S. gross domestic expenditure on R&D was more than three times as large as that of any other country in the world. And the U.S. still leads: in 2009, the most recent year for which there is available data, the United States spent more than 400 billion dollars. European countries spent just under 300 billion dollars combined, while China spent about 150 billion dollars.14 In the United States, private sector manufacturing is the largest source of R&D. The private sector itself accounts for 71 percent of total R&D in the United States, and although U.S. manufacturing accounts for only 11.7 percent of GDP in 2012, the manufacturing sector accounts for 70 percent of all R&D spending by the private sector in the U.S.15 And R&D and innovation are inextricably connected: a National Science Foundation survey found that 22 percent of manufacturers had introduced product innovations and the same percentage introduced process innovations in the period 2006-2008, while only 8 percent of nonmanufacturers reported innovations of either kind.16 Even as the manufacturing industry in the United States underwent major changes and suffered severe job losses during the last decade, R&D spending continued to follow a general upward growth path. A disproportionate share of workers involved in R&D are employed directly or indirectly by manufacturing companies; for example, the US manufacturing sector employs more than a third of U.S. engineers.17 This means that manufacturing provides much of the demand for the U.S. innovation ecosystem, supporting large numbers of scientists and engineers who might not find employment if R&D were offshored along with production. Why America Needs the Industrial Commons Manufacturing creates an industrial commons, which spurs growth in multiple sectors of the economy through linked industries. An “industrial commons” is a base of shared physical facilities and intangible knowledge shared by a number of firms. The term “commons” comes from communally- shared pastures or fields in premodern Britain. The industrial commons in particular in the manufacturing sector includes not only large companies but also small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), which employ 41 percent of the American manufacturing workforce and account for 86 percent of all manufacturing establishments in the U.S. Suppliers of materials, component parts, tools, and more are all interconnected; most of the time, Harvard Business School professors Gary Pisano and Willy Shih point out, these linkages are geographic because of the ease of interaction and knowledge transfer between firms.18 Examples of industrial commons surrounding manufacturing are evident in the United States, including the I-85 corridor from Alabama to Virginia and upstate New York.19 Modern economic scholarship emphasizes the importance of geographic agglomeration effects and co-location synergies. 20 Manufacturers and researchers alike have long noted the symbiotic relationship that occurs when manufacturing and R&D are located near each other: the manufacturer benefits from the innovation, and the researchers are better positioned to understand where innovation can be found and to test new ideas. While some forms of knowledge can be easily recorded and transferred, much “know-how” in industry is tacit knowledge. This valuable tacit knowledge base can be damaged or destroyed by the erosion of geographic linkages, which in turn shrinks the pool of scientists and engineers in the national innovation ecosystem. If an advanced manufacturing core is not retained, then the economy stands to lose not only the manufacturing industry itself but also the geographic synergies of the industrial commons, including R&D. Some have warned that this is already the case: a growing share of R&D by U.S. multinational corporations is taking place outside of the United States.21 In particular, a number of large U.S. manufacturers have opened up or expanded R&D facilities in China over the last few years.22 Next Generation Manufacturing A dynamic manufacturing sector in the U.S. is as important as ever. But thanks to advanced manufacturing technology and technology-enabled integration of manufacturing and services, the very nature of manufacturing is changing, often in radical ways. What will the next generation of manufacturing look like? In 1942, the economist Joseph Schumpeter declared that “the process of creative destruction is the essential fact about capitalism.” By creative destruction, Schumpeter did not mean the rise and fall of firms competing in a technologically-static marketplace. He referred to a “process of industrial mutation— if I may use that biological term—that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating the new one.” He noted that “these revolutions are not strictly incessant; they occurred in discrete rushes that are separated from each other by spaces of comparative quiet. The process as a whole works incessantly, however, in the sense that there is always either revolution or absorption of the results of revolution.”23 As Schumpeter and others have observed, technological innovation tends to be clustered in bursts or waves, each dominated by one or a few transformative technologies that are sometimes called “general purpose technologies.” Among the most world-transforming general pur- pose technologies of recent centuries have been the steam engine, electricity, the internal combustion engine, and information technology.24 As epochal as these earlier technology-driven innovations in manufacturing processes and business models proved to be, they are rapidly being superseded by new technology- driven changes as part of the never-ending process of Schumpeterian industrial mutation. The latest wave of innovation in industrial technology has been termed “advanced manufacturing.” The National Science and Technology Council of the Executive Office of the President defines advanced manufacturing as “a family of activities that (a) depend on the use and coordination of information, automation, computation, software, sensing, and networking, and/or (b) make use of cutting edge materials and emerging capabilities enabled by the physical and biological sciences, for example, nanotechnology, chemistry, and biology. It involves both new ways to manufacture existing products and the manufacture of new products emerging from new advanced technologies.”25 Already computer-aided design (CAD) and computer-aided manufacturing (CAM) programs, combined with computer numerical control (CNC), allow precision manufacturing from complex designs, eliminating many wasteful trials and steps in finishing. CNC is now ubiquitous in the manufacturing sector and much of the employment growth occurring in the sector requires CNC skills or training. Information technology has allowed for enterprise resource planning (ERP) and other forms of enterprise software to connect parts of the production process (both between and within a firm), track systems, and limit waste when dealing with limited resources. Other areas in which advanced manufacturing will play a role in creating new products and sectors and changing current ones are: Supercomputing. America’s global leadership in technology depends in part on whether the U.S. can compete with Europe and Asia in the race to develop “exascale computing,” a massive augmentation of computer calculating power that has the potential to revolutionize predictive sci- ences from meteorology to economics. According to the Advanced Scientific Computing Advisory Committee (ASCAC), “If the U.S. chooses to be a follower rather than a leader in exascale computing, we must be willing to cede leadership” in industries including aerospace, automobiles, energy, health care, novel material development, and information technology.

#### Aerospace decline spills over, collapsing U.S. air power

David Thompson, President, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 12-10-2009, “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, Lexis.

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth. However, the U.S. aerospace workforce is now facing the most serious demographic challenge in his 100-year history. Simply put, today, many more older, experienced professionals are retiring from or otherwise leaving our industrial and governmental aerospace workforce than early career professionals are entering it. This imbalance is expected to become even more severe over the next five years as the final members of the Apollo-era generation of engineers and scientists complete 40- or 45-year careers and transition to well-deserved retirements. In fact, around 50 percent of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within just the next five years. Meanwhile, the supply of younger aerospace engineers and scientists entering the industry is woefully insufficient to replace the mounting wave of retirements and other departures that we see in the near future. In part, this is the result of broader technical career trends as engineering and science graduates from our country's universities continue a multi-decade decline, even as the demand for their knowledge and skills in aerospace and other industries keeps increasing. Today, only about 15 percent of U.S. students earn their first college degree in engineering or science, well behind the 40 or 50 percent levels seen in many European and Asian countries. Due to the dual-use nature of aerospace technology and the limited supply of visas available to highly-qualified non-U.S. citizens, our industry's ability to hire the best and brightest graduates from overseas is also severely constrained. As a result, unless effective action is taken to reverse current trends, the U.S. aerospace sector is expected to experience a dramatic decrease in its technical workforce over the next decade. Your second question concerns the implications of a cutback in human spaceflight programs. AIAA's view on this is as follows. While U.S. human spaceflight programs directly employ somewhat less than 10 percent of our country's aerospace workers, its influence on attracting and motivating tomorrow's aerospace professionals is much greater than its immediate employment contribution. For nearly 50 years the excitement and challenge of human spaceflight have been tremendously important factors in the decisions of generations of young people to prepare for and to pursue careers in the aerospace sector. This remains true today, as indicated by hundreds of testimonies AIAA members have recorded over the past two years, a few of which I'll show in brief video interviews at the end of my statement. Further evidence of the catalytic role of human space missions is found in a recent study conducted earlier this year by MIT which found that 40 percent of current aerospace engineering undergraduates cited human space programs as the main reason they chose this field of study. Therefore, I think it can be predicted with high confidence that a major cutback in U.S. human space programs would be substantially detrimental to the future of the aerospace workforce. Such a cutback would put even greater stress on an already weakened strategic sector of our domestic high-technology workforce. Your final question centers on other issues that should be considered as decisions are made on the funding and direction for NASA, particularly in the human spaceflight area. In conclusion, AIAA offers the following suggestions in this regard. Beyond the previously noted critical influence on the future supply of aerospace professionals, administration and congressional leaders should also consider the collateral damage to the space industrial base if human space programs were substantially curtailed. Due to low annual production rates and highly-specialized product requirements, the domestic supply chain for space systems is relatively fragile. Many second- and third-tier suppliers in particular operate at marginal volumes today, so even a small reduction in their business could force some critical suppliers to exit this sector. Human space programs represent around 20 percent of the $47 billion in total U.S. space and missile systems sales from 2008. Accordingly, a major cutback in human space spending could have large and highly adverse ripple effects throughout commercial, defense, and scientific space programs as well, potentially triggering a series of disruptive changes in the common industrial supply base that our entire space sector relies on.

#### WMD Conflict

Ashley Tellis, Senior Political Scientist, RAND, 1998, “Sources of Conflict in the 21st Century”, http://www.rand. org/publications/MR/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf

This subsection attempts to synthesize some of the key operational implications distilled from the analyses relating to the rise of Asia and the potential for conflict in each of its constituent regions. The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The Korean peninsula, China, and the Indian subcontinent are already arenas of WMD proliferation. While emergent nuclear capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, chemical and biological warfare threats will progressively become future problems. The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

### 2AC Methane Add-on

#### Methane increases cause ozone collapse

Space Today Online, 2005, “The Ozone Hole in 2003 was almost as big…” http://www.spacetoday.org/SolSys/Earth/AntarcticOzoneHole.html

Water and ozone. Scientists wonder if a wetter upper atmosphere might delay global ozone recovery. NASA researchers have found that an increase in water vapor in the stratosphere, stemming partially from greenhouse gases, may delay ozone recovery and increase the rate of climate change. To check on the long-term stratospheric cooling and ozone depletion, NASA put data from satellites and other remote sensors into its GISS global climate model. It was the first study to link greenhouse gases to increased ozone depletion over populated areas. Climate models show cooler stratospheric temperatures happen when there is more water vapor present. Water vapor also leads to the breakdown of ozone molecules. The stratosphere is the dry layer of the atmosphere above the troposphere, where temperatures increase with height. According to satellite data, upper atmospheric temperatures around the world - at altitudes of 20 to 35 miles high -- have cooled between 5.4 and 10.8 degrees Fahrenheit over recent decades. Driving forces. NASA found two driving forces behind the change in stratospheric moisture: Increased emissions of the greenhouse gas methane are transformed into water in the stratosphere, accounting for about a third of the observed increase in moisture there. More water is transported from the lower atmosphere. Warmer air holds more water vapor than colder air, so the amount of water vapor in the lower atmosphere increases as it is warmed by the greenhouse effect. Greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide and methane, may enhance the transport of water into the stratosphere. The increased transport of water vapor to the stratosphere seems likely to have been induced by human activities. Ozone destruction. Rising greenhouse gas emissions account for all or part of the water vapor increase, which causes stratospheric ozone destruction. When more water vapor works its way into the stratosphere, the water molecules can be broken down, releasing reactive molecules that can destroy ozone. If the trend of increasing stratospheric water vapor continues, it could increase future global warming and impede ozone stratospheric recovery.

#### Extinction

Tyrrel Smith PHD TRW Space & Electronics Group, and Edwards Daniel, Pilson Environmental Management Branch, 1999, “Summary of the Impact of Launch Vehicle Exhaust and Deorbiting Space and Meteorite Debris on Stratospheric Ozone” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/ GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA414306

The ozone layer is critical to life on Earth because it absorbs biologically damaging solar ultraviolet radiation. The amount of solar UV radiation received at any particular location on the Earth’s surface depends upon the position of the Sun above the horizon, the amount of ozone in the atmosphere , and local cloudiness and pollution. Scientists agree that, in the absence of changes in clouds or pollution, decreases in atmospheric ozone lead to increases in ground-level UV radiation (Martin [1998], WMO [1998]). Prior to the late 1980s, instruments with the necessary accuracy and stability for measurement of small long-term trends in ground-level UV-B were not available. Therefore, the data from urban locations with older, less-specialized instruments provide much less reliable information, especially since simultaneous measurements of changes in cloudiness or local pollution are not available. When high-quality measurements were made in other areas far from major cities and their associated air pollution, decreases in ozone have regularly been accompanied by increases in UV-B ( WMO [1998]). Therefore, this increase in ultraviolet radiation received at the Earth's surface would likely increase the incidence of skin cancer and melanoma, as well as possibly impairing the human immune system (Kerr et al., [1993]). Damage to terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems also may occur (Martin [1998], WMO [1998]).

### 2AC Grid

#### Nuclear expansion key to grid stability

Margaret Harding, president of 4Factor Consulting. She has worked in the nuclear industry for more than 30 years and advises clients on quality, regulatory, technical, and business issues within the nuclear industry, 2-8-2012, “Role of nuclear energy in creating smarter US grid networks,” Nuclear Energy Insider, http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/operations-maintenance/role-nuclear-energy-creating-smarter-us-grid-networks

Nuclear consultant, Margaret Harding, offers her insights into how smart grid technologies can boost storage capacity on the already constrained US grid network. She also looks at how nuclear's demand response record could actually help solar projects and overall power stability across the US. By Margaret Harding The concept that smart grids are separate from, and conflict with, traditional grids has been discussed in recent times. A key fact that has to be understood is that the current electricity grid in the US is a demand system. That is, electricity is generated as it is demanded. Very little storage capacity is available on the grid today. This makes electricity generation, transmission and distribution among the most complex systems in the world. This relative inelasticity of the industry is at the heart of the issues of intermittent power supplies and demand response. In the past, electricity supply was generated through means that were fairly well controlled. Baseload was provided by coal, hydro, and nuclear with some natural gas and other sources. Natural gas and some of the older less efficient oil units were used to manage demand with highly responsive systems coming on line as demand increased. Stressed out grid However, with the advent of intermittent power suppliers like wind and solar, and changing load curves due to increasing electricity usage (electric cars, more electrical appliances and equipment), the traditional methods of managing the grid are being significantly stressed. In addition, there are significant losses of electricity occurring in the current US transmission and distribution (T&D) system as well as inflexibility for transmission of electricity across long distances required to use intermittent sources that are generally more available in the west at major population and industrial centers in the east. Voltage events, even minor reductions in voltage, have increasingly significant effects on society. With the increased use of computers and sensitive electronics both as stand- alone devices and as a part of equipment used both in industrial and residential applications, we need to find ways to assure the reliability of the grid is as high as possible. What is ‘smart grid’? Smart grid is really about improving the reliability of the overall electricity supply. This entails managing supply as well as demand, but most importantly, the T&D of electricity. By better sensing and prediction of potential issues, including intermittent sources like wind and solar, faults such as transformer failures, or voltage irregularities, and increasing demand, a “smarter grid” will allow various energy sources to work together more effectively with fewer issues reaching the industrial, commercial, and residential consumers of electricity. Where does nuclear fit in? How do nuclear energy facilities contribute to the overall reliability of energy supply? And how can they support some of the other initiatives on the grid? In the US, generation and T&D have been separated in many markets. This separation means that nuclear generators don’t have direct ability to improve the reliability and detection of grid events in the T&D. However, it does not mean that nuclear utilities do not contribute to grid reliability. Nuclear energy tends to be used as base load supply. The reasons for this are primarily economic, though technology does play a role. The economic reasons center around the fact that nuclear is a capital intensive energy source. Because the majority of costs are in the design and construction of the facility, the owners of these plants need to operate them as much as possible to maximize the return on their investments. Nuclear power plants can load follow, but at an efficiency cost in fuel use. Such load-following operation has to be planned for well in advance to assure safe operation of the plant at varying power conditions. Since most utilities want to maximize investment, they are reluctant to plan in advance of intentional operation at other than 100 per cent power. This drive to be base load makes current nuclear energy facilities less an ideal match with wind energy for daily interaction where intermittency is less predictable and peak availability tends to occur in early morning hours when demand is low. In a more seasonal evaluation, most nuclear plants target outages for spring and fall, both periods when wind is more reliably available and seasonal demand tends to be lower. Nuclear solar combo Nuclear and solar, however, can work together in some interesting and more optimal ways. Because solar is tied to hours of daylight and tends to peak at midday when demand is starting to rise to peak as well, nuclear and solar can work as baseload and peak demand response very effectively. In addition, nuclear load-following is best used when a predictable pattern of reduced power and increased power can be used. As solar tends to be more predictable in its cyclical availability, nuclear energy fuel planning can be designed to work in concert with these arrays, should the amount of solar power being generated exceed demand. Solid base of reliable power Aside from nuclear’s direct interaction with intermittent sources, nuclear power plants can have their own impact on grid reliability. Responding to a loss of 1000 MW or more of electricity during peak demand periods can risk cascading failures if unexpected plant trips occur during operation. Nuclear utilities have worked to continue to improve the reliability of these machines, with capacity factors moving into the 90% range and providing a solid base of reliable power. Unplanned reactor outages have become increasingly rare and allow grid operators to rely on nuclear energy for base load demand. In addition, nuclear utilities have increased the robustness of their facilities to withstand loss of power events. By ensuring that the facilities will be available even during severe weather events, or that they can get back online quickly in the event of grid damage, nuclear energy facilities serve as anchor points in regional grid structures that can keep power delivery to consumers.

#### Grid vulnerability allow China to launch cyberattacks and invade Taiwan

Derene 9

(Glenn – Defense Analyst @ Popular Mechanics, “How Vulnerable is U.S. Infrastructure to a Major Cyber Attack?” October 1, 2009, http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military/4307521)

The next world war might not start with a bang, but with a blackout. An enemy could send a few lines of code to control computers at key power plants, causing equipment to overheat and melt down, plunging sectors of the U.S. and Canadian grid into darkness. Trains could roll to a stop on their tracks, while airport landing lights wink out and the few traffic lights that remain active blink at random. In the silence and darkness, citizens may panic, or they may just sit tight and wait for it all to reboot. Either way, much of the country would be blind and unresponsive to outside events. And that might be the enemy's objective: Divert America's attention while mounting an offensive against another country. Pentagon planners have long understood the danger of cyber attacks on U.S. military networks. Indeed, the Defense Department's Global Information Grid is one of the most frequently targeted computer networks on Earth. But the cat-and-mouse game of information espionage on military networks is not the only digital threat that keeps national-security experts up at night. There is a growing concern over the vulnerability of far more tangible assets essential to the economy and well-being of American citizens. Much of the critical infrastructure that keeps the country humming--water-treatment facilities, refineries, pipelines, dams, the electrical grid--is operated using a hodgepodge of technologies known as industrial control systems. Like banks and telecommunications networks, which are also generally considered critical infrastructure, these industrial facilities and utilities are owned by private companies that are responsible for maintaining their own security. But many of the control systems in the industrial world were installed years ago with few or no cyber-security features. That wasn't a big problem when these systems were self-contained. But in the past two decades, many of these controls have been patched into company computer networks, which are themselves linked to the Internet. And when it comes to computer security, a good rule of thumb is that any device that is computer-controlled and networked is vulnerable to hacking. Bad-guy hackers pulling the plug on public utilities is a common theme of Hollywood films, including 2007's Live Free or Die Hard, but such scenarios present more than a mere fictional scare to U.S. intelligence officials. According to Melissa Hathaway, cyber-coordination executive for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the list of potential adversaries in a cyber attack is long, ranging from disgruntled employees to criminals to hostile nations. Most experts agree that China and Russia routinely probe our industrial networks, looking for information and vulnerabilities to use as leverage in any potential dispute. James Lewis, a cyber-security expert for the policy think tank Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), says that although cyber warfare couldn't cripple the U.S., it could serve as an effective military tactic. "If I were China, and I were going to invade Taiwan," he says, "and I needed to complete the conquest in seven days, then it's an attractive option to turn off all the electricity, screw up the banks and so on." Could the entire U.S. grid be taken down in such an attack? "The honest answer is that we don't know," Lewis says. "And I don't like that answer."

#### Extinction

Straits Times (Singapore), June 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable.Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.

### IFR CP

#### Perm do both – shields the link to the net benefit because IFRs can eat up the waste from the plan

#### Perm do the counterplan – it’s not textually competitive

#### IFR is nuclear power

Office of Technology Assessment, of the US Congress, May 1994, “Technical Options for the Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor,” OTA, http://www.princeton.edu/~ota/disk1/1994/9434/9434.PDF

Developers of the ALMR/IFR concept envision many facilities operating as breeder reactors deployed in the21 st century as the next generation of U.S. nuclear power reactors. In this scenario, the amount of plutonium available from dismantled nuclear warheads would be relatively minor compared with the amount of plutonium that would be cycled through these reactors.

#### It’s also not functionally competitive – if they win that IFRs are commercializable then the plan could result in IFRs

#### CPs should be textually and functionally competitive – ensures best competition

#### PICs are bad – voter

#### Distort literature for contrived net benefits and solvency cards

#### Makes it impossible to affirm – we have to negate our own aff

#### Net benefits as disads solve their offense

#### Generic cps also check – agent cps and advantage cps give them plenty of ground

#### Doesn’t solve the aff –

#### Prolif – Wallace and Williams indicate IMMEDIATE scaling up is key – only LWRs are sufficient

David Hill et al, Laboratory Director for Science and Technology at the Idaho National Lab, Michael Sellman, president and CEO of Nuclear Management Co. and Chairman of Idaho National Lab Utility Advisory Board, Mano Nazar, Senior VP and Nuclear COO of Florida Power and Light Co. and Chairman of the EPRJ Nuclear Power Council, 5-28-2010, “Idaho National Laboratory/Nuclear Power Industry Strategic Plan for Light Water Reactor Research and Development,” INL, www.inl.gov/technicalpublications/Documents/3881540.pdf

This strategy supports the drive for nuclear power growth by focusing on LWRs, which stand out in technical maturity, experience, reliability, and industry acceptance. LWR technology represents over 80% of all the world’s commercial reactors and comprises 100% of the U.S. fleet. It is the only technology being considered for commercial deployment in the U.S. today. Nations without nuclear energy programs and nations with non-LWR nuclear reactor technology foundations (such as Great Britain) are transitioning to greater reliance on LWRs for their future nuclear energy needs. Other advanced reactor technologies, such as high-temperature gas-cooled reactors (HTGRs) and liquid metal cooled reactors (LMRs), which are being studied under the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) GEN IV program, have potential and deserve investment in research, development, and demonstration (RD&D). These designs will eventually prove advantageous over LWR technology in certain applications (e.g., HTGRs for process heat and hydrogen generation and LMRs for breeding nuclear fuel and recycling spent LWR fuel). HTGRs and LMRs are thus important areas for research because of the significant contributions they will make in future decades to augment the LWR technology nuclear energy backbone. Still, they are not alternatives to LWRs and must overcome large RD&D challenges before they can become cost-competitive. In contrast, LWRs are essential to meeting the basic energy needs of the nation today by generating vast quantities of electricity safely, reliably, and economically. In turn, they will help fuel the U.S. economy and provide an acceptable quality of life for its citizens. LWRs are and will remain the workhorse for nuclear power generation for much of the 21st Century. Further, future policies to reduce CO2 and other emissions from fossil fuels will inevitably drive an increased reliance on nuclear electricity, which, for the foreseeable future, will come from LWRs.

#### Nat gas – Jenkins indicates lock in is coming now – have to boost alternatives – lock in causes inevitable price spikes and methane spikes

#### Any risk of either of these flip the DA

#### Condo

#### No development – IFRs too costly and take too long

Arjun Makhijani, PhD in engineering and an electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. Makhijani has written many books and reports analyzing the safety, economics, and efficiency of various energy sources. He has testified before Congress and has served as an expert witness in Nuclear Regulatory Commission proceedings, 2001, “Letters to the Editor” Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, May 2001 vol. 57 no. 3 4-5

As for IFRs, the 1996 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study cited by Stanford concluded that there were several safety issues that remain to be resolved and that using advanced sodium-cooled reactors for transmutation “would require substantial development, testing, and large-scale demonstration under Nuclear Regulatory Commission safety review and licensing before one could proceed with confidence.” Even if all the technical problems posed by IFRs were to be solved, the costs of using this technology would be prohibitive. In the United States alone, IFRs would have to fission roughly 80,000 metric tons of heavy metal (about 99 percent of which is uranium). To transmute this amount of heavy metal over 40 years would require the building of about 2,000 IFRs of 1,000-megawatts capacity each. To manage the worldwide stock of spent fuel (both current and projected) in this way would require roughly four times as many reactors. Even assuming that one IFR reactor was brought on line a week, it would take 150 years to build them. The NAS study also expressed skepticism that the reprocessing technology associated with the IFR could be made as economical as its proponents claim. The IFR requirement of collocating the reprocessing element with the reactor would result in even higher costs because of the small scale of collocated plants. NAS's conclusion that there would be a 2 to 7 percent increase in electricity costs was based on low reactor costs and transmutation costs that were “likely to be no less than $50 billion and easily could be over $100 billion” for 600 metric tons of tran-suranics only. If the cost of reprocessing uranium is added, the total cost would increase to $300 billion—$900 billion for the United States alone. It is easy to see why no current transmutation scheme seriously proposes to transmute all the uranium in spent fuel.

#### Doesn’t solve warming – scalability

Charles Barton, energy analyst, 6-28-2009, “S-PRISM Scalability a Repose for Steven Kirsch”http://nucleargreen.blogspot.com/2009/06/s-prism-scalability-repost-for-steven.html

Steve Kirsch has posted an important statement on the IFR today on The Huffington Post. While Kirsch's statement is something of a breakthrough for Nuclear Power on Huffington Post, It contains a major flaw that Kirsch was unaware of . The flaw is simple. IFR/S PRISM technology is not sufficiently scalable to make a difference in the fight against AGW. I spotted the problem in a paper on the S PRISM fuel cycle. I discussed the scalability problem in a posted a month ago. I am reposting "Scalability and Breeder Start Up." Because I believe that the backers of nuclear power should openly debate their options, I intend to publish more posts on the IFR/S PRISM option, and my questions about it in future Nuclear Green posts.¶ Scalability and Breeder Start Up¶ Scalability is a deal breaker in global warming technology. One of the nice things about the LFTR is that it is scalable. You can build them in factories ship them off to coal-fired generation facilities, dig a whole into the ground, plant them, hook um up to the Grid, and turn them on. And then stand back and let them work. Every now and then you might add some thorium and remove some U-233 that would be used to start a new reactor.¶ Basically you could build as many as you wanted too in the LFTR factory. You would need a start up charge of fissionable material - U-233, U-235, or Pu-239. The start up charge would initiate the chain reaction in the reactor, and begin the breeding process. Later fuel will be derived from breeding, so no further nuclear fuel from external sources would be required to keep the chain reaction going.¶ The number of start up charges, the material composition of start up charges, and the size of each charge would pose a potential limit on LFTR scalability. LMFBRs would also require start up charges.¶ Neutron speed would play an important role with faster neutron reactors requiring more fissionable materials to keep a chain reaction going. For example French researchers studying Molten Salt Reactors operating at various neutron speeds found that a Thermal TMSR requited a charge of 790 kgs of U-233 in order to maintain breeding in a 1 GWe reactor. An Epithermal TMSR required 2400 kgs to fulfill the same conditions. While a Fast TMSR required 5200 kgs of U-233. The French also reported that a standard fast neutron reactor - I assume a LMFBR -would require 12,25o kgs of plutonium.¶ An S PRISM related study "S-PRISM Fuel Cycle Study: Future Deployment Programs and Issues," suggested that as of the year 2000, four hundred tons of plutonium could be recovered from spent nuclear fuel. This in turn would provide enough plutonium to supply start up charges for twenty-two, 1520 MWe S-PRISM facilities with ab output of 33,440 MWe. That is about 12 tons per 1 GWe of reactor capacity.¶ Clearly then neutron speed has an adverse effect on reactor scalability.¶ On the other hand neutron speed also influences the fission rate per neutron absorption, this in turn influences neutron production. Pu-239 fissions 25% more often in a fast reactor than in a thermal reactor. On the other hand it still take more Pu-239 to maintain a chain reaction in a fast reactor than in a thermal reactor. Reactor physics tricks and fuel cycle also seem to influence start up charge size.¶ A recent discussion on the EfT form produced quite a lot of useful information. "Jagdish" reported that¶ Indian 500MW PFBR is designed to use only two tons of plutonium.¶ It should be noted that the PFBR uses both radial and axil thorium blankets.

#### IFRs make every aspect of proliferation easier

Amory Lovins, Chair and Chief Scientist – Rocky Mountain Institute, 2009, “’New’ Nuclear Reactors: Same Old Story,” Nuclear Monitor 690, 6-26, http://www.nirs.org/factsheets/lovinsonifretc.pdf

As this becomes evident, other kinds of reactors are being proposed instead--novel designs that claim 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 commercialsize 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 is 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, re-placing 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.) Reprocessing of any kind makes waste management more difficult and complex, increases the volume and diversity of waste streams, increases by several--to manifold the cost of nuclear fueling, and separates bomb-usable material that can’t be adequately measured or protected. Mainly for this last reason, all U.S. 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.

#### This net benefit is anti-reality – Yucca is dead, other storage options are coming now, that method is empirically successful

World Nuclear News, 1-14-2013, “New start for US nuclear disposal,” http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/WR\_New\_start\_for\_US\_nuclear\_disposal\_1401131.html

A new waste disposal strategy was announced on 10 January by Stephen Chu, head of the Department of Energy (DoE). He underlined the importance of nuclear energy to the US power system which counts 104 operating nuclear reactors. Safe management and disposal of highly radioactive used reactor fuel as well as similar military wastes "must remain a national priority" in order to "ensure that nuclear power remains part of our diversified clean-energy portfolio," he said. America's new strategy would see a 'pilot interim store' being in operation in 2021, with a focus on taking used nuclear fuel from current shut down power plant sites. By 2025 a larger 'full-scale interim store' would open, and by 2048 an underground disposal facility should be in place to permanently store and dispose of the material. The facilities could be co-located in any combination or sited separately - all depending on the expressed will of American people. There could even be more than one underground disposal site. The schedule is meant to reduce the growth of the federal government's liabilities under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, under which it was meant to begin taking used reactor fuel from power companies in 1998. As it is, some 68,000 tonnes of used reactor fuel reside at 72 different power plant sites across the country, with the DoE repeatedly reimbursing power companies for the cost of this. The two interim facilities will accept used reactor fuel at a rate faster than the 2000 tonnes per year being produced by the power industry in order to gradually draw down the backlog, said the DoE. "The sooner that legislation enables progress on implementing this strategy, the lower the ultimate cost will be to taxpayers," it said. A new organisation is required to manage the siting, development and operation of the future waste stores, to be established with "an appropriate balance between independence... and the need for oversight by Congress and the executive branch," said the DoE. It may take the form of a federal government corporation or an independent government agency - two arrangements suggested by a RAND Corporation study. Above all, the body must have, "adequate authority and leadership to execute its mission," said DoE. This includes suitable access to the Nuclear Waste Fund, into which power companies have paid $28 billion since 1982. Over the next ten years this organisation will search for suitable sites for these facilities by "encouraging communities to volunteer to be considered" as well as perhaps approaching some communities it believes may have suitable geology. The communities may do so "in expectation of the economic activity that would result from the siting, construction, and operation of such a facility." This approach has been successful in both Sweden and Finland, where geologic disposal sites are now in the licensing stage. A similar approach has been taken in Canada and the UK for their high-level wastes, and in Australia for low-level wastes. In Texas, a low-level waste disposal site operates in Andrews County that was developed on the intiative of local leaders looking to diversify income streams. One area of activity ruled out for the new body was anything to do with reactor fuel reprocessing and recycling. US policy is against this and can be expected to remain so for the practically foreseeable future, said the DoE. Some initial areas of research will concern geologic disposal options: whether existing storage containers used at power plant sites could be directly disposed of in suitable geology; a review of backfilled engineered barrier systems; evaluating geologic media; establishing cooperative agreements with other countries already working on the same issues. The new start comes three years after Chu worked with President Barack Obama to scrap the previous project - centred on Yucca Mountain - which went down a dead end after Congress mandated that site to the anger of leaders in the state of Nevada, notably state Senator Harry Reid. Chu and Obama used the intervening time to gather recommendations from a Blue Ribbon Commission, feeding these into the new strategy. It comes at a crucial time when the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission is reviewing its assessment of 'waste confidence', which currently prevents approval of new reactor projects absent a clear route for long-term management of wastes.

#### Yucca isn’t active – there hasn’t been an eruption for tens of millions of years – pretty miniscule probability

#### Also makes the timeframe impossibly long – we’d have to store waste there for hundreds of years

#### Nuclear growth inevitable globally ­– that’s conceded

#### Geologic storage solves

Jens Birkholzer et al, staff scientist at Earth Sciences Division of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and Nuclear Energy and Waste Program Lead Scientist, 7-3-2012, “Geologic Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Waste: Status, Key Issues, and Trends,” Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2012. 37:4.1–4.28 http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-environ-090611-143314

The future of nuclear power is confronted with several challenges, such as societal concerns about catastrophic accidents (particularly after the disaster at Fukushima Daiichi) and the economic realities related to the high cost of nuclear installations. But perhaps the issue that has over the past decades triggered the greatest and most consistent public concern is the high-level radioactive waste generated by nuclear power plants and other nuclear installations (1). The overarching complication of radioactive waste management is the long-lived toxicity of the waste, which requires isolating it from the biosphere for many hundreds of thousands of years. An international consensus has emerged that such isolation can best be provided by disposal of the waste in geologic repositories, a strategy that today is pursued by most countries in possession of nuclear waste. It is now widely accepted among experts from national waste-management organizations and related international bodies—such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) that the burial of high-level radioactive waste in mined geologic repositories is technically feasible and that it can provide adequate protection to humans and the environment.

#### Warming destroys the biosphere already – that’s McClure

### 2AC Politics

#### No link – no controversy – they failed to read a card on this

Brad Plumer, writer for Ezra Klein’s Wonkblog at Washington Post, 9-20-2011, “The pseudo-debate over Solyndra ,” Wonkblog, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/post/the-pseudo-debate-over-solyndra/2011/09/20/gIQAyN2hiK\_blog.html

Ever since Solyndra went bankrupt in August, there’s been a pseudo-debate in Washington over loan guarantees for energy projects. It’s a pseudo-debate because neither party really believes that energy should be left to the whims of the free market. The GOP has long backed loan guarantees for nuclear power plants, and, as the New York Times reports today, key Republicans such as Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) have been begging the Energy Department for loans for clean-energy projects in their own districts. In practice, the Solyndra squabble is more about scoring a political hit on the Obama administration than a genuine policy dispute. Still, it’s worth revisiting the underlying question: Why should the federal government back risky energy projects?

#### LGs for SMRs now – they’re small scale but equally controversial

#### Winners win

Michael Hirsh, chief correspondent for National Journal, 2-7-2013, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Disads not intrinsic – logical policy maker could do both

#### Obama wont spend PC and he won’t be effective if he does

Jay Cost, staff writer, 2-11-2013, “Obama the Bargainer,” The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/obama-bargainer\_699205.html?page=1

Thus, with the festivities finished and the glow of the inauguration fading, it is fair to ask: Just how powerful will President Obama be in his second term? In other words, how successful will he be at persuading the diverse agents of our government to do what he wants them to do? If the lessons of his first term guide our expectations for the second, then the most likely answer is: not very. At first blush, this assertion might sound absurd. A weak President Obama? Proof of the contrary is in the pudding: The massive stimulus, the health care bill, and financial reform were all epic in their scope and ambition. Surely both left and right agree—whether they celebrate or bemoan the fact—that Obama is a very strong, liberal president. But presidential power—the ability to persuade—has many sources, some external, some internal. The external sources are all reducible to “the political context.” How many seats does the president’s party control in Congress? What is the status of the opposition party? What was the relative strength of the president and his party in the last election? What is his job approval rating? And so on. All of these factors set the boundaries for how easily the president can persuade others. In 2009 and 2010, President Obama enjoyed a very favorable political context. Today, the political context is more favorable to him than it was in 2011, but markedly diminished from the heady days of 2009. So, for instance, President Obama can call for action on “climate change” until he is blue (or, perhaps, green) in the face, but the political environment—including arguably the most conservative House of Representatives since the 1920s—means he lacks the power to make it happen. The internal sources of strength are the president’s political skills, which he deploys in particular circumstances. So the question becomes: How good is he at persuading others, given the political context? If political context is the science of presidential power, quantifiable in electoral results and congressional voting scores, persuasive skill is the art. Here, we must put down the American Political Science Review and pick up Machiavelli’s Prince. As for President Obama’s first term, no other incoming president in recent history had such a surplus of political capital and misused it so terribly. The reason? He lacks important skills that are integral in the exercise of presidential power. All presidents are unique, each possessing or lacking skills useful to a chief executive. Obama is notable in that he has mastered some vital skills better than any recent predecessor, but he exhibits virtually no facility with others. His strengths have been enumerated extensively by a fawning press corps. His favorable coverage is due not only to the media’s ideological commitment to his policy goals, but also to his natural gifts. He awes the press, and many other groups in society, by his very presence. Moreover, he knows he has this power over them. This ability, more than any other, made him president and remains his single greatest source of power. Yet though he affects some people intensely, he himself seems largely unaffected by others. This helps explain why he has used his speaking ability so unevenly: He is wont to misread people, and therefore situations. His Tucson speech, for instance, after the shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, was a political stroke of genius. He intuited what the moment called for and delivered it perfectly. By contrast, his 2009 speech to the International Olympic Committee pitching Chicago was a waste of time and made him look small. Similarly, he has time and again left business leaders feeling nonplussed, inviting them to the White House mainly to serve as window dressing for another teleprompter performance. It is on Capitol Hill that Obama seems most out of touch with his audience. In particular, he does not understand what the key players in Congress expect, yet he is convinced he knows them better than they know themselves. What’s more, he gives little and inconsistent guidance as to what he expects from them. That goes for both Republicans and Democrats. For Republicans, the warning signs appeared early, on the stimulus bill passed in the president’s first month in office. Obama and his team were supremely confident that they could get a $900 billion package through Congress with solid Republican support, so much so that when House minority whip Eric Cantor warned that they would receive no backing from House Republicans, they told him not to embarrass himself with such an absurd prediction. Team Obama failed to anticipate how turned off the congressional GOP would be by the spending side of the package: Democratic appropriators were unloading a wish list that had accumulated during more than a decade of Republican governance. The White House also thought the Republicans would be attracted to the tax cuts that constituted roughly one-third of the package. But the White House did not understand how Republicans view taxes—specifically, the difference between tax credits, which the stimulus favored heavily, and rate cuts, which Republicans prefer. None of this should have come as a surprise to anyone who had done any homework on the congressional GOP. After all, Republicans killed a 1993 stimulus bill that was qualitatively similar, but less than a tenth the size of the 2009 package. What did Team Obama surmise when its predictions fell flat? It certainly did not take time to gauge the congressional GOP more carefully, to build a more nuanced picture of Republicans’ motives and expectations. Instead, it adopted the cartoonish caricature one finds in a Paul Krugman column: Republicans are contemptible knaves, willing to let the economy go down the drain to embarrass the president. The stimulus also featured another theme of presidential-congressional relations under Obama: mixed messages from the White House. Early in the negotiations over the bill, President Obama told House minority leader John Boehner and Cantor that he was interested in their ideas. He did not want to play partisan games; he just wanted to jump-start the economy. Yet when Cantor presented the president a list of suggestions, Obama brought the dialogue to an icy conclusion by infamously declaring, “I won, so I think I trump you on that.” During the deliberations on the bill, the president’s chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, was known to respond to other GOP suggestions by shouting, “We have the votes. F— ’em!” For the first two years of Obama’s tenure, congressional Republicans did not register with the White House at all. Contact was so sparse that when the GOP took control of the House of Representatives, the White House did not even have Boehner’s cell phone number so the president could place a congratulatory call. The case of Michigan Republican Dave Camp is illustrative. According to Bob Woodward in The Price of Politics, The administration’s approach to Congress was different from what he was used to. He had first come to Washington as a congressional staffer during the Reagan administration. Reagan had deployed administration liaisons all over Congress. Camp could remember Reagan getting on the phone with a lowly freshman congressman to discuss legislation. .  .  . During Obama’s first two years in office, Camp was the ranking Republican on the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee. He was one of the more politically moderate House Republicans. Yet the administration’s Hill staff didn’t even seem to know who he was. He never saw them. During the debt ceiling battle of 2011, the president again exhibited cluelessness about the motivations of congressional Republicans. Precious time during the month of July was wasted as Obama insisted again and again on decoupling the Bush-era tax cuts, making permanent the cuts for those making under $250,000, and letting the cuts in the high-end rates expire. His argument was that the congressional GOP could avoid the wrath of Grover Norquist because it would not actually have to vote to increase taxes. It seemed never to cross his mind that tax rate increases such as he was proposing were anathema to congressional Republicans. The bigger problem during the debt ceiling fight, and probably the biggest contributor to the near-default of the country that summer, was Obama’s failure to heed Boehner’s warning that $800 billion in additional tax revenue was his “red line,” above which he could not go. The justification for that figure was that it was all that could be squeezed out of tax reform (and even that was optimistic according to many analysts); beyond that, tax rates would have to be raised in order to bring in more revenue. In late July, after Boehner had made a “grand bargain” offer that included $800 billion in new revenue, Obama asked for another $400 billion. Memories diverge on exactly who said what—Boehner is convinced Obama said he had to have the extra money, while Obama believes he only suggested it. This ambiguity might have been avoided if Obama had not made the rookie mistake of making such a big request over the phone instead of in person. And, anyway, he should have known not to ask, given Boehner’s previous warnings about his red line. Unsurprisingly, the deal blew up shortly afterwards. It boils down to the difference between listening and waiting to talk. With congressional Republicans, Obama always seems to do the latter. So, once again, he was left disappointed, and once again he assumed the worst of his negotiating partners. He surmised that there were simply too many extreme Tea Party Republicans who were prepared to breach the debt ceiling, and that Boehner lacked control of his caucus. Again, a basic understanding of Republican history would have corrected this notion. Like Newt Gingrich and Denny Hastert before him, Boehner is responsible to a majority of the Republican caucus, which for generations has opposed the kinds of rate increases that $1.2 trillion in new revenue would have required. Not only did Obama fail to listen during the debt ceiling struggle, he consistently sent the other side mixed messages. A case in point: Obama’s demagogic April 2011 speech blasted Paul Ryan’s budget as “leaving seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry” and abandoning “the fundamental commitment this country has kept for generations.” In private, however, Obama had praised Ryan for offering a serious proposal and emphasized that both sides had to avoid scaring the elderly for political points. Worse, he had held a bipartisan summit that very day to encourage the two sides to come together on a plan. Obama’s problems communicating with Congress are not limited to the right side of the aisle. Although Democrats need not worry about White House demagoguery or fret that Obama fails to understand their concerns, he has nevertheless done a poor job of engaging them in dialogue. In particular, the White House has often cut congressional Democrats out of the loop, inhibiting interbranch coordination and angering leaders by what they feel is trampling on their institutional rights. Indeed, the president’s signature achievement—Obamacare—almost did not happen because of this. The process by which the health care bill was written was chaotic, to say the least. At one point five bills were circulating on Capitol Hill, three in the House and two in the Senate. Each differed, sometimes dramatically, in how to expand coverage and how to pay for it. And yet the White House did virtually nothing in 2009 to coordinate these efforts. In fact, White House aides privately thought the final House bill was a liberal fantasy, and they had worked out a deal with medical providers that did not include the so-called public option. Yet the president never came out against that proposal, or any other, for that matter. After multiple calls over the summer of 2009 for President Obama to set some ground rules on what he expected, he gave a speech in early September that, though his aides promised specificity, was once again vague. Finally, in early January, when the two chambers had passed their bills and it came time to work out the finer points, President Obama actually stormed out of a meeting after Nancy Pelosi tartly expressed her frustration with his lack of leadership. It was left to Emanuel to finish the negotiations. Worse, the needless delays due to the lack of presidential leadership sapped public support for the reform effort, led to Scott Brown’s victory in the Senate race in Massachusetts that January, and eventually forced Democrats to pass a gratuitously slipshod and ill-conceived bill that otherwise never would have become law. After the 2010 midterms, House Democrats lost their majority, but not all of their clout. It would have been virtually impossible for Boehner to pass a compromise debt ceiling plan through the House in 2011 without at least some Democratic support, so it was appropriate for Pelosi and her leadership team to be kept in the loop. For a while, they were, but as Boehner and Obama approached a grand bargain, House Democrats were excluded. Amazingly, so was Harry Reid. Any deal would obviously have to bear the imprimatur of the Senate majority leader, yet he was cut out of the final talks. It was only after the New York Times scooped the Boehner-Obama grand bargain that the White House brought Senate Democrats into the loop. Unsurprisingly, they were apoplectic, believing that the deal extracted too little from the congressional GOP, and feeling that they had been ignored. In fact, it was the outrage of the Senate Democrats that prompted the White House to go back to Boehner at the last minute to ask for more tax revenue, scuttling the big deal once and for all. All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure. There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill. In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president’s job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: The reason people put me in this office is people felt that I had connected our current predicaments with the broader arc of American history and where we might go as a diverse and forward-looking nation. And that narrative thread we just lost, in the day-to-day problem solving that was going on. .  .  . What the president can do, that nobody else can do, is tell a story to the American people about where we are and where we need to go. While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices. The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one “actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood.” President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one “in the arena.” What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi’s power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side.

#### Davenport ev says he’s already pushing tax reform and gun control – CX is pretty embarrassing here – no articulation of distinction

#### Guns are a heavy lift – drains PC

Joan Walsh, writer for Salon, 2-5-2013, “Obama’s gutsy gun control push” http://www.salon.com/2013/02/05/obamas\_gutsy\_gun\_control\_push/

Second-term Barack Obama continues to show us he’s wiser and tougher than the guy who took office four years ago. The latest sign is his stance on his gun control agenda. In Minneapolis on Monday, he laid out everything he intends to push for, not merely pushing criminal background checks and tougher penalties for gun trafficking, but also the part of his plan that will be the heaviest lifting: an assault weapons ban. This is what many liberals have hoped to see since his earliest political battles in 2009, going all the way back to the initial stimulus skirmishes: a president who tells the American people what he thinks will solve our problems, and who fights for those solutions, who demands congressional votes even on the most controversial agenda items – and who may, down the road, be forced to compromise on some of those priorities, only to fight for them another day. Obama’s speech came in the wake of the NRA’s Wayne LaPierre’s unpantsing by Chris Wallace on “Fox News Sunday.” It was one of the most astonishing political confrontations in memory. Wallace called LaPierre “ridiculous” for suggesting the president’s daughters don’t deserve more protection than other children. He derided him for alleging with no evidence that background checks are a first step to a national registry that would allow the president to take away Americans’ guns. He called the NRA’s claim that the Obama daughters’ school has armed guards “nonsense,” since his children also went there and he knows Sidwell Friends, a Quaker school, doesn’t arm its security. Finally, he mocked LaPierre for suggesting that only the “elite” have protection, pointing out that the NRA head traveled to the Fox interview with his own bodyguards. He reduced the NRA bully to a sputtering wreck. Just four years ago, LaPierre was treated very differently on Fox, when Glenn Beck invited him to come on his show and warn his paranoid viewers of Obama’s gun grab. Admittedly Wallace is less a partisan than the loony Beck, but it’s significant that Fox’s Sunday morning viewers heard a host debunk the claim that Obama’s coming for their guns rather than spread it. Against that backdrop, Obama’s decision to stand before a cadre of law enforcement officers for his Minneapolis speech made great political theater. It served as a reminder that the NRA’s “enemies list” includes the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Association of School Safety and Law Enforcement Officers, and the Police Foundation. (Really, it does. The list is here.) Obama sold the assault weapons ban, in part, as a measure to protect the police. “Weapons of war have no place on our streets, or in our schools, or threatening our law enforcement officers,” he said. ‘Our law enforcement officers should never be out-gunned on the streets.” Salon’s Jillian Rayfield laid out the tough sledding that’s ahead of assault-ban supporters, including the skepticism of purple state Democrats like Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. Reid, rather lordly and ineptly, said on “Meet the Press” that he didn’t know if he supported Sen. Dianne Feinstein’s assault-weapons ban because he hadn’t read it yet. I know the majority leader is a busy guy, but c’mon, Harry. Maybe get someone to read it to you. I’m tired of red- and purple-state Democrats getting a pass on gun issues because hunting, say, is popular in their states. Who could be more valuable than a red-state Democrat in telling hunters that Obama’s agenda won’t take away their hunting rifles? So I’m glad Obama’s demanding that Congress vote on an assault-weapons ban rather than letting leaders table it, as he did with other first-term priorities, even if that means conservative Democrats must take some tough votes. Of course, letting conservative Democrats crush an assault ban may also serve to protect them from the NRA. That’s allegedly why Reid is open to a vote on the issue. But it could have the unintended consequence of letting those newly motivated by Newtown single out Democrats who deserve criticism, or even a primary challenge, on the issue of guns. Dianne Feinstein insists that she will push for her assault weapons ban bill, and Connecticut Sen. Chris Murphy, who used to represent Newtown as a congressman, derided those who’ve declared that push futile. “Too many people in Washington want to eulogize specific pieces of gun reform legislation before the debate has even started,” Murphy told “The Rachel Maddow Show.” The time to act is now. Let me be clear: I think compromise is crucial to getting new policy crafted, and if it turns out legislators can find common ground on a limited package of reforms, chief among them universal criminal background checks, I’d support that. Greg Sargent featured a fascinating interview with crucial GOP House Rep. Scott Rigell of Virginia, who represents a purple district that went for Obama in 2012. Rigell is teaming up with another Republican, Rep. Scott Meehan, along with Democrats Elijah Cummings and Carolyn McCarthy, to push legislation to crack down on gun trafficking designed to evade background checks. Rigell also says he is open to universal background checks, though he is undecided. “I certainly see the merits of that,” he told Sargent. Still, being open to compromise is different from suggesting that Democrats should stick to supporting only measures that they know have broad support. The point of leadership is to lead, and as we saw with gay marriage, when the president stakes out a forward-looking stance on a divisive issue, he can help bring people along with him. I’m glad he’s continuing to push for the assault weapon and large magazine ban, even as the serious sensible people of the Beltway insist it will never pass. Maybe he’ll surprise them. Because of Newtown, we’re in a new era for gun control legislation, which doesn’t mean we’ll get everything we want. But it requires a new approach to political leadership and negotiation, and the president is providing it.

#### The GOP will bail on immigration at the last moment – they only care about scoring points for trying

Alex Pareene, writes about politics for Salon, published author, 1-30-2013, “GOP prepares to blame Obama for immigration deal collapse,” Salon, http://www.salon.com/2013/01/30/gop\_prepares\_to\_blame\_obama\_for\_immigration\_deal\_collapse/

While much of Washington seems very confident that a major immigration reform bill will pass this year, I remain skeptical. As I wrote yesterday, there are still some major obstacles, like “the Republican Party” and “the conservative movement.” But Rush Limbaugh, no friend to the undocumented, recently gave reform supporter Marco Rubio a very generous and non-confrontational interview. This is a big deal, because Limbaugh is going to either give Republican lawmakers cover to support reform without incurring the wrath of their constituents, or he is going to kill the entire thing. The fact that Limbaugh went out of his way to be respectful to Rubio is a sign that Rubio’s got breathing room to actually push for real reform. But Rubio also repeatedly made it plain that he is leaving himself the option of walking away from the whole thing and blaming Obama. Conservatives have convinced themselves that Barack Obama intentionally blew up the possibility of an immigration reform bill in his first term, by forcing them to not support reform. (The theory doesn’t really make sense.) “I think he wants to destroy the Republican Party, particularly in the eyes of Hispanic American voters,” Bill O’Reilly told Marco Rubio. “So he’s going to make it as hard as possible to get anything done and demonize you guys.” The idea is that Barack Obama used his cunning and guile to trick the entire Republican Party into seeking and then relying on the white nativist vote for a generation. So Republicans are preparing the groundwork for the P.R. campaign to blame Obama for this deal’s collapse. Here’s Rubio with Limbaugh: Responding to challenges from Limbaugh that Obama would demand reforms with fewer border security measures, Rubio emphasized his willingness to walk away from a bill if he didn’t get what he wanted on that front. In particular, he said including enforcement measures as a “trigger” for undocumented immigrants to seek permanent residency was key. “Unless there’s real enforcement triggers we are not going to have a bill that moves on the opportunity to apply for a green card,” Rubio said. He added: “I’m not going to be part of a bidding war to see who can put the most lenient path forward” if Obama demands a smoother path to citizenship. The Southwest border commission is the bill’s poison pill — if its support is mandatory for the path to citizenship to proceed, as Rubio seems to be demanding, there will be no path to citizenship. Here’s Lindsey Graham, an old pro when it comes to blowing up immigration reform deals: Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) told reporters on Tuesday that it’s a mistake for the president to push for same-sex couples to be included in immigration reform, if he wants Republicans to support the bill. “Why don’t we just put legalized abortion in there and round it all out,” Graham said to reporters. One might be tempted to explain to Sen. Graham that “legalized abortion” has very little to do with immigration policy, while same-sex couples are in fact regularly and tragically affected by immigration policy, but Sen. Graham wouldn’t care. Sen. Graham is constantly negotiating just how much negotiation he can possibly get, and nothing else. He does not negotiate for the purpose of passing legislation. One important difference between President Obama and Republican congressional leaders is that Obama wants legislation designed to solve problems while Republicans see legislation mainly as a means of scoring political points. If your primary concern is that a problem be solved, the idea of blowing up the entire deal rather than settling for less than you want is absurd. That’s how we ended up with a healthcare reform package with no public option. If your primary concern is purely political, you spend most of your time, as the House GOP does, passing imaginary budgets. This has played out over and over again so far during the Obama presidency. In 2011, Barack Obama proposed a “Jobs Act” that was full of things that he reasonably believed would help ease unemployment. Republicans countered by scotch taping a balanced budget amendment to a pile of corporate tax cuts and calling that a “jobs bill.” The point was to have something to point to and call a “jobs bill,” not to actually propose anything that would help anyone find work. This is why I’m still pretty sure Republicans will play along on reform for a month or two before scuttling the entire deal over some exaggerated bit of Democratic “overreach.” Republicans want to be seen as supporting immigration reform more than they want actual immigration reform. If the end result here is that they get no immigration reform, but they do get points for trying, they will consider that a success.

#### Sets up immigration for March

Meredith Shiner, roll call staff, 2-4-2013, “Leahy Wields Influence Over Guns, Immigration” RollCall, http://www.rollcall.com/news/leahy\_wields\_influence\_over\_guns\_immigration-222144-1.html?pg=2

Of the two biggest pending issues, however, gun control seems to be much more complicated. Reid long has had ties to the National Rifle Association, and it’s widely believed that stricter measures, such as the assault weapons ban championed by Judiciary member Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., face long, if not impossible, odds for passage.¶ But the assault weapons ban is a perfect example of the political and policy balance Leahy must maintain in committee: Does he facilitate its inclusion to give it a leg up on the floor, but possibly imperiling the bill on the floor? Or does he try to force the amendment fight onto the floor, where the provision is almost certain to die?¶ Reid has said he will allow a floor vote on Feinstein’s assault weapons ban, but neither Reid nor Leahy appears especially committed to expending political capital to help it pass.¶ Moreover, Democratic leaders and Leahy have not laid out a path forward on gun control, opting to hold a series of hearings first before beginning their work on legislative language, which sources say the panel would like to finish by month’s end. That would set up the month of March for action on immigration.

#### Gay marriage thumps

Karoun Demirjian, white house correspondent, 2-7-2013, “Obama’s push for gay rights in immigration reform prompts GOP opposition,” Las Vegas Sun, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2013/feb/07/obamas-push-gay-rights-immigration-reform-couple-p/

When President Barack Obama unveiled his blueprint for immigration reform last week, he largely endorsed the Senate’s approach, with a slight twist: Under Obama’s plan, same-sex couples would be entitled to the same immigration rights as heterosexual couples. The difference caught many social conservatives off-guard, some of whom are now openly wondering why, just when the stars were aligning for comprehensive immigration reform, Obama would throw a monkey wrench into the mix. “He is basically pandering to the community,” said Tibi Ellis, a conservative Nevada lobbyist and advocate for immigration reform. “The argument is not about gender, marriage, or anything. The argument is about how do we revise our current immigration system.”   Since the 2012 election, the immigration reform movement has unprecedented support, thanks to Latino voter turnout. The growing cohort pays close attention to where lawmakers stand on immigration — and in 2012, overwhelmingly supported liberal Democrats over conservative Republicans. Republican lawmakers such as Nevada Sen. Dean Heller, who in the past had exclusively favored enforcement as a solution to illegal immigration, are now vocal in their support for a pathway to citizenship for immigrants who entered the country, unauthorized, as children. Even House Majority Leader Eric Cantor is on board.   But those same Republicans are not leaping to endorse the idea of extending immigration benefits to same-sex couples. “It’s interesting,” Heller said when asked about the provision, adding that he was looking forward to a detailed discussion on many specific points of the immigration reform bill as it was drafted. Where Heller is non-committal, other Republicans say the same-sex marriage provision would be a deal-breaker. “Which is more important, LGBT or border security?” Sen. John McCain, one of four Republican members of a bipartisan group of Senators who unveiled their own immigration framework last week, at a Politico breakfast. “If you’re going to load (immigration reform) up with social issues, that is the best way to derail it, in my view.” Republicans working toward an immigration framework do not seem amenable to the idea either. “I would hope that if the president does try to insert himself (into the immigration discussion), he does so with the purpose of trying to reach a bipartisan solution,” said Republican Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, who is working with the House bipartisan group on immigration. “I’ve yet to see anything that the president has put forward that has been, frankly, constructive.” The idea that Obama, who oversaw the end of the military’s Don’t Ask Don’t Tell policy, and declared himself to be in favor of legalizing gay marriage in the run-up to the 2012 campaign, is relatively unsurprising.   In the past several months, the Department of Homeland Security has also taken steps to recognize same-sex couples as “family relationships” when determining whether to deport or use administrative discretion in deportation cases. Obama’s immigration would make same-sex relationships equal to heterosexual relationships for family-based visas as well.   But social conservatives who have resisted legalizing gay marriage say giving legal recognition to same-sex couples in the immigration context would be just as incendiary. Several conservative, pro-immigration religious groups — which have sway with social conservatives in Congress — object to Obama’s inclusion of same-sex couples as beneficiaries under immigration reform law.   “It’s like adding fuel to a fire. Immigration itself can be divisive and emotional; you add another national issue that is equally emotional and divisive and it’s a combustible mix,” said Kevin Appleby, director of immigration and refugee policy for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, one of several religious groups that sent a letter to the White House declaring their opposition last week. “We want an immigration bill, and this will make it harder if not impossible to get an immigration bill.”

#### Visas aren’t key – immigrants prefer their home country or won’t stay long enough to innovate

Vivek Wadhwa et al. Prof @ Duke, Senior Research Assoc @ Labor Program @ Harvard, 3-30-2009,   
“The American Brain Drain and Asia,” http://www.japanfocus.org/-Alex-Salkever/3112

Surprisingly, visa status was not the most important factor determining their decision to return home. Three of four indicated that considerations regarding their visa or residency permit status did not contribute to their decision to return to their home country. In fact, 27% of Indian respondents and 34% of Chinese held permanent resident status or were U.S. citizens. However, respondents overwhelmingly favored their home location with regard to social situations, such as closeness to friends and ability to care for aging parents. The rationale for returnees moving home was echoed by responses of surveyed foreign nationals currently enrolled in U.S. universities. These groups have traditionally represented a disproportionate percentage per capita of advanced degree students. During the 2004–2005 academic year, roughly 60% of engineering Ph.D. students and 40% of Master’s students were foreign nationals, and foreign nationals make up a significant share of the U.S. graduate student population in all STEM disciplines. In the past, the overwhelming majority of these students worked in the United States after graduation. The five-year stay rate for Chinese Ph.D.s was 92% and for Indians 85%. A significant percentage chose to remain permanently. The research team used the social networking site Facebook to recruit 1,224 foreign nationals who are currently studying at U.S. universities or who graduated in 2008. The respondents included 229 students from China and Hong Kong, 117 from Western Europe, and 878 from India. Again, this is not a rigorously scientific sample, but the group is large and random enough to make the results worth considering. The overall consensus among respondents was that the United States was no longer the destination of choice for professional careers. Most students in the sample wanted to stay in the United States, but only for short periods. Among respondents 58% of Indian, 54% of Chinese, and 40% of European students said that they would stay in the United States for at least a few years after graduation if given the chance. However, only 6% of Indian, 10% of Chinese, and 15% of European students said they want to stay permanently. The largest group of respondents— 55% of Indian, 40% of Chinese, and 30% of European students—wants to return home within five years. [6] This is a fairly short tenure considering that the average founding technology entrepreneur from China or India lived in the United States an average of 14 years before launching a company in the United States.

#### Manufacturing’s bigger internal to the economy

Michael Ettlinger, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute, and Kate Gordon, the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress, April 2011, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf)

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private-sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### Zero impact uniqueness here

#### Remittances now and sufficient

#### Relations now and sufficient

#### No ev about the direction of those means this is defense at best

#### Latin American relations are irrelevant – Obama ignores the region

Tim Rogers, writer for the Nicaragua Dispatch, 2-1-2013, “Will US-Latin America policy change under John Kerry?” http://www.nicaraguadispatch.com/news/2013/02/will-us-latin-america-policy-change-under-john-kerry/6613

Aguirre says Latin America will continue to remain on the U.S.’ “backburner” and that U.S. policy toward Nicaragua will “continue to be correct but cool.”¶ ¶ “I don’t expect to see any high level contacts from the U.S. (visit Nicaragua) until Comandante Ortega moderates his rhetoric towards the U.S., sheds some of his radioactive friends and moves towards a more democratic society internally,” Aguirre says.¶ ¶ Washington analysts are also skeptical that Kerry’s past interest in Central America will translate into any substantive policy change toward the region.¶ ¶ Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, notes that the real focus of Kerry’s foreign policy attentions in recent years has been on Afghanistan, Iraq and the Middle East, while his comments on Latin America have been “episodic,” making it “hard to discern a consistent view about U.S. policy towards the region.”¶ ¶ “It is reasonable to expect more continuity than change with Kerry in charge at the State Department,” Shifter tells The Nicaragua Dispatch. “Increasingly, the direction for US foreign policy is set at the White House, and there is no reason to believe that the second Obama administration will differ much from the first

#### Latin American countries want to break away from US relations, not increase them

Ahlul Bayt News Agency (ABNA), 1-12-2013, “Why Latin America Will Not Bow to US Pressure Over Iran” http://abna.ir/data.asp?lang=3&Id=380878

Several Latin American countries have enhanced their diplomatic and trade ties with Iran in recent years, while their relations with the US have been downgraded amid popular demands for an end to dependence on Washington. Although the United States is still the largest economic partner of many Latin American countries, its economic and financial crisis has adversely affected them. This has led some nations, such as Mexico, to announce their intention to diversify their commercial partners in the next years.

### IAEA

#### Amano ev in the 1AC indicates global nuclear inevitable – that’s conceded

#### Wallace and Williams indicate many other countries are developing nukes

#### Makhijani – that’s from 2004 – it’s about global nuclear – that is straight up laughably nonuq

#### IAEA isn’t key – US monitoring is sufficient – takes out the impact

#### Global growth inevitable despite Fukushima

Pete Domenici, former senator from New Mexico, and Warren F. “Pete” Miller, part time Research Professor at Texas A & M University and former assistant secretary for nuclear energy at the U.S. Department of Energy, July 2012, “Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets,” Bipartisan Policy Center, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Leadership%20in%20Nuclear%20Energy%20Markets.pdf

Internationally, the outlook is quite different: a number of countries intend to grow their nuclear fleet or enter the market for nuclear technology for the first time. Though enthusiasm for nuclear investments has been somewhat dimmed by the Fukushima accident, there still seems to be substantial international interest in the further deployment of nuclear power. In 2008, when the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) last conducted its Nuclear Energy Outlook, it analyzed global growth scenarios ranging from 450 to 600 gigawatts of electricity through nuclear capacity by 2050, taking into account existing capacity and new additions.14 Several years later, the lower-end projection seems more likely given the impacts of the worldwide economic crisis and the impacts of the Fukushima accident.15 In fact, Fukushima has caused, appropriately, an international pause as each country with existing or planned nuclear capacity takes time to reassess the safety of its currently operating plants and to review its commitment to future nuclear energy development. Some countries— Germany is a prominent example—have reversed course on their nuclear energy programs. In March 2011, Germany’s 17 reactors generated approximately 25 percent of that country’s electricity supply. After Fukushima, the German government immediately shut down eight reactors and reinstated its policy of phasing out nuclear energy altogether by 2022.16 Italy and Switzerland have made similar decisions to phase out or delay the growth of their nuclear programs.17 After Fukushima, the Japanese government reversed its policy goal of expanding nuclear power to 30 to 40 percent of electric generation.18 As of May 2012, all 54 of Japan’s nuclear power reactors had been shut down for scheduled maintenance; due to public opposition, to date, only one of these plants has been able to restart.19,20 Several other countries, by contrast, have reaffirmed their intentions to continue expanding or developing a nuclear energy program after Fukushima. These countries include China, India, South Korea, and Russia. Together, they are expected to account for 80 percent of new nuclear plant construction globally over the next decade or longer. China alone accounts for 40 percent of planned new construction globally, with 26 new reactors under development.21 Thus, global growth in nuclear energy is still expected to be positive overall.

#### IAEA fails

CFR 7-5-2012, “The Global Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime,” Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/proliferation/global-nuclear-nonproliferation-regime/p18984

Another problem is the lack of adequate verification and enforcement mechanisms available to the IAEA, whose budget, intelligence capabilities, and technological resources fall far short of what would be needed to detect, prevent, or punish NPT violations. In 2010, the IAEA's inspections budget was approximately $164 million. Not surprisingly, even discounting nuclear facilities the IAEA does not have access to, such as those in Iran and North Korea, nuclear materials have reached the black market from installations under IAEA safeguards, namely from several in Pakistan. One positive step has been the adoption of IAEA Additional Protocols , which strengthen the agency's inspections mandate and is in force in 115 countries, including all five recognized nuclear weapon states and, as of 2009, India. Nonetheless, more than half of all NPT member states—including Syria and Iran (which has ratified but not implemented the protocol)—have yet to agree to the toughened inspections regime. A review of the NPT in 2010 failed to reach consensus on U.S. efforts to make the additional protocols mandatory. Other multilateral, informal organizations also play a role in implementing and enforcing the NPT, notably the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG). Made up of forty-six advanced nuclear states, the NSG prohibits the transfer of civilian nuclear materials or technology to states outside the NPT, or those that do not fully comply with IAEA safeguards. However, the NSG's export bans are not legally binding, and members (including the United States, Russia, and China) have taken advantage of the weakness of the NSG regime to pursue civilian nuclear projects with non-NPT members.

#### Multilat organizations fail

CFR 7-5-2012, “The Global Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime,” Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/proliferation/global-nuclear-nonproliferation-regime/p18984

Despite the broad legal coverage of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), a string of failures since the early 1990s have highlighted the ineffectiveness of existing nonproliferation instruments to deter would-be nuclear weapon states. In theory, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) can refer countries that do not comply with the NPT to the UN Security Council (UNSC), which in turn can impose sanctions or other punitive measures. In practice, however, political calculations have often caused deadlock at the UNSC, enabling nuclear rogues § Marked 15:47 § such as Iran to defy successive, fairly weak UN sanctions resolutions with virtual impunity. The IAEA did however, refer Syria to the UNSC in June 2011 due to an "absence of confidence that Syria's nuclear program is exclusively for peaceful purposes."
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#### Winners win – Hirsh indicates the idea of finite PC is a joke – wins generate momentum which pave the way for further victories

#### Winners win

Michael Hirsh, chief correspondent for National Journal, 2-7-2013, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction. Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

#### No tradeoffs – pushing more items doesn’t slow Obama down

Nancy Benac, writer for the Huffington Post, 1-20-2013, “Optimistic Obama faces tough to-do list” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20130120/us-obama-inauguration-analysis/?utm\_hp\_ref=sports&ir=sports

Plouffe argued that the president's big agenda gives him "the sort of focus and energy you need. And I think his intention is to run through the tape all the way." Obama can take heart from any number of things he's got going for him. He has a can-do attitude, growing public support for action on some of his chosen issues and better approval ratings. Democrats gained seats in both houses of Congress in the November election and Republican poll numbers are weak. With the war in Iraq over and U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan winding down, he has more time to focus on domestic priorities. He also doesn't have to worry as much about ruffling feathers because he doesn't have to run for re-election again. "People shouldn't underestimate how much we can get done," the president said in a pre-election interview for Rolling Stone.

#### Gun control this month

Meredith Shiner, roll call staff, 2-4-2013, “Leahy Wields Influence Over Guns, Immigration” RollCall, http://www.rollcall.com/news/leahy\_wields\_influence\_over\_guns\_immigration-222144-1.html?pg=2

Of the two biggest pending issues, however, gun control seems to be much more complicated. Reid long has had ties to the National Rifle Association, and it’s widely believed that stricter measures, such as the assault weapons ban championed by Judiciary member Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., face long, if not impossible, odds for passage.¶ But the assault weapons ban is a perfect example of the political and policy balance Leahy must maintain in committee: Does he facilitate its inclusion to give it a leg up on the floor, but possibly imperiling the bill on the floor? Or does he try to force the amendment fight onto the floor, where the provision is almost certain to die?¶ Reid has said he will allow a floor vote on Feinstein’s assault weapons ban, but neither Reid nor Leahy appears especially committed to expending political capital to help it pass.¶ Moreover, Democratic leaders and Leahy have not laid out a path forward on gun control, opting to hold a series of hearings first before beginning their work on legislative language, which sources say the panel would like to finish by month’s end. That would set up the month of March for action on immigration.

#### Gun control costs tons of PC

Nick Biggi, writer at the Marquette Tribune, 2-5-2013, “Obama pushes for greater gun control” http://marquettetribune.org/2013/02/05/news/guns-obama-pushes-for-greater-gun-control-mg1-cb2-ap3/

“Changing the status quo is never easy,” Obama said. “This will be no exception. The only way we can reduce gun violence in this county is if the American people decide it’s important. If you decide it’s important.” Paul Nolette, an assistant professor of political science, said the president will face much opposition to his original address. “I think the president’s proposal is an effort to move the issue of gun control higher up on the national agenda and build a coalition supporting new gun laws,” Nolette said. “He’s going to need to put a lot of his political capital into this effort if he wants to achieve results, because he will run into a lot of resistance on Capitol Hill.”

#### Obama won’t spend PC on immigration

Jay Cost, staff writer, 2-11-2013, “Obama the Bargainer,” The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/obama-bargainer\_699205.html?page=1

But little such progress will be due to President Obama. It is highly unlikely that he will act as the collective bargainer Neustadt envisioned. He will not be the one to help hammer out policy differences between Senate Democrats and House Republicans, such as illegal immigrants’ status under Obamacare, or help the appropriators find the money needed for enforcement, or create a political space where both parties can declare victory. Sure enough, last week’s campaign-style speech in Las Vegas on immigration reform was classic Obama. Not only did it do nothing to advance the ball on the sensitive negotiations in Congress, but the president demanded immediate amnesty, something to which Republicans will never agree. He also said he would “insist” that Congress vote on his proposal if it did not act in a timely fashion. That captures Obama’s problem in a nutshell. “Insisting” that Congress do something is a good way to make sure nothing happens. Instead, as Harry Truman once said, the president must spend his time “flattering, kissing, and kicking people to get them to do what they are supposed to do anyway.” Barack Obama does not do this. He thinks it beneath him. After four years in office, he still fails to grasp the essence of modern presidential power.

#### Obama’s backing off instead of using political– he agrees PC would backfire

John Avlon, staff writer, 1-31-2013, “Immigration Reform Proposal Shows Similar Ideas between Bush and Obama,” Daily Beast, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/31/immigration-reform-proposal-shows-similar-ideas-betweeen-bush-and-obama.html

Wehner’s comments cut to the heart of the lessons learned. After essentially ignoring immigration reform in its first term, the Obama administration is front-loading the ambitious effort and—for the time, at least—deferring to the Gang of Eight in hopes that it might be less polarizing if the president’s name isn’t on the bill when senators from the opposing party try to sell it to their base. What’s old is new. It’s an irony not lost on Bush administration alumni and family members. The death of the Bush bill came largely at the hands of a right-wing talk-radio revolt that attacked any path to citizenship as “amnesty.” The fact that then–presidential candidate John McCain was sponsoring the bill with none other than Ted Kennedy created an opening for competitors like Mitt Romney to try to get to McCain’s right in a play to the primary’s conservative populist cheap seats. But the other hostile front came from resurgent House Democrats who frankly did not want to give the polarizing lame-duck incumbent named Bush a political win. Fast-forward six years, and the right-wing talk-radio crowd is weakened. The evangelical, law-enforcement, and business communities are now united behind comprehensive immigration reform. Responsible Republicans know they cannot afford to alienate Hispanics any longer. And the presence of Florida Sen. Marco Rubio—a onetime Jeb Bush protégé—is an essential addition to the coalition. “Senator Rubio, a Tea Party choice, is well respected and well liked and trusted,” adds Wehner. “With him as the lead in these negotiations, conservatives are more willing to consider immigration reform than in the past. You’re not seeing the explosion of opposition now that we saw in 2007. That doesn’t mean it won’t happen; but for now, it hasn’t.” Long story short: it’s much easier for Marco Rubio to make the case for the Senate’s bipartisan path to citizenship than to argue on behalf of President Obama’s bill, which would be a nonstarter to much of the base. And so the president wisely held off from offering his specific policy vision in the much-hyped Las Vegas speech earlier this week. It’s not unlike the reason Harry Truman gave for naming the postwar European-aid bill after his secretary of state, George Marshall: “Anything that is sent up to the Senate and House with my name on it will quiver a couple of times and then turn over and die.”

### IFR CP

#### The new 2NC ev mentioned Yucca once – to say that the US ABANDONED Yucca

#### 2AC – This net benefit is anti-reality – Yucca is dead, other storage options are coming now, that method is empirically successful

World Nuclear News, 1-14-2013, “New start for US nuclear disposal,” http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/WR\_New\_start\_for\_US\_nuclear\_disposal\_1401131.html

A new waste disposal strategy was announced on 10 January by Stephen Chu, head of the Department of Energy (DoE). He underlined the importance of nuclear energy to the US power system which counts 104 operating nuclear reactors. Safe management and disposal of highly radioactive used reactor fuel as well as similar military wastes "must remain a national priority" in order to "ensure that nuclear power remains part of our diversified clean-energy portfolio," he said. America's new strategy would see a 'pilot interim store' being in operation in 2021, with a focus on taking used nuclear fuel from current shut down power plant sites. By 2025 a larger 'full-scale interim store' would open, and by 2048 an underground disposal facility should be in place to permanently store and dispose of the material. The facilities could be co-located in any combination or sited separately - all depending on the expressed will of American people. There could even be more than one underground disposal site. The schedule is meant to reduce the growth of the federal government's liabilities under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, under which it was meant to begin taking used reactor fuel from power companies in 1998. As it is, some 68,000 tonnes of used reactor fuel reside at 72 different power plant sites across the country, with the DoE repeatedly reimbursing power companies for the cost of this. The two interim facilities will accept used reactor fuel at a rate faster than the 2000 tonnes per year being produced by the power industry in order to gradually draw down the backlog, said the DoE. "The sooner that legislation enables progress on implementing this strategy, the lower the ultimate cost will be to taxpayers," it said. A new organisation is required to manage the siting, development and operation of the future waste stores, to be established with "an appropriate balance between independence... and the need for oversight by Congress and the executive branch," said the DoE. It may take the form of a federal government corporation or an independent government agency - two arrangements suggested by a RAND Corporation study. Above all, the body must have, "adequate authority and leadership to execute its mission," said DoE. This includes suitable access to the Nuclear Waste Fund, into which power companies have paid $28 billion since 1982. Over the next ten years this organisation will search for suitable sites for these facilities by "encouraging communities to volunteer to be considered" as well as perhaps approaching some communities it believes may have suitable geology. The communities may do so "in expectation of the economic activity that would result from the siting, construction, and operation of such a facility." This approach has been successful in both Sweden and Finland, where geologic disposal sites are now in the licensing stage. A similar approach has been taken in Canada and the UK for their high-level wastes, and in Australia for low-level wastes. In Texas, a low-level waste disposal site operates in Andrews County that was developed on the intiative of local leaders looking to diversify income streams. One area of activity ruled out for the new body was anything to do with reactor fuel reprocessing and recycling. US policy is against this and can be expected to remain so for the practically foreseeable future, said the DoE. Some initial areas of research will concern geologic disposal options: whether existing storage containers used at power plant sites could be directly disposed of in suitable geology; a review of backfilled engineered barrier systems; evaluating geologic media; establishing cooperative agreements with other countries already working on the same issues. The new start comes three years after Chu worked with President Barack Obama to scrap the previous project - centred on Yucca Mountain - which went down a dead end after Congress mandated that site to the anger of leaders in the state of Nevada, notably state Senator Harry Reid. Chu and Obama used the intervening time to gather recommendations from a Blue Ribbon Commission, feeding these into the new strategy. It comes at a crucial time when the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission is reviewing its assessment of 'waste confidence', which currently prevents approval of new reactor projects absent a clear route for long-term management of wastes.

#### Geologic storage solves

Jens Birkholzer et al, staff scientist at Earth Sciences Division of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and Nuclear Energy and Waste Program Lead Scientist, 7-3-2012, “Geologic Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Waste: Status, Key Issues, and Trends,” Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2012. 37:4.1–4.28 http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-environ-090611-143314

The future of nuclear power is confronted with several challenges, such as societal concerns about catastrophic accidents (particularly after the disaster at Fukushima Daiichi) and the economic realities related to the high cost of nuclear installations. But perhaps the issue that has over the past decades triggered the greatest and most consistent public concern is the high-level radioactive waste generated by nuclear power plants and other nuclear installations (1). The overarching complication of radioactive waste management is the long-lived toxicity of the waste, which requires isolating it from the biosphere for many hundreds of thousands of years. An international consensus has emerged that such isolation can best be provided by disposal of the waste in geologic repositories, a strategy that today is pursued by most countries in possession of nuclear waste. It is now widely accepted among experts from national waste-management organizations and related international bodies—such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) that the burial of high-level radioactive waste in mined geologic repositories is technically feasible and that it can provide adequate protection to humans and the environment.

#### Their Brook ev says 300 years

#### The 2NC Kirsch ev says you need dozens of reactors in addition to the demonstration

#### International consensus proves theyre not competitive and power generation will be small

PR Newswire, “Report: Unsuccessful 'Fast Breeder' Is No Solution for Long-Term Reactor Waste Disposal Issues” 2-17-2010, PR Newswire, International Panel on Fissile Materials

Hopes that the "fast breeder"- a plutonium-fueled nuclear reactor designed to produce more fuel than it consumed -- might serve as a major part of the long-term nuclear waste disposal solution are not merited by the dismal track record to date of such sodium-cooled reactors in France, India, Japan, the Soviet Union/Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States, according to a major new study from the International Panel on Fissile Materials (IPFM). Titled "Fast Breeder Reactor Programs: History and Status," the IPFM report concludes: "The problems (with fast breeder reactors) ... make it hard to dispute Admiral Hyman Rickover's summation in 1956, based on his experience with a sodium-cooled reactor developed to power an early U.S. nuclear submarine, that such reactors are 'expensive to build, complex to operate, susceptible to prolonged shutdown as a result of even minor malfunctions, and difficult and time-consuming to repair.'" Plagued by high costs, often multi-year downtime for repairs (including a 15-year reactor restart delay in Japan), multiple safety problems (among them often catastrophic sodium fires triggered simply by contact with oxygen), and unresolved proliferation risks, "fast breeder" reactors already have been the focus of more than $50 billion in development spending, including more than $10 billion each by the U.S., Japan and Russia. As the IPFM report notes: "Yet none of these efforts has produced a reactor that is anywhere near economically competitive with light-water reactors ... After six decades and the expenditure of the equivalent of tens of billions of dollars, the promise of breeder reactors remains largely unfulfilled and efforts to commercialize them have been steadily cut back in most countries." The new IPFM report is a timely and important addition to the understanding about reactor technology. Today, with increased attention being paid both to so-called "Generation IV" reactors, some of which are based on the fast reactor technology, and a new Obama Administration panel focusing on reprocessing and other waste issues, interest in some quarters has shifted back to fast reactors as a possible means by which to bypass concerns about the long-term storage of nuclear waste. Frank von Hippel, Ph.D., co-chair of the International Panel on Fissile Materials, and professor of Public and International Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, said: "The breeder reactor dream is not dead but it has receded far into the future. In the 1970s, breeder advocates were predicting that the world would have thousands of breeder reactors operating by now. Today, they are predicting commercialization by approximately 2050. In the meantime, the world has to deal with the legacy of the dream; approximately 250 tons of separated weapon-usable plutonium and ongoing - although, in most cases struggling - reprocessing programs in France, India, Japan, Russia and the United Kingdom." Mycle Schneider, Paris, international consultant on energy and nuclear policy, said: "France built with Superphenix, the only commercial-size plutonium fueled breeder reactor in nuclear history. After an endless series of very costly technical, legal and safety problems it was shut down in 1998 with one of the worst operating records in nuclear history." Thomas B. Cochran, nuclear physicist and senior scientist in the Nuclear Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said: "Fast reactor development programs failed in the: 1) United States; 2) France; 3) United Kingdom; 4) Germany; 5) Japan; 6) Italy; 7) Soviet Union/Russia 8) U.S. Navy and 9) the Soviet Navy. The program in India is showing no signs of success and the program in China is only at a very early stage of development. Despite the fact that fast breeder development began in 1944, now some 65 year later, of the 438 operational nuclear power reactors worldwide, only one of these, the BN-600 in Russia, is a commercial-size fast reactor and it hardly qualifies as a successful breeder. The Soviet Union/Russia never closed the fuel cycle and has yet to fuel BN-600 with plutonium." M.V. Ramana, Ph.D., visiting research scholar, Woodrow Wilson School and the Program in Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy, Princeton University, said: "Along with Russia, India is one of only two countries that are currently constructing commercial scale breeder reactors. Both the history of the program and the economic and safety features of the reactor suggest, however, that the program will not fulfill the promises with which it was begun and is being pursued. Breeder reactors have always underpinned the DAE's claims about generating large quantities of cheap electricity necessary for development. Today, more than five decades after those plans were announced, that promise is yet to be fulfilled. As elsewhere, breeder reactors are likely to be unsafe and costly, and their contribution to overall electricity generation will be modest at best."

#### Governments have to abandon their programs - at best, they solve in 2050

Thomas B. Cochran et al, senior scientist in the nuclear program and holds the Wade Greene Chair for Nuclear Policy at the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). February 2010, "Fast Breeder Reactor Programs: History and Status", http://fissilematerials.org/library/rr08.pdf

Prospects for breeder reactors After six decades and the expenditure of the equivalent of tens of billions of dollars, the promise of breeder reactors remains largely unfulfilled and efforts to commercialize them have been steadily cut back in most countries. 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. Japan’s Monju reactor operated for only a year before it was shut down by an accident in 1995 and it had not resumed operation as of the end of 2009. There are plans for a new demonstration reactor by 2025 and commercialization of breeder reactors by 2050 but there is reason to doubt these projections. Japan’s Government is not willing to kill its breeder program entirely, because, as in France, the breeder is still the ultimate justification for Japan’s spent fuel reprocessing program. For decades, however, the Japanese Government has been reducing funding for its breeder program and shifting commercialization further and further into the future (see chapter 4). Russia and India are building demonstration breeder reactors. In both cases, however, their breeder (and spent fuel reprocessing) programs leave much to be desired regarding the availability of data on reliability, safety and economics. In the case of India, there is also the potential for use of breeder reactors to produce plutonium for weapons. The high costs of commercial breeder reactors and an international Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty that bans production of fissile materials for weapons will force some of these issues into the open and foster new debates about the value of these breeder programs. In the United States, during the G.W. Bush Administration, fast reactors returned to the agenda as “burner” reactors. In an initiative started in 2006 labeled “The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP),” the U.S. Department of Energy proposed that sodium-cooled fast-neutron reactors be used to make the radioactive waste in spent reactor fuel more manageable. With the removal of the uranium blankets around their cores, fast-neutron reactors would, like light-water reactors, breed less fissile material than they burned. The high-energy neutron spectrum of the sodium-cooled reactors would be more effective, however, in fissioning the non-chain-reacting isotopes of plutonium and minor transuranic elements. Already in 1996, however, a National Academy of Sciences assessment commissioned by the U.S. Department of Energy, had concluded that such an effort would have very high costs and marginal benefits and would take hundreds of years of recycling to reduce the global inventory of transuranic isotopes by 99 percent. 20 The Obama Administration and the U.S. Congress share this skepticism and propose a new research and development program to investigate alternative strategies for managing U.S. spent fuel. 21 The breeder reactor dream is not dead but it has receded far into the future. In the 1970s, breeder advocates were predicting that the world would have thousands of breeder reactors operating by now. Today, they are predicting commercialization by approximately 2050. In the meantime, the world has to deal with the legacy of the dream; approximately 250 tons of separated weapon-usable plutonium and ongoing — although, in some cases struggling — reprocessing programs in France, India, Japan, Russia and the United Kingdom.

#### No global adoption – Russia and developing countries won’t adopt

David Biello, Scientific American's associate editor for environment and energy, 3-21-2012, “Can Fast Reactors Speedily Solve Plutonium Problems?” https://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=fast-reactors-to-consume-plutonium-and-nuclear-waste)

That additional level of transmutation might prove too costly, both in terms of getting the technology licensed to operate in the U.K. and in constructing the reactor itself. Such fast reactors are more expensive than even traditional reactors, such as Westinghouse's new AP-1000 under construction in China and the U.S., which are estimated to cost roughly $7 billion apiece. Conventional light-water reactors can also "consume" plutonium, if need be. "If I was going to try to get rid of 100 tons of plutonium, I'd burn it in a light-water reactor," Cochran says, by making it into the mixed oxide fuels. And "the cheapest thing to do is vitrify it [convert it to glass] and mix it with other nuclear waste." Plus, the U.K. has a poor record in the past with its own experimental fast reactor designs—the Dounreay Fast Reactor and the Prototype Fast Reactor—including multiple sodium leaks. Dounreay also suffered an explosion at its dumping ground for used sodium coolant that may have contributed to radioactive particles from spent fuel turning up on nearby beaches. The Dounreay and Prototype cleanup and decommissioning continue today, despite both having been shut down for decades. Originally, such fast reactors were developed to solve a problem that never panned out: scarcity in the global supply of uranium. The idea was to create fuel within the reactors themselves once fission began, in effect making more than they consumed. But, factoring in inflation, uranium prices remain the same today as they were at the dawn of the nuclear era. "Like all minerals, improvements in the efficiency of extraction and the ability to dig for deeper ores outpaces the depletion of the resource over 100 years or more," Cochran notes. "Economically, fast reactors are not competitive and they're never going to be competitive." "We're not going to run out of uranium," Loewen admits. "Here's a solution for this stuff that's piled up." Ultimately, however, the core problem may be that such new reactors don't eliminate the nuclear waste that has piled up so much as transmute it. Even with a fleet of such fast reactors, nations would nonetheless require an ultimate home for radioactive waste, one reason that a 2010 M.I.T. report on spent nuclear fuel dismissed such fast reactors. Or, as Cochran puts it: "If you want to get rid of milk, don't feed it to cows."

#### Doesn’t solve warming – scalability

Charles Barton, energy analyst, 6-28-2009, “S-PRISM Scalability a Repose for Steven Kirsch”http://nucleargreen.blogspot.com/2009/06/s-prism-scalability-repost-for-steven.html

Steve Kirsch has posted an important statement on the IFR today on The Huffington Post. While Kirsch's statement is something of a breakthrough for Nuclear Power on Huffington Post, It contains a major flaw that Kirsch was unaware of . The flaw is simple. IFR/S PRISM technology is not sufficiently scalable to make a difference in the fight against AGW. I spotted the problem in a paper on the S PRISM fuel cycle. I discussed the scalability problem in a posted a month ago. I am reposting "Scalability and Breeder Start Up." Because I believe that the backers of nuclear power should openly debate their options, I intend to publish more posts on the IFR/S PRISM option, and my questions about it in future Nuclear Green posts.¶ Scalability and Breeder Start Up¶ Scalability is a deal breaker in global warming technology. One of the nice things about the LFTR is that it is scalable. You can build them in factories ship them off to coal-fired generation facilities, dig a whole into the ground, plant them, hook um up to the Grid, and turn them on. And then stand back and let them work. Every now and then you might add some thorium and remove some U-233 that would be used to start a new reactor.¶ Basically you could build as many as you wanted too in the LFTR factory. You would need a start up charge of fissionable material - U-233, U-235, or Pu-239. The start up charge would initiate the chain reaction in the reactor, and begin the breeding process. Later fuel will be derived from breeding, so no further nuclear fuel from external sources would be required to keep the chain reaction going.¶ The number of start up charges, the material composition of start up charges, and the size of each charge would pose a potential limit on LFTR scalability. LMFBRs would also require start up charges.¶ Neutron speed would play an important role with faster neutron reactors requiring more fissionable materials to keep a chain reaction going. For example French researchers studying Molten Salt Reactors operating at various neutron speeds found that a Thermal TMSR requited a charge of 790 kgs of U-233 in order to maintain breeding in a 1 GWe reactor. An Epithermal TMSR required 2400 kgs to fulfill the same conditions. While a Fast TMSR required 5200 kgs of U-233. The French also reported that a standard fast neutron reactor - I assume a LMFBR -would require 12,25o kgs of plutonium.¶ An S PRISM related study "S-PRISM Fuel Cycle Study: Future Deployment Programs and Issues," suggested that as of the year 2000, four hundred tons of plutonium could be recovered from spent nuclear fuel. This in turn would provide enough plutonium to supply start up charges for twenty-two, 1520 MWe S-PRISM facilities with ab output of 33,440 MWe. That is about 12 tons per 1 GWe of reactor capacity.¶ Clearly then neutron speed has an adverse effect on reactor scalability.¶ On the other hand neutron speed also influences the fission rate per neutron absorption, this in turn influences neutron production. Pu-239 fissions 25% more often in a fast reactor than in a thermal reactor. On the other hand it still take more Pu-239 to maintain a chain reaction in a fast reactor than in a thermal reactor. Reactor physics tricks and fuel cycle also seem to influence start up charge size.¶ A recent discussion on the EfT form produced quite a lot of useful information. "Jagdish" reported that¶ Indian 500MW PFBR is designed to use only two tons of plutonium.¶ It should be noted that the PFBR uses both radial and axil thorium blankets.