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#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production, this only contributes to environmental problems and neoliberal market based solutions

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### The impact to the mass consumption politics of the affirmative is planetary destruction, loss of value to life, and mass poverty and dehumanization—the alternative’s criticism of consumption is key to ethical engagement with the planet

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

As noted in the introduction, consumption presents itself as an area of ethical concern in at least three ways: first, because Western-­‐style consumption is putting an immense and unsustainable burden on the planet’s ecosystems, so much so that contemporary cultures of consumption are diminishing the capacity of the planet to support life as we know it in the future;50 second, because the high consumption, resource-­‐intensive lifestyles enjoyed by most people in the richest nations coexist in a world where great multitudes live lives oppressed by material deprivation;51 and thirdly, because there is a large and growing body of sociological and psychological literature indicating that once our basic material needs for food, shelter, clothing, etc. are met, the limitless pursuit of more money and possessions neither produces any lasting happiness nor satisfies the human need for meaning.52 Far from representing the peak of civilization, cultures of mass consumption are showing distinct signs of widespread social, even spiritual, malaise.53 Any one of these issues, it could be argued, would be sufficient for consumption to become a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ When the three issues are considered together, the case for ethical engagement is compelling. At once, however, we are confronted with a strange incongruity, even a contradiction, of sorts, one that seems to tear the present analysis apart. In an age when the facts of ecological degradation, extreme poverty, and consumer malaise lie quite plainly before our eyes, one might have thought that First World consumption practices were already a subject of widespread ethical engagement. That is, one might have expected consumption practices to be a domain of constant and dedicated ethical attention, given that overconsumption seems to be driving several of the world’s most pressing problems (including the problem of consumer malaise). And yet, it can hardly be denied that any ethical engagement that takes place within consumer cultures does not, as a rule, seek to reduce or moderate consumption but rather encourage, glorify, and increase consumption – and increase it without apparent limit.54 And here is the contradiction: consumption is at once an extremely obvious realm for ethical engagement, for the three reasons stated above, and, at the same time, engaging the self by the self for the purpose of deliberately reducing or moderating consumption seems to be more or less unthinkable within modern consumer societies. Indeed, there seems to be an almost unquestioned assumption throughout consumer societies that consumption practices are somehow ‘beyond ethics,’ in the sense that how much we consume does not really need to inform the answer we give to the question of ‘how one ought to live.’ On the contrary, it is presumed that everyone is justified seeking as high a material standard of living as possible, a pursuit that is limited, it would seem, only by the laws of a free market economy.

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion ourselves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western-­‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western-­‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption-­‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.
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#### The 50 states, Washington D.C., and relevant territories should offer to fund Power Purchasing Agreements of electricity from small modular reactors for military installations in the United States to the Department of Defense.

#### States can take the lead in SMR development – South Carolina proves

Chourey 6/23/12 (Sarita, Savannah Morning News, “S.C. hopes to lead in small modular nuclear reactors,” <http://savannahnow.com/hardeeville/2012-06-23/sc-hopes-lead-small-modular-nuclear-reactors#.UB1RxshWpJU>, TGA)

COLUMBIA — Thousands of jobs could be coming to South Carolina, if federal funding helps develop small modular reactors in the state, a prospect that drew a challenge from a nuclear safety group during a news conference Tuesday. Government and industry leaders gathered outside the S.C. Statehouse to lay out how a grant program from the U.S. Department of Energy could strengthen the state’s economy and plug it into the potential $100 billion market. During Tuesday’s event, nuclear-safety activist Tom Clements tried to ask Republican Gov. Nikki Haley how the Palmetto State would address the risk that South Carolina could be stuck with spent fuel as a result of the new small modular reactors (SMR). “It’s logical that the spent reactors and all the spent nuclear fuel would come back here to South Carolina. Are you advocating that we become some kind of holding ground?” said Clements, addressing Haley. “That’s a different conversation altogether,” she responded. “This is about new technology and the new way that we look at nuclear. And so this is not a side conversation that we’re going to have ... .” Clements was then confronted by a Haley staff member, who sought to curtail his questions. Holtec International, whose corporate headquarters are in Jupiter, Fla., is among those competing for federal energy funding to design, license, manufacture and commercialize SMR technology. Representatives from Holtec, SCE&G and Areva, as well as Columbia Mayor Steve Benjamin, others, also convened around the podium at Tuesday’s news conference. SCE&G has offered to operate the reactor if Holtec builds it at the Savannah River Site. “Not only do we have the incredible regulatory environment, we have great support at the federal level, at the state level, and certainly at the local level ... which is, I must say, rare,” said Benjamin. Haley said landing the new industry would benefit generations. “We want the country to see South Carolina is stepping forward not backward,” she said.
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#### Compromise now- pc key

Posner Jan. 8th

[Eric Posner, a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, Jan. 8th, 2013, President can raise debt ceiling on his own, http://www.stltoday.com/news/opinion/columns/president-can-raise-debt-ceiling-on-his-own/article\_1e07459c-348d-5dd0-a12a-96e3ebd354f6.html, uwyo//amp]

With the “fiscal cliff” behind us, we now must look forward to yet another budgetary battle — over the debt ceiling, in a repeat of summer 2011. Is there a way out of the endless stalemate between President Barack Obama and Republicans in Congress? Yes, but it requires the president to assert himself more aggressively than he has so far. The debt standoff is more ominous than the fiscal cliff because it doesn’t reflect a legitimate dispute over public policy. While reasonable people can disagree about the right level of taxation and spending, no one believes that the United States should default on its debt, not even the most ardent Tea Partiers. So holding the debt ceiling hostage is pure brinkmanship — akin to threatening to set off a nuclear bomb in Manhattan if the president fails to agree to spending cuts.

#### Obama’s leverage is key to new fights over debt ceiling and sequestration

-Political capital high: economy on cusp of revival

-AT: Compromise Bill Disproves: Compromised and merely delayed the big battles

Star Ledger, “Obama's legacy trap”, 1/1/2013. http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_legacy\_trap.html

President Barack Obama hopes -- expects, really -- that '13 will be his lucky number, a year to cement his historical legacy and reap the benefits of an economy on the cusp of real revival.¶ That expectation, as much as anything, explains how Obama approached the fiscal cliff and why he opted for compromise over confrontation. The president, eyes fixed on history, always viewed the fight as an obstacle, not a destination, a thing to be gotten past on his way to breaking the historical pattern of weak, scandal-scarred and anticlimactic second-term presidencies.¶ But the endless battle over the budget -- new fights over the debt ceiling and automatic spending cuts loom in a matter of weeks -- could become a legacy trap for Obama, robbing him of precious leverage to redefine his relationship with Republicans on terms more favorable to an ambitious second-term agenda, scholars of the presidency say.¶ "People don't queue up in lines to see the pens for a budget deal under glass, or 'Hey, I just cut this deal with Boehner,'" says presidential historian Douglas Brinkley.¶ "Presidents are remembered for the big things. FDR did Social Security. Truman created the CIA. There's Eisenhower and the highway system. Kennedy and the moon," Brinkley added. "So, it's going to be Obama and what? Obamacare, that's the big one, and killing Bin Laden. There's room for one more big item. What will it be? Immigration? Climate change? It won't be deficits or the fiscal cliff."¶ The White House is casting the potential fiscal deal as a major victory because it forces Republicans to turn their backs on a two-decade policy of opposing all tax increases, even those on the wealthiest Americans, which is a "big win," in the words of one West Wing adviser.¶ For his part, Obama said Monday, "If we're going to be serious about deficit reduction and debt reduction, then it's going to have to be a matter of shared sacrifice -- at least as long as I'm president. And I'm going to be president for the next four years, I think..." he said with a widening smile on Monday.¶ The challenge for a president unusually attuned to his place in history is how to manage fights like the cliff without being diverted by them, and how to suppress the GOP challenge without it becoming a major drain of his time, popular good will and power.¶ "The question is whether he's willing to use the leverage he has to get a better deal. He has a chance to make history here," said Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, reflecting the mixed emotions of many nervous progressives watching the cliff talks from the sidelines. "Standing up to them would not only be a gift to the country, but a big part of his legacy."¶ One staffer for a senior Senate Democrat, summing up the view of several other aides interviewed by POLITICO, called the potential deal a "cave," and warned that Obama's Monday afternoon campaign-style event ahead of the final deal was a "Leon Lett moment" -- a reference to the Dallas Cowboys lineman who fumbled the ball while celebrating a touchdown short of the goal line.¶ But Obama and his staff believe Americans would have blamed him for taking the country over the cliff, and they emphasize his refusal to negotiate over the looming debt ceiling in a couple of months. Nonetheless, even the president concedes that the smaller cliff deal, while possibly postponing bigger battles, prolongs a fight Obama had hoped to move quickly past.¶ Even if he were to become bogged down, Obama's place in history is already assured. He is the nation's first black president, a controversial Beltway neophyte who managed to ram through landmark health reform (the future of which future remains opaque), an incumbent who won a fresh term despite a sour economy, a commander in chief who ended two unwanted wars -- all the while tallying unprecedented national debt and deficits.

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

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

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

#### Sequestration devastates the economy, collapses heg, and culminates in Middle Eastern war

Hutchison 9/21

[Kay Bailey Hutchison,, U.S. Senator from the great state of Texas, 9/21/2012 “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis]

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

#### Middle East goes nuclear

Russell 9

[James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers, #26, http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf]

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.
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#### Plan takes 10 years to solve

King 11

[Marcus King, Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team at Center for Naval Analyses, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March 11, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>, \\wyo-bb]

The time required to obtain design certification, license, and build the next generation of nuclear plants is about 9 to 10 years. After the first plants are built it may be possible to reduce the time required for licensing and construction to approximately 6 years [45].

#### No widespread blackouts in the US, system checks

Ledger 12

[Donna Leinwand Leger, “Energy experts say blackout like India's is unlikely in U.S.,” USA Today, 7/13/12, <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/story/2012-07-31/usa-india-power-outage/56622978/1> //uwyo-baj]

A massive, countrywide power failure like the one in India on Tuesday is "extremely unlikely" in the United States, energy experts say. In India, three of the country's government-operated power grids failed Tuesday, leaving 620 million people without electricity for several hours. The outage, the second in two days in the country of 1.21 billion people, is the world's biggest blackout on record. The U.S. electricity system is segmented into three parts with safeguards that prevent an outage in one system from tripping a blackout in another system, "making blackouts across the country extremely unlikely," Energy Department spokeswoman Keri Fulton said. Early reports from government officials in India say excessive demand knocked the country's power generators offline. Experts say India's industry and economy are growing faster than its electrical systems. Last year, the economy grew 7.8% and pushed energy needs higher, but electricity generation did not keep pace, government records show. "We are much, much less at risk for something like that happening here, especially from the perspective of demand exceeding supply," said Gregory Reed, a professor of electric power engineering at University of Pittsburgh. "We're much more sophisticated in our operations. Most of our issues have been from natural disasters." The U.S. generates more than enough electricity to meet demand and always have power in reserve, Reed said. "Fundamentally, it's a different world here," said Arshad Mansoor, senior vice president of the Electric Power Research Institute in Washington and an expert on power grids. "It's an order of magnitude more reliable here than in a developing country." Grid operators across the country analyze power usage and generation, factoring outside factors such as weather, in real time and can forecast power supply and demand hour by hour, Mansoor said. "In any large, complex interactive network, the chance of that interconnection breaking up is always there," Mansoor said. "You cannot take your eye off the ball for a minute." Widespread outages in the U.S. caused by weather are common. But the U.S. has also had system failures, said Ellen Vancko, senior energy adviser for the Union of Concerned Scientists, based in Washington. On Aug. 14, 2003, more than 50 million people in the Northeast and Canada lost power after a major U.S. grid collapsed. The problem began in Ohio when a transmission wire overheated and sagged into a tree that had grown too close to the line, Vancko said. That caused other power lines to overheat until so many lines failed that the system shut itself down, she said. "That was less a failure of technology and more a failure of people, a failure of people to follow the rules," Vancko said. "There were a whole bunch of lessons learned." In 2005, in response to an investigation of the blackout, Congress passed a law establishing the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) to enforce reliability standards for bulk electricity generation.

#### DOD already taking efforts to shield itself from grid outages

GAO 9

[Government Accountability Office, “Defense Critical Infrastructure:” , http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/297169.html, \\wyo-bb]

DOD has taken some steps to assure the availability of its electrical power supplies by identifying and addressing the vulnerabilities and risks of its critical assets to electrical power disruptions. For example, from August 2005 through October 2008, DOD issued Defense Critical Infrastructure Program guidance for identifying critical assets, assessing their vulnerabilities, and making risk management decisions about those vulnerabilities. Also, as previously discussed, DOD has conducted DCIP vulnerability assessments on 14 of the 34 most critical assets and has scheduled assessments for 13 of the remaining assets, but it has not yet scheduled assessments for 5 of the non-DOD- owned most critical assets.[Footnote 56] The DCIP vulnerability assessments conducted so far have identified specific electrical power- related vulnerabilities to some of the critical assets, including vulnerabilities associated with the reliability of the assets' supporting commercial electrical power grid, the availability of backup electrical power supplies, and single points of failure in electrical power systems supporting the assets.[Footnote 57] Addressing the risks associated with these vulnerabilities--by remediating, mitigating, or accepting those risks--can help DOD assure the availability of electrical power to the critical assets. For example, at all 6 most critical assets we visited, the DOD asset owners have installed diesel- based electrical power generators as backup sources of electricity during electrical power disruptions. Other (non-DCIP) DOD mission assurance programs also have the potential to help DOD assure the availability of electrical power supplies to its most critical assets. For example, we found that Joint Service Integrated Vulnerability Assessments and similar vulnerability assessments from the military services, which have been conducted on some of the installations with critical assets for antiterrorism and force protection purposes, also have identified vulnerabilities related to electrical power. Furthermore, DOD also has taken steps to coordinate with other federal agencies, including DOE and DHS, as well as electrical industry organizations, and these steps may help to assure the supply of electricity to its critical assets. For example, to represent its concerns and interests on electricity, DOD participates in the Energy Government Coordinating Council. The council provides DOD and other federal agencies with a forum for sharing their concerns, comments, and questions on energy-related matters--including critical infrastructure protection--with DOE, which chairs the group.[Footnote 58] In another effort involving DOE, several DOD combatant commands--including U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command--have recently agreed to accept a DOE departmental representative to serve as an energy attaché to the commands. The DOE representatives will provide energy-related expertise to their respective commands, particularly with respect to the commands' energy-related planning activities and the security and reliability of the commands' energy infrastructure. DOD has also partnered with various federal agencies and industry organizations to further increase the assurance of electrical power. For example, DOD serves as co-chair of the federal Task Force on Electric Grid Vulnerability of the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on Homeland and National Security, which was established in January 2009 to identify research and development needs for electrical grid vulnerabilities and to coordinate with other federal agencies to address those needs.[Footnote 59] In addition, DOD officials are collaborating with a working group established by the Edison Electric Institute in early 2009 called the Energy Security Partnership Group. The group focuses on improving communications between DOD and its utilities and on identifying and removing barriers to the development of comprehensive energy security programs at DOD installations. Also, in July 2009, DOD participated in an interagency exercise cosponsored by DHS, DOE, and DOD called Secure Grid 2009, Electric Grid Tabletop Exercise, for which officials from DOD, DOE, DHS, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, and the Edison Electric Institute, among others, jointly developed recommendations and potential responses to two scenarios involving theoretical physical and cyber-related attacks on U.S. electrical power grids. Our survey results confirm that some steps are being taken at various levels within DOD to improve the assurance of electrical power supplies to its most critical assets. For example, according to the survey and reports we reviewed, DOD conducted vulnerability and risk assessments involving electrical power on 24 of the most critical assets through a variety of DOD mission assurance reviews, including DCIP assessments, Joint Staff Integrated Vulnerability Assessments, combatant command assessments, DOD agency assessments, and local installation assessments. The survey results also indicate that secondary sources of electricity--such as uninterruptible power supply systems and diesel generators--provide some backup electrical power capabilities to almost all of the critical assets. In addition, according to the survey, asset owners and host installations for some of the critical assets whose vulnerabilities have been assessed have taken specific measures to address those vulnerabilities, such as eliminating single points of failure, developing electrical power disruption contingency plans, installing emergency electrical power generators, and increasing physical security measures around electrical power facilities.

#### Relations between China and Taiwan are improving right now and will continue

The China Post, 2011

[The China Post, English newspaper published in Taiwan, China’s Top Negotiator Plans to Visit South This Month: Report, The China Post, February 11,2011, http://www.chinapost.com.tw/taiwan/china-taiwan-relations/2011/02/11/290652/Chinas-top.htm//UWYO TDA]

TAIPEI -- The **top Chinese negotiator on Taiwan is planning a visit this month to the southern part of the island**, a stronghold of pro-independence sentiments, officials and the media said yesterday. Chen Yunlin, **head of China's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait, aims to tour several cities in the south in late February to promote trade**, the United Evening News quoted unnamed sources as saying**. His planned stops include** Kaohsiung and Tainan, **where anti-China feelings remain strong** and relevant security protection for Chen and an accompanying business delegation are being discussed, it said. An official at the association's **Taiwanese counterpart Straits Exchange Foundation confirmed that Chen was scheduled to visit the island later this month** although details of the trip were yet to be finalized. Chen's previous visits to Taiwan had sparked protests from those who feared that closer ties with the mainland could erode the island's de facto sovereignty. In the absence of official contacts between the two sides, Chen's semi-official association is authorized by Beijing to handle civilian exchanges with Taiwan. China still claims Taiwan as part of its territory awaiting unification, by force if necessary, though the two sides have been governed separately since the end of a civil war in 1949. However, **ties have improved markedly since Ma Ying-jeou took office in 2008.**

#### No US-China war – regional stability

Ackerman 11

(Robert, quoting former admiral Timothy Keating, the official blog of the Armed Forces Communication and Electronics Association, 5/10/11, “War Between China, U.S. Not Likely,” <http://www.afcea.org/signal/signalscape/index.php/2011/05/10/11510/>)

The United States and China are not likely to go to war with each other because neither country wants it and it would run counter to both nations’ best interests. That was the conclusion of a plenary panel session hosted by former Good Morning America host David Hartman at the 2011 Joint Warfighting Conference in Virginia Beach. Adm. Timothy J. Keating, USN (Ret.), former head of the U.S. Pacific Command, noted that China actually wants the United States to remain active in the Asia-Pacific region as a hedge against any other country’s adventurism. And, most of the other countries in that region want the United States to remain active as a hedge against China. Among areas of concern for China is North Korea. Wallace “Chip” Gregson, former assistant secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, said that above all China fears instability, and a North Korean collapse or war could send millions of refugees streaming into Manchuria, which has economic problems of its own. As for Taiwan, Adm. Keating offered that with each day, the likelihood of a Chinese attack on Taiwan diminishes. Economic ties between the two governments are growing, as is social interaction. He predicts that a gradual solution to reunification is coming. The United States can hasten that process by remaining a powerful force in the region, he added.

# Prolif

#### Prolif will be slow even in the new era.

Tepperman ‘9 (Jonathon, former Deputy Managing Ed. Foreig Affairs and Assistant Managing Ed. Newsweek, Newsweek, “Why Obama should Learn to Love the Bomb”, 44:154, 9-7, L/N)

The risk of an arms race--with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one--is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; **that's spread at glacial pace**." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors--Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say--might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

#### US won’t be able to exert prolif leadership — too many bureaucratic constraints.

NEI, ’12

[Nuclear Energy Institute, "Improved Policies for Commercial Nuclear Trade Will Create American Jobs," June, <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/policybrief/improved-policies-for-commercial-nuclear-trade-will-create-american-jobs?page=1>, \\wyo-bb]

While U.S. firms offer some of the most innovative and safest nuclear energy technologies, they are hampered by cumbersome trade regulations, lack of coordination among the federal agencies involved, an inefficient export licensing process, limited options for financing nuclear exports and the absence of an international liability regime. These companies face intense competition from suppliers in nations with less restrictive policies and substantial government subsidies for their nuclear industries.

 To facilitate a greater U.S. role in the global commercial nuclear market, government support must be integrated into a seamless mechanism that includes coordination of nuclear trade policy, creation of bilateral agreements, export control reform and enhanced export financing. It also is vital that the United States pursue the international adoption of effective civil nuclear liability regimes.

#### No impact to prolif --- states won’t use them offensively

Mueller 10

[John Mueller , Professor of political science at Ohio State University, “Calming Our Nuclear Jitters”, Issues in Science & Technology, Winter2010, Vol. 26, Issue 2, <http://www.issues.org/26.2/mueller.html>, \\wyo-bb]

The fearsome destructive power of nuclear weapons provokes understandable dread, but in crafting public policy we must move beyond this initial reaction to soberly assess the risks and consider appropriate ac tions. Out of awe over and anxiety about nuclear weapons, the world’s super-powers accumulated enormous arsenals of them for nearly 50 years. But then, in the wake of the Cold War, fears that the bombs would be used vanished almost entirely. At the same time, concerns that terrorists and rogue nations could acquire nuclear weapons have sparked a new surge of fear and speculation. In the past, excessive fear about nuclear weapons led to many policies that turned out to be wasteful and unnecessary. We should take the time to assess these new risks to avoid an overreaction that will take resources and attention away from other problems. Indeed, a more thoughtful analysis will reveal that the new perceived danger is far less likely

marked

than it might at first appear. Albert Einstein memorably proclaimed that nuclear weapons “have changed everything except our way of thinking.” But the weapons actually seem to have changed little except our way of thinking, as well as our ways of declaiming, gesticulating, deploying military forces, and spending lots of money. To begin with, the bomb’s impact on substantive historical developments has turned out to be minimal. Nuclear weapons are, of course, routinely given credit for preventing or deterring a major war during the Cold War era. However, it is increasingly clear that the Soviet Union never had the slightest interest in engaging in any kind of conflict that would remotely resemble World War II, whether nuclear or not. Its agenda emphasized revolution, class rebellion, and civil war, conflict areas in which nuclear weapons are irrelevant. Thus, there was no threat of direct military aggression to deter. Moreover, the possessors of nuclear weapons have never been able to find much military reason to use them, even in principle, in actual armed conflicts. Although they may have failed to alter substantive history, nuclear weapons have inspired legions of strategists to spend whole careers agonizing over what one analyst has called “nuclear metaphysics,” arguing, for example, over how many MIRVs (multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles) could dance on the head of an ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile). The result was a colossal expenditure of funds. Most important for current policy is the fact that contrary to decades of hand-wringing about the inherent appeal of nuclear weapons, most countries have actually found them to be a substantial and even ridiculous misdirection of funds, effort, and scientific talent. This is a major if much-underappreciated reason why nuclear proliferation has been so much slower than predicted over the decades. In addition, the proliferation that has taken place has been substantially inconsequential. When the quintessential rogue state, Communist China, obtained nuclear weapons in 1964, Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone sternly proclaimed that nuclear war was “almost inevitable.” But far from engaging in the nuclear blackmail expected at the time by almost everyone, China built its weapons quietly and has never made a real nuclear threat. Despite this experience, proliferation anxiety continues to flourish. For more than a decade, U.S. policymakers obsessed about the possibility that Saddam Hussein’s pathetic and technologically dysfunctional regime in Iraq could in time obtain nuclear weapons, even though it took the far more advanced Pakistan 28 years. To prevent this imagined and highly unlikely calamity, damaging and destructive economic sanctions were imposed and then a war was waged, and each venture has probably resulted in more deaths than were suffered at Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined. (At Hiroshima and Nagasaki, about 67,000 people died immediately and 36,000 more died over the next four months. Most estimates of the Iraq war have put total deaths there at about the Hiroshima-Nagasaki levels, or higher.) Today, alarm is focused on the even more pathetic regime in North Korea, which has now tested a couple of atomic devices that seem to have been fizzles. There is even more hysteria about Iran, which has repeatedly insisted it has no intention of developing weapons. If that regime changes its mind or is lying, experience suggests it is likely to find that, except for stoking the national ego for a while, the bombs are substantially valueless and a very considerable waste of money and effort.

# 2nc
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#### Uniform 50 state action is legit

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publius, 2011

State Positioning In anticipation of an expanded federal role, states began to position themselves to influence federal policy, both through associations representing all fifty states as well as individual state attempts to shape the outcome of any future policy. Consequently, one could begin to consider states, both collectively and individually, as strategic actors engaged in intergovernmental lobbying in search of most favored status as the federal government moved onto terrain that they had long dominated. In some instances, this entailed state alliance with other entities, including industries and environmental advocacy groups. Organizations that represent the views of all states must of course contend with differences among their membership but generally find consensus positions that allow them to take fairly uniform stands

marked

in attempting to influence federal policy. Virtually all of these state-based entities took a fairly similar stance on possible expansion of the federal role in climate change, reflected in position papers, policy briefs, public workshops, and formal testimony aimed at the 111th Congress and the Obama Administration. They generally tended to endorse intergovernmental strategies that would protect existing state policies and allow for continued state innovation. They also sought to extract as much rent as possible, in the form of grants and other financial support, from the federal government to cover implementation costs, further promote their most promising renewable energy sources, and underwrite efforts to “adapt” to changing climates. Among those associations that represent elected state officials, for example, the National Governors Association and National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) took generally similar positions. This reflects some differences on issues such as vehicle emission standards, reflecting the regional divides noted above. But most other areas of climate change reflect a fairly uniform position, represented in a 2009 NCSL resolution that received overwhelming support: “Federal legislation should not preempt state or local governments from enacting policy options that differ from federal choices or from enacting stricter or stronger measures.” Those organizations that represent state agencies with a common function, such as the Environmental Council of the States (environmental protection agencies), the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (electricity regulatory boards), the National Association of State Energy Officials (energy departments), and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (state and local air quality units), took similar stances, though tailored to their particular area. In short, these groups sought to protect state interests under contested federalism, whether giving states latitude to sustain existing policies or take additional steps in the future.

#### [ ] Federal action stifles state action in anticipation

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publlius, 2011

The limited scope and uncertain future of new federal climate policy initiatives thus far under contested federalism underscored the reality that much of the American approach to climate policy will in all likelihood continue to be state- and regionally-centered in the coming years. After the surge of sub-federal policy development in the period of state domination, states began to slow their efforts, in large part due to anticipated federal action on a large scale. The collapse of Congressional deliberation on major legislation returned much of the lead in climate governance to states. This raised significant questions of implementation, including a series of major challenges and opportunities.

#### Overlap leads to policy failure

Rivlin, 12

(Sr. Fellow-Economic Studies at Brookings & Founding Director of CBO, 6/12, “Rethinking Federalism for More Effective Governance” http://publius.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/06/12/publius.pjs028.full?keytype=ref&ijkey=j9keOPmOHj0c2xV)

A bolder approach would be for the federal government to cede some major functions to the states and concentrate on carrying out its remaining national responsibilities more effectively. The case for dividing the governmental job rests partly on efficiency—**lowering the administrative cost of federal state overlap and interaction**. It also rests on the perception that the United States is an extremely diverse country and that many governmental services should be tailored to local conditions. Whether the service is education or housing or transportation, residents of inner city Philadelphia have different needs than those of rural Kansas or coastal Alaska. Governments closer to the scene are better able to assess the needs of citizens and design programs to meet them. It is easier for citizens at the state and local level to be actively involved in what their government does and call officials to account for their performance.

#### B. Civilian SMR’s solve grid—online by 2022

Sands, 2012

[Derek, Inside Energy with Federal Lands, Several states vie for chance to host DOE-funded small nuclear reactors, 7-9-12, Accessed online via Lexis Nexis] /Wyo-MB

Proposals to build new nuclear reactors in the US have not always been welcomed with open arms, especially after the 1979 accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant in Pennsylvania.¶ But that's not the case with newly emerging devices called small modular nuclear reactors, which are touted for their safety and their ability to be transported to their deployment sites on freight trains or even semi-trailer trucks.¶ Several states are champing at the bit to host SMRs, and the Energy Department is mulling how to dole out $452 million in federal funding for the sub-300-MW devices.¶ Nikki Haley, South Carolina's Republican governor, wants to bring two SMRs to the Savannah River Site, a Cold War-era nuclear weapons facility that DOE operates in her state.¶ "Every state wants it. Every state is going to fight to get it. Every state is going to try to make itself pretty enough," Haley said last month. "There are two projects that are going to be given by the Department of Energy this fall. We want both of them."¶ To date, four companies have submitted SMR design concepts to DOE in the hopes of getting a chunk of the $452 million in federal funding, which the firms could use to complete and license their ideas with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Babcock & Wilcox is seeking DOE funding for its 180-MW mPower design; NuScale Power has submitted its 45-MW NuScale design; Westinghouse Electric has offered its 225-MW Westinghouse SMR design; and Holtec International has submitted its 160-MW SMR-160 design.¶ DOE's program aims to have US-designed SMRs — which are no larger than 300 MW in size — in commercial operation by 2022.

# tix

#### Middle East CBW conflict – causes extinction

Ochs 2

Richard, June 9, pg. <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>.

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### Sequestration destroys US global military power—-collapses deterrence and triggers multiple scenarios for nuclear war

Hunter 9/30

[Duncan is a U.S. Representative from Alaska. "SEQUESTRATION SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE," 2012, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/sep/30/tp-sequestration-sends-wrong-message-to-us/?page=1~~%23article>]

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

### Uq

#### Yes compromise-fiscal cliff gives bipartisan incentive to compromise

North Dallas Gazette Jan. 8th

[North Dallas Gazzette, Staff writer, Jan. 8th, 2013, Beyond the fiscal cliff, <http://northdallasgazette.com/2013/01/08/beyond-the-fiscal-cliff/>, uwo//amp]

All of the participants in our budget process now have an incentive to agree to a bipartisan compromise on deficit reduction, while protecting those who benefit from Social Security and Medicare. There were acrimonious debates while the measure was being considered. Some very difficult decisions will have to be made by legislators in the coming weeks. We must have significant discussions about additional revenue sources. We need to consider shared sacrifices. The future of our nation, our children and their children are at stake. I have reservations about any attempts to cut Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid benefits as some are suggesting. These programs are vitally important to millions of people in Texas. The proposed spending cuts, referred to as sequester, will do great damage to our national and state economies if we do not come up with additional sources of revenue. I strongly oppose cuts in services to those who suffer from diabetes, end stage renal disease and other illnesses that disproportionately impact many of those who elected me to represent them in Congress. I am fully aware of the devastation these cuts would have on medical care in economically distressed communities. I will work with the President, members of my party and members of the Republican Party to reach a solution that is fair and just for all Americans. Together we can achieve such a result. It is something that we must do to ensure our personal futures and the future of our nation.

#### Republicans and Dems agree- a compromise will be found

CharlotteObserver.com Jan. 7th

[CharlotteObserver.com, Jan 7th, 2013, Cut spending, but not with debt-ceiling knife,

<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2013/01/07/3770898/cut-spending-but-not-with-debt.html#storylink=cpy>, uwyo//amp]

None of this means Democrats can party like it’s 1999. Republicans are right (if maddeningly vague) that America has a spending problem. The last two years have seen an utter failure by President Obama and Congress to address that fact, culminating with a fiscal cliff solution that dodged it altogether. The cliff deal removed some uncertainty about tax rates but was not a serious step toward reducing deficits. Many Democrats grudgingly acknowledge the need for spending cuts in the abstract. Republicans are much better about putting the topic on the public agenda. Rarely, though, has either side shown authentic interest in specific spending cuts in the trillions of dollars as part of a balanced and effective deficit-reduction package.

### PC k

#### Second, His pc is key-

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

Financial Times Jan. 2nd

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

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

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

Shear & Calmes Jan. 2nd

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

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

### link

#### They will get linked- similar deadlines/issues

Wisenthal Jan. 8th

[Joe Wisenthal, correspondent, Jan. 8th, 2013, There Are Three Big Fiscal Battles That Need To Be Resolved In Just The Next Two Months,

<http://www.businessinsider.com/there-are-three-big-fiscal-battles-that-need-to-be-resolved-in-just-the-next-two-months-2013-1>, uwyo//amp]

Q: How does the debt limit relate to other upcoming fiscal debates? A: The debt limit is the most important of three separate fiscal issues Congress must address in Q1. Beyond the debt limit, congressional leaders and the President must work out two other issues: further delay in spending cuts under "sequestration" and an extension of government spending authority. While these are separate issues, it is clearly possible that all three could be wrapped up into one agreement. Spending cuts under sequestration are scheduled to take effect from March 1, 2013. Those cuts had been scheduled to take effect January 1, but were delayed two months as part of the fiscal compromise reached last week. In the upcoming debate lawmakers will aim to delay those cuts once again, offsetting the increased spending that would result with savings (spread over ten years) from other areas of the budget.

#### SMR debates are polarizing

Carper and Schmid 11

[Ross Carper (rosscarper@gmail.com), a writer based in Washington state, is the founding editor of the creative nonfiction project BeyondtheBracelet.com. Sonja Schmid (sschmid@vt.edu) is an assistant professor in Science and Technology Studies at Virginia Tech. “The Little Reactor That Could?” Issues in Science and Technology, <http://www.issues.org/27.4/carper.html>]

Historically, nuclear energy has been entangled in one of the most polarizing debates in this country. Promoters and adversaries of nuclear power alike have accused the other side of oversimplification and exaggeration. For today’s industry, reassuring a wary public and nervous government regulators that small reactors are completely safe might not be the most promising strategy. People may not remember much history, but they usually do remember who let them down before. It would make more sense to admit that nuclear power is an inherently risky technology, with enormous benefits that might justify taking these risks. So instead of framing small reactors as qualitatively different and “passively safe,” why not address the risks involved head-on? This would require that the industry not only invite the public to ask questions, but also that they respond, even—or perhaps especially—when these questions cross preestablished boundaries. Relevant historical experience with small compact reactors in military submarines, for example, should not be off limits, just because information about them has traditionally been classified.

# 1nr

#### Legislation will inevitably fail and it won’t cause Obama pc because it will be seen as a moral victory

Tomasky Jan. 8th

[Michael Tomasky, correspondent, Jan. 8th, 2013, The Gun Debate Heats Up, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/08/the-gun-debate-heats-up.html>, uwyo//amp]

Obama will be up against it on this one. Even an incoming Democratic senator, from North Dakota, just distanced herself mightily from the Biden package. But I've come to believe that all political losses are not created equal. Guns are kind of a sui generis issue. If Obama advances some proposals and has 60 percent of public opinion on his side, and said proposals are thwarted because the minority 40 percent is overrepresented on Capitol Hill, and because some people who know better are just scared shitless of the NRA, there can be a sort of moral victory in that, and I doubt seriously that losing to the NRA would cost Obama all that much face, as it were. Well, at least he tried.

#### Must have a complete rejection of production focus to study energy production from a consumption angle, any permutation will fail because it contributes to the hegemony of production based solutions to problems

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

This chapter is an attempt to point in an alternative direction, what I term the consumption angle. The task is straightforward in the initial stages of conceptualizing: reject the production angle, adopt its polar opposite, the consumption angle, and play out its implications. The result is to show how the consumption angle raises questions outside the production angle. The first step, however, is to play out the nature of the production angle and its associated ‘‘environmental improvement’’ approach and show how they neglect throughput and irreversibility issues. Before proceeding, however, it is worth noting that, although such initial conceptualization is, in many ways, straightforward, the more operational it becomes the trickier it gets, as will be evident in the hypothetical example at the end of this chapter. This trickiness, I suspect, is not due so much to the difficulties of constructing an alternative logic, one grounded in the biophysical, as it is to the hegemony of the production angle. When the idea of production as the core of economic activity is pervasive, problems in the economy (like ecosystem decline and community deterioration) are logically construed as indeed, production problems, problems to be solved with more or better production. If more, even better, production makes only marginal improvements, if it increases risk or material throughput, 3 it only postpones the day of reckoning. Contradictions mount and risks proliferate. The challenge is to push beyond the production angle, to chart an analytic perspective that at once eschews the production orientation and raises difficult questions about excess resource use.