## US Energy & Electric Power Policy The National Security Imperative

DAVID GATTIE (<u>DGATTIE@UGA.EDU</u>)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND SECURITY

NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

JANUARY 19, 2022

## Atlantis Space Shuttle Cockpit



## A Battle of Ideas

The US is in the middle of a national and international discussion as to which energy resources will drive the US economy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century—a debate that, increasingly, is revolving around <u>global</u> climate change and <u>domestic</u> carbon reduction.

Bottom Line Up Front

#### AMERICA IS CONSIDERING A GRAND EXPERIMENT ON TWO OF ITS MOST CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECTORS

-ITS ENERGY AND ELECTRIC POWER SECTORS -

AT A TIME WHEN IT'S FACING SOME OF THE MOST CHALLENGING COMPETITION IN US HISTORY

"The United States has entered <u>an era of long-term</u> <u>competition with revisionist powers</u>. A key aspect of this competition will revolve around <u>a contest for</u> <u>technological superiority</u> waged between the <u>national innovation bases of the respective</u> <u>competitors</u>. The outcome of this competition will determine not just <u>American national security</u> but also how the nations of the world interact—and whether a free and open political and economic system will remain the foundation of those interactions."

(The Contest for Innovation: Strengthening America's National Security Innovation Base in An Era of Strategic Competition, *Ronald Reagan Institute*, 2019)



#### The Contest for Innovation:

Strengthening America's National Security Innovation Base in an Era of Strategic Competition

Report of the Task Force on 21st-Century National Security Technology and Workforce

## 3 Underlying Contentions for this Talk

- 1. Energy is preeminently a resource with *intrinsic national security value* 
  - Value that currently is unaccounted for in US policy
- 2. Energy is not merely a market commodity or diplomatic chattel for global climate change deliberations
  - It's central to the strength and diversity of the <u>US industrial base</u>, thus America's capacity to remain a great power
- **3**. What America can do with its energy sector is not necessarily what America should do with its energy sector

## Overview

- US energy, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and electric power trends
- Global realities of energy consumption and CO<sub>2</sub>
- Global competition and national security implications of US energy & climate policy
- Security concerns and questions



![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

### U.S. Wind Resource (80m)

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

### **U.S. Photovoltaic Solar Resource**

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

Author: Billy Roberts - October 20, 2008

This map was produced by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory for the U.S. Department of Energy.

### Power Generation Resources: Operational Characteristics

Energy	Operational Characteristics Based on Reliability, Availability						
Resource	Туре	Dependency Constraints	Generation	Resource Geography			
Coal	Storable	Energy resource is <u>independent of weather conditions</u> and is controlled at the plant through <u>on site storage</u> (1-3 month supply)	Baseload	Transportable, maintains energy density			
Natural Gas	Flow Dependent	Energy resource is generally independent of weather conditions, <u>is not stored on site</u> , and can be controlled at the plant but is <u>subject to upstream availability</u> (e.g., severe weather such as winter storms, hurricanes, etc. that impact infrastructure or upstream facilities and create disruptions in flow, <u>import disruptions</u> )	Dispatchable, flexible	Transportable, maintains energy density			
Nuclear	Storable	Energy resource is <u>independent of weather conditions</u> and is controlled at the plant through <u>on site storage</u> (up to a 1.5 year supply)	Baseload	Transportable, maintains energy density			
Hydro	Flow Dependent & Storable	Energy resource is <u>seasonally weather-dependent</u> but can be controlled at the plant	Dispatchable	Geography dependent			
Solar & Wind	Flow Dependent & Intermittent	Energy resource is <u>daily, monthly, and seasonally weather-</u> <u>dependent</u> and cannot be controlled at the plant	Neither baseload nor dispatchable	Not transportable, energy density varies by geography			

## Performance Comparisons

CAPACITY FACTORS:

SOLAR, WIND, HYDRO, COAL, NATURAL GAS, NUCLEAR

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

	Status	Plant	Nameplate Capacity (MW)	Location	Generation (MWhrs)	Retirement Year (or announced)	
	Retired (11)	Crystal River	860	Florida	7,000,079	2013	
		Kewaunee	566	Wisconsin	4,990,254	2013	
		San Onofre 2 & 3	2,150	California	18,097,173	2013	US Nuclear Reactors:
		Vermont Yankee	604	Vermont	5,060,582	2014	
		Fort Calhoun	483	Nebraska	3,425,235	2016	Shutdown & Under Threat
		Oyster Creek	608	New Jersey	4,585,091	2018	
		Pilgrim	674	Massachusetts	5,414,318	2019	
		Three Mile Island 1	803	Pennsylvania	5,214,196	2019	
	-	Duane Arnold	601	Iowa	5,235,716	2020	8.5% of 2020 LIS puckear level
		Indian Point 2	1,016	New York	8,351,945	2020	
		Total	Total 8,365		67,374,589 <		
	Planned (8)	Diablo Canyon 1 & 2	2,240	California	16,258,298	2024, 2025	Recently preserved by state action
		Palisades	772	Michigan	5,995,123	2022	Shut Down April 20, 2021
		Dresden 2 & 3	1,797	Illinois	15,478,888	2021	Shut Down April 30, 2021
	(-)	Byron 1&2	2,300	Illinois	15,524,894	2021	
		Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3	2,300 1,038	Illinois New York	15,524,894 9,108,821	2021 2021	
		Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total	2,300 1,038 8,147	Illinois New York	15,524,894 9,108,821 62,366,024	2021 ) 2021 <	<ul> <li>7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation</li> </ul>
		Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse	2,300 1,038 8,147 894	Illinois New York Ohio	15,524,894 <b>9,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063	2021 2021 ← 2020 (Hold)	<ul> <li>7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation</li> </ul>
		Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio	15,524,894 <b>3,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962	2021 2021 ← 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold)	<ul> <li>7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation</li> </ul>
		Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania	15,524,894 <b>3,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold)	<ul> <li>7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation</li> </ul>
		Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York	15,524,894 <b>9,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold)	<ul> <li>7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation</li> </ul>
	State Action	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York New York	15,524,894 <b>3,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (hold)	— 7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation
	State Action	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna Clinton	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581 1,065	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York New York Illinois	15,524,894 <b>9,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888 9,462,481	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold)	<ul> <li>7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation</li> </ul>
	State Action (16)	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna Clinton Nine Mile Point 1&2	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581 1,065 2,054	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York New York Illinois New York	15,524,894 <b>9,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888 9,462,481 15,640,608	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017, 2018 (Hold)	— 7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation
	State Action (16)	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna Clinton Nine Mile Point 1&2 Quad Cities 1 & 2	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581 1,065 2,054 1,819	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York New York Illinois New York Illinois	15,524,894 <b>9,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888 9,462,481 15,640,608 15,712,445	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017, 2018 (Hold) 2018 (Hold)	- 7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation
	State Action (16)	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna Clinton Nine Mile Point 1&2 Quad Cities 1 & 2 Salem 1 & 2	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581 1,065 2,054 1,819 2,295	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York Illinois New York Illinois New York Illinois	15,524,894 <b>9,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888 9,462,481 15,640,608 15,712,445 16,145,436	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017, 2018 (Hold) 2018 (Hold) 2020, 2021 (Hold)	7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation 16.2% of 2020 US nuclear generation
	State Action (16)	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna Clinton Nine Mile Point 1&2 Quad Cities 1 & 2 Salem 1 & 2 Hope Creek	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581 1,065 2,054 1,819 2,295 1,172	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York New York Illinois New York Illinois New Jersey New Jersey	15,524,894 <b>3,108,821</b> <b>62,366,024</b> 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888 9,462,481 15,640,608 15,712,445 16,145,436 10,592,697	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017, 2018 (Hold) 2018 (Hold) 2020, 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold)	7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation 16.2% of 2020 US nuclear generation
	State Action (16)	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna Clinton Nine Mile Point 1&2 Quad Cities 1 & 2 Salem 1 & 2 Hope Creek Millstone 2 & 3	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581 1,065 2,054 1,819 2,295 1,172 2,073	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York Illinois New York Illinois New Jersey New Jersey Connecticut	15,524,894 9,108,821 62,366,024 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888 9,462,481 15,640,608 15,712,445 16,145,436 10,592,697 15,714,855	2021 2021 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017, 2018 (Hold) 2018 (Hold) 2020, 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2020 (Hold)	7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation 16.2% of 2020 US nuclear generation
	State Action (16)	Byron 1&2 Indian Point 3 Total Davis-Besse Perry Beaver Valley 1 & 2 FitzPatrick R. E. Ginna Clinton Nine Mile Point 1&2 Quad Cities 1 & 2 Salem 1 & 2 Hope Creek Millstone 2 & 3 Total	2,300 1,038 8,147 894 1,240 1,808 848 581 1,065 2,054 1,819 2,295 1,172 2,073 15,849	Illinois New York Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania New York Illinois New York Illinois New York Illinois New Jersey New Jersey Connecticut	15,524,894 9,108,821 62,366,024 7,228,063 10,990,962 15,393,393 6,588,676 4,332,888 9,462,481 15,640,608 15,712,445 16,145,436 10,592,697 15,714,855 127,802,504	2021 2021 < 2020 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2021 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017 (Hold) 2017, 2018 (Hold) 2017, 2018 (Hold) 2020, 2021 (Hold) 2020 (Hold) 2020 (Hold) ∠020 (Hold) ∠020 (Hold)	7.9% of 2020 US nuclear generation 16.2% of 2020 US nuclear generation Data Source: US EIA; NEI

# Global Energy & CO<sub>2</sub>

## CONTEXT & GLOBAL REALITIES

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_0.jpeg)




# Global Competition & National Security Implications

## FOSSIL FUELS, NUCLEAR & RENEWABLES

# **Fossil Fuels**







## **Russia: Energy Producer & Disruptor**

- Russia oil and gas
  - 50% of Russia's exports are oil and gas
  - 12.6% of global oil production
  - 16.6% of global gas production; 8.3% of global LNG exports
  - 29% of Europe's crude oil and 32.9% of Europe's gas is from Russia





## China: Energy Consumer & Strategic Challenger

- Consumes 26.1% of world's total energy and 26.5% of world's fossil fuels
- 84.3% of its energy use is fossil fuels; 56.6% is coal
- Made in China 2025 and 14<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan includes all energy resources and associated technologies—including fossil fuels.
  - China is currently financing 56,135 MW of coal plants globally, but has signaled a willingness to dial back future financing
- China's Arctic Policy "promotes technology innovation in Arctic oil and gas drilling and exploitation"

References:

https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/territorial-disputes-south-china-sea https://china.usembassy-china.org.cn/china-escalates-coercion-against-vietnams-longstanding-oil-and-gas-activity-in-the-south-china-sea/

https://endcoal.org/finance-tracker/

http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white\_paper/2018/01/26/content\_281476026660336.htm









# **Civilian Nuclear Power**





# Nuclear Power in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Of these 155 reactors, 105 are associated with China or Russia—either by location or by reactor technology.

Number of Reactors Since 2000						
Country	Connected to Grid	Under Construction				
China	47	14				
Russia	13	3				
India	12	6				
South Korea	10	4				
Japan	5	2				
Pakistan	5	1				
Czech Republic	2					
Ukraine	2	2				
Argentina	1	1				
Belarus	1	1				
Brazil	1	1				
Iran	1	1				
UAE	1	3				
US	1	2				
Romania	1					
Bangladesh		2				
Finland		1				
France		1				
Slovakia		2				
Taiwan		0				
Turkey		3				
UK		2				
Total	103	52				

<u>Source:</u> World Nuclear Association; IAEA (2021)



## Renewables











## **Global Solar Generation**

	Solar Generation	Total Ger	neration (2020)	GDP (2020)		
Country	2020 Share of World Total (%)	Fossil Fuels & Nuclear (%)	Fossil Fuels, Nuclear & Hydro (%)	Constant 2015 US\$ (millions)	Share of World Total (%)	
China	30.5	71.2	88.2	14,625,052	17.9	
US	15.7	80.1	86.8	19,278,194	23.6	
Japan	9.7	73.3	81.1	4,324,541	5.3	
India	6.9	79.8	90.3	2,480,916	3.0	
Germany	5.9	51.7	54.9	3,434,436	4.2	
Italy	3.0	57.5	74.0	1,744,164	2.1	
Australia	2.8	75.6	81.1	1,490,374	1.8	
Spain	2.4	56.0	66.7	1,180,730	1.4	
France	1.5	67.4	79.1	2,410,286	3.0	
UK	1_5	54.6	56.7	2,810,363	3.4	
Subtotal	79.9			53,779,055	65.9	
World				81,562,560	<b>— — 1</b> 00	

<u>GDP Data Source:</u> *World Bank* <u>Energy Data Source:</u> *BP Statistical Review of World Energy 2021* 

## **Global Wind Generation**

	Wind Generation	Total Generation (2020)			GDP (2020)		
Country	2020 Share of World Total (%)	Fossil Fuels & Nuclear (%)	Fossil Fuels, Nuclear & Hydro (%)		Ô	Constant 2015 US\$ (millions)	Share of World Total (%)
China	29.3	71.2		88.2	1	14,625,052	17.9
US	21.4	80.1		86.8		19,278,194	23.6
Germany	8.2	51.7		54.9		3,434,436	4.2
UK	4.8	54.6		56.7		2,810,363	3.4
India	3.8	79.8		90.3		2,480,916	3.0
Brazil	3.6	16.4		80.4		1,749,107	2.1
Spain	3.3	56.0		66.7		1,180,730	1.4
France	2.6	67.4		79.1		2,410,286	3.0
Canada	2.3	32.2		91.9		1,600,331	2.0
Australia	14_	75.6		81.1		1,490,374	1.8
Subtotal	80.7					51,059,789	62.6
World						81,562,560	<b>- 1</b> 00

<u>GDP Data Source:</u> World Bank <u>Energy Data Source:</u> BP Statistical Review of World Energy 2021

#### Solar PV, Wind Turbine & Li-ion Supply Chain













Source: Giurco D., Dominish E., Florin N., Watari T., McLellan B. (2019) Requirements for Minerals and Metals for 100% Renewable Scenarios. In: Teske S. (eds) Achieving the Paris Climate Agreement Goals. Springer, Cham. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05843-2\_11">https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05843-2\_11</a>





#### Figure 3.—Major Import Sources of Nonfuel Mineral Commodities for which the United States was greater than 50% Net Import Reliant in 2020





**Bernreuter Research** 



ARCTIC OCEAN

A General Contrast in Perspectives

#### China and Russia:

PACIFIC

OCEAN

Energy and energy technologies are instruments of national power to achieve geopolitical objectives—national security and national power are at the center of their energy policy





## **SECURITY CONCERNS**

- China and Russia are strategically exploiting fossil fuel resources and technologies as the U.S. debates moving away from fossil fuels and developing economies move in the same direction as Russia and China
- 2. This will reduce the diversity of energy resources and technologies in America's industrial base while great power competitors China and Russia expand and diversify theirs

## **SECURITY CONCERNS**

- **3.** Russia and China dominate civilian nuclear exports as the U.S. works to revive its nuclear industry and keep existing plants in operation
- 4. China currently is a dominant market force in global solar PV, batteries and the rare earth/metals supply chain
- 5. America's great power competitors are engaged in an all-theabove energy and energy technology strategy, leveraging state-owned enterprises to meet their respective geopolitical objectives

## **SECURITY QUESTIONS**

 Will policymakers in China and Russia subject their respective energy technology industrial bases and state-owned enterprises to an all-in effort to reduce carbon emissions and solve the climate crisis?
Or will they weaponize climate diplomacy?

Or will they weaponize climate diplomacy?

2. If the U.S. disengages from fossil fuels and doesn't aggressively promote nuclear power, will this shift the geopolitical advantage in global energy and energy technology partnerships to China and Russia?

> Will emerging economies be vulnerable to provider nations?

## **SECURITY QUESTIONS**

- **3.** As the U.S. shifts toward renewables and a greater dependency on a global supply chain of rare earths & metals, what impact will this have on U.S. energy security?
- 4. What will be the impact on US national security if the energy resources and energy technologies that operationalize America's industrial base shift asymmetrically relative to great power competitors?

#### 21<sup>st</sup> Century America

US Military, US Industry **Critical Infrastructure** Trade & Commerce **Cybersecurity & The Grid Economic Growth Great Power Competitors** Security for Allies Post-WWII World Order



#### 21<sup>st</sup> Century America

US Military, US Industry **Critical Infrastructure** Trade & Commerce **Cybersecurity & The Grid Economic Growth Great Power Competitors** Security for Allies Post-WWII World Order




### **21<sup>st</sup> Century America**

US Military, US Industry

Critical believe ture Trade & Competence Cybersecurity 1 he Grid Econo c Growth Great Power Competitors Security for Allies

Post-WWII World Order





# America is facing unprecedented security challenges in the $21^{\text{ST}}$ century

-PARTICULARLY WITH GREAT POWER COMPETITORS AND

ENERGY RESOURCES & TECHNOLOGIES-

## Has the U.S. evaluated the RISK of REORGANIZING ITS ECONOMY AND RESTRUCTURING ITS INDUSTRIAL BASE WITH THE PRIMARY FOCUS BEING TO REDUCE DOMESTIC CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS?

## \*UGA Engineering and The <sup>†</sup>Center for International Trade & Security (CITS) <sup>\*†</sup>David Gattie—<sup>†</sup>Justin Conrad—<sup>†</sup>Josh Massey

**Applied Energy Studies** 

Informing US policy to better align with national security realities and geopolitical dimensions of the global energy sector





Energy Systems

National Security

## Thank You

## Additional References

- McFarlane, R, and Gattie D. 2021. Nuclear Affairs. The National Interest, (176): 69-75. November/December Issue. Link to Article
- Gattie, DK. 2021. South Korea's Summit Solution Dreams and Zero Carbon Realities. The National Interest. March 30, 2021. [Link to article: <u>https://nationalinterest.org/feature/south-korea%E2%80%99s-summit-solution-dreams-and-zero-carbon-realities-181517</u>]
- Gattie, DK. 2021. President Biden's Executive Order on Climate Change: Implications for the US Industrial Base. Expert Brief for Global America Business Institute. February 24, 2021. [Link to Brief]
- Gattie DK and Massey JNK. 2020. 21<sup>st</sup> Century US Nuclear Power Policy: Standing at a Strategic Crossroads. Strategic Studies Quarterly [Link to Paper]
- Gattie, DK. 2020. US energy, climate and nuclear power policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: The primacy of national security. *The Electricity Journal*, 33(1) 106690. [Link to Paper]
- Gattie, DK. 2019. Testimony Before the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change—Building a 100% Clean Economy: Solutions for Economy-Wide Deep Decarbonization". [Link to Gattie Testimony]
- Gattie, DK. 2020. House climate plan needs global and national security context. The Hill. July 9, 2020. [Article Link]
- Gattie, DK. 2019. U.S. Nuclear Power: America's Brand is at Risk. *Morning Consult*. October 29, 2019. [Article Link]
- Gattie, DK. 2019. Will the US Lead? Or let China and Russia dominate nuclear energy. The Hill. May 22, 2019. [Article Link]
- Gattie, DK. 2019. The Green New Deal: Isolationist in scope and blind to geopolitical realities. The Hill. February 11, 2019. [Article Link]
- Gattie, DK. 2017. U.S. National Security and a Call for American Primacy in Civilian Nuclear Power. Forbes. Sept. 7, 2017. [Article Link]