# CEDA Round Triples – ASU RV vs. Kansas FS (Aff)

## 1AC

#### Same as Northwestern 1AC.

## 2AC

### Peak Uranium

#### Prefer our evidence on the question of nuclear war – none of their impact evidence has quantitative studies like nuclear peace theory.

Rauchhaus ‘9

[Rauchhaus, “Evaluating the Nuclear Peace Hypothesis: A Quantitative Approach,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2/5/09 jcr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/53/2/258>]

In recent years, neo-liberal explanations of the Long Peace have received the most rigorous empirical scrutiny. 7 Realist explanations including the distribution of power, system polarity, and alliance systems have also received considerable attention. 8 Surprisingly, the nuclear peace hypothesis—one of the central tenants of realist explanations for the Long Peace— has received relatively little quantitative scrutiny. Scholars have employed case studies, counterfactual analysis, and formalized their arguments with game theory, but, with the exception of this issue (Gartzke and Jo, Horowitz, Beardsley and Asal, This issue), only a handful of studies have attempted to quantitatively evaluate the effects of nuclear weapons (Bueno de Mesquita and Riker 1982; Geller 1990; Asal and Beardsley 2007). Moreover, previous quantitative studies have exclusively focused on the relationship between nuclear weapons and crises, or between nuclear weapons and dispute escalation. The relationship between nuclear weapons and the probability of war remains quantitatively untested. The central purpose of this paper is to offer an empirical answer to the question: do nuclear weapons reduce the probability of war? To answer this question, this project borrows 3 heavily from the last 15 years of work on democratic peace theory (DPT). Beginning with Maoz and Russett (1993), the dyadic DPT research design has been reproduced in dozens of articles and survived peer review in nearly every leading journal of political science and international relations. Building on Pevehouse and Russett (2006) and using the same key “control” variables, this study incorporates new data that allow for the quantitative evaluation of the nuclear peace hypothesis. The results presented below indicate that the impact of nuclear weapons is more complicated than is conventionally appreciated. Both proliferation optimists (Waltz 1981) and proliferation pessimists (Sagan 1994) find confirmation of some of their key claims. As proliferation optimists contend, when two states possess nuclear weapons, the odds of war drop precipitously. However, in most other respects, proliferation pessimists find vindication of their position. In disputes where only one of two parties posses nuclear weapons, there is an increased chance of war. Moreover, nuclear weapons are generally associated higher likelihoods of crises, uses of force, and conflicts involving lower-levels of casualties. The findings of this article are consistent with the larger themes of the special issue, demonstrating that nuclear possession can enhance the security of their possessors by shifting conflict to the lower end of the intensity spectrum.

### States CP

#### Perm do both. Solves GOP backlash because thirty republican governors would all back reprocessing.

#### Conditionality is a voting issue – being able to kick positions at will destroys argumentative responsibility, skews the 2AC, the focal point of all aff offense, because we have to spend more time answering things than they do kicking them, and justifies aff conditionality to be reciprocal. Counter interpretation is dispositionality. Allows us to stick them to positions. Solves all their offense.

#### Information distortion means the CP links to politics

**Kiely, ‘12** [2/17/12, Eugene Kiely, Washington assignment editor USA today, “Did Obama ‘Approve’ Bridge Work for Chinese Firms?” http://www.factcheck.org/2012/02/did-obama-approve-bridge-work-for-chinese-firms/]

Who’s to blame, if that’s the right word, if the project ends up using manufactured steel from China? The National Steel Bridge Alliance [blames](http://americanmanufacturing.org/blog/shameful-use-taxpayer-dollars-alaska) the state railroad agency. The Alliance for American Manufacturing [says](http://americanmanufacturing.org/blog/alaskan-manufacturers-outraged-potential-%E2%80%9Cmade-china%E2%80%9D-railroad-bridge) the federal Buy American laws have been “weakened with loopholes and various exemptions that make it easier for bureaucrats to purchase foreign-made goods instead of those made in American factories with American workers.” So, how did Obama get blamed for the decisions by state agencies and for state projects that, in at least one case, didn’t even use federal funds? The answer is a textbook lesson in how information gets distorted when emails go viral. We looked at the nearly 100 emails we received on this subject and found that Obama wasn’t mentioned at all in the first few emails. Typical of the emails we received shortly after the ABC News report aired was this one from Oct. 11, 2011: “I just got an email regarding Diane Sawyer on ABC TV stating that U. S. Bridges and roads are being built by Chinese firms when the jobs should have gone to Americans. Could this possible be true?” The answer: Yes, it’s true. End of story, right? Wrong. Days later, emails started to appear in our inbox that claimed ABC News reported that Chinese firm were receiving stimulus funds to build U.S. bridges — even though the broadcast news story didn’t mention stimulus funds at all. (The report did include a clip of Obama delivering a speech on the need to rebuild America’s bridges and put Americans to work, but said nothing about the president’s $830 billion stimulus bill.) Still, we received emails such as this one on Nov. 4, 2011, that included this erroneous claim language: “Stimulus money meant to create U.S. jobs went to Chinese firms. Unbelievable….” It didn’t take long for Obama to be blamed. That same day — Nov. 4, 2011 — we received an email that made this leap to Obama: “SOME CHINESE COMPANIES WHO ARE BUILDING ‘OUR’ BRIDGES. (3000 JOBS LOST TO THE CHINESE FIRM)…..AND NOW OBAMA WANTS ‘MORE STIMULUS MONEY’…..THIS IS NUTS ! ! ! If this doesn’t make you furious nothing will….” This year, Obama’s name started to surface in the subject line of such critical emails — raising the attack on the president to yet another level and perhaps ensuring the email will be even more widely circulated. Since Jan. 17, we have gotten more than a dozen emails with the subject line, “ABC News on Obama/USA Infrastructure,” often preceded with the word “SHOCKING” in all caps. The emails increasingly contain harsh language about the president. Since Jan. 11, 23 emails carried this added bit of Obama-bashing: “I pray all the unemployed see this and cast their votes accordingly in 2012!” One of those emails — a more recent one from Feb. 8 — contained this additional line: “Tell me again how Obama’s looking out for blue collar guys. He cancels pipelines, and lets Chinese contractors build our bridges…” And so it goes, on and on. All from a news report that blamed state officials — not Obama — for spending taxpayer money on Chinese firms to build U.S. bridges.

#### States CP are V/I. 1.) No comparative literature compares the action of 50 states simultaneously vs. the federal government. Kills education because it removes substantive clash about energy production. 2.) Fiat abuse – uniformity eliminates the only aff against state action, which is enforcement. Kills competitive equity.

#### CP can’t solve – federal investment is necessary to remove the perceptual ban on reprocessing.

Adams, ‘8

[Rod, “What Do You Do About the Waste? Recycle and Reuse”, Clean Technica, 5-29-2008,

<http://cleantechnica.com/2008/05/29/what-do-you-do-about-the-waste-recycle-and-reuse/>, RSR]

The US used to have a plan to recycle our fuel as well, but a great deal of marketing and pressure by people that do not like the idea of using plutonium as a source of commercial heat resulted in President Ford issuing a presidential order to temporarily halt nuclear fuel recycling in 1976. President Carter, a man who claimed to be a nuclear engineer, made that ban permanent in the hopes that forcing US companies to avoid fuel recycling would cause others to abandon the very logical idea. That effort did not work as planned, but the people who had invested large amounts of time and money into building three recycling plants in the US only to have them shut down with the stroke of a pen decided “once bitten, twice shy.” Though President Reagan removed the ban, President Clinton essentially reinstated it and no commercial company has been willing to build a facility and risk having it turn into a white elephant after an election.

#### Doesn’t solve the aff – absent the plan, companies will never believe that the federal government will allow reprocessing, so they won’t invest. That’s Selyukh 10.

#### Plan sends the key signal to jumpstart cooperation with Russia—they’ll say yes.

Rojansky, deputy director Russia and Eurasia Program at Carnegie, ‘10

[Matthew, “As New START Debate Rages, Quiet Nuclear Progress With Russia”, U.S. News and World Report, 12-9-2010,

http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/12/09/as-new-start-debate-rages-quiet-nuclear-progress-with-russia]

Beyond benefiting relations, cooperation on peaceful nuclear energy makes financial sense. The United States and Russia have invested substantially in civilian nuclear research and development, and both share basic interests in capitalizing on the global "nuclear energy renaissance" by developing proliferation-resistant reactor technologies, increasing environmental safety, and making nuclear energy more economically competitive. And when it comes to civil nuclear power, Russia brings a lot to the table. For instance, the United States does not operate so-called "fast breeder" reactors and reprocessing facilities that don't produce nuclear waste that can be used for weapons, but Russia does. And, while the United States hasn't built a single new n uclear power plant since 1973, Russia opened its first fast breeder reactor that very year and plans to bring 26 new nuclear facilities online before 2030. And the Kremlin has already allocated some $3.6 billion for research on fast breeders and other projects under a program dedicated to the next generation of nuclear technology. With U.S. support, Russia has developed a sophisticated infrastructure to securely store spent nuclear fuel—and Moscow even offered to store and reprocess spent fuel from the United States, while no American state has been willing to do the same. Russian companies already supply roughly half of the uranium consumed in U.S. and European power plants and will need to supply more in the future as the United States is only able to produce a fifth—at most—of its nuclear fuel stock domestically. Fortunately, Russia's nuclear industry is interested in expanding its uranium enrichment and reprocessing activity in the U.S. market and potentially cooperating with American firms, including GE and Westinghouse, on bids for contracts in other countries. Closer U.S.-Russia cooperation on nuclear power means better nuclear security. As a major player in civil nuclear markets worldwide, Russia has a unique window into potential risks and opportunities to insist on measures that protect sensitive sites and technologies. Russia, with U.S. support, also has the chance to compete more effectively with China's nuclear industry, which is less scrupulous in its nonproliferation commitments. The importance of partnering with Russia was made clear during Secretary Clinton's recent trip to Central Asia. Belarus, the former Soviet republic, agreed to give up its stock of highly enriched uranium by 2012 in return for U.S. help in developing a new nuclear power reactor. But Russia has had its eye on this potentially lucrative project, and has the right experience to work effectively with Belarus's Soviet-era infrastructure. Washington should cooperate—instead of compete—with Moscow to build an environmentally safe, proliferation-proof reactor in Belarus. A quarter century after the Chernobyl disaster, this would be a powerful symbol that both sides can move beyond the Cold War legacy.

#### Effective relations solve nuclear war

Lukyanov ’11

(Fyodor, editor-in-chief of Russia in Global Politics magazine, “Nuclear destruction remains the basis of relations”, The Telegraph, 1-5-2011, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sponsored/russianow/opinion/8241050/Nuclear-destruction-remains-the-basis-of-Russia-US-relations.html)

When President Dmitry Medvedev warned in his latest state-of-the-nation address that a new arms race could begin in the next decade, the hall erupted in applause. No wonder. For many of the Russian senators in the audience, that term calls to mind their younger years, something pleasant in and of itself. Added to which many people on both sides of the Atlantic, it seems, sorely miss those “good old days” when everything was clear: two worlds, two systems, and explicit rules of the game.¶ One finds oneself thinking of the advantages of a systemic confrontation, given the political and legal free-for-all into which the planet has been sinking ever since.¶ But reminiscences aside, what did the president mean? And we should consider that Prime Minister Vladimir Putin also said in his recent interview with Larry King that an arms race would lead not only to the failure of the anti-missile defence shield but also to the non-ratification of Start II. The latter is doubtful: that agreement is not of such calibre. But as for the anti-missile defences, Moscow’s logic is understandable.¶ The question remains: can Russia and the US break the vicious circle of mutual nuclear containment, or will this type of relationship, frankly absurd today, be preserved in future?¶ Whatever Moscow and Washington do, the material and technological basis of their relations remains not simply restraint, but Mutually Assured Destruction. Another use for the vast arsenals they amassed up to the late Eighties simply does not exist. No international problem requires such a quantity of nuclear charges and missiles. The political logic of that period has long since lost its force; the whole world has changed. But you can’t argue with weapons: the logic of arsenals still dictates, no matter how often Russia and the United States reiterate that they no longer see each other as adversaries.¶ A quick liquidation of stockpiles will not be achieved. First of all, strategic nuclear forces are mainly political weapons and a matter of status. No one will simply give these up. This is especially true of Russia, which no longer has any other features of a superpower. And, judging by discussions underway in Washington, idealists there are being squeezed on all sides, too.¶ Second, one needs at the very least a qualitatively different level of trust between Russia and the United States; the first shoots that appeared during the “reset” may very soon be trampled.¶ And finally, the time when these two giants set the tone in the nuclear sphere has long since past. Proliferation goes on, quietly. China’s nuclear arsenal, though only a fraction of Russia’s and America’s, is becoming an increasingly important factor in that country’s growing influence. Neither Washington nor Moscow can allow the other to be in the same “league” with Beijing because then the counterweights to its influence would be even less.¶ Nevertheless, the needlessness of assured destruction is obvious, and this situation must be somehow overcome. The only way is a gradual rapprochement in the strategic sphere which will make the nuclear containment of Russia and the United States an anachronism. And for this, joint work on anti-missile defences would be ideal. If this is undertaken in earnest, sooner or later it will become apparent that missiles aimed at each other are patently absurd given that the “adversaries” are building a joint shield. This is a long, hard road, the success of which, though not guaranteed, is none the less possible. Especially when one realises the real threats facing both countries in the 21st century.¶ On the other hand, it’s obvious what will happen if, in the sphere of anti-missile defence, nothing comes together and they each go their own way. In that case, the old type of relations will inevitably recur since that same nuclear rubicon will be preserved. An American missile defence system would be built against any other country possessing missile potential, including, of course, Russia – even if Russia were not the main object. Moscow would then automatically begin searching for ways of overcoming that anti-missile shield.¶ No one will abolish mutual nuclear deterrence as the basis of balance so long as the two nuclear superpowers are not engaged in a common cause. All of this goes beyond the bounds of rational argument, but the burden of arsenals aimed at one another will continue to return us to the confrontation of 30 years ago, even if in a farcical form.¶ One must not forget that all this is a game of nerves. These gigantic arsenals are inapplicable; the anti-missile system is virtual since most likely it will never be created. The paradox is that the political effect of the idea of an anti-missile shield is more than real since it touches the heart of the problem of strategic stability.¶ To imagine an arms race of the classic kind that existed in the latter half of the 20th century is impossible. The entire developed world is too concerned with budget deficits and national debt: in reality these problems represent a far greater threat to stability than do any classic threats. True, in that situation nuclear weapons regain the significance they seemed to be losing. Meanwhile, Nato’s just-published strategic conception clearly states that nuclear weapons, primarily American, are that alliance’s supreme guarantee of security. So say goodbye to a non-nuclear world. And in the United States, where only recently there was talk of investing in hi-tech conventional weapons of a new generation, cost estimates now show that preserving the nuclear component would be cheaper.¶ Be that as it may, anti-missile defence represents a fork in the road: one way leads to a new system of relations between Russia and the United States, with both sides ceasing to view the other as a strategic threat; the other leads back to a model of the Cold War – albeit a wittingly senseless one.

### South Korean ENR

#### NUQ - The US has no ban on reprocessing AND we’ve backed reprocessing twice in the last 15 years – Savannah ran a government reprocessing facility for nuclear weapons waste AND Bush advocated global reprocessing under GNEP - Neither caused a break in proliferation norms.

#### No proliferation – global reprocessing now denies and US safeguards too strong.

Lee, 2010 Wise Intern at the American Nuclear Society, ‘12

[Nathan, WISE, “Sustainability Of U.S. Nuclear Energy: Waste Management And¶ The Question Of Reprocessing”, 2012,

<http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2010/NathanLeeWISE2010.pdf>, RCM]

No matter how much some nuclear energy proponents might play down the dual purpose of nuclear technologies, as long as the fundamental driving force remains the splitting of the atom, so too will the risk of proliferating those technologies for use in an atom-splitting bomb. Seeking a proliferation-proof nuclear energy policy is futile; instead, a smart policy should aim to maximize proliferation resistance under the given circumstances.¶ In the case of reprocessing used nuclear fuel, the principal concern is over the isolation of plutonium in the product stream, which could then be converted for use in a bomb. Unprocessed used nuclear fuel is sufficiently secure against physical enemy intrusion due to the multiplicity of highly radioactive components it contains. Since plutonium itself is not highly radioactive, it becomes much easier to approach after separation. Although newer reprocessing technologies leave different radioactive contaminants in the product stream to offset the loss in proliferation resistance, none of them remain significantly “self-protecting” by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) standards (Fig. 10).¶ There are several avenues by which plutonium proliferation could occur. A terrorist group or rogue state could steal the plutonium from the product stream of another country’s reprocessing plant or could acquire the technology itself on the black market to isolate plutonium themselves. Another risk involves a state legally operating a reprocessing facility but illegally diverting plutonium from the product stream or operating a clandestine plant in parallel. Any of these scenarios could occur for all the reprocessing technologies considered. While the risk levels for one-pass Pu recycling and full actinide recycling would vary based on total material flow, amount of transport required, technology safeguards, and additional factors, the fundamental issue of plutonium isolation is the same.¶ President Carter’s decision to ban reprocessing in the U.S. was ostensibly motivated by this issue. It was supposed to deter other nuclear countries from reprocessing as well, thereby bolstering global nonproliferation. However, they did not follow suit; several countries now operate reprocessing facilities. Consequently, the proliferation ramifications of implementing reprocessing in the United States in the 21st century are no longer the same as perceived in the early stages of the nuclear industry. Not only has the international deterrent argument been largely discredited, but the marginal impact in the global proliferation risk from initiating reprocessing in the U.S. would be much less substantial now that there already exists an established international reprocessing market. Furthermore, by entering this market, some argue that the U.S. might actually slow the dissemination of reprocessing technology by providing the service to other countries that wish to reprocess their used nuclear fuel, making domestic development less economical.38¶ However U.S. reprocessing would affect the global interplay, by far the most critical factor for deciding whether to reprocess domestically would be our own ability to prevent direct proliferation. In this arena, the U.S. has proven over the last sixty years that it can effectively manage and safeguard large plutonium stockpiles and dangerous technologies.39 Moreover, improvements are already underway in utilizing real-time monitoring of material flows to detect and prevent proliferation attempts.40

#### Global nuclear renaissance makes prolif inevitable because global on-site storage of waste that causes prolif. That’s Bunn.

#### We control the only internal link to South Korean proliferation – refusal to back reprocessing causes relations collapse and South Korean breakout

Yurman, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Dan, “Revisiting Reprocessing in South Korea”, ANS Nuclear Café, 8-2-12,

<http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/08/02/revisiting-reprocessing-in-south-korea/>, RSR]

Comes now the request by the South Korean government, first aired in October 2010, to revise the bilateral cooperation treaty with the U.S. It has been in place for more than 40 years and it is a cornerstone of U.S./South Korean diplomatic relations. Many specialists in the field of nonproliferation see a “hard and fast” policy against any expansion of uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing as a key to stopping states like North Korea from pursuing these activities. That strategy hasn’t worked and, as a result, South Korea wants relief from the restriction in the now-decades-old treaty. Negotiations over changes to the treaty have been going on since last December, but appear to be stalemated around a key set of issues. It is a delicate dance, as diplomats like to say, because if the U.S. leans too heavily on South Korea, it could sour relations between the two countries and spawn nationalist sentiment that might lead to a nuclear weapons program. Since the 1950s, South Korea has depended on the U.S. nuclear arsenal as a shield against aggression from its neighbor to the north.

#### AND that card proves there is no risk of South Korean prolif from US reprocessing. They obviously don’t perceive it as a prolif risk since they are demanding reprocessing now.

#### US-SoKo relations k2 regional stability and global security

Clinton 10 [Hillary Rodham Clinton, “America’s Engagement in the Asia-Pacific”, October 28, 2010, http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/10/150141.htm]

This year also marked a milestone with another ally: the 60th anniversary of the start of the Korean War, which Secretary Gates and I commemorated in Seoul this past summer. And in two weeks, our presidents will meet in Seoul when President Obama travels there for the G-20 summit. Our two countries have stood together in the face of threats and provocative acts from North Korea, including the tragic sinking of the Cheonan by a North Korean torpedo. We will continue to coordinate closely with both Seoul and Tokyo in our efforts to make clear to North Korea there is only one path that promises the full benefits of engagement with the outside world – a full, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization.The alliance between South Korea and the United States is a lynchpin of stability and security in the region and now even far beyond. We are working together in Afghanistan, where a South Korean reconstruction team is at work in Parwan Province; in the Gulf of Aden, where Korean and U.S. forces are coordinating anti-piracy missions. And of course, beyond our military cooperation, our countries enjoy a vibrant economic relationship, which is why our two Presidents have called for resolving the outstanding issues related to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement by the time of the G-20 meeting in Seoul.

#### East Asian instability leads to World War III

Knight Ridder 2k

(Jonathon S. Landay, “Top administration officials warn stakes for U.S. are high in Asian conflicts”, 3-11, L/N)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But **even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war**. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. **Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. "Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile**," said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "**We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster**."

#### Norms and diplomacy are irrelevant – internal political will is the primary motivating factor driving prolif

Mez, senior associate Professor at the Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universitat, ‘12

[Lutz, director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, “Nuclear energy – any solution for sustainability and climate protection?” Energy Policy, Science Direct]

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

### Word PIC

#### Perm: do both.

#### Perm do the CP.

#### a. This is legitimate because they’re not functionally competitive. Our interpretation is that CPs must be both textually and functionally competitive.

#### b. Infinitely Regressive – anything can be textually competitive – all you have to do is change or add letters, numbers, or punctuation and it can be competitive. Destroys predictability and in depth debate, skewing ground neg.

#### c. Word PICs are artificially competitive because they overinflate the value of a contrived net benefit.

#### d. Strategy Skew – we can’t read add on advantages, which are critical for defense against the status quo, or case turns to the counterplan, because it’s our plan action. Steals 9 minutes of 1AC offense.

#### Voter for competitive equity.

#### Discourse doesn’t shape reality – it’s the other way around.

Fram-Cohen, Linguist and Freelance Writer, ‘85

[Michelle, “Reality, Language, Translation: What Makes Translation Possible”,

http://enlightenment.supersaturated.com/essays/text/michelleframcohen//possibilityoftranslation.html]

The idea that language is created inside one's mind independently of outside experience eliminates the possibility that the external world is the common source of all languages. But a common source of all languages underlies any attempt to explain the possibility of translation. Chomsky suggests that the common basis of all languages is universal phonetics and semantics, with the result that "certain objects of human thoughts and mentality are essentially invariable across languages." (13) To the best of my knowledge Chomsky did not develop this idea in the direction of explaining the possibility of translation. In contrast, linguist Eugene Nida insists that outside experience is the common basis of all languages when he writes that "each language is different from all other languages in the ways in which the sets of verbal symbol classify the various elements of experience." (14) Nida did not provide the philosophical basis of the view that the external world is the common source of all languages. Such a basis can be found in the philosophy of Objectivism, originated by Ayn Rand. Objectivism, as its name implies, upholds the objectivity of reality. This means that reality is independent of consciousness, consciousness being the means of perceiving reality, not of creating it. Rand defines language as "a code of visual-auditory symbols that denote concepts." (15) These symbols are the written or spoken words of any language. Concepts are defined as the "mental integration of two or more units possessing the same distinguishing characteristic(s), with their particular measurements omitted." (16) This means that concepts are abstractions of units perceived in reality. Since words denote concepts, words are the symbols of such abstractions; words are the means of representing concepts in a language. Since reality provides the data from which we abstract and form concepts, reality is the source of all words--and of all languages. The very existence of translation demonstrates this fact. If there was no objective reality, there could be no similar concepts expressed in different verbal symbols. There could be no similarity between the content of different languages, and so, no translation. Translation is the transfer of conceptual knowledge from one language into another. It is the transfer of one set of symbols denoting concepts into another set of symbols denoting the same concepts. This process is possible because concepts have specific referents in reality. Even if a certain word and the concept it designates exist in one language but not in another, the referent this word and concept stand for nevertheless exists in reality, and can be referred to in translation by a descriptive phrase or neologism. Language is a means describing reality, and as such can and should expand to include newly discovered or innovated objects in reality. The revival of the ancient Hebrew language in the late 19th Century demonstrated the dependence of language on outward reality. Those who wanted to use Hebrew had to innovate an enormous number of words in order to describe the new objects that did not confront the ancient Hebrew speakers. On the other hand, those objects that existed 2000 years ago could be referred to by the same words. Ancient Hebrew could not by itself provide a sufficient image of modern reality for modern users.

#### Their certainty about the effects of language belies the nature of human agency and the importance of context, making us powerless in the face of language – Extricating the language from the plan doesn’t make the words “go away” – Confrontation via the permutation solves best

Butler 97 (Judith, Excitable Speech, UC-Berkeley, p. 13)

Indeed, recent effort to establish the incontrovertibly wounding power of certain words seem to founder on the question of who does the interpreting of what such words mean and what they perform. The recent regulations governing lesbian and gay self-definition in the military of, indeed, the recent controversies over rap music suggest that no clear consensus is possible on the question of whether there is a clear link between the words that are uttered and their putative power to injure. To argue, on the one hand, that the offensive effects of such words is fully contextual, and that a shift of context can exacerbate or minimize that offensiveness, is still not to give an account of the power that such words are said to exercise. To claim, on the other hand, that some utterances are always offensive, regardless of context, that they carry their contexts with them in ways that are too difficult to shed, is still not to offer a way to understand how context is invoked and restaged at the moment of utterance.

### CIR Politics

#### No recession now – Best indicators prove risk of recession is 0.20%

Perry 13 [Mark, Chart of the day: US recession probability is down to 0.20%, AEIdeas, The public policy blog of the American Enterprise Institute, http://www.aei-ideas.org/2013/02/chart-of-the-day-us-recession-probability-is-down-to-0-20/]

The chart above shows University of Oregon economics professor Jeremy Piger’s “Recession Probability Index” from January 1990 to November 2012, based on the 4 monthly variables used by the NBER to determine U.S. recessions: 1) non-farm payroll employment, 2) the index of industrial production, 3) real personal income excluding transfer payments, and 4) real manufacturing and trade sales.¶ According to Professor Piger, “Historically, three consecutive months of recession probabilities exceeding 0.8 (see graph) has been a good indicator that an expansion phase has ended and a new recession phase has begun, while three consecutive months of recession probabilities below 0.2 has been a good indicator that a recession phase has ended and a new expansion phase has begun.”¶ Based on an update yesterday, the Recession Probability Index has been trending downward for the last three months and fell to 0.20% in November, the lowest level since June and July when the probability was also 0.20%. Based on this historically accurate measure of the probability of a US recession, the US economy is not even close to being in the early stages of an economic contraction.

#### **PC isn’t real —butterfly effect – only winners win.**

Hirsh ‘13 (Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, 2/9/2013, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, NP)

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through.¶ Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years.¶ Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.¶ What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”¶ As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.¶ Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Fiat solves the link – won’t be perceived.

#### Plan popular and Graham shields the link.

Russell ’13 (Pam Radtke, Budget Cutters Eye Nuclear Reprocessing Plant, Roll Call, 5 February 2013, http://www.rollcall.com/news/budget\_cutters\_eye\_nuclear\_reprocessing\_plant-222173-1.html?pg=1, da 2-14-13)

The scrutiny is raising concern among the project’s supporters, especially with across-the-board spending cuts set to kick in next month unless Congress acts to postpone them or enact an alternative austerity plan.¶ “We must stay the course and create a pathway to safely and responsibly dispose of weapons grade plutonium,” Rep. Joe Wilson, R-S.C., wrote in a letter he has been circulating among his colleagues that would urge the White House to preserve the project. “If we fail to uphold our end of this agreement, dire consequences could be felt by our close allies across the globe, as Russia may choose not to honor its end of the agreement.”¶ The MOX facility has survived earlier challenges. Former Rep. David L. Hobson, R-Ohio, said his efforts to kill funding for the project when he served as Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee chairman were thwarted by the political clout of South Carolina lawmakers — including fiscal conservatives such as Wilson, Sen. Lindsey Graham and former Sen. Jim DeMint.¶ Hobson described the project as a jobs program for South Carolina. In addition to the 2,600 employees now working on it, the completed facility will require permanent workers to operate it for up to two decades. The plant is part of the larger Savannah River Site in South Carolina, an Energy Department-managed site that employs 12,000.¶ Hobson said one of the biggest regrets of his tenure was agreeing to back off efforts to end the project when he was told they could hurt Republican Gov. Mark Sanford’s re-election chances in 2006.¶ “I got rolled,” Hobson said.¶ Laura Peterson of Taxpayers for Common Sense, which has called for an end to the project, said conservative Republicans who otherwise might be expected to complain about cost overruns are deterred by the support it enjoys from Graham. And Hobson said DeMint — a leading champion of small government and spending cuts who now heads The Heritage Foundation — never suggested killing the MOX program.¶ “This is worse than earmarks,” Hobson said. “This is appalling.”¶ Neither Graham’s nor DeMint’s staffs responded to requests to comment on the project, but Wilson and other supporters say it is vital to fulfilling the 2000 arms deal with Russia. Failing to move ahead with the program, Wilson warned, could lead the Russians not to honor its end of the agreement.

#### Logical policy maker can do both.

#### CIR won’t pass – guest worker reform kills the deal.

Palmer and Nocera, 3-21

[Anna and Kate, “GOP: Unions to blame if immigration reform fails”, Politico, 3-21-13,

<http://www.politico.com/story/2013/03/gop-unions-to-blame-if-immigration-fails-89198.html>, RSR]

An immigration reform bill hasn’t even been unveiled, but key Republican lawmakers are already singling out unions as the reason why a deal could fail.¶ The GOP offensive taps into long-simmering disagreement between the business community and unions over how to handle visas for low-skilled workers, which was one key reason why comprehensive immigration reform failed in 2007, the last time the issue was debated seriously in Washington.¶ Sen. Marco Rubio told POLITICO the guest worker program is key to his supporting immigration reform.¶ “I don’t think it’s any secret that in the past, unions killed immigration reform,” Sen. Marco Rubio said. “I think because of pressure from some of their members, they’ve at least publicly changed their stance on this. But I don’t think they are doing cartwheels over this.”¶ Republicans are walking a fine line on immigration reform, trying not to alienate their base while hoping to attract millions of Latino voters that supported Democrats in the 2012 election.¶ An immigration package without a guest worker program is almost guaranteed to fail.¶ “I’m not going to be a part of a bill that doesn’t create a process so people can come temporarily to work if we need them,” Rubio said. “They can’t undercut American workers, but if we don’t have a system for foreign workers to come temporarily when we need them, we’re going to have an illegal immigration problem again.”¶ Unions take issue with Rubio’s position that they aren’t working in good faith to find a compromise for how visas for low-skilled workers should be regulated.¶ AFL-CIO’s Ana Avendaño said that Republicans trying to cast unions as the reason for immigration reform to fail “reek of desperation.”¶ “It is their last gasp of trying to rewrite the rules of future flow to undermine the wages of local workers,” Avendaño said, arguing that constituents and the Latino population wouldn’t be swayed by Rubio’s argument that a plan for low-wage workers held up citizenship for 11 million people.¶ But Rubio is hardly alone. Other Republican leaders on immigration reform like Rep. Raul Labrador are also sounding the alarm against unions. An amendment that President Barack Obama backed in 2007 would have stripped out the guest worker provision and was one of the issues that thwarted immigration reform happening last time. Republican opposition to immigration reform at the time was well-documented.¶ “It’s the labor unions who do not want a guest worker program that’s viable, that’s functional,” the Idaho Republican said. “They’re fighting right now in the Senate to make the guest worker program so unwieldy, so expensive that no one will use it.”¶ He added: “There’s no way that a Republican would vote for immigration without a workable guest worker program. I think the unions know that, and if you see any break apart in this immigration reform thing that we’re doing, it’s going to be because the unions and the Democratic senators are unwilling to do what the American people want because they are willing to put the labor unions ahead of the American people.”¶ The push against unions comes as the so-called Gang of Eight senators appear to be closing in on a deal for immigration reform.¶ The disagreement over how to handle visas for low-skilled workers has been brewing for months. Senators tasked the AFL-CIO and U.S. Chamber of Commerce in December to come to an agreement over how to deal with the so-called future flow piece.¶ The two groups had been meeting for weeks but failed to come to a compromise. Despite putting out a list of principles, the two sides were unable to put more details together and decided to work with the Senate negotiators instead.¶ Rep. Luis Gutierrez acknowledged at a Christian Science Monitor breakfast Tuesday that it was a “thorny issue.”¶

#### Bottom of the docket – won’t be voted upon until after immigration.

#### Won’t pass – Obama needs house GOP on board. Also, PC isn’t key.

Washington Post, 3-21

[Editorial Board, “Republican rank-and-file still struggle with immigration”, The Washington Post, 3-21-13,

http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/republican-rank-and-file-still-struggle-with-immigration/2013/03/21/aa5fe336-9017-11e2-bdea-e32ad90da239\_story.html, RSR]

In the House, some prominent Republicans including Majority Leader Eric Cantor (Va.) have tried to coax the party’s rank-and-file away from its absolutist opposition to citizenship — or, as the GOP dead-enders prefer to call it, amnesty. A bipartisan group of House lawmakers has been meeting with increasing frequency since the election, trying quietly to hammer out principles they can agree upon.¶ But so many House Republicans have been so entrenched on the issue for so long that the idea of supporting any form of earned citizenship — even one that requires paying a fine and back taxes and going to the back of the line for years — would require crossing an ideological Rubicon.¶ Take the example of Rep. Bob Goodlatte, a conservative Republican who represents a swath of Virginia’s Shenandoah Valley. In hearings in the House last month, Mr. Goodlatte suggested that he’d prefer a middle ground between what he called the “extremes” of mass deportation and amnesty.¶ Talk about false equivalents: Mass deportation of 11 million people, two-thirds of them employed, isn’t just an “extreme”; it’s fantasy, as Republican leaders have come to recognize. A pathway to citizenship, on the other hand, is a recognition of the reality that undocumented immigrants, many of whom have been here for 15 years and more, have become part of America’s fabric. A 13-year wait would mean between 300,000 and 500,000 of today’s illegal immigrants would probably die before they become eligible for citizenship, according to Pew Hispanic Center senior demographer Jeffrey S. Passel. Yet even that is too lenient for many House Republicans. Ultimately it will be up to Republican leaders to sway sufficient numbers of the party’s back-benchers § Marked 10:43 § if sweeping immigration reform is to stand a chance. Failure to do so, as the RNC report made plain, is a defeat not only for humane and rational policy but also for the party — one with resounding demographic consequences.
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### Politics

#### Democratization doesn’t solve war – history proves.

Kupchan, Professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University, ‘11

[Charles A, April, “Enmity into Amity: How Peace Breaks Out,”

<http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/iez/07977.pdf>]

Second, contrary to conventional wisdom, democracy is not a necessary condition for stable peace. Although liberal democracies appear to be better equipped to fashion zones of peace due to their readiness to institu­tionalize strategic restraint and their more open societies – an attribute that advantages societal integration and narrative/identity change – regime type is a poor predic­tor of the potential for enemies to become friends. The Concert of Europe was divided between two liberalizing countries (Britain and France) and three absolute monar­chies (Russia, Prussia, and Austria), but nevertheless pre­served peace in Europe for almost four decades. Gen-eral Suharto was a repressive leader at home, but after taking power in 1966 he nonetheless guided Indonesia toward peace with Malaysia and played a leading role in the founding of ASEAN. Brazil and Argentina embarked down the path to peace in 1979 – when both countries were ruled by military juntas. These findings indicate that non-democracies can be reliable partners in peace and make clear that the United States, the EU, and de­mocracies around the world should choose enemies and friends on the basis of other states’ foreign policy behav-ior, not the nature of their domestic institutions.

#### No Recession – consumer confidence, housing starts, and jobs are up

The BRICS Post 13 [Analysts: Dip in US GDP but no recession January, 31, http://thebricspost.com/analysts-dip-in-us-gdp-but-no-recession/#.UR7vHB1lkdg]

Overall economic growth expected to be between 1.5 and 2 per cent for 2013. [Getty Images]¶ The US budget crisis known as the fiscal cliff coupled with lower defense spending and a drop in exports caused the economy to shrink by 0.1 per cent in the fourth quarter of 2012.¶ “Information received since the Federal Open Market Committee met in December suggests that growth in economic activity paused in recent months, in large part because of weather-related disruptions and other transitory factors,” the Federal Reserve said yesterday in a press release commenting on the contraction.¶ But economists are warning that the contraction should not derail overall economic growth which is expected to be between 1.5 and 2 per cent for 2013. They said strong consumer data and a resurgent housing market indicate there is no fear of a recession.¶ The Federal Reserve also pointed to promising figures which indicated that unemployment was steadily falling and that inflation was below forecast.¶ “The Committee expects that, with appropriate policy accommodation, economic growth will proceed at a moderate pace and the unemployment rate will gradually decline toward levels the Committee judges consistent with its dual mandate.”

#### World economy growing

Miller 13 [Rick, R-Word For U.S. Economy in 2013 is Rebound Not Recession, Bloomberg News, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-31/r-word-for-u-s-economy-in-2013-is-rebound-not-recession.html]

A strengthening world economy also should bolster American exporters.¶ China reported economic growth accelerated in the fourth quarter for the first time in two years, raising prospects that a regional lift will fuel demand for U.S. goods. Developing nations are projected to expand 5.5 percent in 2013, more than last year, while Europe stabilizes, according to projections from the World Bank.¶ General Electric Co. (GE)’s fourth-quarter profit topped analysts’ estimates as demand in emerging markets fueled the aviation and health-care divisions, which helped build a record $210 billion order backlog for the Fairfield, Connecticut-based company.¶ “We saw real strength in the emerging markets, and the developed regions stabilized,” Chief Executive Officer Jeffrey Immelt said on a Jan. 18 conference call. GE “entered 2013 with substantial momentum,” he said.