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### 2AC

#### 1. We meet- companies can still choose to take the contract

#### 2. Counter interpretation- financial incentives are disbursement of public funds or contingent commitments

Webb 93

(lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.¶ By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where *public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed*, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive *effects* which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, thedefinition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to *encourage* behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### Ground- it is grounded in the literature and is the only way to intrinsically keep military affs in the topic which are key to beat states counterplans, and it links much harder to disads

#### Limits- only adds procurement affs to their list, but limits out all indirect incentive effects their allows

#### Education- key to talk about different actors use of energy and how energy’s connection to the military

#### Reasonability key to prevent a race to the most limiting definition

# Case

#### Terrorists could pull a bioterror attack off– remote control planes, hijacking

Condron and Leake ‘12

(STEPHANIE CONDRON and CHRISTOPHER LEAKE of Daily Mail. Christopher Leake has been defence and home affairs editor at Mail on Sunday, UK communications director at tesco plc, Industrial and Consumer Affairs Editor at The Mail on Sunday, the daily telegraph, industrial correspondent at the daily telegraph, London, industrial corrrespondent at express & star¶ Reporter and Deputy Editor at West Cheshire Newspapers. “Poison drones carrying biological weapon are new Olympic threat, warns Colonel in charge of keeping London calm” UPDATED: 18:23 EST, 5 May 2012 accessed online August 25, 2012 at http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2140173/Poison-drones-new-Olympic-threat-warns-Colonel-charge-keeping-London-calm.html)

A senior Army officer has warned that unmanned drones carrying deadly poison could be used in a devastating terrorist attack during the Olympic Games.¶ Lieutenant Colonel Brian Fahy delivered the grim warning at a meeting intended to allay the fears of residents worried about the Army’s plans to place missiles on the rooftops of flats.¶ He said it was ‘feasible’ that remote-controlled aircraft filled with poison and small enough to fit into a backpack could be used as a biological weapon in the capital.¶ He told The Mail on Sunday: ‘An Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) can be put in a backpack. They come in all sorts of sizes and it’s feasible they could be filled with something noxious and flown by remote-control.’¶ ¶ Now there's a block of flats you wouldn't break into! Surface-to-air weapons are put in place to form an Olympic ring of steel to protect the Games¶ The biggest ship in London! HMS Ocean heads up the Thames in show of strength before the Olympics (as Defence Secretary warns: 'We would shoot down a jet if necessary')¶ Lieut Col Fahy – the officer responsible for community relations during the Games – made his remarks on Friday in Leytonstone, East London, near one of six sites which could see the deployment of surface-toair missile batteries in order to shoot down aircraft attempting to infiltrate an Olympic ‘no fly’ zone.¶ Fears: An unmanned drone could be used by terrorists to deliver a biological weapon strike, a senior army officer warned¶ During the meeting at Buxton School, his team showed locals a ‘dummy’ missile battery and allowed children to play on the unarmed weapon.¶ Lieut Col Fahy declined to elaborate on what type of poison might be used during an aerial attack.¶ He said: ‘For the duration of the Olympics anyone flying into controlled airspace is to file their flight plan with the Civil Aviation Authority.¶ ‘The range of threats varies in size and capability. It could be a commercial airliner hijacked by somebody with malicious intentions or a protest group using a microlight to get their name in the papers.’¶ His poison warning came as it was revealed that SAS troops have had anthrax emergency training at the Government’s top-secret military research establishment at Porton Down, Wiltshire.¶ Sources say the elite soldiers wore biochemical protection suits, gloves and masks during exercises over the past few months to prepare for any attack using the deadly bacteria.¶ Such an incident could threaten the lives of thousands of people attending the Games this summer.¶ Lieut Col Fahy told The Mail on Sunday: ‘We have worked up a comprehensive plan to protect against the potential hijacking of a commercial airliner down to slow-moving microlights or radio-controlled planes.’ ¶ Battle stations: The army placed a surface-to-air missile on top the Fred Wigg tower block in Waltham Forest, est London as part of a series of security tests for the 2012 Olympics¶ Asked if they would fire a missile at a protester flying a microlight near the Olympic site, Lieut Col Fahy said: ‘We would not take it out. For something like that we would scramble helicopters to go and look at it.¶ ‘There will be an RAF sniper on board if there was serious evidence to suggest something like that represented a threat. That information gets passed on and it’s a political decision to engage.¶ ‘It’s the same politicians who will decide whether we fire surface-to-air missiles at a potential threat. It’s a decision that I’m quite happy not to make. It will weigh very heavily.’¶ Defence Secretary Philip Hammond has made it clear he is ready to give the order to shoot down any aircraft threatening the Olympics with a 9/11-style attack.

# Second CP

### Functional PICs Bad

#### A. Steals 9 minutes of 1AC offense

#### B. Unpredictable- there is an infinite number of subsets to pick out of

#### C. Education- wrecks larger discussion of policy, and leads to a race to the bottom of finding the most obscure act to PIC out of.

#### D. Rejecting the team key to prevent these arguments in the future

#### Perm not textually competitive not an opportunity cost of the plan

#### 2AC AT Meltdowns- SMR’s are safe

Loudermilk 11

(Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs” Journal of Energy Security, May 2011, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375>, SEH)

Promoting safer nuclear power¶ The debate over nuclear energy over the years has consistently revolved around the central question “Is nuclear power safe?” Certainly, the events at Fukushima illustrate that nuclear power can be unsafe, however, no energy source is without its own set of some inherent risks on the safety front—as last year’s oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico or the long-term environmental consequences of fossil fuel use demonstrate—and nuclear power’s operating record remains significantly above that of other energy sources. Instead, accepting the role that nuclear energy plays in global electricity generation, especially in a clean-energy environment, a more pointed question to ask is “How can nuclear power be made safer?”¶ Although large reactors possess a stellar safety record throughout their history of operation, SMRs are able to take safety several steps further, in large part due to their small size. Due to simpler designs as a result of advancing technology and a heavy reliance on passive safety features, many problems plaguing larger and earlier generations of reactors are completely averted. Simpler designs mean less moving parts, less potential points of failure or accident, and fewer systems for operators to monitor. Additionally, small reactor designs incorporate passive safety mechanisms which rely on the laws of nature—such as gravity and convection—as opposed to human-built systems requiring external power to safeguard the reactor in the event of an accident, making the reactor inherently safer.¶ Furthermore, numerous small reactor concepts incorporate other elements—such as liquid sodium—as coolants instead of the pressurized water used in large reactors today. While sodium is a more efficient heat-transfer material, it is also able to cool the reactor core at normal atmospheric pressure, whereas water which must be pressurized at 100-150 times normal to prevent it boiling away. As an additional passive safety feature, sodium’s boiling point is 575-750 degrees higher than the reactor’s operating temperature, providing an immense natural heat sink in the event that the reactor overheats. Even should an accident occur, without a pressurized reactor no radiation would be released into the surrounding environment.¶ Even on the most basic level, small reactors provide a greater degree of security by merit of providing lower energy output and using less nuclear fuel. To make up for the loss in individual reactor generating capacity, small reactors are generally designed as scalable units, enabling the siting of multiple units in one location to rival the output capacity of a large nuclear plant. However, with each reactor housed independently and powering its own steam turbine, an accident affecting one reactor would be limited to that individual reactor.

### Multiple Condo Bad

#### A. Fairness- No stable 2AC offense can’t game for later in the debate, it’s not reciprocal and it also allows them read opposite positions and use our offense on one against us on the other.

#### B. Education- prevents deep debates, and just has the 2NR go for the argument with the least ink.

#### C. critical thinking- no stable 1NC advocacy, and it’s not real world.

#### D. Rejecting the team is the only way to remedy abuse

# States

## AT States

#### Don’t solve

#### States can’t force DoD policy

#### States don’t have legal authority over military bases- they are enclaves

Tymkovich 12

(Seymour, Circuit Judge, “ALLISON v. BOEING LASER TECHNICAL SERVICES” <http://www.leagle.com/xmlResult.aspx?xmldoc=In%20FCO%2020120810042.xml&docbase=CSLWAR3-2007-CURR>, SEH)

Under a body of constitutional law applicable to federal enclaves, U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 17, state law that is adopted after the creation of the enclave generally does not apply on the enclave. A federal enclave is created when a state cedes jurisdiction over land within its borders to the federal government and Congress accepts that cession. These enclaves include numerous military bases, federal facilities, and even some national forests and parks. Federal enclave doctrine operates as a choice of law doctrine that dictates which law applies to causes of action arising on these lands.¶ It is well-established that after a state has transferred authority over a tract of land creating a federal enclave, the state may no longer impose new state laws on these lands. But state laws enacted before the cession continue to apply unless Congress specifically overrides them. The question here is whether state common law causes of action recognized after the state ceded the enclave to the federal government are available on federal enclaves. This question is governed by a long string of Supreme Court precedent that makes it clear that the law on a federal enclave is the state law that governed the land at the time the federal government established the enclave, not state law enacted thereafter—unless that law was expressly adopted by the enclave's new sovereign, the federal government.

# Elections

### Romney Will Win- History

#### Romney will win- history at cycle

Cost 9-21

Dr. Jay is a Political Writer for the Weekly Standard and received his Ph. D in Political Science in Political Science from Deleware, “Historically, Obama Isn’t in Strong Shape,” <http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/morning-jay-historically-speaking-obama-isnt-strong-shape_652813.html>

Conservatives are growing worried, and Democrats gleeful, about Obama’s lead in the polls, basically for the same reason: it is late in the season (or so it seems), and the incumbent president has a lead. That is a good thing for Obama.¶ Perhaps, but three fundamental points need to be kept in mind.¶ First, Obama is weaker than previous incumbents who went on to victory. When we are looking through history, the only poll we can really utilize is Gallup if we want an apples-to-apples comparison. For better or worse, Gallup is the only polling organization consistently doing polling of registered voters since 1952. Even media outlets that have been polling a long time have changed pollsters over the years, so Gallup is the only game in town when we are investigating history.¶ Here is where Gallup has found incumbent presidents at this point, i.e. roughly mid-September, since 1956.¶ Through 2004 every incumbent who was above 50 percent at this point won, and every incumbent who was under 50 percent at this point lost. As of today, Obama is under 50 percent.

¶

### Romney Supports

#### Romney has supported Nuclear Power- there’s no reason he’d oppose the plan.

### 2AC Link Turn

#### New Military Base Spending is popular

**Bloomberg 9/4**

(Danielle Ivory, “Virginia Leads Swing States at Risk Over Cliff: BGOV Barometer” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-09-04/virginia-leads-swing-states-at-risk-over-cliff-bgov-barometer.html>, SHE)

For some swing-state voters, the presidential election may come down to who they want holding the net if their economies go over the fiscal cliff.¶ The BGOV Barometer shows that the battlegrounds of Virginia, Colorado and Pennsylvania are among 19 states and the District of Columbia that depended on U.S. government contracts for more than 3 percent of their 2011 gross domestic product. The states are vulnerable to $1.2 trillion in automatic 10-year budget reductions, called sequestration, that will begin in January if Congress and the White House fail to agree on a deficit-reduction plan. ¶ President Barack Obama and his Republican challenger, Mitt Romney , need the 42 electoral votes represented by Virginia, Colorado and Pennsylvania as they compete for the 270 it takes to win. Their lines of attack on the automatic cuts, which along with tax increases make up the fiscal cliff, may help determine the outcome in those swing states.¶ “It’s going to increasingly become an issue in this election,” said Todd Harrison , a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments in Washington. “Both sides want to run against sequestration.¶ “Maybe that’s what this boils down to,” Harrison said in an interview. “Whose approach do you prefer for avoiding sequestration?”¶ The government spent more than $500 billion on federal contracts in 2011. Agencies awarded $58.9 billion in orders that year for work performed in Virginia.¶ ‘Tentacles Everywhere’¶ Federal awards represented 14 percent of the economy in the state, home to the Pentagon and headquarters of top federal contractors such as McLean-based SAIC Inc. (SAI) The company was the top recipient of awards in Virginia, receiving $3 billion for work in the state. SAIC performs computer and engineering services for agencies including the Department of Defense .¶ Federal awards support economies outside the state, so a contract in Virginia might have implications for a lawyer or consultant in Ohio or Texas, Ric Brown, the state’s finance secretary, said in an interview. “It has tentacles everywhere,” he said.¶ Contractors performing work in Colorado won $10.2 billion in U.S. awards last year, which represented 3.8 percent of the state’s economy. Lockheed Martin Corp. (LMT), based in Bethesda, Maryland , won the most in contracts, $2.41 billion, for work in the state. The company is the No. 1 U.S. defense contractor.¶ ‘Held Hostage’¶ Agencies last year awarded $17.7 billion in contracts for work in Pennsylvania. The state relied on the awards for 3.1 percent of its economy. Bechtel Group, based in San Francisco , was the top recipient of contracts in the state with $1.99 billion in awards.¶ The three swing states also have direct federal employees and military bases that require additional government funding. Nevada, Florida, Wisconsin, Ohio and Iowa -- swing states with 69 electoral votes -- may be less vulnerable because they derived less than 3 percent of their economy from federal contracts.

**Top Political Scientists Agree the infusion of spending is popular**

**Krinner & Reeves ’12**

Douglas is Associate Professor of Political Science at Boston University and Andrew is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Boston University, “The Influence of Federal Spending on Presidential Elections,” <http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSR%2FPSR106_02%2FS0003055412000159a.pdf&code=1c7ae66018f9fe746798fcc5c0bfb3b2>

This research thus suggests two ways in which the uneven distribution of grant spending across the country¶ might inﬂuence presidential voting patterns. First, r**esidents of counties that receive an infusion of election year grant spending may be more likely to perceive**¶ **direct personal beneﬁts from federal spend**ing than¶ residents of counties that did not receive increased¶ grant spending. Such voters might judge the administration more responsive to their needs, evaluate its¶ performance more favorably, and become increasingly¶ likely to vote for the incumbent party. Second, **past**¶ 350American Political Science Review Vol. 106, No. 2¶ **research suggests that voters need not personally receive federal beneﬁts to be inﬂuenced by increased**¶ **federal spending in their community**. Rather, **through**¶ **personal networks of family and friends, as well as local**¶ **news coverage of the impact of recent federal spending**¶ **in their communities, voters in high-spending communities may perceive the incumbent administration in a**¶ **more favorable light**. Thus, **regardless of whether voters actually hold the president functionally responsible**¶ **for such increased beneﬁts** (to themselves or their communities) or whether voters are simply retrospective,¶ **for many Americans increased grant spending in their**¶ **home county may increase their likelihood of voting**¶ **for the incumbent party’s candidate in the upcoming**¶ **election.**

### 2AC- Agencies Don’t Link

#### Agencies avoid politics – empirically proven

Shane 95

Dean and Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh (Peter, “Political Accountability in a System of Checks and Balances: The Case of Presidential Review of Rulemaking”, 48 Ark. L. Rev. 161, 1995)

Such was the regulatory oversight system dedicated most faithfully to a categorical separation of powers philosophy that, in turn, was touted as advancing the cause of accountability. But even without careful parsing, the record suggests obvious accountability issues. First, it was the conclusion of the most extensive journalistic study of the Council that it intervened in "dozens of unpublicized controversies over important federal regulations, leaving what vice presidential aides call "no fingerprints' on the results of its interventions." 58 The White House's efforts to avoid public disclosure of its oversight activity took multiple forms: resisting FOIA disclosure of documents belonging to President Reagan's Task Force on Regulatory Relief on the ground that the Task Force (and, by implication, the Council) was not a covered "agency"; 59 resisting Congressional access to information about the Council beyond published fact sheets and the testimony of individuals who did not participate in Council deliberations; 60 keeping decisions at staff level to shield them from the greater publicity that would likely follow cabinet level involvement. 61 Intriguingly, only one Council decision - pressuring EPA on pollution permit modifications - ever escalated to actual presidential involvement; 62 the usual, albeit tacit, rule was to avoid appeals to the President wherever possible. 63 It would not seem unrealistic that behind this approach lay a desire to buffer the President from criticism for Council policies, especially given a campaign promise to be the "environmental president." 64 That would, of course, be the opposite of accountability

### 2AC No I/L

#### Energy not key

#### Voters won’t change their minds- new study proves

Bartles 9-21

Larry is Professor of Political Science at Vanderbilt, “There go the Undecided Voters,” <http://themonkeycage.org/blog/2012/09/21/there-go-the-undecided-voters/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+themonkeycagefeed+%28The+Monkey+Cage%29&utm_content=Google+Reader>

Lynn Vavreck has an informative piece on the New York Times Campaign Stops blog today tracing shifts in presidential voting intentions from late 2011 through early September. The data are from the Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project, which interviewed nearly 44,000 people last December and has subsequently been reinterviewing 1,000 per week. (Top monkey John Sides is a collaborator in the CCAP study, and I received access to some of these data for an earlier Campaign Stops post that Vavreck and I wrote together.)¶ Through most of the spring and early summer, more than half of the survey respondents who were undecided last December were still declining to choose a candidate, with the rest breaking slightly for Mitt Romney over Barack Obama. Since around mid-June, more of these previously undecided voters have begun to commit, with Obama gaining and, in the last few weeks, surpassing Romney among those who were originally undecided. According to Vavreck, “These decisions seem largely to have been motivated by party identification.”¶ Meanwhile, both candidates have managed to retain the vast majority of prospective voters who supported them last December. Over the course of 2012, Obama has held 96% of those who supported him in 2011 and added 3% of those who originally said they would vote Republican. For his part, Romney has held 94% of those who intended to vote Republican and added 2% of those who intended to vote for Obama. (Vavreck notes that the 2008 CCAP study found almost as much stability in candidate preferences, with Obama holding 90% of his early supporters and John McCain holding 92% of his.)¶ To readers versed in election studies, these findings will seem very reminiscent of those from the first scholarly analysis of campaign effects: “conversion is, by far, the least frequent result and activation the second most frequent manifest effect of the campaign.” However, whereas Lazarsfeld and his colleagues in 1940 studied 600 prospective voters in Erie County, Ohio, Vavreck and her colleagues in 2012 have 44,000 nationwide. That’s real scientific progress.

#  Resiliency K

### Permutation

#### Perm: do both. If the alternative solves then it can overcome any residual links to the perm.

#### Perm do the affirmative and the alternative in all other instances.

### Scenario-Planning Good

#### Complexity theory useless for policy making

Cairney 10

(Paul, Chair in Politics and Public Policy¶ BA (Hons), MSc, PhD at Aberdeen University, “Complexity Theory in Public Policy” <http://www.psa.ac.uk/journals/pdf/5/2010/121_665.pdf>, SEH)

Why has Complexity Theory Struggled for Attention?¶ The first difficulty with complexity theory is that it is difficult to pin down. While we¶ may find similar discussions in a wide range of texts in the literature, this may be merely¶ because it is vague. Its appeal in the sciences may be because it means different things to¶ different people, suggesting that initial enthusiasm and cross-disciplinary cooperation may be replaced by growing scepticism.¶ The second is that, when we do pin the meaning of complexity theory down, it seems to¶ present a deterministic argument. The danger is that if the complex system is¶ predominantly the causal factor then we lose sight of the role that policymakers play;¶ there may be a tendency to treat the system as a rule-bound structure which leaves¶ minimal room for the role of agency. It is tempting to contrast this picture with¶ interpretive social science which rejects the assumption of structural constraint. Rather, it¶ explores how agents perceive their decision-making environments; how they reproduce,¶ accept or challenge the structural, institutional and wider systemic constraints that they¶ appear to face when making decisions. Indeed, they may even reject terms such as¶ ‘institution’ and ‘rule’ because they imply a sense of permanence or common¶ understanding that has not been demonstrated (Bevir and Rhodes, 2003; 2006). This is¶ the essence of the study of politics, explaining why different policymakers make different¶ decisions under the same circumstances. Yet, there is perhaps good reason to resist this¶ temptation because, if the aim of complexity theory is to identify a shift in rule-bound¶ behaviour, then it could have something in common with interpretivist accounts which¶ seek to understand how agents interpret, adapt to and influence their decision-making¶ environment. This seems to be Teisman and Klijn’s (2008: 289) point when they focus¶ on agents adapting to the fitness landscape. Further, as Schneider and Bauer (2007: 6)¶ discuss, complexity theory appears to differ from the old functionalist logic of systems¶ theories that has gone out of fashion in political science. A kinder treatment of¶ complexity suggests that, so far, it has been used in public policy more to provide¶ practical advice to public managers than to inform the wider theological debates on¶ structure and agency we find in political science. I return to this theme in the next¶ section. The third is that it is difficult to identify or define a system and separate it from its¶ environment. For Mitleton-Kelly (2003: 30) this is not a problem because it is useful to¶ work on the assumption that there is no fixed boundary between the two. Rather, the¶ picture is one of overlapping systems or an ‘intricate web of inter-relationships’,¶ suggesting that systems as a whole engage in ‘co-evolution’. Rather than a system¶ adapting to its environment, we picture organisations influencing and being influenced by¶ the ‘social ecosystem’ which consists of other organisations (2003: 31).¶ This conclusion raises a fourth problem related to scale or perspective in complex¶ systems. Not only do we not know what a complex system is, but we don’t know at what¶ level we should view it. Wider scientific accounts relate the benefit of complexity theory¶ to the ability to step back and see the system as a whole, in much the same way that we¶ move from looking at molecules to observing the whole being. Yet, this doesn’t guide us¶ too much, because we could still see systems at different levels, such as a healthcare¶ system or a political system or even an international political system (plus authors such as¶ Mitleton-Kelly often seem to situate analysis at the organisational level). While this¶ gives us some flexibility, it could raise a whole host of further theoretical questions (are¶ central policymakers situated within, or treated as external to, the systems they cannot¶ control? If a country’s political system is made up of a number of other systems, does this suggest that there are super-emergent processes when systems interact with each¶ other?).¶ The fifth is that it is difficult to know which types of policy issue or area complexity¶ theory applies to. For example, Klijn (2008: 314) suggests that complexity theory is best¶ suited to ‘wicked problems’, suggesting that it refers primarily to issues of joined-upgovernment¶ and/ or intractable policy problems (what would this exclude?). Bovaird¶ (2008: 325) suggests that complex systems “are less likely to be found in ‘command-andcontrol’¶ environments”. This is confusing for two related reasons. First, the best¶ example in the UK of a command-and-control approach is the English NHS. Yet,¶ Kernick (2006) argues that complexity theory is well suited to explain why the NHS is¶ impervious to central control. Second, perhaps Bovaird is referring not to areas with¶ command-and-control styles, but those conducive to them. If so, there seems to be no¶ way to decide which areas are most relevant. The irony of governance, highlighted by¶ Rhodes (1997), in which successive governments have contributed to their own lack of¶ central control, knows no bounds. Perhaps the point is that the identification of¶ emergence and self-organizing behaviour is most likely in areas where the role of the¶ ‘centre’ is not strong, but this also raises further issues (below). The sixth is that, although anti-reductionism and whole-systems approaches sound¶ attractive (almost like a valence issue), reductionist theories have a strong hold in¶ political science. Indeed, rational choice theory may represent complexity theory’s¶ poplar opposite because it seeks parsimonious results based on a reduction of the social¶ world into as few factors as possible. This is as much a practical as a philosophical issue.¶ While we may view the world as a complex system, we do not have the ability to study it¶ as one. The ACF, for example, situates analysis at the level of the subsystem and¶ identifies two main processes: a process of learning within subsystems as advocacy¶ coalitions compete to define the policy problem and account for new information, and an¶ external process which may produce shocks to the system that change how the subsystem¶ operates (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Weible et al, 2009). The interesting aspect¶ of this framework is that, while from a complex systems perspective we may prefer to¶ study the system as a whole, the ACF may be no worse a way to study the process when¶ we are faced with limited resources and cognitive abilities.¶ A final problem may be that complexity theory complicates the study of public policy¶ without offering something new. This point seems strongest when applied to the study¶ of implementation. For example, one case study in the PMR special issue demonstrates¶ ‘how local governments develop contrasting behaviour on the same national policy¶ impulse due to self-organizing abilities to combine adaptiveness and self referentiality’¶ (Teisman and Klijn, 2008: 296), but Teisman and Klijn do not show how this differs from¶ similar ‘bottom-up’ processes of self-selection in implementation structures (Hjern, 1981;¶ Hjern and Porter, 1982) or street-level bureaucracy (Lipsky, 1980) identified 30 years ago¶ (also compare Buuren and Gerrits’ 2008: 382 line that ‘decisions are neither the starting¶ nor the finishing points of a decision-making process’ with Barret and Fudge’s focus on¶ ‘policy in action’). Similarly, the statement that complexity theory shows us that¶ ‘managers are not the rational beings presented in many managerial handbooks (Teisman and Klijn, 2008: 297) does not seem startlingly original. We are in the very¶ familiar territory of uncertain policy effects and unintended consequences. A¶ sympathetic assessment might suggest that these points are being restated because the¶ lessons from bottom-up studies have been lost or ignored. This seems to be the tone of¶ Butler and Allan’s (2008) argument that there is no one-best-way in the delivery of local¶ services and in Kernick’s (2006: 388) criticism of the assumption of a single¶ organizational solution in the NHS (and promotion of a more meaningful dialogue¶ between those who design and those who deliver and use the service). But is there¶ anything more to complexity theory than this?

### Threat Con Impact Defense

#### The alternative locks in the war system – infinite number of non-falsifiable ‘root causes’ means only incentive theory solves

Moore ’04 – Dir. Center for Security Law @ University of Virginia, 7-time Presidential appointee, & Honorary Editor of the American Journal of International Law, Solving the War Puzzle: Beyond the Democratic Peace, John Norton Moore, pages 41-2.

If major interstate war is predominantly a product of a synergy between a potential nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence, what is the role of the many traditional "causes" of war? Past, and many contemporary, theories of war have focused on the role of specific disputes between nations, ethnic and religious differences, arms races, poverty or social injustice, competition for resources, incidents and accidents, greed, fear, and perceptions of "honor," or many other such factors. Such factors may well play a role in motivating aggression or in serving as a means for generating fear and manipulating public opinion. The reality, however, is that while some of these may have more potential to contribute to war than others, there may well be an infinite set of motivating factors, or human wants, motivating aggression. It is not the independent existence of such motivating factors for war but rather the circumstances permitting or encouraging high risk decisions leading to war that is the key to more effectively controlling war. And the same may also be true of democide. The early focus in the Rwanda slaughter on "ethnic conflict," as though Hutus and Tutsis had begun to slaughter each other through spontaneous combustion, distracted our attention from the reality that a nondemocratic Hutu regime had carefully planned and orchestrated a genocide against Rwandan Tutsis as well as its Hutu opponents.I1 Certainly if we were able to press a button and end poverty, racism, religious intolerance, injustice, and endless disputes, we would want to do so. Indeed, democratic governments must remain committed to policies that will produce a better world by all measures of human progress. The broader achievement of democracy and the rule of law will itself assist in this progress. No one, however, has yet been able to demonstrate the kind of robust correlation with any of these "traditional" causes of war as is reflected in the "democratic peace." Further, given the difficulties in overcoming many of these social problems, an approach to war exclusively dependent on their solution may be to doom us to war for generations to come. A useful framework in thinking about the war puzzle is provided in the Kenneth Waltz classic Man, the State, and War,12 first published in 1954 for the Institute of War and Peace Studies, in which he notes that previous thinkers about the causes of war have tended to assign responsibility at one of the three levels of individual psychology, the nature of the state, or the nature of the international system. This tripartite level of analysis has subsequently been widely copied in the study of international relations. We might summarize my analysis in this classical construct by suggesting that the most critical variables are the second and third levels, or "images," of analysis. Government structures, at the second level, seem to play a central role in levels of aggressiveness in high risk behavior leading to major war. In this, the "democratic peace" is an essential insight. The third level of analysis, the international system, or totality of external incentives influencing the decision for war, is also critical when government structures do not restrain such high risk behavior on their own. Indeed, nondemocratic systems may not only fail to constrain inappropriate aggressive behavior, they may even massively enable it by placing the resources of the state at the disposal of a ruthless regime elite. It is not that the first level of analysis, the individual, is unimportant. I have already argued that it is important in elite perceptions about the permissibility and feasibility of force and resultant necessary levels of deterrence. It is, instead, that the second level of analysis, government structures, may be a powerful proxy for settings bringing to power those who may be disposed to aggressive military adventures and in creating incentive structures predisposing to high risk behavior. We should keep before us, however, the possibility, indeed probability, that a war/peace model focused on democracy and deterrence might be further usefully refined by adding psychological profiles of particular leaders, and systematically applying other findings of cognitive psychology, as we assess the likelihood of aggression and levels of necessary deterrence in context. A post-Gulf War edition of Gordon Craig and Alexander George's classic, Force and Statecraft,13 presents an important discussion of the inability of the pre-war coercive diplomacy effort to get Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait without war.14 This discussion, by two of the recognized masters of deterrence theory, reminds us of the many important psychological and other factors operating at the individual level of analysis that may well have been crucial in that failure to get Hussein to withdraw without war. We should also remember that nondemocracies can have differences between leaders as to the necessity or usefulness of force and, as Marcus Aurelius should remind us, not all absolute leaders are Caligulas or Neros. Further, the history of ancient Egypt reminds us that not all Pharaohs were disposed to make war on their neighbors. Despite the importance of individual leaders, however, we should also keep before us that major international war is predominantly and critically an interaction, or synergy, of certain characteristics at levels two and three, specifically an absence of democracy and an absence of effective deterrence. Yet another way to conceptualize the importance of democracy and deterrence in war avoidance is to note that each in its own way internalizes the costs to decision elites of engaging in high risk aggressive behavior. Democracy internalizes these costs in a variety of ways including displeasure of the electorate at having war imposed upon it by its own government. And deterrence either prevents achievement of the objective altogether or imposes punishing costs making the gamble not worth the risk. Testing the Hypothesis Theory without truth is but costly entertainment. HYPOTHESES, OR PARADIGMS, are useful if they reflect the real world better than previously held paradigms.

In the complex world of foreign affairs and the war puzzle, perfection is unlikely. No general construct will fit all cases even in the restricted category of "major interstate war"; there are simply too many variables. We should insist, however, on testing against the real world and on results that suggest enhanced usefulness over other constructs. In testing the hypothesis, we can test it for consistency with major wars; that is, in looking, for example, at the principal interstate wars in the twentieth century, did they present both a nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence?' And although it is by itself not going to prove causation, we might also want to test the hypothesis against settings of potential wars that did not occur. That is, in nonwar settings, was there an absence of at least one element of the synergy? We might also ask questions about the effect of changes on the international system in either element of the synergy; that is, what, in general, happens when a totalitarian state makes a transition to stable democracy or vice versa? And what, in general, happens when levels of deterrence are dramatically increased or decreased?

### PIKs Are Bad

#### 1. Steals 1AC offense

#### 2. Moots topic education

#### Predictions are accurate enough and should be used as a basis for political action

Chernoff 2009. Fred, Prof. IR and Dir. IR – Colgate U., European Journal of International Relations, “Conventionalism as an Adequate Basis for Policy-Relevant IR Theory”, 15:1

For these and other reasons, many social theorists and social scientists have come to the conclusion that prediction is impossible. Well-known IR reflexivists like Rick Ashley, Robert Cox, Rob Walker and Alex Wendt have attacked naturalism by emphasizing the interpretive nature of social theory. Ashley is explicit in his critique of prediction, as is Cox, who says quite simply, ‘It is impossible to predict the future’ (Ashley, 1986: 283; Cox, 1987: 139, cf. also 1987: 393). More recently, Heikki Patomäki has argued that ‘qualitative changes and emergence are possible, but predictions are not’ defective and that the latter two presuppose an unjustifiably narrow notion of ‘prediction’.14 A determined prediction sceptic may continue to hold that there is too great a degree of complexity of social relationships (which comprise ‘open systems’) to allow any prediction whatsoever. Two very simple examples may circumscribe and help to refute a radical variety of scepticism. First, we all make reliable social predictions and do so with great frequency. We can predict with high probability that a spouse, child or parent will react to certain well-known stimuli that we might supply, based on extensive past experience. More to the point of IR prediction – scepticism, we can imagine a young child in the UK who (perhaps at the cinema) (1) picks up a bit of 19th-century British imperial lore thus gaining a sense of the power of the crown, without knowing anything of current balances of power, (2) hears some stories about the US–UK invasion of Iraq in the context of the aim of advancing democracy, and (3) hears a bit about communist China and democratic Taiwan. Although the specific term ‘preventative strike’ might not enter into her lexicon, it is possible to imagine the child, whose knowledge is thus limited, thinking that if democratic Taiwan were threatened by China, the UK would (possibly or probably) launch a strike on China to protect it, much as the UK had done to help democracy in Iraq. In contrast to the child, readers of this journal and scholars who study the world more thoroughly have factual information (e.g. about the relative military and economic capabilities of the UK and China) and hold some cause-and-effect principles (such as that states do not usually initiate actions that leaders understand will have an extremely high probability of undercutting their power with almost no chances of success). Anyone who has adequate knowledge of world politics would predict that the UK will not launch a preventive attack against China. In the real world, China knows that for the next decade and well beyond the UK will not intervene militarily in its affairs. While Chinese leaders have to plan for many likely — and even a few somewhat unlikely — future possibilities, they do not have to plan for various implausible contingencies: they do not have to structure forces geared to defend against specifically UK forces and do not have to conduct diplomacy with the UK in a way that would be required if such an attack were a real possibility. Any rational decision-maker in China may use some cause-and-effect (probabilistic) principles along with knowledge of specific facts relating to the Sino-British relationship to predict (P2) that the UK will not land its forces on Chinese territory — even in the event of a war over Taiwan (that is, the probability is very close to zero). The statement P2 qualifies as a prediction based on DEF above and counts as knowledge for Chinese political and military decision-makers. A Chinese diplomat or military planner who would deny that theory-based prediction would have no basis to rule out extremely implausible predictions like P2 and would thus have to prepare for such unlikely contingencies as UK action against China. A reflexivist theorist sceptical of ‘prediction’ in IR might argue that the China example distorts the notion by using a trivial prediction and treating it as a meaningful one. But the critic’s temptation to dismiss its value stems precisely from the fact that it is so obviously true. The value to China of knowing that the UK is not a military threat is significant. The fact that, under current conditions, any plausible cause-and-effect understanding of IR that one might adopt would yield P2, that the ‘UK will not attack China’, does not diminish the value to China of knowing the UK does not pose a military threat. A critic might also argue that DEF and the China example allow non-scientific claims to count as predictions. But we note that while physics and chemistry offer precise ‘point predictions’, other natural sciences, such as seismology, genetics or meteorology, produce predictions that are often much less specific; that is, they describe the predicted ‘events’ in broader time frame and typically in probabilistic terms. We often find predictions about the probability, for example, of a seismic event in the form ‘some time in the next three years’ rather than ‘two years from next Monday at 11:17 am’. DEF includes approximate and probabilistic propositions as predictions and is thus able to catagorize as a prediction the former sort of statement, which is of a type that is often of great value to policy-makers. With the help of these ‘non-point predictions’ coming from the natural and the social sciences, leaders are able to choose the courses of action (e.g. more stringent earthquake-safety building codes, or procuring an additional carrier battle group) that are most likely to accomplish the leaders’ desired ends. So while ‘point predictions’ are not what political leaders require in most decision-making situations, critics of IR predictiveness often attack the predictive capacity of IR theory for its inability to deliver them. The critics thus commit the straw man fallacy by requiring a sort of prediction in IR (1) that few, if any, theorists claim to be able to offer, (2) that are not required by policy-makers for theory-based predictions to be valuable, and (3) that are not possible even in some natural sciences.15 The range of theorists included in ‘reflexivists’ here is very wide and it is possible to dissent from some of the general descriptions. From the point of view of the central argument of this article, there are two important features that should be rendered accurately. One is that reflexivists reject explanation–prediction symmetry, which allows them to pursue causal (or constitutive) explanation without any commitment to prediction. The second is that almost all share clear opposition to predictive social science.16 The reflexivist commitment to both of these conclusions should be evident from the foregoing discussion.

### Predict Possible

#### IR predictions are possible

HARVEY, 97Frank Harvey, associate professor of Political Science, Dalhouse University, The Future’s Back: Nuclear Rivalry, Deterrence Theory, And Crisis Stability After The Cold War, 1997, p. 139

Finally, the lack of purity and precision, another consequence of linguistic relativism, does not necessarily imply irrelevance of purpose or approach. The study of [IR] international relations may not be exact, given limitations noted by Wittgenstein and others, but precision is a practical research problem, not an insurmountable barrier to progress. In fact, most observers who point to the context-dependent nature of language are critical not so much of the social sciences but of the incorrect application of scientific techniques to derive overly precise measurement of weakly developed concepts. Clearly, our understanding of the causes of international conflict—and most notably war—has improved considerably as a consequence of applying sound scientific methods and valid operationalizations. The alternative approach, implicit in much of the postmodern literature, is to fully accept the inadequacy of positivism, throw one’s hands up in failure, given the complexity of the subject, and repudiate the entire enterprise. The most relevant question is whether we would know more or less about international relations if we pursued that strategy.

### Linear Predictions Good

#### Linear models can be useful for effective decisionmaking

Robyn M. Dawes. 1957. U of Oregon. The Robust Beauty of Improper Linear Models in Decision Making.American Psychologist. July.

The linear model cannot replace the expert in¶ deciding such things as "what to look for," but it¶ is precisely this knowledge of what to look for in¶ reaching the decision that is the special expertise¶ people have. Even in as complicated a judgment¶ as making a chess move, it is the ability to code¶ the board in an appropriate way to "see" the¶ proper moves that distinguishes the grand master¶ from the expert from the novice (deGroot, 1965;¶ Simon & Chase, 1973). It is not in the ability¶ to integrate information that people excel (Slovic,¶ Note 2). Again, the chess grand master considers¶ no more moves than does the expert; he just¶ knows which ones to look at. The distinction between¶ knowing what to look for and the ability¶ to integrate information is perhaps best illustrated¶ in a study by Einhorn (1972). Expert doctors¶ coded biopsies of patients with Hodgkin's disease¶ and then made an overall rating of the severity of¶ the process. The overall rating did not predict¶ survival time of the 193 patients, all of whom died. (The correlations of rating with survival¶ time were all virtually 0, some in the wrong direction.)¶ The variables that the doctors coded did,¶ however, predict survival time when they were¶ used in a multiple regression model.¶ In summary, proper linear models work for a¶ very simple reason. People are good at picking¶ out the right predictor variables and at coding¶ them in such a way that they have a conditionally¶ monotone relationship with the criterion. People¶ are bad at integrating information from diverse¶ and incomparable sources. Proper linear models¶ are good at such integration when the predictions¶ have a conditionally monotone relationship to the¶ criterion.

#### Prefer specific scenarios – even if we invoke some security logic, the fact that others will securitize means that we have to make worst-case assessments to avoid escalation

Ole Waever, Senior Research Fellow – Copenhagen Peace Research Inst., 2K

(I. R. Theory & the Politics of European Integration, ed Kelstrup/Williams p. 282-285)

The other main possibility is to stress responsibility. Particularly in a field like security one has to make choices and deal with the challenges and risks that one confronts – and not shy away into long-range or principled transformations. The meta-political line risks (despite the theoretical commitment to the concrete other) implying that politics can be contained within large ‘systemic’ questions. In line with the classical revolutionary tradition, after the change (now no longer the revolution but the meta-physical transformation), there will be no more problems whereas in our situation (until the change) we should not deal with the ‘small questions’ of politics, only with the large one (cf. Rorty 1996). However, the ethical demand in post-structuralism (e.g. Derrida’s ‘justice’) is of a kind that can never be instantiated in any concrete political order – it is an experience of the undecidable that exceeds any concrete solution and re-inserts politics. Therefore, politics can never be reduced to meta-questions; there is no way to erase the small, particular, banal conflicts and controversies. In contrast to the quasi-institutionalist formula of radical democracy which one finds in the ‘opening’ oriented version of deconstruction, we could with Derrida stress the singularity of the event. To take a position, take part, and ‘produce events’ (Derrida 1994: 89) means to get involved in specific struggles. Politics takes place ‘in the singular event of engagement’ (Derrida 1996: 83). Derrida’s politics is focused on the calls that demand response/responsibility in words like justice, Europe and emancipation. Should we treat security in this manner? No, security is not that kind of call. ‘Security’ is not a way to open (or keep open) an ethical horizon. Security is a much more situational concept oriented to the handling of specifics. It belongs to the sphere of how to handle challenges – and avoid ‘the worst’ (Derrida 1991). Here enters again the possible pessimism hich for the security analyst might be occupational or structural. The infinitude of responsibility (Derrida 1996: 86) or the tragic nature of politics (Morgenthau 1946, Chapter 7) means that one can never feel reassured that by some ‘good deed’, ‘I have assumed my responsibilities’ (Derrida 1996: 86). If I conduct myself particularly well with regard to someone, I know that it is to the detriment of an other; of one nation to the detriment of another nation, of one family to the detriment of another family, of my friends to the detriment of other friends or non-friends, etc. This is the infinitude that inscribes itself within responsibility; otherwise there would be no ethical problems or decisions. (ibid.; and parallel argumentation in Morgenthau 1946; Chapters 6 and 7) Because of this there will remain conflicts and risks – and the question of how to handle them. Should developments be securitized (and if so, in what terms)? Often our reply will be to aim for de-securitization and then politics meet meta-politics; but occasionally the underlying pessimism regarding the prospects for orderliness and compatibility among human aspirations will point to scenarios sufficiently worrisome that responsibility will entail securitization in order to block the worst. As a security/securitization analyst, this means accepting the task of trying to manage and avoid spirals and accelerating security concerns, to try to assist in shaping the continent in a way that creates the least insecurity and violence – even if this occasionally means invoking/producing ‘structures’ or even using the dubious instrument of securitization. In the case of current European configuration, the above analysis suggests the use of securitization at the level of European scenarios with the aim of preempting and avoiding numerous instances of local securitization that could lead to security dilemmas and escalations, violence and mutual vilification.

#### Extinction Outweighs

Amien Kacou. 2008. WHY EVEN MIND? On The A Priori Value Of “Life”, Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, Vol 4, No 1-2 (2008) cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184

Furthermore, that manner of finding things good that is in pleasure can certainly not exist in any world without consciousness (i.e., without “life,” as we now understand the word)—slight analogies put aside. In fact, we can begin to develop a more sophisticated definition of the concept of “pleasure,” in the broadest possible sense of the word, as follows: it is the common psychological element in all psychological experience of goodness (be it in joy, admiration, or whatever else). In this sense, pleasure can always be pictured to “mediate” all awareness or perception or judgment of goodness: there is pleasure in all consciousness of things good; pleasure is the common element of all conscious satisfaction. In short, it is simply the very experience of liking things, or the liking of experience, in general. In this sense, pleasure is, not only uniquely characteristic of life but also, the core expression of goodness in life—the most general sign or phenomenon for favorable conscious valuation, in other words. This does not mean that “good” is absolutely synonymous with “pleasant”—what we value may well go beyond pleasure. (The fact that we value things needs not be reduced to the experience of liking things.) However, what we value beyond pleasure remains a matter of speculation or theory. Moreover, we note that a variety of things that may seem otherwise unrelated are correlated with pleasure—some more strongly than others. In other words, there are many things the experience of which we like. For example: the admiration of others; sex; or rock-paper-scissors. But, again, what they are is irrelevant in an inquiry on a priori value—what gives us pleasure is a matter for empirical investigation. Thus, we can see now that, in general, something primitively valuable is attainable in living—that is, pleasure itself. And it seems equally clear that we have a priori logical reason to pay attention to the world in any world where pleasure exists. Moreover, we can now also articulate a foundation for a security interest in our life: since the good of pleasure can be found in living (to the extent pleasure remains attainable),[17] and only in living, therefore, a priori, life ought to be continuously (and indefinitely) pursued at least for the sake of preserving the possibility of finding that good. However, this platitude about the value that can be found in life turns out to be, at this point, insufficient for our purposes. It seems to amount to very little more than recognizing that our subjective desire for life in and of itself shows that life has some objective value. For what difference is there between saying, “living is unique in benefiting something I value (namely, my pleasure); therefore, I should desire to go on living,” and saying, “I have a unique desire to go on living; therefore I should have a desire to go on living,” whereas the latter proposition immediately seems senseless? In other words, “life gives me pleasure,” says little more than, “I like life.” Thus, we seem to have arrived at the conclusion that the fact that we already have some (subjective) desire for life shows life to have some (objective) value. But, if that is the most we can say, then it seems our enterprise of justification was quite superficial, and the subjective/objective distinction was useless—for all we have really done is highlight the correspondence between value and desire. Perhaps, our inquiry should be a bit more complex.

**A2: Romney Kills**

**Relations inevitable under Romney and tension inevitable under either**

**CQ Weekly 9-10**

“U.S.-Russia Reset: From Diplomacy to Reset,”

President Obamaentered office pledging to “reset” America’s troubled relations with Russia. But despite some tangible successes, including a new nuclear arms reduction treaty and increased sanctions on Iran, Democrats on the campaign trail are hardly touting their breakthroughs with Moscow. Indeed, Republicans and their presidential nominee, Mitt Romney, have used relations with Russia as one of their few consistent foreign policy attack lines against the White House.¶ The campaign rhetoric reinforces what has been a reality for months: **The once-celebrated reset is over**, with Vladimir V. Putin’s recoronation as Russia’s president in May the most visible symbol. New **divisions over the Syrian uprising, Russia’s human rights record and missile defense** — combined with shifting political circumstances in both the United States and Russia **— have soured diplomacy between the two nations.**¶ **But overheated rhetoric** out of Moscow and Washington aside, th**e two nations still have an incentive to cooperate on critical security and economic issues, including** the **Afghanistan** War **and trade**. Beyond the battle for the White House, how Congress balances collaboration on these issues with complaints about Putin’s heavy-handed policies will help determine just how frigid the relationship becomes. Republicans have promised to take a harder line with Russia if they win control of the Senate and the White House, but **as** GOP Sen. John **McCain** of Arizona **observes, it’s in nobody’s interest to “reignite the Cold War**.”¶ Now that Russia has joined the World Trade Organization, the renewed tension is playing out in the trade arena. Without legislation to normalize trade relations, U.S. companies are unable to take advantage of eased access to Russian markets. Republicans have urged the White House to lean on Democrats to support the necessary changes. House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp of Michigan, in announcing a June hearing on Russia’s accession to the WTO, said he wanted to see the “administration’s active engagement on all of the issues” related to U.S. trade with Russia.¶ The White House, however, wants to avoid an awkward public debate. “The House leadership was obviously goading Obama to come out and make more statements in support of the legislation,” says Carroll Colley, a Russia analyst at the Eurasia Group, a political-risk consulting company. However, with Putin at Russia’s helm, no politician “wants to step out and advocate anything vis-à-vis Russia” right now, he says.¶ Andrew Kuchins, director of the Center for Strategic and International Studies’ Russia program, agrees. “Russia’s just kind of a stinker right now,” Kuchins says, pointing to its widely criticized crackdown on the anti-Putin female punk band Pussy Riot and its continued support of strongman Bashar al-Assad’s bloody war against dissidents in Syria.¶ Russia’s recent actions have complicated the push in Congress to normalize trade relations, a high priority for both the U.S. business community and the Obama administration. To do so, Congress must remove Russia from a list of countries facing U.S. trade restrictions under the Jackson-Vanik amendment to a 1974 trade law. The amendment was intended to punish the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries for restricting Jewish emigration, an issue long since resolved.¶ On both the right and the left, critics of Russia’s human rights record have insisted that any legislation normalizing trade must include a component to penalize those who have violated human rights in Russia. The enormous anti-Putin political protests last fall and the ensuing government crackdown have only strengthened their hand.¶ To win the support of such critics, pro-trade House and Senate leaders have agreed to add language from a separate bill, named for the Russian lawyer and anti-corruption activist Sergei Magnitsky, who died in police custody in 2009. The bill would establish a freeze on the travel and assets of human rights violators from Russia or, in some versions, anywhere in the world. House leaders told the business community it would hold a vote on the trade normalization bill this week, but it’s not clear whether they have enough votes to win passage. The political sensitivity around anything that looks to be supporting Russia and Putin in the heat of campaign season may force a delay until after the election.¶ ‘Where They Park Their Cash’¶ Russians are eager to gain preferential trade status with the United States, but they’re irate about the language in the Magnitsky bill. The main concern in Moscow, according to Colley, is that Europe might adopt a similar law. “That’s where Russians vacation, and that’s where they park their cash,” he says. “This is a priority for them.”¶ Colley predicts considerable blowback from Moscow if the Magnitsky language becomes law. “It’s unclear how that will manifest itself,” he says, but he could imagine Russia making life difficult for American citizens who seek visas or for U.S. businesses that operate there.¶ The conflict in Syria is also a “big, big variable” in U.S. relations with Russia, Kuchins says. Members of Congress have, through various bills, blasted Russia’s continued support of Assad. For example, both chambers included language in their fiscal 2013 defense authorization bills that would bar funding for additional U.S. military purchases of Russian-made Rosoboronexport helicopters, which are used in Afghanistan, because that arms manufacturer also sells attack helicopters to the Assad regime.¶ One House-passed amendment to the fiscal 2013 Defense appropriations bill would go so far as to prohibit funds for nuclear nonproliferation activities with Russia unless Moscow demonstrates that it has worked to reduce weapons proliferation.¶ And after a short lull, missile defense is raising hackles in both capitals. The Obama administration tamped down a long-running dispute with Moscow on the subject when it announced, in 2009, alterations to U.S. plans for an anti-ballistic missile shield in Eastern Europe. In 2010, NATO kicked off talks with Russia on potential areas of cooperation on missile defense. Those talks, however, have stalled, and Russian saber rattling has increased; in recent months, Kremlin officials have publicly threatened to junk the New START pact and take military action if they don’t get their way.¶ In the United States, Republicans have made clear that missile defense is one of their priorities. The House in July passed an amendment to the defense policy bill that would prohibit funds from being used to share with Russia classified information about missile defense systems. Even if Obama is elected to another term, he may not have much flexibility in dealing with missile defense, given how closely GOP lawmakers are watching the issue. And if Republicans take over the White House, heightened confrontation with Russia on missile defense is a near-certainty.¶ Several Accomplishments¶ Despite the rising tensions, Obama’s approach to Russia “resulted in a number of agreements that served U.S. foreign and national security policy” over the past three years, Kuchins says. These include New START, a pact creating NATO transit corridors to Afghanistan through Russia and Moscow’s acquiescence to a strict new set of United Nations sanctions against Iran.¶ Those sanctions have yet to deter Iran from continuing its nuclear enrichment program. But as part of the “P5 plus one” — the group comprising the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany — Russia remains an active player in efforts to resolve the standoff diplomatically.¶ Also, Russia has a major incentive to help stabilize Afghanistan — which is more or less in its backyard — as NATO troops withdraw over the next two years.¶ And even though Republican congressional opposition makes new arms control agreements in the next few years unlikely, **GOP lawmakers have signaled that, should they take control of Congress and the White House, they aren’t particularly interested in curbing existing treaties**. **Under those pacts, Russia and the United States continue to work together to destroy and safeguard nuclear, chemical and biological weapons.**¶ Richard G. Lugar, the Senate’s retiring arms control sage, recently visited Russia, Georgia and Ukraine to observe some of those efforts. He is pushing for the United States and Russia to extend what is known as the “umbrella agreement,” an executive initiative that underpins the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, in which the United States and the former Soviet Republics work together to dismantle excess weapons of mass destruction. (The program is also known as Nunn-Lugar, after the Indiana Republican and his former colleague Sen. Sam Nunn, a Georgia Democrat.)¶ The agreement, which has been extended before, expires in 2013. Lugar says that “a good number of other deadly weapons of mass destruction” — which the United States is ready to help Russia destroy — remains.¶ He worries that the increasingly heated rhetoric between Washington and Moscow could hamper such cooperation. Quoting retired diplomat Thomas R. Pickering, Lugar notes that the two countries have “been sort of kicking each other in the shins” in recent months. “The problem is, if there is too much kicking in the shins and so forth, people become unhappy with each other,” he says.¶ “Taking the perspective of the safety of the American people or the safety of the world, we better move past that,” Lugar adds. “The missiles we saw being cut up are not theoretical.”

### Russia Relations Defense

**Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, economic concerns, and nuclear security**

**Graham 2007**

(Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html>, WEA)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when **Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability.** Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.