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## 1nC Politics---Immigration

**CIR will pass —Momentum, Obama’s pushing and the Senate and House are close to a deal**

Mali, 3-25-13, The Hill, Obama to host new citizens, push for action on immigration reform, [Meghashyam], p. http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/290053-obama-to-host-new-citizens-press-congress-on-immigration-reform

President Obama will host a naturalization ceremony on Monday for 28 new citizens, including 13 service members, at the White House. The move comes as the president continues to press lawmakers to pass comprehensive immigration reform, one of his second-term priorities. Obama will be joined by Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Director Alejandro Mayorkas in the East Room. The president will deliver remarks at the ceremony, the White House announced. “The event underscores the contributions made to the United States by immigrants from all walks of life, including the foreign-born members of the U.S. Armed Forces, as well as our shared history as a nation of immigrants,” said a White House official. “While the President remains pleased that Congress continues to make progress towards commonsense immigration reform, he believes Congress needs to act quickly, and he expects a bill to be introduced as soon as possible.” Bipartisan groups in both the House and Senate are moving closer to unveiling separate immigration reform proposals. The Senate’s “Gang of Eight” introduced their framework in January, calling for a pathway to citizenship, heightened border security, increased high-skilled immigration and a guest worker program. But since then, senators have been tied down in negotiations over the details of the plan, with many key issues still unresolved. Reports last week, though, said that sources close to the talks said they hoped to have a bill by the end of April. The bipartisan House group has yet to share details of their proposals, but their work has already received general support from leaders in both parties. Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) last week praised their work as a “pretty responsible solution.” House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said the group was “very close to an agreement,” and that lawmakers had made “real progress.” Advocates for immigration reform see a real chance that a bill could pass Congress this year, with growing momentum on both sides. But any immigration deal would need to pass muster with House GOP lawmakers, many of whom have said they will oppose measures that grant “amnesty” to illegal immigrants and have questioned proposed protections for gay or lesbian couples. But after the strong showing President Obama made among Hispanic voters in the 2012 election, a growing number of conservative lawmakers have signaled they would back immigration reform, including measures to provide a pathway to citizenship. Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) unveiled his own proposal last week, which would first require strengthened border security before allowing illegal immigrants to apply for legal status. Paul’s support for eventual citizenship could help rally other conservative lawmakers to back reform. Obama has held similar naturalization ceremonies at the White House in prior years. In 2012, he marked the Fourth of July by helping to naturalize 25 active-duty service members. That ceremony came weeks after Obama had issued an executive order allowing many illegal immigrants who were brought over to the United States as children to remain in the country and avoid deportation.

**Political capital is key---Obama’s leading negotiations with the GOP**

AFP 2-19-13, “Obama courts key Republicans on immigration reform,” 2013, Factiva

US President Barack Obama on Tuesday called key Senate Republicans, with whom he is at odds on other many top issues, to discuss the prospects for bipartisan immigration reform.¶ Obama placed the calls following complaints he had not done enough to reach across the political aisle on the key issue, and after the leak of partial White House immigration plans angered Republican players in the debate.¶ The White House said that Obama had spoken to Republican Senators Lindsey Graham, John McCain and Marco Rubio, to discuss a "shared commitment to bipartisan, commonsense immigration reform."¶ "The President reiterated that he remains supportive of the effort underway in Congress, and that he hopes that they can produce a bill as soon as possible that reflects shared core principles on reform."¶ "He thanked the senators for their leadership, and made clear that he and his staff look forward to continuing to work together with their teams to achieve needed reform."¶ Obama's aides said he also wanted to speak to Republican Senator Jeff Flake, of Arizona, but was unable to reach him because he was traveling.¶ Cuban-American Rubio, a rising star of the Republican Party, is emerging as a key player in the immigration debate, and he warned that leaked versions of White House plans obtained by USA Today would be "dead on arrival."¶ Eight senators -- four of Obama's Democratic allies and four Republicans -- unveiled a joint plan last month aiming to provide a route to legal status for illegal immigrants living on US soil.¶ Under the White House fallback plan, illegal immigrants would have to wait eight years until applying for legal permanent residency, and, in practice, at least 13 years before they could apply for US citizenship.¶ Advocates of immigration reform say that time period is too long -- while conservative opponents still rail against "amnesty" for illegal immigrants, reflecting the toxicity of much of the immigration reform debate.¶ Obama had been sharply at odds with Graham and McCain for their role in delaying the confirmation of his pick for defense secretary Chuck Hagel.¶ His call to Rubio, who is traveling in the Middle East, came after the Florida senator's office had said that no one in his office had met White House officials to discuss immigration.¶ The White House had maintained that its staffers had met congressional officials working on immigration reform.¶ Obama's move may be seen as an effort to prevent partisan wrangling from derailing hopes of immigration reform, as it did under the presidency of his predecessor George W. Bush.¶ Immigration reform may be Obama's best chance for a genuine legacy-boosting success in his second term.¶ Senior Republicans, meanwhile, are wary of entering another election hampered by the mistrust of Hispanic voters, a growing slice of the electorate for whom immigration reform is a key issue.¶ A key sticking point in the debate is the Republican demand that the process of offering legal status to illegals should only start once the US southern border with Mexico has been certified as secure.¶ Obama has so far declined to make that linkage.

**Plan drains Obama’s PC**

**Nuclear incentives are unpopular**

CTL, 12

(Clean Tech Law, 7/28, “No More Solyndras Bill” is back, http://www.cleantechlaw.org/2012/07/no-more-solyndras-bill-is-back.html#more

It appears that the rebellion by some Republican Congressmen last week against the “No More Solyndras Bill” has been “dealt with” by Republican leadership. No details have emerged on how much blood was shed in putting down the rebellion. The bill is named for a solar manufacturer that received a $500 million dollar loan guarantee and later filed for bankruptcy. **Republicans** have spent a year and a lot of money trying to find wrongdoing by the White House. They found none so they **are trying to end of the loan programs all together.** The bill was before the House Energy and Power Subcommittee last week. Rep. Ed Whitfield (R-KY.), the chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee abruptly recessed the hearing after three Republicans expressed concerns about the Republican-sponsored bill according to Politico. Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX), Michael Burgess (R-TX) and Phil Gingrey (R-GA) complained about a provision that would effectively end the loan guarantee program. They argued that it needs to be reformed, not killed. **Republican standard operating procedure is “repeal and probably not replace**.” Keep but reform is not allowed so the hearing came to an abrupt halt. Barton wrote the loan guarantee bill in 2005. House Republicans, Mitt Romney, and national GOP leaders have been bashing President Obama over Solyndra and **the DOE’s broader loan program**. **The overall Republican theme was that the federal government shouldn’t waste taxpayers’ money on handouts to risky renewable energy companies**. The GOP infighting caused The Wall Street Journal editorial board to lambast the Republican lawmakers who raised concerns about the bill, calling them out by name. GOP energy and environmental adviser Mike McKenna said the editorial was both a surprise and a wake-up call to those who have been "wandering" on the issue. “Republicans will be fiscal frauds if they renew the very money-losing energy programs they attacked Barack Obama for,” the WSJ wrote in an editorial that appeared online Wednesday night and in print Thursday. “When the next Solyndra goes bankrupt, voters will have more than Mr. Obama to blame.” That was enough for a trip to the elephant shed. Rep. Whitefield believes he has the votes so they will resume the hearing today and vote on the bill Wednesday morning. He expects the bill to be before the entire House in September after Congress returns from its 5-week vacation The Department of Energy has defended the loan program while conceding it could use some tweeking. The Department has made internal reforms since Solyndra. Secretary Chu has said the program is overall successful. Solyndra and other failures all together represent a smaller loss than Congress itself appropriated for when it passed the legislation under Bush. The DOE says total losses as of now are less than 3% of the total portfolio. That is less than venture capitalists plan for when they invest in new ventures. Mitt Romney bragged about Bain Capital having only a 20% loss on investments it made when he was at the helm. He said that in response to criticism about the Bain-owned companies that went bankrupt causing thousands to lose their jobs. The loan-killing bill is being supported by the American Energy Alliance (AEA) the lobbying arm of the Institute for Energy Research (IER). This is group largely funded by oil and gas companies whose objective is essentially to debunk and kill renewable energy using “research.” AEA President Thomas Pyle said in a statement: “Either you stand with Solyndra and other bankrupt experiments in politicized venture capital, or you stand with hardworking American taxpayers. Either you want to protect rent-seeking cronies in the renewable industry, or you want to preserve the sacred trust of the men and women who sent you to Washington.” It is no surprise **Republicans dance to that tune.** The bill is the pet project of Republican House Leadership including Speaker Boehner and Leader Eric Cantor. Boehner has received $241,600 in campaign contributions from oil and gas companies this election cycle. Eric Cantor (RTP-VA) has received $176,250.

**CIR is key to US hegemony**

Nye, 2012, “Immigration and American Power,” December 10, Project Syndicate, [a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University; Joseph], p.http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.”¶ In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans.¶ As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the decline of American power.¶ Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades.¶ During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008.¶ Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively.¶ But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors.¶ While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population.¶ For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades.¶ Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.¶ In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition**,** skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies.¶ Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US.¶ Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both.¶ Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightestfrom the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.¶ That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

## 1nC DA- Electricity Prices

**Electricity prices low now---that's key to the economy**

Here's the tie-breaker---predictive ev---prices will remain low---this also solves for the economy---"reshoring" of jobs and foreign capital influx

**von Schirach, 2/16** - International Economic Development Consultant and International Affairs Commentator and Writer for Avanz International (Paolo, 2/16/13, "America Has Close To The Lowest Electricity Prices In The Developed World – This Is A Huge Comparative Advantage – Energy Intensive Industries Will Relocate Where Electricity Is Most Affordable", http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2013/02/16/america-has-close-to-the-lowest-electricity-prices-in-the-developed-world-this-is-a-huge-comparative-advantage-energy-intensive-industries-will-relocate-where-electricity-is-most-affordable/, KONTOPOULOS)

WASHINGTON – With all its problems, due to the discovery and exploitation of new carbon based energy reserves, and to public policy that strongly favors consumers, America has a major comparative advantage vis-a-vis global competition: rock bottom electricity prices. Some of America’s competitors like Australia are energy rich. But they tax electricity more ands so cosumers pay more.¶ Low price policy¶ Traditionally American policy-makers have favored lower prices, hence lower taxes. But now, with the shale gas revolution fully underway, the US added to its historic advantage the lowest natural gas prices in the developed world, (less than half of what it costs in Europe). And this low cost advantage is going to last a long time. Natural gas powered plants will produce cheap electricity for many decades.¶ Some rich countries like Denmark (most expensive electricity) or the Netherlands may afford to pay a lot for electricity. Others like Italy, Brazil or Turkey that tax electricity rather heavily are likely to be penalized by the high cost of powering factories.¶ Electricity just one factor, but significant¶ All in all, energy is just one factor contributing to the overall cost of doing business. The relative conditions of other critical infrastructure, corporate taxes, man power quality, the legal system and more also influence decisions related to location of new facilities and the actual global competitiveness of whatever is made in any given country or region.¶ Attracting investors¶ Still, right now the US is undergoing a small but significant industrial renaissance driven in part by the allure of low electricity costs. Many energy intensive industries such as steel or smelters are considering relocating or expanding in the US and especially in the energy producing states like Texas or Pennsylvania. ¶ Everything else being equal, rock bottom electricity cost may be the deciding factor in luring new investors.

**New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices**

Cooper 2009 (Mark, SENIOR FELLOW FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT VERMONT LAW SCHOOL, "THE ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS: RENAISSANCE OR RELAPSE?," <http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Cooper%20Report%20on%20Nuclear%20Economics%20FINAL%5B1%5D.pdf>)

Within the past year, estimates of the cost of nuclear power from a new generation of reactors have ranged from a low of 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) to a high of 30 cents. This paper tackles the debate over the cost of building new nuclear reactors, with the key findings as follows: • The initial cost projections put out early in today’s so-called “nuclear renaissance” were about one-third of what one would have expected, based on the nuclear reactors completed in the 1990s. • The most recent cost projections for new nuclear reactors are, on average, over four times as high as the initial “nuclear renaissance” projections. • There are numerous options available to meet the need for electricity in a carbon-constrained environment that are superior to building nuclear reactors. Indeed, nuclear reactors are the worst option from the point of view of the consumer and society. • The low carbon sources that are less costly than nuclear include efficiency, cogeneration, biomass, geothermal, wind, solar thermal and natural gas. Solar photovoltaics that are presently more costly than nuclear reactors are projected to decline dramatically in price in the next decade. Fossil fuels with carbon capture and storage, which are not presently available, are projected to be somewhat more costly than nuclear reactors. • Numerous studies by Wall Street and independent energy analysts estimate efficiency and renewable costs at an average of 6 cents per kilowatt hour, while the cost of electricity from nuclear reactors is estimated in the range of 12 to 20 cents per kWh. • The additional cost of building 100 new nuclear reactors, instead of pursuing a least cost efficiency-renewable strategy, would be in the range of $1.9-$4.4 trillion over the life the reactors. Whether the burden falls on ratepayers (in electricity bills) or taxpayers (in large subsidies), incurring excess costs of that magnitude would be a substantial burden on the national economy and add immensely to the cost of electricity and the cost of reducing carbon emissions.

**The impact is global war**

Harris and Burrows, 9 – \*counselor in the National Intelligence Council, the principal drafter of Global Trends 2025, \*\*member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, Washington Quarterly, http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_burrows.pdf)

Increased Potential for Global Conflict¶ Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period **include** the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for **greater** conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt **in a constantly volatile economic environment** as they would be if change would be steadier.¶ In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. **Terrorist groups** in 2025 **will likely be** a combination of descendants of long established groups inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become **self-radicalized**, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower **in an economic downturn**.¶ **The most dangerous casualty** of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence **would** almost certainly **be the Middle East.** Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, **worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider** pursuing their own **nuclear** ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. **The lack of strategic depth** in neighboring states like Israel, **short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of** Iranian **intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises**.¶ **Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices**. **Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies**. In the worst case, **this could result in interstate conflicts** if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. **Maritime security concerns** are providing a rationale for naval buildups and **modernization efforts**, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to **increased tensions, rivalries, and** counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in **a more dog-eat-dog world.**

**Economy fragile now and will overcome budget cuts---small issues could derail**

**The Guardian, 3/28** (3/28/13, "US economy growing at faster rate than estimated but recovery is still sluggish", http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2013/mar/28/us-economy-grows-faster-rate, KONTOPOULOS)

The US economy grew at a moderately faster rate at the end of last year than previously reported, but the pace of growth remains sluggish, the Commerce Department said on Thursday.¶ In the final quarter of 2013, the US economy expanded at an annual rate of 0.4%. That was slightly better than the previous estimate of 0.1% growth. The revision reflected stronger business investment and export sales.¶ Analysts think the economy is growing at a rate of around 2.5% in the current January-March quarter, which ends this week.¶ Steady hiring has kept consumers spending this year. And a rebound in company stockpiling, further gains in housing and more business spending also likely drove faster growth in the first quarter.¶ The 0.4% growth rate for the gross domestic product, the economy's total output of goods and services, was the weakest quarterly performance in almost two years and followed a much faster 3.1% increase in the third quarter. The fourth quarter was hurt by the sharpest fall in defense spending in 40 years.¶ For all of 2012, the economy grew 2.2% after a 1.8% increase in 2011 and a 2.4% advance in 2010. Since the recession ended in mid-2009, the economy has been expanding at sub-par rates as a string of problems from higher gas prices to Europe's debt crisis have acted as a drag on the US economy.¶ Growth appears to be strengthening this year even after taxes increased on Jan. 1 and automatic government spending cuts totaling $85 billion started to take effect on March 1. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the combination of tax increases and spending cuts could trim economic growth this year by about 1.5 percentage points. The CBO is predicting just 1.5% growth for 2013.¶ But so far, the economy is showing signs of holding its own against the fiscal drag.¶ Employers have added an average of 200,000 jobs a month since November. That helped lower the unemployment rate in February to 7.7%, a four-year low.¶ Economists expect similar job gains in March, in part because a measure of unemployment benefit applications fell this month to a five-year low.¶ Sales of previously occupied homes rose in February to the highest level in nearly three years, while builders broke ground on more houses and apartments. Annual home prices jumped in January by the most since June 2006, according to a closely watched measure.¶ Stock prices have surged. On Wednesday, the Standard & Poor's 500 index was within two points of its all-time high.¶ All of that is making consumers feel wealthier, which could lead to more spending. Consumer spending drives 70% of economic activity.

## 1nC K- Security K

**Discourses of danger reproduces an American identity that posits the US as a the defender of global freedom and liberty**

**Campbell, 98** – Professor of International Politics at the University of Newcastle (David, 1998, Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, Google Books, p.180, KONTOPOULOS)

The crisis of representation the United States faces is unique only in the particularities of its content. The form of the dilemma is something common to all states. **The state has never been a stable ground on which a fixed identity has been secured against danger**: **the variety of state forms throughout modernity have always been a historically contingent panoply of practices that have served to constitute identity through the negation of difference and the temptation of otherness**. With the intensification of state power in the late nineteenth century, Foreign Policy helped contain and discipline the identities to which foreign policy had given rise. In our late modern era, where we find proliferating challenges that cannot be readily contained within the state, the discourse of danger associated with the discursive economy of foreign policy/Foreign **Policy will have to work overtime to overcome the ever present threats to the once stable representation of an always unstable sovereign domain. The discursive economy of foreign policy will** thus **be taxed in its efforts to reproduce and contain challenges to the political identity of nations** such as the United States. However, for (**the U**nited **S**tates of) America— which I have argued is the imagined community par excellence, the state that **requires a discourse of danger** probably more than any other— the crisis of representation is particularly acute. The operation of anticommunism as a prominent discourse of danger in the United States throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries— with its ability to encompass the entire population, intensively structure the practices of everyday life, and offer a link between internal and external threats in ways that circumscribe the boundaries of legitimacy— is probably the best example of an effective discourse of danger. But with (as discussed in the Introduction) the globalization of contingency, the erasure of the markers of certainty, and the rarefaction of political discourse, **reproducing the identity of "the U**nited **S**tates" **and containing challenges to it are likely to require new discourses of danger**. Of course, talk of a shift from old to new discourses of danger drastically oversimplifies the complexity of this cultural terrain. Transformations of this kind do not occur in discrete or sequential stages, for there has always been more than one referent around which danger has crystallized. What appears as new is often the emergence of something previously obscured by that which has faded away or become less salient. In this context, **there is no shortage on the horizons of world politics of potential candidates for new discourses of danger** (such as AIDS, "terrorism," and the general sign of anarchy and uncertainty). Consider just one example. The environment has occasionally emerged as **an international discourse of danger**. For example, a focus on the environmental catastrophes of Eastern Europe has been prominent. 2 One of the effects of this interpretation has been to **reinscribe East-West understandings of global politics in a period of international transformation by suggesting that "they" in the East are technologically less sophisticated and ecologically more dangerous than "we" in the West. This produces a new boundary that demarcates the "East" from the "West" in a period when the old frontiers of identity are no longer sustainable**. But environmental danger can also be figured in a manner that challenges traditional forms of identity inscribed in the capitalist economy of the "West." As a discourse of danger that results in disciplinary strategies that are de-territorialized, involve communal cooperation, and refigure economic relationships, the environment can serve to enframe a different rendering of "reasoning man" than that associated with the subjectivities of liberal capitalism, thereby making it more unstable and undecidable than anticommunism. 3 **The major issues regarding the possible emergence of a new discourse of danger(s) in this period can be indicated by some questions. In terms of the reproduction of American identity along the lines established in the cold war,** will any of the likely candidates be as extensive or intensive as that which they are needed to replace? In other words, are **we going to witness the persistence of cold war practices even after their most recent objects of contention have passed on**? Will these practices be represented in the mode of the society of security? Or, alternatively, **do any of the new dangers being focused on in this juncture contain the possibility for a different figuration of American identity that would diverge from the enmity of the cold war**? These questions, dealing with the rewriting of security, inform the argument in the remaining chapters. To make the analysis more specific, the first task is to consider an issue that has been officially identified a danger or threat necessitating vigilance and defense in the (so-called) post-cold war world: the incidence of drug consumption in America. Before proceeding, an observation about the strategy of argumentation employed in this chapter is in order. It begins with a consideration of the claims of "fact" made by the policy discourses to support their articulation of danger. In discussing counterevidence, my intent is not to juxtapose one realm of fact with another. To the contrary, my desire is to demonstrate that within each realm of policy discourse it is possible to construct, in its own terms, a competing narrative that denaturalizes and unsettles the dominant way of constructing the world, thus prying open the space for an alternative interpretation concerned with the entailments of identity. Indeed, although I begin this chapter by operating largely within the terms of these policy discourses, I have attempted to politicize the terms of the debate. For example, instead of "the drug problem" or "drug abuse" I speak of "drug consumption"; instead of "drug users" or "addicts" I speak of "drug consumers" or "people addicted"; and instead of "drug traffickers" and "cartels" I speak of the "drug industry." Of course, no representation is neutral, and the terms of my discourse are certainly contestable, but their estranging quality is designed to help make obvious the way in which formulations of identity are sequestered within even the technical arguments of public policy with which we are most familiar. 4 As such, this consideration of contemporary discourses illustrates the relevance to the current period of the idea that foreign policy/Foreign Policy is constitutive of political identity.

**That makes extinction inevitable**

**Willson, 02** – Ph.D in Humanities from New College San Francisco, JD from American University (Brian, 12/1/02, “Armageddon or Quantum Leap? U.S. Imperialism and Human Consciousness from an Evolutionary Perspective”, <http://www.brianwillson.com/quantum.html>, KONTOPOULOS)

Awaiting the impending U.S. government's concocted "preventive" war against Iraq (indeed, against the world), **this is** perhaps one of **the most frightening moment**s **in human history**. In a surreal scenario, **the U.S.** government **is renewing** active **threats of using nuclear weapons** and reviving use of anti-personnel land mines, **and is introducing new technological weapons of death** we can only imagine, and some we cannot. As grim as **this** scene **is**, I believe it must be **the inevitable** and logical **extension of the continued growth** ad nauseum **of the American Way Of Life** (AWOL) in particular, and the Western Way Of Life in general. Premeditated murder of thousands--perhaps millions--of innocents is the price for AWOL's insatiable consumption and its bloodthirsty vengeance, totally abdicating responsibility for lethal consequences to the planet and its species, including, ironically, our own. Perhaps Gaia is presenting the current transparent dangers to us as like a cosmic gift so that we might actually be able to *see* the extraordinary folly of our ways in time to creatively "storm the Bastille."U.S. Terrorist Roots **U.S.** civilization was founded on and **has been sustained by** terrorism, facilitated by Eurocentric racism, classism, and arrogant **ethnocentrism**. The grossest irony of all, of course, is that the "War on Terror," to be successful, must focus on our own civilization, the most egregious proponent of terror the world has even known. Terror was systematically utilized since our country's beginnings in the 1600s. The following instructions, facilitated by a cruel racism, are part of the historic record: "burning and spoiling the [Indian] country," (Captain John Underhill, Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1636); "put to death the [Pequot Indian] men of Block Island" (Massachusetts Bay Governor John Winthrop's order to Captain John Endecott, 1637); "laying waste," and instilling "terror...by any means" among the Indians (General George Washington, 1779); "[with] malice enough in our hearts to destroy everything that contributes to their support" (General John Sullivan, 1779). In a prominent history book published in 1906 (*The History of the United States,* James Wilford Garner, Ph.D. and Henry Cabot Lodge, Ph.D, L.L.D), the "destruction" of the American Indian is explained as follows: "History teaches that inferior people must yield to a superior civilization....They must take on civilization or pass out. The Negro was able to endure slavery while learning the rudiments of civilization; the Indian could not endure slavery, and...refused to be taught." Attitudes uttered by white, Puritan, Christian men, civilian and military, thus set the tone for our civilization, sentiments that to this day have not been seriously renounced. **We remain** primarily **a** white male supremacy **society with** overtly **expressed** as well as suppressed **sentiments of racism and classism dominating** much of our **political life and foreign policy. How can someone drop a bomb knowin**g that thousands of innocents will be murdered **if the bomber is not possessed by** cruel racism and/or ugly **ethnocentrism**? Conveniently left out of the historical record is the fact that our civilization has been founded on three holocausts, the first being theft of virtually all our land base at gunpoint while murdering millions of the original inhabitants. The second brought us "free" labor from Africa, but resulted in two-thirds of all those originally targeted for apprehension being murdered in the process of trying to escape or from being stowed as human cargo in slave ships known as floating coffins. The third holocaust took place during what the founder and publisher of *Time* and *Life* magazines, Thomas Luce, called "The American Century." This century witnessed more than 300 military and perhaps 10,000 covert interventions by the U.S. into more than 100 countries, stealing resources at gunpoint while murdering millions of the increasing numbers of impoverished people struggling for independence. "American exceptionalism" must succeed at *any* cost. In the process, the three Buddhist "poisons" are employed: greed -- for profit at any cost of human suffering; hatred -- of any obstacles to profit; ignorance -- of **the** **intimate link between Western corporations/governments and "Third World" repressive regimes.**  **U.S.** Oligarchy It does not matter which of the two parties, the republocrats or demoblicans, is in power. They both easily consented to the selection of their chief executive officer in violation of the rights of thousands of illegally disenfranchised Black voters, and of their Constitutional system itself that makes no provision for the Supreme Court to make such selection. Both **believe in preserving the** "**national security**" **of AWOL, which means continued, unabated acceleration of extraction, consumption and pollution patterns, and obscene profits for the plutocrats and their bribed oligarchs in Washington. For all this to happen, Mr. Bush, indeed, has laid out the necessary plans for a world imperium to assure, in his and his cohorts' minds, continuation of our Western way of life, business- and profits-as-usual.**  **These oligarchs are not able to perceive the fact that** **further continuation of AWOL guarantees our destruction**. **They are not able to even consider the need for radical contraction and creative alternatives. They act as if blind drunk with their personal and political values of money and power, under the cloak of their disfigured version of Jesus. Unfortunately,** **the inevitable consequences** **of their business-as-usual forces** **are systematic destruction of** virtually **all sustainable ecosystems and human-created institutions**.   **Origins of "Civilization"** **Some history. As the revolution of urban civilization took root some 5,000 years ago the basic ingredients of "Western civilization" were introduced into our human evolutionary journey.** **The basic model of "civilization**," **for all but the most isolated and exceptional Indigenous groups, has seen** the advent of powerful male oligarchs surrounded by elite bureaucracies of scribes and priests, overseeing hierarchies that involuntarily enforced large numbers of laborers, often violently captured during wars, to construct large projects for the pleasure of the king. **Wars, systematic violence,** and harsh class division originated with "civilizations." Secrecy of priestly knowledge about cosmic regularities and calendar-making assured that knowledge was monopolized by the small elite surrounding the oligarch. And **the maxim, "the best defense is attack," was** often **used** in early warfare, roots of **our** preventive **strikes** of today. According to Asian and Scandinavian scholars there have been nearly 15,000 wars during the last 5,000 years.   Extraordinarily Dangerous Trends The U.S. economy reveals increasing vulnerabilities to the fiction and hot air behind Wall Street and the continued exploitation and creation of misery upon which it is based. **The U.S. regime has chosen to protect its illusion** of omnipotence **under the veil of fighting** "terrorism" and its curtailing of civil liberties is similar to a police state. Increasingly desperate means used by people in power to maintain that power is a historically typical, predictable phenomenon. **Never before**, however, **have oligarchs** commanded so much power and **possessed** so many **w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction, **with explicit intentions to use such weapons preventively** rather than defensively. I believe that **we are at a pivotal point** in history**. We sit precariously perched on a ledge overlooking imminent extinction as a very real possibility** at this juncture in our long, 7- to 8-million-year human evolutionary journey. Academics often talk about how history is cyclical, but two demonstrable trends, clearly not cyclical, indicate that **we are dangerously near the end of our evolutionary branch**

**C. Alternative text—reject the affirmative to desecuritize the Political.**

**D. The role of the ballot is to interrogate methodologies—to weigh their case the Aff has to legitimize securitization first**

**Williams, 03** – Professor of International Relations at the University of Ottawa (Michael, December 2003, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics”, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 47, No. 4, JSTOR, KONTOPOULOS) PDF

A second major criticism of the Copenhagen School concerns the ethics of securitization. Simply put, if **security is nothing more than a specific form of social practice-a speech-act tied to existential threat and a politics of emergency**-then does this mean that **anything can be treated as a "security" issue and** that, as a consequence, **any form of violent, exclusionary**, or irrationalist **politics must be viewed simply as another form of "speech-act" and treated "objectively**"? Questions such as these have led many to ask whether despite its avowedly "constructivist" view of security practices, **securitization theory is** implicitly **committed to a methodological objectivism that is politically irresponsible and lacking in any basis from which to critically evaluate claims of threat, enmity, and emergency**.29 A first response to this issue is to note that the Copenhagen School has not shied away from confronting it. In numerous places the question of the ethics of securitization are discussed as raising difficult issues. As Wever has argued in relation to theorizing the highly sensitive issue of identity, for example, Such an approach implies that **we have to take seriously concerns about identity, but have also to study the specific and often problematic effects of their being framed as security issues. We have also to look at the possibilities of handling some of these problems in nonsecurity terms, that is to take on the problems but leave them unsecuritized. This** latter **approach recognizes that social processes are already under way whereby societies have begun to thematize themselves as security agents that are under threat. This process of social construction can be studied, and the security quality of the phenomenon understood, without** thereby actually **legitimizing it.** (1995: 66; see also Waever, 1999). As sustained as these considerations have been, it must be admitted that the answers are somewhat less searching than the questioning, and that this remains one of the most underarticulated aspects of securitization theory (Wyn Jones, 1999: 111-12). I would like to suggest, however, that there are two important issues at stake in these questions, each of which can be clarified through a greater recognition of the Schmittian elements of securitization theory. The first, and simplest point is that in some ways the Copenhagen School treats securitization not as a normative question, 27 I owe this insight especially to Didier Bigo. 28 **Again, there are clear links here between securitization theory and classical Realism's stress on the "ethic of responsibility." 29 Voiced, for example, in Erickson (1999). These issues are, of course, also central to debates concerning social constructivismm ore generally.S ee in particulart he exchange between John Mearsheimer( 1994/95, 1995) and Alexander Wendt (1995).** A broad overview can be found in Price and Reus-Smit (1998). 521 Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics but as an objective process and possibility. Very much like Schmitt, they view securitization as a social possibility intrinsic to political life. In regard to his concept of the political, for example, Schmitt once argued, **It is irrelevant here whether one rejects, accepts, or perhaps finds it an atavistic remnant of barbaric times that nations continue to group themselves according to friend and enemy, or whether it is perhaps strong pedagogic reasoning to imagine that enemies no longer exist at all.** The concern here is neither with abstractions nor normative ideals, but with inherent reality and the real possibility of making such a distinction. One may or may not share these hopes and pedagogic ideals. But, rationally speaking, it cannot be denied that nations continue to group themselves according to the friend-enemy antithesis, that the distinction still remains actual today, and that this is an ever present possibility for every people existing in the political sphere (1996 [1932]: 28).**30 In certain settings, the Copenhagen School seems very close to this position. Securitization must be understood as both an existing reality and a continual possibility.** Yet equally clearly there is a basic ambivalence in this position, for it raises the dilemma that securitization theory must remain at best agnostic in the face of any securitization, even, for example, a fascist speech-act (such as that Schmitt has often been associated with) that securitizes a specific ethnic or racial minority. To say that we must study the conditions under which such processes. I would like to suggest that it is in response to these issues, and in regard to the realm of ethical practice, that the idea of security as a speech-actta kes on an importance well beyond its role as a tool of social explanation. **Casting securitization as a speechact places that act within a framework of communicative action and legitimation that links it to a discursive ethics** that seeks to avoid the excesses of a decisionist account of securitization. While the Copenhagen School has been insufficiently clear in developing these aspects of securitization theory, they link clearly to some of the most interesting current analyses of the practical ethics of social-constructivism. As Thomas Risse (2000) has recently argued, **communicative action is not simply a realm of instrumental rationality and rhetorical manipulation. Communicative action involves a process of argument, the provision of reasons, presentation of evidence, and commitment to convincing others of the validity of one's position. Communicative action** (speech-acts) **are** thus **not just** given **social practices, they are implicated in a process of justification**. Moreover, as processes of dialogue, **communicative action has a potentially transformative capacity**. As Risse puts it: **Argumentative rationality appears to be crucially linked to the constitutive rather than the regulative role of norms and identities by providing actors with a mode of interaction that enables them to mutually challenge and explore the validity claims of those norms and identities. When actors engage in a truth-seeking discourse, they must be prepared to change their own views** of the world, their interests, and sometimes even their identities. (2000: 2)31 30 More broadly,i t can be argued that for Schmitti t was not only a possibilityb, ut a choice, a decision, that he paradoxically saw as necessary if a vital human life was to be lived. For an analysis of Schmitt in relation to a vitalistic romanticisma nd a virulenth ostilityt o liberalisms ee againW olin( 1992). Schmitt'sv italismm arkso ne of the clearest differences with **the Copenhagen School, as discussed below. 31 Risse's analysis here draws greatly on that of Habermas. For Habermas's own treatment of speech-act theory see Habermas (1984). For Habermas's own views on Schmitt see Habermas (1990); a recent brief survey of the relationship between Habermas and Schmitt in the context of International Relations is Wheeler (2000), and a more extended and varied collection is Wyn Jones (2001). As speech-acts, securitizations are in principle forced to enter the realm of discursive legitimation. Speech-act theory entails the possibility of argument, of dialogue, and thereby holds out the potential for the transformation of security perceptions both within and between states. The securitizing speech-act must be accepted by the audience,** and while the Copenhagen School is careful to note that "[a]ccept does not necessarily mean in civilized, dominance-free discussion; it only means that an order always rests on coercion as well as on consent," it is nonetheless the case that "[s**]ince securitization can never only be imposed, there is some need to argue one's case**"(Buzan et al., 1998: 23), and that "[s]uccessful securitization is not decided by the securitizer but by the audience of the security speech-act: does the audience accept that something is an existential threat to a shared value? Thus **security** (as **with all politics)** ultimately **rests** neither with the objects nor with the subjects but **among** the **subjects**"( 1998:31). **It is via this commitment to communicative action and discursive ethics**, I would like to suggest, that the Copenhagen School seeks to avoid the radical realpolitik that might otherwise seem necessarily to follow from the Schmittian elements of the theory of securitization. **Schmitt** appeals to the necessity and inescapability of decision, enmity, and "the political." He **appeals to the mobilizing power** of myth **in the production of friends and enemies, and asserts the need for a single point of decision to the point of justifying dictatorship. He mythologizes war and enmity** as the paramount moments of political life.32 By contrast, the Copenhagen School treats securitization as a social process, and casts it as a phenomenon largely to be avoided. Securitization is the Schmittian realm of the political, and for precisely this reason it is dangerous and-by and large-to be avoided.33 This element of the Copenhagen School is clearly illustrated in the concepts of "desecuritization" and "asecurity" which form integral aspects of securitization theory. As a consequence of their Schmittian understanding of security-and in contrast to many (indeed most) other forms of security studies-the Copenhagen School does not regard security as an unambiguously positive value. In most cases, securitization is something to be avoided. While **casting an issue as one of "security**" may help elevate its position on the political agenda, it also **risks placing that issue within the logic of threat and decision, and potentially within the contrast of friend and enemy**.34 "**Security**,"accordingly, **is** something **to be** invoked with great care and, in general, **minimized** rather than expanded-a movement that should be sought in the name of stability, tolerance, and political negotiation, not in opposition to it. "**Desecuritization" involves** precisely this process; a **moving of issues off the "security" agenda** and back into the realm of public political discourse and "normal" political dispute and accommodation. The transformation of many elements of European security as part of the end of the Cold War stands as a key example (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup, and Lemaitre, 1993). Similarly, the concept of "asecurity" designates a (probably optimal) situation in which relations are so firmly "politicized" that there is little chance of them becoming re-securitized, a case that Waever argues is illustrated by the Nordic countries whose relations with each other constitute an "asecurity community" rather than a "security community" in the more conventional sense (Waver, 1998b). 32 See, for example, the direct discussion of-and partial contrast to-Schmitt's use of enmity in the construction of sovereignty in Waver (1995: fn. 63); Schmitt also figures in the analysis of religion as a "referent object" pursued in Bagge Lausten and Waver (2000:726, 733). 33 Here, too, the links to classical Realism are strong, for as William Scheuerman (1999) has brilliantly illustrated, this was precisely the tack adopted by Hans Morgenthau in his extended critical engagement with Schmitt. 34 Recognizing this particular Schmittian legacy hopefully also helps clarify the dispute between the Copenhagen School and those who think its scepticism toward the word and concept of "security" is politically debilitating. 523 Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics As a contribution to political practice, the sociological analysis of the Copenhagen School attempts to provide tools whereby these transformative processes can be fostered. **By exposing the limits imposed by the securitization of specific issues, it provides resources for challenging these limitations. In presenting security as a speech-act, the Copenhagen School** is doing more than developing a sociological thesis: it is **presenting a political ethic**. This does not mean that securitizations will always be forced to enter the realm of discursive legitimation. Indeed, part of the power of securitization theory lies in its stress on how "security" issues are often or usually insulated from this process of public debate: they operate in the realm of secrecy, of "national security," of decision. Equally, relations may be "sedimented" to such a degree that discursive ethics and tactics of social negotiation are unlikely to succeed and need to be subordinated (at least in the short term) to more traditional mechanisms of (relatively fixed) interest manipulation and material power balancing.35 These are key elements of any analysis of security policy. But the limitations should also not be overstated. **As resistant as they may be**, these **security policies** and relationships **are susceptible to being pulled back into the public realm and capable of transformation**, particularly **when the social consensus underlying the capacity for decision is challenged**, either **by questioning** the **policies**, **or** by **disputing the threat**, or both.36
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**Most qualified experts say Chinese aggression doesn’t mean anything**

**Stratfor 2k1**

[2001 annual forecast, January 1, http://www.stratfor.com/products/premium/read\_article.php?selected=&id=101197&showForecasts=1&forecas

ts=1]

It is impossible to understate the positions of relative weakness of the Russian and Chinese governments, a position that will fuel concern. Neither is prepared militarily, politically, economically or socially to weather serious hostility with the United States. China is only beginning to restructure and upgrade its military. And the Chinese government has only begun to expand its military and political sphere of influence, regionally and globally. The Chinese economy is particularly vulnerable, still relying on a steady flow of foreign direct investment from the United States and its allies. This capital flow is important in controlling the huge social disparities between the regions of China. In addition, China has not yet secured access to vital resources, especially oil, free from potential U.S. interdiction in the event of a crisis like the one that flared in the Taiwan Strait in the 1990s. A premature downturn in relations with Washington would choke off investment and trade - and leave Beijing unable to control the regions and competing domestic interests that threaten to tear China apart.

**Deterrence prevents India/Pakistan conflict.**

**Tepperman ‘9**

Jonathan Tepperman, Deputy Editor at Newsweek Magazine and former Deputy Managing Editor of Foreign Affairs, September 14, 2009, Newsweek, September 14, 2009, Lexis Academic

**The record** since then **shows** the same pattern repeating: **nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back**, always for the same reasons. **The best** recent **example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring** their own **nukes** in 1998. **Getting their hands on w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it **did** dramatically **mellow their behavior**. **Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have** never fought another war**,** despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). **They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up**, in Kashmir in 1999, **both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests**. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and co-author of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. **The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders on each side did what they had to do to avoid it**.

No indo pak war

Mutti 9 – over a decade of expertise covering on South Asia geopolitics, Contributing Editor to Demockracy journal (James, 1/5, Mumbai Misperceptions: War is Not Imminent, http://demockracy.com/four-reasons-why-the-mumbai-attacks-wont-result-in-a-nuclear-war/)

Writer Amitav Ghosh divined a crucial connection between the two messages. “When commentators repeat the metaphor of 9/11, they are in effect pushing the Indian government to mount a comparable response.” Indeed, India’s opposition Hindu nationalist BJP has blustered, “Our response must be close to what the American response was.” Fearful of imminent war, the media has indulged in frantic hand wringing about Indian and Pakistani nuclear arsenals and renewed fears about the Indian subcontinent being “the most dangerous place on earth.” As an observer of the subcontinent for over a decade, I am optimistic that war will not be the end result of this event. As horrifying as the Mumbai attacks were, they are not likely to drive India and Pakistan into an armed international conflict. The media frenzy over an imminent nuclear war seems the result of the media being superficially knowledgeable about the history of Indian-Pakistani relations, of feeling compelled to follow the most sensationalistic story, and being recently brainwashed into thinking that the only way to respond to a major terrorist attack was the American way – a war. Here are four reasons why the Mumbai attacks will not result in a war: 1. For both countries, a war would be a disaster. India has been successfully building stronger relations with the rest of the world over the last decade. It has occasionally engaged in military muscle-flexing (abetted by a Bush administration eager to promote India as a counterweight to China and Pakistan), but it has much more aggressively promoted itself as an emerging economic powerhouse and a moral, democratic alternative to less savory authoritarian regimes. Attacking a fledgling democratic Pakistan would not improve India’s reputation in anybody’s eyes. The restraint Manmohan Singh’s government has exercised following the attacks indicates a desire to avoid rash and potentially regrettable actions. It is also perhaps a recognition that military attacks will never end terrorism. Pakistan, on the other hand, couldn’t possibly win a war against India, and Pakistan’s military defeat would surely lead to the downfall of the new democratic government. The military would regain control, and Islamic militants would surely make a grab for power – an outcome neither India nor Pakistan want. Pakistani president Asif Ali Zardari has shown that this is not the path he wants his country to go down. He has forcefully spoken out against terrorist groups operating in Pakistan and has ordered military attacks against LeT camps. Key members of LeT and other terrorist groups have been arrested. One can hope that this is only the beginning, despite the unenviable military and political difficulties in doing so. 2. Since the last major India-Pakistan clash in 1999, both countries have made concrete efforts to create people-to-people connections and to improve economic relations. Bus and train services between the countries have resumed for the first time in decades along with an easing of the issuing of visas to cross the border. India-Pakistan cricket matches have resumed, and India has granted Pakistan “most favored nation” trading status. The Mumbai attacks will undoubtedly strain relations, yet it is hard to believe that both sides would throw away this recent progress. With the removal of Pervez Musharraf and the election of a democratic government (though a shaky, relatively weak one), both the Indian government and the Pakistani government have political motivations to ease tensions and to proceed with efforts to improve relations. There are also growing efforts to recognize and build upon the many cultural ties between the populations of India and Pakistan and a decreasing sense of animosity between the countries. 3. Both countries also face difficult internal problems that present more of a threat to their stability and security than does the opposite country. If they are wise, the governments of both countries will work more towards addressing these internal threats than the less dangerous external ones. The most significant problems facing Pakistan today do not revolve around the unresolved situation in Kashmir or a military threat posed by India. The more significant threat to Pakistan comes from within. While LeT has focused its firepower on India instead of the Pakistani state, other militant Islamic outfits have not. Groups based in the tribal regions bordering Afghanistan have orchestrated frequent deadly suicide bombings and clashes with the Pakistani military, including the attack that killed ex-Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in 2007. The battle that the Pakistani government faces now is not against its traditional enemy India, but against militants bent on destroying the Pakistani state and creating a Taliban-style regime in Pakistan. In order to deal with this threat, it must strengthen the structures of a democratic, inclusive political system that can also address domestic problems and inequalities. On the other hand, the threat of Pakistani based terrorists to India is significant. However, suicide bombings and attacks are also carried out by Indian Islamic militants, and vast swaths of rural India are under the de facto control of the Maoist guerrillas known as the Naxalites. Hindu fundamentalists pose a serious threat to the safety of many Muslim and Christian Indians and to the idea of India as a diverse, secular, democratic society. Separatist insurgencies in Kashmir and in parts of the northeast have dragged on for years. And like Pakistan, India faces significant challenges in addressing sharp social and economic inequalities. Additionally, Indian political parties, especially the ruling Congress Party and others that rely on the support of India’s massive Muslim population to win elections, are certainly wary about inflaming public opinion against Pakistan (and Muslims). This fear could lead the investigation into the Mumbai attacks to fizzle out with no resolution, as many other such inquiries have. 4. The international attention to this attack – somewhat difficult to explain in my opinion given the general complacency and utter apathy in much of the western world about previous terrorist attacks in places like India, Pakistan, and Indonesia – is a final obstacle to an armed conflict. Not only does it put both countries under a microscope in terms of how they respond to the terrible events, it also means that they will feel international pressure to resolve the situation without resorting to war. India and Pakistan have been warned by the US, Russia, and others not to let the situation end in war. India has been actively recruiting Pakistan’s closest allies – China and Saudi Arabia – to pressure Pakistan to act against militants, and the US has been in the forefront of pressing Pakistan for action. Iran too has expressed solidarity with India in the face of the attacks and is using its regional influence to bring more diplomatic pressure on Pakistan.

**Russia is winning nuclear contracts in India now but the plan pushes them out—the impact is Russia-India cooperation and successful Indian rise**

Bhadrakumar, 12-25-2012 “Wanted: An Ambassador to Russia,” Russia & India Report, [Former Ambassador, MK], http://indrus.in/articles/2012/12/25/wanted\_an\_ambassador\_to\_russia\_21271.html

A tripod becomes unstable if one leg gives way. India’s foreign policy can be compared to a tripod. In the contemporary world situation, the optimal way of taking advantage of the co-relation of forces (which no doubt work to India’s advantage) demands three strong interlocking vectors – its respective partnerships with the United States, China and Russia. 2012 has been a good year for the “defining partnership of the 21st century” between India and the US. Call it maturing, but much realism entered into it, and the Indian side successfully waded through syrupy rhetoric and discerned what is useful and what is not. The desire not to be an Asia-Pacific “lynchpin” was a telling example. 2012 has been a truly transformative year for India-China relations and historians will look back to estimate that the discourse changed. The Indian diplomacy has been at its creative best for a long time. The policymaker worked diligently despite the dispiriting polarisation and upheaval in the country’s domestic politics. But, alas, it is when we come to the traditionally strongest vector of independent India’s foreign policy that a dismal picture emerges – the partnership with Russia. Things became so uncertain that like insects afraid of sunlight, Indian officials dispensed with the customary media briefing as a build-up to President Vladimir Putin’s visit to Delhi. They wouldn’t risk a joint press conference with Putin. Yet, the prying eyes of the media – Indian and western media – could penetrate the aura of unreality masking the steady atrophy of the India-Russia relationship. Putin came as the day dawned and left for home as dusk fell. There is no more any romance – like when Barack Obama and Michelle waltzed through Mumbai or Hillary Clinton’s had her town-hall jigs in Chennai or Kolkata. Arguably, statesmen are also human beings and when Putin with his legendary passion for India went back after such a bare “working visit”, one wonders what were the thoughts that razed through his mind. The western media gleefully put him down as an arms merchant who came to Delhi to sell weapons to the Indians and went back with contracts worth $3 billion tucked away in his brief case. True, the western media never really liked Putin, but in this case they had a point. Putin’s visit laid bare that India-Russia relationship today is largely about defence cooperation. India wants to modernise its military and has ambitions to develop a world-class armament industry (like China’s), but cannot get the technology from anywhere else than Russia. Despite the nuclear deal with the US, the gates of western technology warehouse remains shut and India’s admission to the technology control regimes remains a distant dream. Meanwhile, it is only Russia, which will hand over a nuclear submarine or jointly develop a “hypersonic” missile. Aside defence cooperation, India-Russia ship is running aground having hit two atolls – Kudankulam and Sistema. Quintessentially, the US has finally managed to become the “sleeping partner” in India-Russia nuclear cooperation. The Americans sought a “level playing field”, which meant no Kudankulam 3 and 4 until and unless a way out could be found for the US as well to sell reactors to India. Kudankulam 3 and 4 may have to wait till a “Swadeshi” coalition led by the Bharatiya Janata Party replaces the present leadership in Delhi. But it is the Sistema dispute that raises awkward questions. The Russian company invested in India at the invitation of the UPA government. It is a big investment of $3.1 billion. But the goal post has since been shifted in India and Sistema has been left in the lurch. The UPA pleads helplessness, although it should have pleaded before the Supreme Court for a special dispensation for Sistema since the foreign investor is not mixed up with 2G scam. Besides, it is a case of foreign direct investment. Doesn’t the government intervene in special circumstances with the judiciary? Of course, it does. Ironically, on the eve of Putin’s visit, the government did intervene to let go the two Italian sailors who were under trial in Kochi on murder charges so that as good Roman Catholics, they could enjoy Christmas at home. (Frankly, they may not even return to Kochi and the far-right parties in Italy propose to field them as candidates in the upcoming parliamentary election to show the thumb at India.) Be that as it may, UPA government is preaching to the Russians the mystique of the separation of powers between the executive and the judiciary in India. Unsurprisingly, Russians aren’t impressed. In the kind of crony capitalism prevailing in India, a similar affected Indian business house would compromise with the ruling party and strike a Faustian deal to secure a honey pot somewhere else so that nothing is eventually lost when the balance sheet is drawn, and the gravy train rolls on. But a foreign investor can’t be expected to subscribe to our political culture. Suffice to say, Sistema is stuck in the Indian-Russian throat. India can’t – and Russia won’t – spit it out. And neither can pretend that life is normal so long as this lump remains stuck in the throat just where the larynx separates things from the oesophagus. There is a real danger of asphyxiation. The missing link Russia, like any ambitious power, is a serious practitioner of globalization. Its trade with China touches $100 billion, with European Union $490 billion. The IMF data puts its foreign currency reserves as of November at $528 billion. Something like 20000 companies from the EU have Russian subsidiaries, about 6000 of them from Germany alone. Around 80 percent of the EU’s foreign investment goes to Russia. Surely, India can have a much bigger trade volume than the abysmally low $10 billion annually when Turkey can pile up a flourishing Russia trade of $35 billion. Why is the Turkish analogy important? First, Turkey was Russia’s cold war adversary and came from behind India to storm past it as Russia’s economic partner. Second, it says something about national priorities. Russia and Turkey enjoy none of the profound trust and mutual understanding that characterises Russia-India relations. Turkey is Russia’s strategic adversary-cum-rival in a number of situations in regional politics. Yet, the stress is on cool pragmatism, which downplays political rifts and strategic discords and instead focuses on trade partnership and energy cooperation. The missing link in the India-Russia relations is economic content. Paradoxically, with or without each other’s help, the two countries are capable of pursuing a robustly independent foreign policy in today’s multi-polar world. Each is also perfectly capable of pursuing its core interests on the global arena. The progression toward a democratised world order that accommodates the emerging powers is an inexorable process and is not predicated on India and Russia working shoulder to shoulder. However, at the end of the day, a relationship such as India and Russia’s would have a dim future if it were not built on the bedrock of a vibrant economic partnership. The two countries would drift apart unknowingly. Sadly, this is already happening. It is sad because the relationship with Russia serves a crucial purpose for India in balancing – energizing, stimulating, complementing, substituting, supplementing – its partnership with the US and China. Simply put, without a strong pivotal relationship with Russia, Indian diplomacy becomes poorer, suboptimal.

**Russia-India relations key to prevent India-Pakistan war**

Mahapatra, 12-24-12, A time-tested partnership,” Russia & India Report,[Indian commentator with areas of interests include India-Russia relations, conflict and peace, and strategic aspects of Eurasian politics; Dr. Debidatta Aurobinda], p. <http://indrus.in/articles/2012/12/24/a_time-tested_partnership_21235.html>

Russia may be interested to play a friendly role in developing trust between India and Pakistan. Kadakin pointed out Russia is ready to play “whatever possible” role to improve Indo-Pak ties. In the past, Soviet Union had played a key role particularly after the Indo-Pak war of 1965, to broker peace in Tashkent between the two warring countries. Leaders of India and Pakistan had highly appreciated the Soviet role, particularly its Prime Minister, Alexi Kosygin, in nudging the two countries to sign agreement of peace. Russia’s already good relationship with India, and its emerging bonhomie with Pakistan, may play a positive role for peace and stability in South Asia. It needs emphasis that India-Russia political and strategic partnership is seamless throughout the decades since India got independence. Perhaps this seamless nature of the relationship makes the analysts and policy makers to take the partnership for granted. But as the Putin visit takes place, the political and strategic content of the relationship will find not only reiteration but also witness some significant agreements towards making the world, including Afghanistan and South Asia, a peaceful and stable place.

**US has already lost the free trade battle to China – market dominance exists now**

**Auslin**, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, August 15, 20**11**, [Michael, “Build, Hold, and Clear: An American Strategy for Asia ,” online: http://www.aei.org/print?pub=articleandpubId=103997andauthors=%3Ca%20href=scholar/127%3EMichael%20Auslin%3C/a%3E] SM

The Indo-Pacific's great economic dynamism makes it especially unfortunate that, under the Obama administration, the U.S. has surrendered the high ground on free trade. We are losing to China, which has steadily expanded its free-trade zones, including with ASEAN, though in ways that do not protect workers' rights or build in rigorous consumer-safety mechanisms. Washington needs to recapture leadership on free trade, ensuring markets for American exports, continued affordable consumer goods at home, and the free flow of ideas that benefits economic activity. Our position in the Indo-Pacific will become less tenable if we are a bystander to the growth of India, Vietnam, Indonesia, and other countries.

**Squo solves**

**Domenici**, Former U.S. Senator and Bipartisan Policy Senior Fellow, **and Miller,** Ph.D, Former Department of energy Assistant **September** 20**12** [Senator Pete V., and Dr. Warren F. “Pete” “Maintaining U.S. ¶ Leadership in ¶ Global Nuclear ¶ Energy Markets,” ¶ A Report of the Bipartisan ¶ Policy Center’s Nuclear Initiative, Energy and Infrastructure Program] SM

COMMERCIAL NUCLEAR OPERATIONS ¶ As the world’s largest commercial nuclear operator and ¶ dominant weapons state, the United States has traditionally ¶ been the clear leader on international nuclear issues. Today, ¶ the United States still accounts for approximately one- ¶ quarter of commercial nuclear reactors in operation around ¶ the world and one-third of global nuclear generation.33 This ¶ position is likely to shift in coming decades, as new nuclear ¶ investments go forward in other parts of the world while ¶ slowing or halting in the United States. In past decades, ¶ the United States was also a significant exporter of nuclear ¶ materials and technologies, but this dominance too has ¶ slowly declined. ¶ At present, however, the U.S. safety and security ¶ infrastructure and regulatory framework remain without ¶ peer and U.S. expertise and guidance on operational ¶ and regulatory issues continues to be sought around ¶ the world. The domestic nuclear industry established the INPO in the wake of the Three Mile Island accident ¶ in 1979 in a collective effort to hold all industry players ¶ accountable to the highest standards for safe and reliable ¶ commercial operations. Similarly, the NRC is seen as the ¶ gold standard for commercial nuclear regulation. As long ¶ as other countries seek to learn from the experience and ¶ expertise of U.S. firms and regulators, the United States will ¶ enjoy greater access to international nuclear programs. A ¶ substantial reduction in domestic nuclear energy activities ¶ could erode U.S. international standing.

--- NO PROLIF – 5 reasons

Evans and Kawaguchi – co-chairs of the International Nuclear Non-Proliferation Disarmament Commission which includes 27 distinguished nuclear experts from around the globe **–** 12-16-09

[Gareth Evans, currently an Honorary Professorial Fellow at the University of Melbourne, President Emeritus of the Brussels-based International Crisis Group, degrees in Law and Arts from Melbourne and Oxford, and Honorary Doctorates from Melbourne, Sydney and Carleton universities, and is an Honorary Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, Yoriko Kawaguchi, B.A. in international relations from the University of Tokyo, and a master's in economics from Yale University, dozens of other top-level officials, “ELIMINATING NUCLEAR THREATS Report of the A Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers”, online]

3.18 It is important to keep all these concerns in perspective, and not unduly exaggerate them. Major surges have been predicted before but have not eventuated – in the 1960s (when almost every country of any capacity, including Australia, was exploring the option) and the 1970s (when there may have been less confidence in U.S. security guarantees following its failure in Vietnam). There is nothing automatic or inevitable about a country’s decision to acquire nuclear weapons, and multiple factors – five in particular – have in the past, and will in the future, impose a strong sense of caution and restraint. 3.19 First among them is the normative force of the NPT itself, which is why it is so important to maintain and strengthen its effectiveness, a recurring theme of this report. A second, related, consideration is that status and prestige cuts both ways: while this has always been thought to be a factor motivating states to acquire nuclear weapons – to be up there with the Permanent Five globally, and to be a very big dog on the regional block – it may well be that, these days, more respect attaches to a show of restraint, and commitment to international norms or, putting it another way, of good international citizenship. A third, and again related, factor is that domestic public opinion is often a powerful restraining force, as it very much has been – and is likely to continue to be – in Japan: leaders who run against that tide run major political risks. 3.20 A fourth, and very powerful factor, is the existence of strong security guarantees from a credible alliance partner: there can be no doubt that the extended deterrence offered by the U.S. nuclear umbrella has been a major reason over the decades why states in Europe and North East Asia, in particular, have been willing to forego a nuclear weapons option even when perceiving themselves to be very vulnerable to nuclear attack. (Whether there is any justification for a nuclear – as distinct from conventional-weapon umbrella – sheltering allies from non-nuclear threats is a question taken up later in this report.) 3.21 The remaining major consideration is simply technological capability, which is too often glossed over. There is a real gap between possession of a first class nuclear research and civil power generation capability and the development of the technologies to support a full weapons program which should not be underestimated. That is why, for example, one should not make too many easy assumptions about the capacity of countries like Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Turkey to respond quickly to a move by Iran to acquire nuclear-armed status. But that said, crash programs can achieve extraordinary results: Israel was characterized in a recent U.S. Defense Science Board study as having had, in 1960 “Nil Weapons Potential”, but within five years had moved up the chart to “Modest”, then “High” to “Potential for Serial Production”, i.e. full nuclear-armed status. On balance this Commission, while not wishing to 3.22 be unduly alarmist or to exaggerate the extent to which a trickle of break-outs is likely to turn into a flood, is deeply concerned about the present vulnerability of the nonproliferation regime, and believes that it is of paramount importance that it be systemically strengthened, and that this be supplemented by an intelligent and constructive case by case approach to particular problem areas as they now appear, and arise in the future. These will be recurring themes in later sections of this report as policy options are more specifically addressed.

Doesn’t cause war

Waltz, 07 – Professor of Political Science at UC Berkeley (Kenneth, 3/22/07, “A Nuclear Iran”, Journal of International Affairs, Lexis Nexis, KONTOPOULOS)

First, nuclear proliferation is not a problem because nuclear weapons have not proliferated. "Proliferation" means to spread like wildfire. We have had nuclear military capability for over fifty years, and we have a total of nine militarily capable nuclear states. That's hardly proliferation; that is, indeed, glacial spread. If another country gets nuclear weapons, and if it does so for good reasons, then that isn't an object of great worry. Every once in a while, some prominent person says something that'sobviously true. Recently, Jacques Chirac [president of France] said that if Iran had one or two nuclear weapons, it would not pose a danger. Well, he was right. Of course, he had to quickly retract it and say, "Oh no, that slipped out, I didn't know the microphone was on!" Second, it doesn't matter who has nuclear weapons. Conversely, the spread of conventional weapons makes a great deal of difference. Forinstance, if a Hitler-type begins to establish conventional superiority, it becomes very difficult to contain and deter him. But, with nuclear weapons, it's been proven without exception that whoever gets nuclear weapons behaves with caution and moderation. Every country--whether they are countries we trust and think of as being highly responsible, like Britain, or countries that we distrust greatly, and for very good reasons, like China during the Cultural Revolution behaves with such caution. It is now fashionable for political scientists to test hypotheses.Well, I have one: If a country has nuclear weapons, it will not be attacked militarily in ways that threaten its manifestly vital interests. That is 100 percent true, without exception**,** over a period of more than fifty years. Pretty impressive.

## 1nC Russia F/L

**No solvency—Russian scientists won’t cooperate on nuclear energy—fear prosecution under treason law**

Berls, 2012, The Future of U.S. Russia Relations: Beyond 2012, PANEL TWO

INTERESTS AND VALUES, November 28, [Senior Advisor, Nuclear Materials Security Program and Director, Moscow Office; Robert], p. http://carnegieendowment.org/files/112812\_REBeyond2012\_Panel\_2\_transcript.pdf

There is some – right now, an ongoing negotiation between the Department of Energy – the U.S. Department of Energy and Rosatom about developing a – or signing very soon an agreement on R & D cooperation that would allow for a resumption – a lot of the work that was done during the 1990s in lab-to-lab cooperation. So this – and there’s a lot to be done in Russia by American scientists. I mean, the Russians have some pretty advanced systems in nuclear energy that the Americans would like to be able to study, so it would be an exchange of scientists. The big caveat, I think, right now is this new law on treason. Will it so scare Russian scientists away from any cooperation that this type of – this R & D agreement will be an empty document? It’s hard to say, but – I think there are opportunities out there, but it’s going to be a tough slug forward making that happen.

**Self-interest ensures Russian cooperation on terrorism and proliferation**

Kramer & Shevtsova, 2-21-13, The American Interest, Here We Go Again: Falling for the Russian Trap [former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, is president of Freedom House; senior fellow at the Carnegie Moscow Center; David; Lilia], p. http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1391

America, after all, remains focused on dealing with threats from Iran, North Korea, terrorism, and proliferation. On the first two of those, Russia has probably provided all the cooperation it can; on terrorism and proliferation, more can be done but that is because they are top Russian priorities as well. Even so, however, there are limits to what can be accomplished with a regime like Putin’s. Pursuit of such “strategic cooperation” will never lead to “strategic partnership.” This cooperation may be the best the West and the United States can do, at least until the end of Obama’s second term, after which a new administration will come to office thinking it knows the right way to work with Russia. But one has to take this approach for what it is and not for what it is not. One has to understand that such an approach distracts from the real problems in Russian-American relations and the actual situation in Russia.

**No solvency—Lack of agreement on BMD, conventional weapons and troops, and TNWs block further arms reductions by the US and Russia**

Hahn, 2013, US and Russian Bilateral Agenda: Preventing a full meltdown in relations, March 5, [Adjunct Professor and Researcher of Monterey Terrorism Research and Education Program & Senior Associate (Non-Resident) at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; Gordon], p. http://www.bsr-russia.com/en/economy/item/3302-us-and-russian-bilateral-agenda-preventing-a-full-meltdown-in-relations.html

The larger issue in U.S./Russia relations is nuclear arms and missile defense talks. Here matters stand at a post-Cold War low point, and progress will be difficult and is unlikely. New START nuclear arms reduction treaty stipulates that by 2018 the two nuclear superpowers cut their arsenals to 1,550 deployed warheads. In December 2011 then Russian president Dmitry Medvedev threatened that Russia would abandon the New START treaty––if the U.S. begins to deploy the planned anti-missile defense system (AMD) in Europe. Other roadblocks to a new strategic arms agreement include Russian demands for a legally binding document that would pledge the U.S. not to deploy the AMD system against Russia and for a conventional arms agreement covering weapons and troops in Europe be concluded before nuclear arms talks. For its part, the U.S. wants to include theater-scale and tactical nuclear missiles in any talks on strategic intercontinental ballistic missiles.

**Plan causes US-Russia coop—enables reductions of 1000, beyond New START levels**

Rybachenkov ’12 (A RUSSIAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE FUTURE OF ARMS CONTROL AND MUTUAL DETERRENCE1 Vladimir Rybachenkov2 1 Text of presentation at the Fourth Annual Nuclear Deterrence Summit, Arlington, VA, USA, February 14-17, 2012. 2 Senior Research Scientist, Center for Arms Control, Energy and Environment Studies

Though the Military doctrine of Russia and the US Nuclear Posture Review (both documents adopted in 2010) stipulate that the use of nuclear weapons would only be considered in extreme circumstance when the very existence of the state is under a threat, there is still a risk of an unauthorized or accidental launch. Moreover, in the era of globalization nuclear deterrence is inevitably conducive to further nuclear pro- liferation. A question emerges at this point: what should be done to move our countries away from relations framed by a model of mutually assured destruction which continues to prevail in the US – Russian dialogue? The logical answer would be to proceed gradu- ally with further reductions of nuclear arms levels on the basis of the minimal suffi- ciency principle, to enhance strategic stability in the context of equal security for all and to exclude the possibility of first nuclear strike or missile launch due to a tech- nical failure or shortage of time for the political leaders to make a decision. The New START Treaty, which reduced nuclear arsenals of Russia and the USA by 30% in comparison with the 2003 Moscow Treaty, made an important contribution to building predictability and confidence between our countries. A stage was set to further reductions eventually going down to the level of 1000 deployed warheads but evidently this would require involvement of other nuclear states.

**New START didn’t lead to Russian TNW reductions—further reductions would**

Miles Pomper, Center for Nonproliferation Studies Senior Research Associate, William Potter, Center for Nonproliferation Studies Director, and Professor, Nikolai Sokov, Center for Nonproliferation Studies Senior Research Associate, 12/4/2009, Breaking the U.S.-Russian deadlock on nonstrategic nuclear weapons,' http://thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/breaking-the-us-russian-deadlock-nonstrategic-nuclear-weapons

As U.S. and Russian negotiators hammer out a replacement to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which expires tomorrow, some Republican senators have already criticized PDF negotiators for not including nonstrategic nuclear weapons--a category of nuclear arms not subject to legally binding limits or verification and one in which there is a great disparity between U.S. and Russian holdings. The U.S. nonstrategic nuclear arsenal is estimated at 1,100 warheads (150-200 of them stationed in five European countries--Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey) while Russian nonstrategic stocks may number as high as 5,000 warheads.1 Although unwilling to include limitations on nonstrategic nuclear weapons in the current negotiations, U.S. and Russian officials have indicated that nonstrategic nuclear arsenals might be addressed in a new set of arms control talks that is expected to commence after the START replacement treaty is ratified.

**Russia-China war is coming – Russian TNWs deter it**

Saaradzhyan, Harvard Kennedy School's Belfer Center Research Fellow, January 2010

Simon, "Russia’s NoN-stRategic NucleaR WeapoNs iN theiR cuRReNt coNfiguRatioN aNd postuRe: a stRategic asset oR liability?," http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/russian-position-NSNWs.pdf

Serving as a equalizer vis-a-vis China whose conventional forces in the Far East are already su- perior to Russia’s assets in the region and this disparity continues to grow. The two countries have settled their border disputes, signed a treaty of friendship in 2001 and are partners in the Shang- hai Cooperation Organization. They also agreed to not be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other or to target their nuclear weapons at each other in a deal signed in 1992.33 However, all this doesn’t fully preclude the possibility that fast-growing China, which is already challenging Russia’s dominance in oil- and gas-rich Central Asia, will not come to pose a security threat to Russia’s resource-rich Siberia and Far East in the future. While Russian officials generally remain mum on the issue, former officials and Russian experts do point to the potential threat of China’s conventional supremacy. “After the end of the Cold War...Moscow lost its superiority in conventional forces over NATO, China and the far eastern alliance led by the U.S,” according to Alexei Arbatov, one of Russia’s most authoritative arms con-trol experts who has reportedly been one of the co-authors of Russia’s official Strategy of National Security Until Year 2020 that President Dmitry Medvedev approved in May 2009.34 Now Russia sees its non-strategic nuclear weapons as the “nuclear equalizer” for lagging behind the West and China in conventional forces, according to Arbatov.35 More recently, the Defense Ministry has edged closer to acknowledging that China could become a rival. In July 2009 a reporter for the Defense Ministry’s newspaper Krasnaya Zvezda pointed out to General Nikolai Makarov that one of the slides in the commander’s own presentation “show that it is, afterall, NATO and China that are the most dangerous of our geopolitical rivals.” He then asked the general whether the brigades, which have replaced Cold War era divisions to make the armed forces more fit to fight local conflicts as opposed to all-out wars of the 20th century, will be prepared to “conduct defensive operations in massive warfare.”36 Makarov didn’t mention either China or NSNW in his answer, but earlier at the same conference he did point out that “in terms of China, we are conducting a very balanced, well-thought policy.” 37 However, as someone who has worked as a defense and security journalist in Russia for 15 years, the author of this article can note that Krasnaya Zvezda reporters more often than not get pre-approval for the questions they ask top commanders, so the reference to China as a “strongest geopolitical rival” is no accident. More recently, in what leading Russian military expert Alexander Khramchikhin rightfully described as an “epochal statement,” chief of the Ground Forces Staff Lt. General Sergei Skokov stated in September 2009, when describing what kind of warfare the newly-established Russian army brigades should prepare for, “If we talk about the east, then it could be a multi-million- strong army with traditional approaches to conducting combat operations: straightforward, with large concentrations of personnel and firepower along individual operational directions.”. Significantly, the only of the Russian Army’s twenty four divisions to avoid re-organization into brigades is located in the Far East and its firepower is mostly submachine guns and artillery, according to the Defense Ministry.38 “For the first time since the early days of Gorbachev, a high-ranking national commander has de facto acknowledged officially that PRC is our potential enemy,” Khramchikhin wrote of Skokov’s statement.39

**No nuclear terrorism**

**---no desire –--can’t obtain: states deterred, no “loose nukes”, safeties check theft**

**---technical and financial hurdles**

Mueller ‘9

[John, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, “THE ATOMIC TERRORIST?”, April 30, http://www.icnnd.org/research/Mueller\_Terrorism.pdf]

Thus far terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists on the issue, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. It is highly improbable that a would-be atomic terrorist would be given or sold a bomb by a generous like-minded nuclear state because the donor could not control its use and because the ultimate source of the weapon might be discovered. Although there has been great worry about terrorists illicitly stealing or purchasing a nuclear weapon, it seems likely that neither “loose nukes” nor a market in illicit nuclear materials exists. Moreover, finished bombs have been outfitted with an array of locks and safety devices. There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were utterly to fail, collapsing in full disarray. However, even under those conditions, nuclear weapons would likely remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb would most likely end up going off in their own territory, would still have locks, and could probably be followed and hunted down by an alarmed international community. The most plausible route for terrorists would be to manufacture the device themselves from purloined materials. This task requires that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered in sequence, including the effective recruitment of people who at once have great technical skills and will remain completely devoted to the cause. In addition, a host of corrupted co-conspirators, many of them foreign, must remain utterly reliable, international and local security services must be kept perpetually in the dark, and no curious outsider must get consequential wind of the project over the months or even years it takes to pull off. In addition, the financial costs of the operation could easily become monumental. Moreover, the difficulties are likely to increase because of enhanced protective and policing efforts by self-interested governments and because any foiled attempt would expose flaws in the defense system, holes the defenders would then plug. The evidence of al-Qaeda’s desire to go atomic, and about its progress in accomplishing this exceedingly difficult task, is remarkably skimpy, if not completely negligible. The scariest stuff—a decade’s worth of loose nuke rumor—seems to have no substance whatever. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in an al-Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan: “Make use of that which is available ... rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach.” In part because of current policies—but also because of a wealth of other technical and organizational difficulties—the atomic terrorists’ task is already monumental, and their likelihood of success is vanishingly small. Efforts to further enhance this monumentality, if cost-effective and accompanied with only tolerable side effects, are generally desirable.

# 2NC

**Haynes ev concedes plan won’t come online until 2025 at best---happens after the DA AND it says China is UNCERTAIN about HTGR**

**Haynes ’12** (Mark Haynes President, Concordia Power On Behalf Of The NGNP Industry Alliance Testimony On “Helium: Supply Shortages Impacting our Economy, National Defense and Manufacturing” July 20, 2012

Opportunity for U.S. Leadership in HTGR Technology Deployment Currently, Japan, China, Russia and Korea have existing HTGR programs – **including operating** test **reactors in Japan and China. Of these, China’s is by far the most aggressive** with a small test reactor currently in operation for 10 years and a commercial scale demonstration in the early stages of construction. The willingness and ability of the Chinese to move forward with any exports of their specific HTGR technology variant are unclear. **There is a strong potential for the U.S. to become the dominant world player in HTGR technology**. The U.S. advantage in this technology **stems from a long-term R&D program** at the Department, a well-developed industry base including potential major industrial end-users, and what is likely **the most successful HTGR fuel development and testing program in history** and as noted, a U.S. fuel vendor is poised to move forward to provide for commercial scale fuel development. Further, **solid groundwork has been laid for licensing** the technology at the NRC. In addition, the U.S. is host to at least three major international graphite companies whose historic legacy and current work in the field would allow a quick scale up into large-scale production. Summary **Post‐Fukushima, the HTGR brings a new level of intrinsic safety** that enables its co‐location with other industries and communities. It can dramatically reduce CO2 emissions from petrochemical production, petroleum refining and extraction of bitumen from oil sands and shale. **It is economical today in Europe, Asia and the Middle East** where natural gas price is tied to oil parity. The Alliance concludes that even U.S. gas prices are likely to emerge in a range that will make this technology competitive for process heat and power in the 2020+ time‐frame as utilities, transportation and natural gas compete to arbitrage the current U.S. price advantage. Further, if one envisions oil in the $130+ per barrel range in the 2020+ time‐frame, it provides an economic approach to production of synthetic fuels from indigenous carbon sources with virtually no carbon footprint. It is the game changing technology that can address the overarching global energy policy goals of energy and feedstock security, economic growth/GDP (jobs) and carbon footprint (climate). Based on the current trajectory, **if funding were sufficient in the coming years, this technology could be deployed** initially in the mid 2025 time frame. As with LWR SMRs, there are several compelling reasons for the federal government to support the development of HTGRs. However, by the nature of the HTGR potential markets, the reasons are somewhat different: 1. Growth in the Economy and Jobs – The Alliance’s market analysis indicates that within the first 25 years of application in the U.S. and the Alberta oil sands industry, nearly a trillion dollars in gross domestic product could be generated. Further, **the modular HTGR is particularly well suited for small to medium and developing countries, with its scalable modular deployment and superior safety characteristics** that do not rely on intervention of any systems or people to safely avoid major events during operation. Altogether, this translates into profitable growth in new market sectors for the nuclear energy system and equipment suppliers, owner/operators and energy end-user industries with many thousands of highly-skilled, high-paying jobs. This growth is good for industry and good for the U.S., North America and other countries that choose to participate and engage this technology. **China is already underway with the deployment of their version of a modular HTGR design that may compete globally**. 2. Energy Price Stability – The HTGR energy pricing is expected to be stable over an operational plant life of more than 60 years by virtue of the fact that <20% of the energy cost is tied directly to the fuel raw material. By supplanting natural gas and other fossil fuels for producing heat, the modular HTGR provides insulation from energy price variability. 3. Alternative Uses for Indigenous Carbon Resources & Improving Energy Security – HTGR technology provides an attractive path to take advantage of indigenous carbon (coal, pet coke, municipal solid waste, etc.) by gasifying the carbon with co-production of hydrogen, all using the modular HTGR technology, and ending-up with chemical feedstock or transportation fuels. As an example, if you matched-up about thirty-one 50,000 barrels-per-day carbon conversion plants with the annual coal production output of Kentucky, you could convert that coal to transportation fuels equivalent to about one fourth of the U.S. import demand today with minimal CO2 emissions. This improves both energy security and independence. 4. Minimizes Carbon Emissions – Environmental factors range from incremental advantages associated with fuel utilization, waste management, land use and cooling water requirements. Unique within nuclear, the modular HTGR is the only carbon reducing game-changing technology on the foreseeable horizon for supplanting fossil fuels in the production of high temperature process heat. The end-user community that is driving the Alliance envisions a path that would eliminate as much as 80% of its carbon footprint with this technology. Substantially lower carbon footprints cannot be achieved without bold technology advances. 5. Minimizes Water Usage – The high thermal efficiency of modular HTGR technology can make use of dry cooling as an economic alternative in those areas where water is limited. 6. Exports - HTGRs may have a special potential in terms of export. **Many of our U.S. industrial process heat users are also major U.S. based international companies. If those companies adopt HTGRs for their U.S. based facilities, they may then readily adopt them for one or more of their overseas facilities**. Or alternatively**, after HTGRs are licensed in the U.S., they may choose to adopt the reactors at one or more of their non-U.S. facilities first. Either way, this export pathway seems unique to HTGRs.**

**The elements of China’s nuclear policy now and the future excludes HTGR---prefer it because it cites a Chinese white paper**

**WNA, 12** - World Nuclear Association (July 2012, "Nuclear Power in China", http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf63.html, KONTOPOULOS)

Reactor technology

China has set the following points as key elements of its nuclear energy policy:

PWRs will be the mainstream but not sole reactor type.

Nuclear fuel assemblies are fabricated and supplied indigenously.

Domestic manufacturing of plant and equipment will be maximised, with self-reliance in design and project management.

International cooperation is nevertheless encouraged.

## Electricity Prices

## 2NC---Overview---Economy Shell

Specifically, decline magnifies existing impacts—this proves the DA turns the aff 1st

**Miller, 08** – Journalist for Digital Journal (G. Robert M., 10/25/08, “Guns vs. Shovels – The Central Question Behind Our Next Economy”, <http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/261595>, KONTOPOULOS)

But before we look at **the modern ‘Guns versus Butter’ model**, it first has to be noted that this phrase **was originally popularized in a time where securing economic prosperity was a primary concern in nearly every nation**. More importantly, **when** **these nations did experience economic collapse, nearly all of them chose Guns.** There is no question that **Nazi aggression spawned World War II, however, what was happening in Europe became a world war for** a purpose as central to the heart of the capitalist as was the instantaneous end of the holocaust to the heart of the compassionate; **economic prosperity**. Simply said, **big wars are big money; and to truly break from the embrace of the Great Depression, a big commitment to the economy was necessary. And due to the leadership that guided the balance between ‘Guns and Butter’ in the US through World War II, the economy was considerably improved**; this was true for many western nations.

## 2NC---UQ

**Most recent ev**

Electricity prices at historic lows now – shale gas, utility actions prove

Reuters 3/6/13 "US utilities seen burning more coal as prices decline," http://www.miningweekly.com/article/us-utilities-seen-burning-more-coal-as-prices-decline-2013-03-06

In 2012, the price of gas, which has historically been more expensive than coal, dropped to a more than ten-year low due primarily to record shale gas production.¶ Those weak gas prices depressed power prices to at least decade lows in most regions and in part caused generators to switch from coal to gas plants in record numbers.¶ Since 2009, generators have announced plans to shut more than 40 000 MW of coal-fired capacity over the next several years as the weak power prices make it uneconomic for them to invest in emission control equipment needed to keep the older coal plants compliant with stricter environmental rules.

## 2NC---Link---Nuclear

**New nuclear reactors drive up electricity costs—studies predict a doubling or tripling of current electricity rates due to energy efficiency and building costs—that’s Cooper.**

**Nuclear power triples the cost that consumers pay**

Madsen et al 2009 (Travis, Analyst @ Frontier Group and Maryland PIRG Foundation, Johanna Neumann @ Maryland PIRG Foundation, and Emily Rusch @ CalPIRG Education Fund, "The High Cost of Nuclear Power," <http://www.nirs.org/nukerelapse/calvert/highcostnpower_mdpirg.pdf>)

Compounding the problem are the high cost estimates for new nuclear reactors. Some estimates of the cost of power from a new nuclear reactor range as high as 25 to 30 cents per kWh – triple electricity rates in most parts of the country. Adding power at even half this price to a service territory could increase the cost that consumers pay for electricity, motivating additional efforts to conserve and dampening the power demand the plant was built to serve. This exact situation contributed to the failure of the last wave of nuclear power plant construction in the United States. Dozens of reactors were cancelled, and billions of dollars in unnecessary investment were lost.

**Nuclear power displaces the low prices of natural gas---causes spikes in consumers rate**

Niemeyer 3/6/12 (Kyle, science writer for Ars Technica. He has B.S. and M.S. degrees in Aerospace Engineering from Case Western Reserve University, and is currently a Ph.D. candidate focusing on combustion modeling, "Chain reaction: the (slow) revival of US nuclear power," http://arstechnica.com/science/2012/03/chain-reaction-the-slow-revival-of-us-nuclear-power/)

Proponents for greater use of nuclear power often tout its low cost and zero emissions. According to the US Energy Information Administration, electricity from nuclear power will cost 11.39 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) in 2016. By comparison, conventional coal plants would generate electricity at 9.5 cents per kWh and onshore wind at 9.7 cents per kWh. Advanced natural gas plants offer by far the lowest cost at 6.6 cents per kWh.¶ However, it isn’t the cost of electricity that’s the problem. The largest barrier to more nuclear power plants may be the initial cost of construction. According to the report, the capital cost of nuclear plants always escalated over original estimates. The final costs of plants built through 1980—meaning all of them, since only one has been built since 1978—were on average 50 percent higher than comparable coal plants. This even includes retrofits to the coal plants to meet the higher emissions standards of the Clean Air Act.¶ Comparison of electricity costs from nuclear, coal, and gas from different studies.¶ Wikimedia Commons¶ Cost escalation remains an issue. A group of companies announced a two-reactor project in Texas in 2006, with an estimated cost of $5.2 billion. Three years later, the cost was revised to $10 billion, then $13 billion a few weeks later. The final estimate eventually reached $18.2 billion, over three times the original estimate. That's more expensive than an equivalently-sized natural gas plants, which also wouldn’t take nearly as long to build.¶ Considering the increasingly low price of electricity from natural gas, the report emphasized the need for some sort of carbon pricing to make nuclear attractive. Natural gas power plants are beginning to replace coal plants and they emit about half the greenhouse gases. Without a price on carbon dioxide emissions, nuclear power is actually more expensive than coal, oil, or natural gas, due to the massive upfront cost.

## 2NC---U.S. Key to World

**U.S. key to world economy**

U.S. key to the world economy—there’s no uniqueness for their defense—every major world economy from Europe to Japan to China are either slowing down or in recession, the U.S. is the determinant whether the global economy will enter a recession or not—that’s World Crunch.

World Crunch, 10-30-12, Facing The Fiscal Cliff, Obama Is Best Hope For Global Economy, p. http://www.worldcrunch.com/eyes-on-the-u.s./facing-the-fiscal-cliff-obama-is-best-hope-for-global-economy/us-elections-obama-romney-fiscal-cliff/c5s10001/#.UJPZJWcsH-s

The fiscal cliff would include both the expiration of the Bush tax cuts and the end of cuts to employers' taxes, put in place by Obama. It would also mean the end of unemployment insurance and drastic cuts in public spending for defense, healthcare and other government sectors, for a total of $100 billion in cuts per year. According to the Congressional Budget Office, that would prompt a 1.3 percent contraction in the US economy next year. With most of Europe in recession, Japan stagnated, China slowing down and the US still shaky, a new US recession could have wide-reaching and unpredictable consequences for the global economy. There is no question that the strong numbers in Latin American economies will cool. In this scenario, there would be a real possibility of a global depression, just as we nearly experienced four years ago.

**It’s a ripple effect—U.S. is key**

**Daily Yomiuri, 09** (1/3/09, “Global Economic Revival Hinges on U.S. Recovery”, Lexis Nexis, KONTOPOULOS)

As if rolling down a steep hill, the global economy has deteriorated rapidly since being hit by the financial crisis that started in the United States. Trying times will no doubt continue in 2009. Developed countries, including the United States, European nations and Japan, entered into economic recessions last year, while the four big newly emerging countries, including China and India, saw their booming economies slow down significantly. The International Monetary Fund predicts that the global economy will further slow this year, with global economic growth rate in real terms to be only about 2 percent. It is the first time since the end of World War II that Japan, the United States and European countries will all register negative economic growth at the same time. China meanwhile is expected to see single-digit economic growth for the second consecutive year. Rise together, fall together The so-called decoupling theory, which posits that the economic doldrums of developed countries can be covered by the high growth of the newly emerging economies, has crumbled like cookies. The world cannot find a way out of simultaneous recessions in the absence of an economic engine. When will recovery of the global economy come? Even optimistic economists say the latter half of 2010 or later. The key factor is the recovery of the U.S. economy. In the United States, housing market conditions continue to deteriorate and the number of unemployed is sharply increasing. Consumer spending, which accounts for 70 percent of U.S. gross domestic product, also remains sluggish. Taking such situations into consideration, the U.S. Federal Reserve Board introduced an essentially zero-interest-rate policy at the end of December. It also has taken quantitative easing measures such as the outright purchase of long-term government bonds. The Fed has shown its determination to prevent the economy from weakening further and to stop deflation by taking unconventional crisis response measures. However, the Fed's monetary measures alone are not enough. The Fed must coordinate its actions with fiscal measures from the federal government. Will Obama's stimulus deliver? Barack Obama, who becomes U.S. president on Jan. 20, is planning to take large economic stimulus measures worth more than 800 billion dollars (72 trillion yen), including tax reductions and public investments such as the maintenance and repair of roads and bridges. He also plans employment measures aimed at creating jobs for 3 million people over two years. The future 44th president is said to have taken a cue from the New Deal program implemented by the 32nd president, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to tackle the Great Depression that started in 1929. Immediately after he takes office, Obama will be tested on whether he can revive the U.S. economy.

## AT: Global Econ

**Global econ not resilient**

**Kern, 3/27** - Chief Economist at the British Chambers of Commerce (David, 3/27/13, "Markets cannot defy the economic realities indefinitely", http://www.financialdirector.co.uk/financial-director/opinion/2253942/markets-cannot-defy-the-economic-realities-indefinitely, KONTOPOULOS)

THE UPBEAT MOOD of the financial markets, reinforced by strong US job figures, has pushed share prices to new multi-year highs. The S&P 500 approached its all-time high in the first half of March; other stock market indices also surged. But the hard reality remains that the world economy is facing serious obstacles to a sustainable recovery. Many growth forecasts are being downgraded. The eurozone is in recession, with GDP likely to fall in 2013. The US is doing better than other regions, but its outlook is still mediocre. Even China is facing difficulties; growth is slowing, at a time when concerns over rising inflation and a property market bubble are forcing the Chinese authorities to tighten policy.¶ The present situation is risky and potentially unstable. The main force driving the exuberance is the expectation that aggressive injections of huge amounts of cheap money by the main central banks will continue in the foreseeable future. Hopes that the real economy will improve are playing a minor role only, even in the US. Indeed, if growth picks up significantly, the effect could be perverse, because fears of higher interest rates would almost certainly push up bond yields and depress equities. However, since real growth is likely to remain weak in the foreseeable future, it is reasonable to ask whether the reliance on ever-increasing monetary accommodation can sustain indefinitely buoyant financial markets.¶ Sequester effect¶ The US economy created 236,000 new jobs in February, much more than the expected increase of 160,000; the jobless rate edged down from 7.9 to 7.7%. Construction jobs rose by 48,000 – the biggest increase in almost six years – confirming the housing upturn. US house prices rose by some 7% in the year to December 2012. But, in spite of the positive news, there is a risk that the “sequester”, the $85bn obligatory budget cuts that came into effect on 1 March, will slow US growth.¶ Even if the politicians agree to modify the sequester, the Federal Reserve is determined to maintain ultra-low official rates at 0-0.25%, and to continue with bond purchases totalling $85bn per month until the US jobless rate falls to 6.5%. This is unlikely to happen before mid-2014. Meanwhile, GDP growth in 2013 is forecast at 2%, much stronger than in the eurozone, but slightly lower than in 2012 and weak by US historical standards.¶ The eurozone recession deepened further, as GDP fell by 0.6% in Q4 2012 compared with Q3, the region’s worst performance in almost four years. The fourth quarter contraction was not confined to the weak periphery. Germany, the largest and strongest regional economy, shrank by a surprisingly large 0.6% in Q4, while France’s GDP fell by 0.3%. The eurozone in total recorded declines in every quarter of last year; in full-year terms, GDP declined by 0.6% in 2012, a worse performance than in the US, UK and Japan. This year, the economy is expected to improve slowly. But for 2013 as a whole, eurozone GDP is still expected to fall by a further 0.2%, one again worse than in other major regions.¶ Limited benefits¶ Threats of an imminent euro collapse have eased since the height of the crisis in 2011. The European Central Bank (ECB) stands ready to buy the sovereign bonds of weak countries, if they are prepared to accept prescribed conditions of deficit-reduction and structural reforms. But national pride has so far stopped countries such as Spain from asking for help, and this limits the benefits of the vital ECB support.¶ There are also mounting risks that new crises may erupt. Cyprus is facing severe banking pressures and urgently needs support. But difficulties have emerged, reflecting differences over burden sharing. An early agreement is still likely, but the present brinkmanship is dangerous. Cyprus is a tiny country, accounting for only 0.1-0.2% of eurozone GDP. But there could be far-reaching negative repercussions if the country is pushed into default.¶ The inconclusive results of the recent Italian elections could become a source of instability. If it proves impossible to form a new, stable Italian government, there will have to be new elections, and this could lead to a prolonged period of uncertainty. So far, the markets have not been unduly concerned, but the situation could easily worsen. The role of the ECB will become even more critical in these circumstances. At its last meeting, the ECB decided to keep official rates unchanged at 0.75%. But in the face of negative growth and unresolved political uncertainties, we expect a reduction to 0.5% in the next few months.¶ In the UK, the markets are primarily focusing on the Budget on 20 March, and on Mark Carney’s arrival in July as the new Bank of England governor. Following the 0.3% negative GDP growth in Q4 2012, and the downgrading of the UK’s credit rating by Moody’s, the government is under renewed pressure to change course and abandon its Plan A for cutting the deficit.¶ This is unlikely to happen. Though we lost the prestigious AAA status, our rating is still very high. We cannot afford repeated downgrades. But UK economic policies will be modified, by combining further spending cuts with pro-growth measures, e.g. more spending on infrastructure, and tax cuts to encourage investment.¶ If the markets believe the chancellor is determined to slash the structural deficit, they will tolerate more spending on measures likely to increase the economy’s productive potential. The expectation that fiscal consolidation must be offset by more aggressive monetary policies is problematic. The markets expect more quantitative easing, even before Carney takes over. But tolerating higher inflation, for a longer period, is risky. Sterling has already weakened markedly, in anticipation of policy changes. If the pound falls further, the benefits to exports will be small. But higher inflation will squeeze businesses and individuals, and cause serious damage to the economy.
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## Politics

## 2NC---Cyber-Terrorism

**Immigration reform generates an effective base of IT experts.**

McLarty 2009 (Thomas F. III, President – McLarty Associates and Former White House Chief of Staff and Task Force Co-Chair, “U.S. Immigration Policy: Report of a CFR-Sponsored Independent Task Force”, 7-8, http://www.cfr.org/ publication/19759/us\_immigration\_policy.html)

We have seen, when you look at the table of the top 20 firms that are H1-B visa requestors, at least 15 of those are IT firms. And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States. We're seeing a lot more activity around cyber-security, certainly noteworthy attacks here very recently. It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to generate a more effective group of IT experts here in the United States, many of which are coming to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions from overseas and often returning back? This potentially puts us at a competitive disadvantage going forward. MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more talented students studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really have a tremendous ability to develop these kind of technology and scientific advances, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of the green card being handed to them or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, that's going to strengthen, I think, our system, our security needs.

**That deters and solves the impact to cyberattacks**

Saydjari 2008 (O. Sami, Cyber Defense Agency, LLC, “Structuring for Strategic Cyber Defense: A Cyber Manhattan Project Blueprint”, 2008 Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, http://www.acsac.org/2008/program /keynotes/saydjari.pdf)

As a step toward a security research plan that includes such capabilities, we should identify endstates— goals in terms of how we want our systems to ideally operate. This fresh perspective includes the overall strategic picture and connects clearly with strategic actions that significantly mitigate strategic vulnerabilities. If, for example, the nation has a capability to quickly recover its critical information infrastructure, then the end-state is that strategic attack damages are mitigated and critical services are restored quickly, possibly deterring adversaries from attempting a future attack. Desired End-States. The National Cyber Defense Initiative (NCDI) Opening Moves Workshop [4] identified important end-states, the outcome of a 10- year research effort to create critical capabilities. The following end-states appear in the workshop proceedings: --Continuity of Critical Information Infrastructure Operations. Create technology that would be the basis for a resilient US cyber infrastructure that would sustain critical functions in the face of attacks, including those that could be affected by determined adversaries. --Well-Defended Critical Assets. Make it economically prohibitive for an adversary to cause strategic damage to critical US infrastructures. Currently, adversaries can attack critical systems without investing substantial resources.

**Cyberterrorism will cause accidental launch that triggers the Dead Hand and nuclear war**

**Fritz 2009** (Jason, BS – St. Cloud, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control”, Study Commissioned on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, July, www.icnnd.org/Documents/Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking\_NC2.doc)
*Direct control of launch*
The US uses the two-man rule to achieve a higher level of security in nuclear affairs. Under this rule two authorized personnel must be present and in agreement during critical stages of nuclear command and control. The President must jointly issue a launch order with the Secretary of Defense; Minuteman missile operators must agree that the launch order is valid; and on a submarine, both the commanding officer and executive officer must agree that the order to launch is valid. In the US, in order to execute a nuclear launch, an Emergency Action Message (EAM) is needed. This is a preformatted message that directs nuclear forces to execute a specific attack. The contents of an EAM change daily and consist of a complex code read by a human voice. Regular monitoring by shortwave listeners and videos posted to YouTube provide insight into how these work. These are issued from the NMCC, or in the event of destruction, from the designated hierarchy of command and control centres. Once a command centre has confirmed the EAM, using the two-man rule, the Permissive Action Link (PAL) codes are entered to arm the weapons and the message is sent out. These messages are sent in digital format via the secure Automatic Digital Network and then relayed to aircraft via single-sideband radio transmitters of the High Frequency Global Communications System, and, at least in the past, sent to nuclear capable submarines via Very Low Frequency (Greenemeier 2008, Hardisty 1985). The technical details of VLF submarine communication methods can be found online, including PC-based VLF reception. Some reports have noted a Pentagon review, which showed a potential “electronic back door into the US Navy’s system for broadcasting nuclear launch orders to Trident submarines” (Peterson 2004). The investigation showed that cyber terrorists could potentially infiltrate this network and insert false orders for launch. The investigation led to “elaborate new instructions for validating launch orders” (Blair 2003). Adding further to the concern of cyber terrorists seizing control over submarine launched nuclear missiles; The Royal Navy announced in 2008 that it would be installing a Microsoft Windows operating system on its nuclear submarines (Page 2008). The choice of operating system, apparently based on Windows XP, is not as alarming as the advertising of such a system is. This may attract hackers and narrow the necessary reconnaissance to learning its details and potential exploits. It is unlikely that the operating system would play a direct role in the signal to launch, although this is far from certain. Knowledge of the operating system may lead to the insertion of malicious code, which could be used to gain accelerating privileges, tracking, valuable information, and deception that could subsequently be used to initiate a launch. Remember from Chapter 2 that the UK’s nuclear submarines have the authority to launch if they believe the central command has been destroyed. Attempts by cyber terrorists to create the illusion of a decapitating strike could also be used to engage fail-deadly systems. Open source knowledge is scarce as to whether Russia continues to operate such a system. However evidence suggests that they have in the past. Perimetr, also known as Dead Hand, was an automated system set to launch a mass scale nuclear attack in the event of a decapitation strike against Soviet leadership and military. In a crisis, military officials would send a coded message to the bunkers, switching on the dead hand. If nearby ground-level sensors detected a nuclear attack on Moscow, and if a break was detected in communications links with top military commanders, the system would send low-frequency signals over underground antennas to special rockets. Flying high over missile fields and other military sites, these rockets in turn would broadcast attack orders to missiles, bombers and, via radio relays, submarines at sea. Contrary to some Western beliefs, Dr. Blair says, many of Russia's nuclear-armed missiles in underground silos and on mobile launchers can be fired automatically. (Broad 1993) Assuming such a system is still active, cyber terrorists would need to create a crisis situation in order to activate Perimetr, and then fool it into believing a decapitating strike had taken place. While this is not an easy task, the information age makes it easier. Cyber reconnaissance could help locate the machine and learn its inner workings. This could be done by targeting the computers high of level official’s—anyone who has reportedly worked on such a project, or individuals involved in military operations at underground facilities, such as those reported to be located at Yamantau and Kosvinksy mountains in the central southern Urals (Rosenbaum 2007, Blair 2008) Indirect Control of Launch Cyber terrorists could cause incorrect information to be transmitted, received, or displayed at nuclear command and control centres, or shut down these centres’ computer networks completely. In 1995, a Norwegian scientific sounding rocket was mistaken by Russian early warning systems as a nuclear missile launched from a US submarine. A radar operator used Krokus to notify a general on duty who decided to alert the highest levels. Kavkaz was implemented, all three chegets activated, and the countdown for a nuclear decision began. It took eight minutes before the missile was properly identified—a considerable amount of time considering the speed with which a nuclear response must be decided upon (Aftergood 2000). Creating a false signal in these early warning systems would be relatively easy using computer network operations. The real difficulty would be gaining access to these systems as they are most likely on a closed network. However, if they are transmitting wirelessly, that may provide an entry point, and information gained through the internet may reveal the details, such as passwords and software, for gaining entrance to the closed network. If access was obtained, a false alarm could be followed by something like a DDoS attack, so the operators believe an attack may be imminent, yet they can no longer verify it. This could add pressure to the decision making process, and if coordinated precisely, could appear as a first round EMP burst. Terrorist groups could also attempt to launch a non-nuclear missile, such as the one used by Norway, in an attempt to fool the system. The number of states who possess such technology is far greater than the number of states who possess nuclear weapons. Obtaining them would be considerably easier, especially when enhancing operations through computer network operations. Combining traditional terrorist methods with cyber techniques opens opportunities neither could accomplish on their own. For example, radar stations might be more vulnerable to a computer attack, while satellites are more vulnerable to jamming from a laser beam, thus together they deny dual phenomenology. Mapping communications networks through cyber reconnaissance may expose weaknesses, and automated scanning devices created by more experienced hackers can be readily found on the internet. Intercepting or spoofing communications is a highly complex science. These systems are designed to protect against the world’s most powerful and well funded militaries. Yet, there are recurring gaffes, and the very nature of asymmetric warfare is to bypass complexities by finding simple loopholes. For example, commercially available software for voice-morphing could be used to capture voice commands within the command and control structure, cut these sound bytes into phonemes, and splice it back together in order to issue false voice commands (Andersen 2001, Chapter 16). Spoofing could also be used to escalate a volatile situation in the hopes of starting a nuclear war. “ \*\*[they cut off the paragraph]\*\* “In June 1998, a group of international hackers calling themselves Milw0rm hacked the web site of India’s Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC) and put up a spoofed web page showing a mushroom cloud and the text “If a nuclear war does start, you will be the first to scream” (Denning 1999). Hacker web-page defacements like these are often derided by critics of cyber terrorism as simply being a nuisance which causes no significant harm. However, web-page defacements are becoming more common, and they point towards alarming possibilities in subversion. During the 2007 cyber attacks against Estonia, a counterfeit letter of apology from Prime Minister Andrus Ansip was planted on his political party website (Grant 2007). This took place amid the confusion of mass DDoS attacks, real world protests, and accusations between governments.

## Uniqueness Debate

**2aC evidence says House GOP oppose but they are close to reaching a deal with Boehner’s backing**

Afzali, 3-20-13, Newsmax, Momentum Builds Among Republicans for Immigration Reform, [Cyrus], p. http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/rubio-paul-immigration-reform/2013/03/20/id/495549

Republican Sens. Rand Paul and Marco Rubio are among an emerging group of Republicans helping to gather momentum for passage of comprehensive immigration reform, a move many in the party see as crucial to gaining the support Hispanic voters. Paul became the latest Republican to change his message this week when he told illegal immigrants who are willing to work in America, “We will find a place for you.” He and Rubio, and other Republicans, are calling for a new stance on immigration, although many in the party remain wary of any provision that would grant illegal immigrants full citizenship. As reported by The Hill, House Speaker John Boehner has endorsed the bipartisan negotiations, going as far as to call the framework they’ve created “a pretty responsible solution” to the immigration issue. His remarks were the first he's made on the issue since bipartisan groups in both the House and Senate began talking several weeks ago in hopes of reaching a compromise. The House group of four Republicans and four Democrats told Boehner for the first time last week that a deal was close.

## Thumper Debate

**Immigration is the top agenda item and Obama is lobbying Congress for passage**

Fifield, 3-20-13, Financial Times, Immigration: Pressure mounts on Obama to overhaul citizenship requirements, [Anna], p. http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/9235c2aa-8ad4-11e2-b1a4-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2OUBxAATN

With every attempt of the past decade ending in failure, is there any reason to think that this year’s effort at comprehensive immigration reform will be any more successful? High quality global journalism requires investment. Emboldened by his resounding re-election, Mr Obama has put reform at the top of his legislative agenda this year, urging Congress to pass a “common sense” bill that would create a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants and provide more visas for highly skilled workers. If it passes, the bill will mark the most profound immigration changes in a generation, not just for the US but for Mexico, too. About two-thirds of the estimated 11m undocumented people living in the US are Mexican and giving them the opportunity to earn US citizenship would have a significant impact on their earning power. Latin American immigrants who became citizens during the Reagan-era reforms in 1986 enjoyed wage increases in the range of 6 to 13 per cent, according to a report from the libertarian Cato Institute. If immigration reform includes a guest worker programme, that would benefit Mexico by allowing more seasonal workers to come and go as needed. But these are big ifs. Immigration reform is a tricky political issue at any time and especially so amid continuing economic malaise. Opponents of reform say that giving papers to unauthorised immigrants “rewards” them and allows them to take jobs away from Americans. Some even say it will precipitate a flood of new arrivals over the Mexican border. Some of the strongest advocates still put the prospects for reform passing this year at 50-50, citing opposition from conservative “Tea Party” members in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. Bob Goodlatte, the Republican chairman of the House of Representatives judiciary committee, has argued against creating a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. “People have a pathway to citizenship right now: It's to abide by the immigration laws and if they have a family relationship, if they have a job skill that allows them to do that, they can obtain citizenship,” Mr Goodlatte said last month. Despite such rhetoric, there is cause for optimism. There has been new consensus between groups usually on opposite sides of the issue – the labour unions and big business lobbies – to push for reform, adding to pressure to overhaul the system. A bipartisan “gang of eight” senators has put forward a blueprint and similar efforts are under way in the House. But the biggest factor is simple demographics. Hispanic voters comprise the fastest growing part of the electorate and their share of the US population is forecast to rise from 17 per cent now to 29 per cent by 2050. The pressure group Voto Latino puts that in context, noting that there are 50,000 Hispanic Americans turning 18, the voting age, every month. The Hispanic electorate as a bloc has long tended to support Democrats. In last year’s election, 71 per cent backed Mr Obama, to Republican Mitt Romney’s 27 per cent. This was in large part because of Mr Romney’s hostile language during the Republican campaign, when he said that, if president, he would make conditions so bad for illegal immigrants that they would choose to “self-deport”. As they try to avoid further alienating the Hispanic electorate, some Republicans are eager to remove the issue of immigration from the table before the midterm elections at the end of next year. Influential conservatives have been expressing new-found support for reform and that could help its passage through Congress. Republicans have long insisted that security on the border needs to be tightened but the Obama administration’s increased enforcement – including the use of drones to monitor movement – and a record number of deportations has helped slow the flow of people entering the US illegally. The continued weakness in the US job market – and the relative health of the Mexican economy – has helped cut numbers, too. The Pew Hispanic Center last year suggested that the net flow of immigrants from Mexico to the US had actually ground to a halt. Mr Obama is keeping the pressure on Congress. “Send me a comprehensive immigration reform bill in the next few months and I will sign it right away,” he said in his State of the Union address last month. The president knows the clock is ticking. If reforms are not passed by September, the opportunity will pass. And that means immigration would be put back in the too-hard basket for a few more years.

## PC Key Debate

**Obama political capital is key to forging a compromise**

Kaplan, 3-21-13, National Journal, How the Tea Party Came Around on Immigration, [Rebecca], p. factiva

In the other chamber, Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., has signed onto a comprehensive bipartisan framework with seven other senators that carves out a way for current illegal immigrants to eventually become citizens—provided that further measures are first taken to slow illegal immigration. Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., who attracted national attention with his 13-hour filibuster over the administration’s drone policies, just this week injected himself into the immigration debate with a speech unveiling his own plan that calls for comprehensive reform. Sen. Mike Lee, R-Utah, who claims strong tea-party backing, was initially part of the bipartisan Senate talks but ultimately backed out, saying he agreed with a majority of the plan’s principles but could not support what he saw as a special path to citizenship for people who broke the law. Then there’s another Hispanic lawmaker, Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas, who in his brief time since his election in 2012 has already made a name for himself as an outspoken member of the minority. He says he’s interested in beefing up border security and fixing the legal immigration system—but not a plan that contains a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants. It’s too simplistic to say that the fate of immigration reform hinges on these six Republicans. As with any big, complicated issue, a variety of forces are at work, including the Obama administration’s efforts to reach a compromise.

Yes vote switching—even due to unrelated legislation

Simes and Saunders ‘10 – \*publisher of the National Interest, Executive Director of The Nixon Center and Associate Publisher of The National Interest, served in the State Department from 2003 to 2005 [12/23, Dimitri and Paul, National Interest, “START of a Pyrrhic Victory?”, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/start-pyrrhic-victory-4626, CMR]

Had the lame-duck session not already been so contentious, this need not have been a particular problem. Several Senate Republicans indicated openness to supporting the treaty earlier in the session, including Senator Lindsey Graham and Senator John McCain. Senator Jon Kyl—seen by many as leading Republican opposition to the agreement—was actually quite careful to avoid saying that he opposed New START until almost immediately prior to the vote. Our own conversations with Republican Senate sources during the lame duck session suggested that several additional Republicans could have voted to ratify New START under other circumstances; Senator Lamar Alexander is quoted in the press as saying that Republican anger over unrelated legislation cost five to ten votes. By the time the Senate reached New START, earlier conduct by Senate Democrats and the White House had alienated many Republicans who could have voted for the treaty. That the administration secured thirteen Republican votes (including some from retiring Senators) for the treaty now—and had many more potentially within its grasp—makes clear what many had believed all along: it would not have been so difficult for President Obama to win the fourteen Republican votes needed for ratification in the new Senate, if he had been prepared to wait and to work more cooperatively with Senate Republicans. Senator Kerry’s comment that “70 votes is yesterday’s 95” ignores the reality that he and the White House could have secured many more than 70 votes had they handled the process differently and attempts to shift the blame for the low vote count onto Republicans.

## AT: Winners Win

**Default to contextual ev—Obana can’t win on energy**

Eisler 12 “Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” April 2, [Researcher @ the Chemical Heritage Foundation; Matthew], http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital from his energy policy from either the left or the right by the end of his first term.¶ The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy, but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

**Winners-win is empirically denied with Obama—each win eroded his political capital**

Eberly, 1-21-13, Baltimore Sun, The presidential power trap [Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Policy, St. Mary’s College of Maryland; Todd],p. <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121_1_political-system-party-support-public-opinion>

Barack Obama's election in 2008 seemed to signal a change. Mr. Obama's popular vote majority was the largest for any president since 1988, and he was the first Democrat to clear the 50 percent mark since Lyndon Johnson. The president initially enjoyed strong public approval and, with a Democratic Congress, was able to produce an impressive string of legislative accomplishments during his first year and early into his second, capped by enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. But with each legislative battle and success, his political capital waned. His impressive successes with Congress in 2009 and 2010 were accompanied by a shift in the public mood against him, evident in the rise of the tea party movement, the collapse in his approval rating, and the large GOP gains in the 2010 elections, which brought a return to divided government.

## Link Debate

**Independently, CTL says the plan will be attacked by GOP deficit hawks—that kills the agenda**

Blame shifting/partisanship, Capital, Leaks

**The Hill, 7-11** – “Debt-ceiling talks hit brick wall as President Obama, GOP trade jabs,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/170841-debt-talks-hit-brick-wall-obama-gop-trade-jabs.

President **Obama and GOP leaders traded accusations** Monday **over who was to blame** as talks to raise the nation’s $14.3 trillion debt ceiling stalled over the size and scope of the package. **Both sides pointed to the other as inflexible** as the odds increased that Congress will not raise the nation’s borrowing limit by an Aug. 2 deadline. Obama said Republicans were refusing to allow any tax hikes in the deal, including provisions aimed at the wealthiest taxpayers, while Republicans said the White House’s insistence on tax increases and resistance to meaningful Social Security and Medicare reforms was the problem. **Obama said** during a late morning press conference that **he had “bent over backwards**” to meet the GOP halfway. “I do not see a path to a deal if they do not budge. Period,” Obama said. **Less than two hours later**, Speaker John **Boehner** (R-Ohio) **retorted: “It takes two to tango**. “I understand that **this is** going to take sacrifice, and is **going to take political capital on both sides**,” Boehner said. “I’m certainly willing to take my fair share of it, but if we’re going to take political capital, then let’s stand up and do the big thing, the right thing for the country.” Obama reiterated that he will not sign a short-term deal into law, citing election-year politics: “It’s not going to get easier. It’s going to get harder. So we might as well do it now — pull off the Band-Aid; eat our peas.” **Leaks after a Monday** afternoon **meeting** at the White House between Obama and congressional leaders **underscored the tensions**. Weeks ago, details barely emerged from closed-door talks, while on Monday all sides were frantically working to get their message out. Republicans said their meeting focused on the medium-sized deal based on the Biden talks, despite Obama’s public push for a larger deficit-reduction package. Democratic officials, for their part, said Obama echoed the call he made during a morning news conference, telling Republicans they should shoot for the biggest deal possible and lay out why a “cut-only” plan would not add up to the savings sought by Boehner. Obama said the savings identified by the Biden group would yield about $1.5 trillion, not enough to raise the debt ceiling beyond the 2012 elections and meet Boehner’s requirement that deficits be cut by a higher amount than the borrowing limit is raised.

The plan requires political capital

Government backing nuclear power requires political capital to restore confidence—prefer this over the link turn because it’s contextual to the plan’s solvency mechanism of using government action to promote confidence in the private sector

Rosenbaum, 2000, Public-Private Policy Partnerships, ed. by Pauline Vaillancourt Rosenau, [Director Emeritus of the Bob Graham Center for Public Service and Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of Florida; Walter], p. 65

The future domestic redevelopment of commercial nuclear power has been debated for the last decade primarily in terms of technology and economics. Yet many of the economic and technological problems experienced by the U.S. nuclear power industry, many of which have never been considered as institutional problems, originated directly from the character of the industry's institutional misdesign. The institutional management style involved extreme secrecy, public disclosures of technological decisions as fait accompli, distrust of public involvement in the technology planning, an exuberant confidence in the technology's economic viability, and reliance upon regulatory models derived from experience with military nuclear weapons development during World War II. Remedies for such institutional problems are the sine qua non on any agenda of further strategies for commercial nuclear power in the United States because public trust and governmental willingness to invest political capital in nuclear energy depends as much upon restored confidence in the management of the technology as it does upon proof of its technical or economic viability.

**Debates on expanding nuclear power will spark controversy—environmental lobbys hard against the plan**

Ackley, 2008, Roll Call, June 9, “Nuclear Energy Poisons Legislative Environment” [Kate], p. http://www.rollcall.com/issues/53\_148/-25723-1.html

But many key environmental lobbyists say that tax subsidies for nuclear power could become a poison pill for any global warming bill and that if a carbon reduction bill required a substantial nuclear power subsidy, that might be too high a price to pay. In addition, nuclear opponents say that even without a climate change bill this year, they will be keeping close watch on all legislation in case the nuclear industry tries to use any other bills to further its agenda. “The debate is just going to intensify,” said Kevin Kamps, radioactive waste watchdog for anti-nuclear lobby Beyond Nuclear. “We see industry trying to attach its money grabs to any legislation. They really do try to hitch their wagon to whatever’s moving. We will remain vigilant for the rest of this year.” Specifically, Kamps said he would work to block loan guarantee programs for nuclear plants and any tax incentives for the industry. Geoff Fettus of the Natural Resources Defense Council, another environmental lobbying organization, said American taxpayers should not have to support the nuclear industry. “These are large corporate subsidies that distort the market for a mature polluting industry,” Fettus said. While nuclear companies clearly want the subsidies for their own business interests, Fettus added that some business interests “want to use it as a poison pill” to nuke any climate change measures.

**Promoting nuclear energy will drain political capital**

Stagliano, 2001, A Policy of Discontent: The Making of a National Energy Strategy, [former deputy assistant secretary for policy analysis in the DOE and Resources for the Future visitng scholar; Vito], p. 79

Had the legislators queried the senior ranks of Bush's White House, however, they would have discovered, notwithstanding the explicit policy agenda outlined in Building a Better America, profound antipathy to the very idea that the president’s political capital should be spent on a public issue as unpromising as energy. Chief among the antagonists was John Sununu, the White House chief of staff. As governor of New Hampshire, Sununu had come to be known as a champion of nuclear energy. He had given unstinting support to the construction of the Seabrook nuclear power plant. He saw federal energy exclusively in political terms. "Politics of energy is [sic] real," he declared in a speech delivered in Washington six months before the 1988 presidential election. "It is easy to gather political points," he went on, "by saying ‘no.’ It is very difficult to say ‘yes` [to energy policy initiatives] without political cost."