### 2AC AT – Must eliminate a ban / restriction is a ban

#### Testing and licensing are prohibitions – no reactor will be able to operate without testing and a license

Brailsford 12 Beatrice Brailsford et al, ALLIANCE FOR NUCLEAR ACCOUNTABILITY March 2012 Nuclear Budget Busters http://ananuclear.org/Portals/0/documents/final.pdf

Current Completion Date: In mid-January 2011, DOE said that construction will be completed in 2012. DOE now claims that the MOX plant will achieve “cold start-up operation” in late 2013. However, DOE has not confirmed any reactors to use MOX fuel and refuses to produce a schedule for MOX plant operation. Because the NRC will likely require four to six years of MOX testing in a reactor, followed by fuel performance evaluation and licensing, the MOX plant is at grave risk of sitting idle with no utility able to use its product.

#### We eliminate the prohibition – the plan is not a procedural change. It doesn't make meeting the requirement easier. It eliminates the requirement altogether.

#### We aren’t waive anything on the fuel cycle

#### No ban is permanent –drilling on federal lands could be permitted by licensing it, etc

#### Restriction is any limitation

Law.com Dictionary 13 http://dictionary.law.com/Default.aspx?selected=1835

Restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision.

#### The negative overlimits -- there are hardly any cases that meet their interpretation. A core issue in the literature is NRC licensing requirements

#### Limits are not affected – their ground is the same even if the change is procedural

Neg has ground. There is no abuse. They can just take a position against nuclear energy. They have no right to particular arguments, and that assumption begs the question of what the topic means.

#### Our interpretation is reasonable based on our arguments. Competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and permits exclusion of just one more case – the one the aff is running.

### 2AC PIC

#### Perm—do both

#### No reactors have commited

Fretwell 13 Sammy Fretwell, The State (Columbia, S.C.) February 5, 2013 Columbia Dispatch Cost, goal of plutonium-fuel factory questioned http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/national\_world/2013/02/05/cost-goal-of-plutonium-fuel-factory-questioned.html

Meanwhile, federal officials are scrambling to find a utility that will use the mixed-oxide fuel. The project’s sole customer, Duke Energy, pulled out in 2009. The Tennessee Valley Authority has expressed interest, but the federally owned company hasn’t decided whether to burn MOX fuel at its atomic-energy plants.

“The MOX program may be both wasting taxpayer dollars and ultimately failing to reduce our stores of surplus weapons-grade plutonium,” U.S. Rep. Ed Markey, D-Mass., said in a Jan. 14 letter to outgoing U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu.

No reactors are willing to buy the MOX

Brailsford 12 Beatrice Brailsford et al, ALLIANCE FOR NUCLEAR ACCOUNTABILITY March 2012 Nuclear Budget Busters http://ananuclear.org/Portals/0/documents/final.pdf

[The] Mixed Oxide (MOX) Plutonium Fuel Fabrication Facility under construction at the Savannah

River Site in South Carolina would produce MOX fuel for commercial nuclear reactors though there

are no U.S. reactors contracted to use that fuel.

• Original cost in 2004 was to be $1.6 billion, and the completion date was 2007.

• FY 2013 budget request: $388 million for construction. Total estimated cost is $7.1 billion.

Construction is to be completed in 2012 with cold start-up in 2013.

• Risk – The MOX plant will produce expensive plutonium fuel that no utilities want to buy.

#### Cost is the barrier for reactors

Skutnik 12 Steve Skutnik, assistant professor of Nuclear Engineering at the University of Tennessee. 9-10-12

The Neutron Economy Wading into the "nuclear zombie" horde

<http://neutroneconomy.blogspot.com/2012/09/wading-into-nuclear-zombie-horde.html>

 Zombie Argument #3: Nobody wants MOX

A relatively specious argument which can be relatively swiftly put down. First, TVA has expressed interest - hence why these hearings are taking place in the first place. In addition to TVA, Duke Energy has also expressed potential interest in purchasing the converted MOX fuel from the Savannah River Site.

Most of the reason U.S. utilities have been reluctant to purchase MOX fuel for reactors up until now comes down to cost - pound for pound, MOX fuel does cost more, and utilities receive no credit back toward fees paid into the nuclear waste fund for any net reduction in waste sent to an (eventual) repository. (The Megatons to Megawatts program, by contrast, produced a fuel which is the same exact form as used in current reactors - hence, it was cheaper and easier).

Incentives are necessary because of costs

Fleischauer 10Eric Fleischauer, The Decatur Daily, Ala. July 31, 2010 The Decatur Daily (Alabama) Distributed by McClatchy-Tribune Business News lexis

An advantage of converting plutonium to MOX is that it cannot be converted back to weapons-grade, easing concerns Russia had over U.S. disposal efforts.

"It's more expensive than uranium, so the government has to pay the utility to take it," Lyman said. "The upshot is we're stuck with the more expensive, more complicated option because that's what the Russians wanted us to do."

#### Subsidies are necessary to offset higher costs

Hanna 12 Autumn Hanna, Taxpayers for Common Sense June 19, 2012 MOX Misses the Mark

<http://www.taxpayer.net/library/article/mox-misses-the-mark>

In late 2008 the contract between Duke Energy and MOX Services committing Duke to buying the MOX produced at the Savannah River Site was terminated, leaving the DOE without a buyer for the fuel. Since MOX will carry a much higher price tag than conventional fuel, the DOE will have to pay companies to take the fuel off their hands--if, that is, they can find any companies interested in processing the volatile substance.

### 2AC Immigration—NDT [Econ]

#### 1—US Russia relations turns the DA—stabilize regional economic conflicts before they can escalate

#### 2—Economic decline doesn’t cause war.

Jervis 11 [Robert, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics in the Department of Political Science, and a Member of the Arnold A. Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Force in Our Times Saltzman Working Paper No. 15 July 2011 http://www.siwps.com/news.attachment/saltzmanworkingpaper15-842/SaltzmanWorkingPaper15.PDF]

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy, and bring back old-fashioned beggar-thy-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a pre-existing high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, **it will not make war thinkable.**

#### 3—No recession—econ recovering—best indicators prove risk is low.

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

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

#### 4—Logical policy maker can do the plan and pass immigration reform.

5— No immigration reform – GOP border security requirement

York 3-27

Byron York Chief Political Correspondent The Washington Examiner Border security in exchange for immigration reform? Napolitano says no deal. http://washingtonexaminer.com/border-security-in-exchange-for-immigration-reform-napolitano-says-no-deal./article/2525505

Republicans working to craft a comprehensive immigration reform bill say there is one rock-bottom requirement for any deal: The border must be secure, and proven to be secure, before any path to citizenship is created for the millions of immigrants currently in the country illegally. That is the one non-negotiable GOP demand. And on Tuesday, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano flatly rejected it. “Relying on one thing as a so-called trigger is not the way to go,” Napolitano told a breakfast meeting of journalists. Asked about her department’s recent revelation that it will not produce a long-promised method of measuring border security, known as the Border Condition Index, Napolitano said, “We’re confident that the border is as secure as it’s ever been. But there’s no one number that captures that.” Without a way to measure border security, many Republican reform advocates say, there’s no way to go forward with a reform agreement. Sign Up for the Byron York newsletter! Napolitano’s comments were one more bit of evidence, if Republicans needed any, that the Obama administration does not intend to make enhanced border security a precondition of immigration reform. “Every position and action the administration takes is consistent with the idea that they have no desire to accomplish immigration security,” said one GOP Senate aide who spoke on condition of anonymity. “One of the challenges in crafting any reform is that the American people do not have confidence in this administration’s willingness to enforce current immigration law,” said Alex Conant, spokesman for Marco Rubio, the Republican senator and Gang of Eight member who has staked considerable political capital on the negotiations. “Senator Rubio and several members of the immigration working group share these concerns, and it’s reflected in the solution they are trying to craft. Our legislation will include real security triggers to make sure out borders are secured.” Added Conant: “Senator Rubio will not support any legislation that does not include real security triggers to make sure our borders are secured.” As for Napolitano, another aide said, “I wonder if she’s freelancing, or carrying a message from the White House.” At Tuesday’s White House briefing, spokesman Jay Carney was asked that very question, and while he spoke at length without saying anything definitive, Carney appeared to suggest that President Obama agrees with Napolitano. From the transcript: QUESTION: Secretary Napolitano said today that triggers are not necessary before comprehensive immigration reform. So what does the White House do to convince those on the other side? Since there are no reliable metrics about border security, what will you do to convince them that the border is secure enough for immigration and a path to citizenship to begin? MR. CARNEY: Well, I think the question is excellent, and I would note that what Secretary Napolitano has said — Secretary Napolitano has said that the Department of Homeland Security measures progress using a number of metrics to make sure we are putting our resources where they will have the most impact. And I think that while there are different ways to look at this issue, the fact is, by a host of measures, there has been great improvement in our border security. Certainly the facts are there when it comes to the resources that have been applied to border security — the doubling of border security agents, as well as the other metrics that you will often hear Secretary Napolitano or others discuss. So we look at a variety of measures. And I think you can look at what this President has committed to and the record on border security since he came into office to evaluate his assertion that border security is a vital element of comprehensive immigration reform. That has been his position, and it continues to be. And I would note — and this is something that has been acknowledged by important members of the Senate, Republican members — the progress that has been made on this very important issue, border security. Much of — the last time comprehensive immigration reform was essentially abandoned, some of the issues — the principal reason for that was because of concerns about border security. And many of the metrics that were put forward then have been met — the goals and the targets that were said to have to be achieved before we could move forward have been met. But this is an ongoing issue. This is an ongoing concern, and it’s an ongoing project of this administration. And it will certainly be an important part of immigration reform. QUESTION: Do you — does the White House oppose commissions or certain triggers before a path to citizenship can begin? MR. CARNEY: What we have said and I’ll say today is that we are not going to judge the bill before it’s been written. And we are working with the senators who are in the Gang of Eight as they make progress, and they’ve made considerable progress, and that is worth noting. Senator Schumer just the other day talked about where they are in that process and the progress that they’ve been making, and we were heartened by that. But as the President said yesterday, we have to keep pushing. We have to make sure that we follow through on this progress, and that that progress leads to a bill that has bipartisan support and that can be signed by this President. And we’re not there yet. Progress is being made. It’s being made in the Senate, which is where the President hoped it would be made. And we are very much monitoring that process and engaging in that process. But it’s not done yet, and I don’t want to prejudge a bill that hasn’t been written. QUESTION: But if I could just press you on it, it does appear as though that Secretary Napolitano did today prejudge. She said the triggers are not necessary. Does the White House agree with that assessment? MR. CARNEY: I think what she was saying — and the assessment we do agree with — is that there are a variety of metrics by which you can measure, and we do measure, progress on border security. And these are metrics that others use to measure border security, including Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and beyond the Senate, beyond the Congress. So we’re working with Congress on this, with the Senate on this. Progress has been made. Border security is one of the key principles that the President has put forward that has to be part of comprehensive immigration reform. He has demonstrated his seriousness on this issue, as has Secretary Napolitano. But it is something that we’re — it’s not a done project. We have to continue working on it. Cut through all the verbiage, and Carney seemed to say precisely what Napolitano said: If Republicans demand that tougher border enforcement be a precondition for comprehensive immigration reform, they can forget about making a deal, now or ever.

#### 6—Obama is already spending political capital on the issue – the administration wants cuts, That's 1AC Roff evidence. That means Obama wouldn’t support the plan—any interpretation of fiat claiming he would is silly.

#### 7—Congress will fight the cuts—burns Obama’s political capital.

Fletcher 13 Kenneth Fletcher, Los Alamos Study Group Feb 1, 2013 Nuclear Weapons & Materials Monitor vol 17 no 5

MOX SUSPENSION ON THE TABLE IN THE EVENT OF SEQUESTRATION http://www.lasg.org/press/2013/NWMM\_1Feb2013.html

The deferral of MOX would lead to stiff opposition to the project’s backers in Congress, however, chief among them Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.). “Sen. Graham would have serious issues with a decision to suspend MOX,” spokesman Kevin Bishop said in a written response. Rep. Joe Wilson (R-S.C.), whose district includes the Savannah River Site, is also engaged in supporting the project and was circulating a letter among Congressional colleagues backing MOX late last week. “If the Administration decides to suspend the MOX program at the Savannah River Site, our national security here at home could be affected. Not only does this facility provide for a safer America, it also promotes energy independence, two initiatives the Obama Administration claims to support,” Wilson spokeswoman Caroline Delleney said in a written response.

#### 8—Graham can get the funding – history proves

Russell 13 Pam Radtke Russell, Roll Call Staff Feb. 5, 2013 Budget Cutters Eye Nuclear Reprocessing Plant

Taxpayers for Common Sense http://www.taxpayer.net/media-center/article/budget-cutters-eye-nuclear-reprocessing-plant

 The MOX facility has survived earlier challenges. Former Rep. David L. Hobson, R-Ohio, said his efforts to kill funding for the project when he served as Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee chairman were thwarted by the political clout of South Carolina lawmakers — including fiscal conservatives such as Wilson, Sen. Lindsey Graham and former Sen. Jim DeMint.

Hobson described the project as a jobs program for South Carolina. In addition to the 2,600 employees now working on it, the completed facility will require permanent workers to operate it for up to two decades. The plant is part of the larger Savannah River Site in South Carolina, an Energy Department-managed site that employs 12,000.

Hobson said one of the biggest regrets of his tenure was agreeing to back off efforts to end the project when he was told they could hurt Republican Gov. Mark Sanford’s re-election chances in 2006.

“I got rolled,” Hobson said.

Laura Peterson of Taxpayers for Common Sense, which has called for an end to the project, said conservative Republicans who otherwise might be expected to complain about cost overruns are deterred by the support it enjoys from Graham. And Hobson said DeMint — a leading champion of small government and spending cuts who now heads The Heritage Foundation — never suggested killing the MOX program.

“This is worse than earmarks,” Hobson said. “This is appalling.”

Neither Graham’s nor DeMint’s staffs responded to requests to comment on the project, but Wilson and other supporters say it is vital to fulfilling the 2000 arms deal with Russia. Failing to move ahead with the program, Wilson warned, could lead the Russians not to honor its end of the agreement.

#### 9—Obama is staying away from immigration reform – keeps the GOP on board

AP 3-28

Associated Press March 28, 2013 Obama 'confident' immigration bill could pass by summer http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/28/obama-says-immigration-bill-could-pass-by-summer/

While overhauling the nation's patchwork immigration laws is a top second term priority for the president, he has ceded the negotiations almost entirely to Congress. He and his advisers have calculated that a bill crafted by Capitol Hill stands a better chance of winning Republican support than one overtly influenced by the president. In his interviews Wednesday, Obama tried to stay out of the prickly policy issues that remain unfinished in the Senate talks, though he said a split between business and labor on wages for new low-skilled workers was unlikely to "doom" the legislation. "This is a resolvable issue," he said. The president also spoke Wednesday with Univision. His interviews followed a citizenship ceremony conducted Monday at the White House where he pressed Congress to "finish the job" on immigration, an issue that has vexed Washington for years. The president made little progress in overhauling the nation's fractured immigration laws in his first term, but he redoubled his efforts after winning re-election. The November contest also spurred some Republicans to drop their opposition to immigration reform, given that Hispanics overwhelmingly backed Obama. In an effort to keep Republicans at the negotiation table, Obama has stayed relatively quiet on immigration over the last month. He rolled out his immigration principles during a January rally in Las Vegas and made an impassioned call for overhauling the nation's laws during his early February State of the Union address, then purposely handed off the effort to lawmakers.

#### 10—Obama will just use executive order to pass immigration reform. He already declared that he will.

The Hill 2-16

The Hill, 2/16/13, “Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform” http://thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform#ixzz2L6gVWc7r

President Obama can – and will – take steps on immigration reform in the event Congress doesn't reach a comprehensive deal this year, according to several House Democratic leaders. While the Democrats are hoping Congress will preclude any executive action by enacting reforms legislatively, they say the administration has the tools to move unilaterally if the bipartisan talks on Capitol Hill break down. Furthermore, they say, Obama stands poised to use them. "I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "He's ready to move forward if we're not." "I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "He's ready to move forward if we're not." Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.), vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, echoed that message, saying Obama is "not just beating the drum," for immigration reform, "he's actually the drum major." "There are limitations as to what he can do with executive order," Crowley said Wednesday, "but he did say that if Congress continued to fail to act that he would take steps and measures to enact common-sense executive orders to move this country forward." Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who heads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said there are "plenty" of executive steps Obama could take if Congress fails to pass a reform package. "The huge one," Grijalva said, is "the waiving of deportation" in order to keep families together.

#### 11—Obama doesn’t has the magic amount of PC to pass CIR and overwhelm thumpers but not enough to pass the plan—make them quantify the link threshhold.

#### 12—**Obamas losing capital on Keystone – Senate vote**

SB 3-25

SustainableBusiness.com, 03/25/2013, “Senate Votes YES On Tar Sands Pipeline” http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/index.cfm/go/news.display/id/24698

It was late Friday afternoon when the State Department denied any negative environmental impacts from the Keystone tar sands pipeline. In another late Friday action, when there's little publicity, the Senate voted 62-37 to approve the Keystone pipeline as an amendment to the budget. All Republicans voted in favor of the non-binding amendment - a "symbolic" vote - but so did plenty of Democrats. The purpose of the vote was to exert more pressure on President Obama to approve the pipeline. It's extremely upsetting to see how many Senators are in the pockets of the fossil fuel industry and who don't take climate change seriously. After analyzing the votes, Oil Change International found that those who voted for the pipeline have received 3.5 times more campaign contributions from fossil fuel interests than those who voted against it. Before voting for the pipeline, they received a total of $499,648 from the industry and a grand total of $30,978,153. "Today's vote presents yet another reason why Congress is less popular than root canals," says David Turnbull of Oil Change International. "Every single effort from Congress to influence the Keystone XL pipeline decision has been backed by millions in dirty energy money. This vote was nothing more than a $31 million sideshow whose sole purpose was to kiss the rings of the Senate's Big Oil benefactors." "Tar sands pipelines have no place in the debate over the federal budget and Congress has no business rubber stamping dangerous, unnecessary Big Oil projects. This vague, nonbinding resolution does nothing but show how eager these Senators are to please their Big Oil masters," says Michael Brune, Executive Director of Sierra Club.

#### 13—Obama has no political capital

Vespa 3-22

Matt Vespa | March 22, 2013 | CBS Political Director Now: Obama Shouldn't Agitate GOP; Back in January: 'Go For The Throat,' Mr. President http://www.newsbusters.org/blogs/matt-vespa/2013/03/22/180-turn-cbs-political-director-says-obama-shouldnt-agitate-gop-said-go-

Perhaps Dickerson was part of the liberal crowd that felt the president, fresh off his reelection, has a mandate, but was wholly illusory. Don't look for Dickerson's colleagues in the liberal media to examine this stunning reversal. Doing so would highlight that Obama fatigue is slowly but surely setting in, not just in Washington but in the hinterland. The president won a second term, but he lacks the political capital to set the agenda on his terms. He cannot negotiate from a position of strength because he has none. Dickerson now sees it, and surely others in the media do as well. The question is when will the media start to note openly that the emperor has no clothes.

3—H-1Bs fail – no labor market test, wage requirements are too low, visas are held by employers, and oversight and enforcement failures

Hira 10

Ron Hira associate professor of public policy at Rochester Institute of Technology, October 14, 2010 “The H-1B and L-1 Visa Programs: Out of Control,” http://epi.3cdn.net/490c30d8f9f16bc16c\_b0m6b5b9c.pdf

H-1B and L-1 visa use has become antithetical to policy makers’ goals due to four fundamental flaws: 1. Neither visa requires a labor market test. Employers can and do bypass American workers when recruiting for open positions and even replace outright existing American workers with H-1B and L-1 guest workers. 2. Wage requirements are too low for H-1B visas, and they are non-existent for L-1. The programs are extensively used for wage arbitrage. Employers have told the GAO that they hire H-1Bs because they can legally pay below-market wages. Th e Department of Labor has certifi ed wages as low as $12.25 per hour for H-1B computer professionals. The arbitrage opportunities for L-1 visas can be even greater because employers pay home-country wages. In the case of workers from India—the largest source country for L-1 visas—this can mean a 90% discount for importing an L-1 guest worker compared to hiring an American. 3. Visas are held by the employer rather than the worker. H-1B and L-1 visa workers can be easily exploited and put into poor working conditions but have little recourse because the working relationship is akin to indentured servitude. 4. Program oversight and enforcement is deficient. Department of Labor review of H-1B applications has been called a “rubber stamp” by its own Inspector General. A DHS IG report found that one in five H-1Bs were granted under false pretenses. Th e L-1 visa program has not been reviewed for more than four years even though the last DHS IG report found that there were “signifi cant vulnerabilities to abuse.”

### 2AC Sequestration

#### 1—Case Turns the DA—Russia relations solve

#### 3—Logical policymaker can do the plan and pass immigration reform.

#### 4—Impacts to the cliff are overstated

Preble 12

Christopher Preble is the vice president for defense and foreign-policy studies at the Cato Institute, Let Sequestration Happen July 17, 2012 http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/let-sequestration-happen-7204

Sequestration likely won’t be as bad as special interests and those in favor of ever-increasing military spending claim. The reductions would only apply to FY 2013 budget authority, not outlays. The Pentagon and Congress will then have greater flexibility starting in FY 2014 to adjust the reductions under the BCA spending caps. In the meantime, many programs could continue on funding already authorized. We must also keep the cuts in proper perspective. The DoD base budget under sequestration would total $469 billion, about what we spent in 2006, not exactly a lean year for the Pentagon. And as for the claim that the military cuts will result in perhaps one million lost jobs, that seems implausible considering that the cuts would amount to less than three tenths of one percent of GDP. More to the point, the defense budget should never be seen as a jobs program. In a dynamic, market economy, capital and resources adjust to changing demand. Some regions and municipalities that are relatively more dependent upon military spending might suffer some short-term effects, but there is evidence that economies reliant on the military can recover. Some regions could emerge stronger and more diversified. Other reporting indicates that some businesses are already positioning themselves to weather reduced government spending.

#### 5—Agenda thumps the DA:

#### 6—Administrative actions blunt sequestration

Tsai 12-29

Joyce Tsai, December 29th, 2012, “How badly will budget cuts hurt troops, DOD civilians?” <http://www.stripes.com/news/how-badly-will-budget-cuts-hurt-troops-dod-civilians-1.202310>

Patrick Lester, director of fiscal policy at OMB Watch, a progressive Washington think tank, tells people not to panic. He argues that based on his nonprofit’s analysis, the politics for a deal being struck is much better in January. “Pain focuses the mind,” he said. The White House and executive office agencies have some ability to soften sequestration’s harshest impacts — if it kicks in — because the effects won’t come down immediately. They can offset some of the pain because they have the authority to control the rate of federal spending. They could use carryover funds to help cushion cuts, redirect funds to more urgent activities and accelerate spending to avoid employee furloughs, Lester said.

#### Spending fights now

The aff is negligible

#### 9—Won’t pass—not enough alternative cuts

Carroll 1/18/2013, Conn, senior editorial writer for the examiner, “Morning Examiner: the Sequester is going to happen,” http://washingtonexaminer.com/morning-examiner-the-sequester-is-going-to-happen/article/2519017#.UPryqidZUoM

This reality has already been accepted by many in the conservative defense hawk community. American Enterprise Institute defense expert Mackenzie Eaglen recently told [Human Events](http://www.humanevents.com/2013/01/10/hodge-on-looming-defense-cuts-is-it-time-to-start-bargaining-down/),”At the end of the day, there aren’t going to be any more acceptable alternative spending cuts to replace the sequester, or more tax increases. We know some type of sequestration’s going to happen for defense, because there is nowhere else to go. The continuous punting is not a solution.”

#### Doesn’t solve conflict.

Fettweis, Political Science – Tulane, 10 [Christopher J., fifth year doctoral student in the University of Maryland's Department of Government and Politics. His primary interests include US foreign and national security policies. His dissertation, currently titled The Geopolitics of Energy and the Obsolescence of Major War, focuses on the relationship between oil and conflict. Mr. Fettweis has a BA in History from the University of Notre Dame, Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy, April 2010 Survival, 52:2, 59 - 82]

One potential explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed fairly quickly: US actions do not seem to have contributed much. The limited evidence suggests that there is little reason to believe in the stabilising power of the US hegemon, and that there is **no relation** between the relative level of American activism and international stability. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defence spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defence in real terms than it had in 1990, a 25% reduction.29 To internationalists, defence hawks and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible 'peace dividend' endangered both national and global security. 'No serious analyst of American military capabilities', argued neo-conservatives William Kristol and Robert Kagan in 1996, 'doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace'.30 And yet the verdict from the 1990s is fairly plain: the world grew **more peaceful** while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable US military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. **No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races; no regional balancing occurred** once the stabilis-ing presence of the US military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in US military capabilities. Most of all, the United States was no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Bill Clinton, and kept declining as the George W. Bush administration ramped the spending back up. Complex statistical analysis is unnecessary to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.

### 2AC Security

#### 1—FW: weigh the aff against the alt—NB of fairness—they moot 9 minutes of 1ac offense.

#### Conditionality bad – voting issue – skews 2AC time and strategy, undermines depth of argument, justifies infinite CPs, and ruins advocacy skills – turns education. Pre-round conditionality solves – they can decide the best policy before the round.

#### 2) Case outweighs

#### A) Arms Control failure risks nuclear war – huge US and Russia stockpiles and more nuclear states means the risk of accidents or miscalculation is too high. None of their link arguments are about the threat of US Russia miscalculation.

#### B) Hot spots – US-Russia cooperation checks conflict scenarios all over the world. Breaks down the tensions they indict because it creates a more open and less divisive international order.

#### C) Don’t prioritize structural violence or racism – nuclear war would cause suffering all over the world and cause more structural violence. It would create divisions that cause more racism.

#### 3) Perm do both

#### 4—Anti-proliferation is good. We should try to get rid of as many nuclear weapons as possible

Paul Schulte, Director of Prolif & Arms Control - Ministry of Defense @ UK, ‘7 [*International Affairs* 83.3, “Universal vision or bounded rationality?” p. Blackwell]

It is also very much worth remembering that, despite Walker’s criticisms, the effect of the imperfect NPT regime is not simply to exploit the non-nuclear weapon states and keep them at a permanent disadvantage. Crucial benefi ts of Walker’s manged system of abstinence still apply: ‘the nuclear umbrellas (extended deterrence) held over … allies, which reduced incentives to acquire nuclear arms; and security assurances to states renouncing nuclear weapons that they would not be used against them’. And, while the treaty holds, non-nuclear weapon states can generally (though to inevitably varying degrees) expect also to avoid regional nuclear arms races, in which they might have to cope with newly nuclear-armed neighbours, whether or not they obtain nuclear weapons themselves. These systemic incentives surely explain much of the continuing and still significant strength of the NPT regime. In the particular, undoubtedly critical, case of Iran, the IAEA has, as intended, been functioning effectively in bringing objective verification evidence to the world’s attention. In response, rather than unduly concerning themselves with Walker’s abstract ‘hydra-headed problem of reconciliation’, the UN Security Council and the EU, as well as the United States, with the discreet support of Gulf governments, have so far, as Walker in fact concedes, indicated a willingness to act strongly. This international determination takes into account Iran’s previous undertakings and compliance history, its specific political culture, and its fateful geopolitical position in the centre of an unstable region of immense worldwide importance. As they used to say, grudgingly, during the Northern Ireland Troubles, ‘It’s the kind of solution which might work in practice but will never stand up in theory.’ Conclusion There is a permanent role for eloquent reminders of universal background imperatives. Walker’s article in this issue of International Affairs fulfils that role, emphasizes the importance of a sense of overall coherence related to a hopeful destination, and vividly expresses the intellectual frustration felt by non-nuclear weapon states and anti-nuclear campaigners. But, while so many decision-makers—and not only those in the American government—remain in practice unpersuaded of the strength and practical applicability of his interpretation of the nuclear disarmament imperative, there is also a case for bounded rationality and dogged engagement with current strategic and political realities. (Game theory, too, came out of the enlightenment.) It is not unenlightened to work to counter further proliferation which would permanently weaken the present regime and create additional obstacles to the eventual project of total nuclear abolition. The NPT regime is the best we have. As so many experts have so often observed, the treaty would not be achievable now—perhaps even a little less so after Walker’s critique. It would be unfortunate, therefore, if his passion for abstract systemic perfection led to further undermining of regime legitimacy and credibility. In nuclear matters, as in others, we should not exalt a universal vision of the best by destructively deprecating the actually existing, though contingent, good. Even Kant saw the necessity to work sometimes with things as they are, because ‘Out of the crooked timber of humanity, no straight thing was ever made’.6

#### 5—Data proves heg lowers absolute poverty and war deaths.

Barnett 11 (Thomas P.M. Barnett, Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>,

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding. As a result, the vector of structure-building connectivity shifted from trans-Atlantic to trans-Pacific. But if the connectivity push of the past several decades has been from West to East, with little connectivity extended to the South outside of the narrow trade of energy and raw materials, the current connectivity dynamic is dramatically different. Now, the dominant trends are: first, the East cross-connecting back to the West via financial and investment flows as well as Asian companies "going global"; and second, the East creating vast new connectivity networks with the South through South-South trade and investment. The challenge here is how to adjust great-power politics to these profound forces of structural change. Because of the West's connectivity to the East, we are by extension becoming more deeply connected to the unstable South, with China as the primary conduit. Meanwhile, America's self-exhausting post-Sept. 11 unilateralist bender triggered the illusion -- all the rage these days -- of a G-Zero, post-American world. The result, predictably enough for manic-depressive America, is that we've sworn off any overall responsibility for the South, even as we retain the right to go anywhere and kill any individuals -- preferably with flying robots -- that we deem immediately threatening to our narrowly defined national security interests. The problem with this approach is that China has neither the intention nor the ability to step up and play anything resembling a responsible Leviathan over the restive South, where globalization's advance -- again, with a Chinese face -- produces a lot of near-term instability even as it builds the basis for longer-term stability.

#### 6—Perm: do the aff and reject security logic. Every neg author would agree with the aff—the aff analyzes risk and adopts peaceful conflict resolution. That solves the endless war argument—when we perceive a threat we just fix it.

Experience proves safety

Reilly 13 BILL REILLY, a retired colonel, formerly headed the U.S. Army's reactor program. Sunday, July 1, 2012 Updated: Tue Jan 29, 2013. MOX offers a nuclear power boost http://www.columbiatribune.com/commentary/op-ed/mox-offers-a-nuclear-power-boost/article\_4075b9c4-bd1c-5f22-99fb-0783224782cf.html#.USB3wmfQaSo

The TVA reactors, however, would not be the first nuclear power plants to use MOX. Some 30 reactors worldwide use MOX produced at nuclear reprocessing facilities in France, Great Britain, Japan and other countries. At those facilities, plutonium remaining in used fuel left over from the production of nuclear-generated electricity has been used since the 1960s to make MOX. More than 6,000 MOX fuel assemblies have been used safely in reactors around the world. It's a well-established technology, especially in Europe.

Consensus supports safety

Yurman 12 Dan Yurman, formerly at the Idaho National lab and reporter for Fuel Cycle Week 9-9-12 Idaho Samizdat:

Nuke Notes Mix it up about MOX in Chattanooga <http://djysrv.blogspot.com/2012/09/mix-it-up-about-mox-in-chattanooga.html>

ANS members and its board have endorsed the important role that ANS should play as a professional society in informing the public about the nonproliferation benefits of the MOX fuel program and the safe and successful track record of manufacturing and using MOX fuel.

This endorsement by the ANS Board of Directors is not common in ANS position statements and underscores the importance of this issue.

Every credible scientific and technical organization in the world that has closely examined this issue has endorsed the use of MOX fuel technologies for this purpose.

#### 7—Alt fails

Jeroen Gunning, Lecturer in International Politics @ Univ. of Wales, ‘7 [*Government and Opposition* 42.3, “A Case for Critical Terrorism Studies?” p. Blackwell-synergy]

The notion of emancipation also crystallizes the need for policy engagement. For, unless a ‘critical’ field seeks to be policy relevant, which, as Cox rightly observes, means **combining** ‘critical’ and ‘problem-solving’ approaches, it does not fulfil its ‘emancipatory’ potential.94 One of the temptations of ‘critical’ approaches is to remain **mired** in critique and deconstruction without moving beyond this to reconstruction and policy relevance.Vital as such critiques are, the challenge of a critically constituted field is also to engage with policy makers – and ‘terrorists’ – and work towards the realization of new paradigms, new practices, and a transformation, however modestly, of **political structures**. That, after all, is the original meaning of the notion of ‘immanent critique’ that has historically underpinned the ‘critical’ project and which, in Booth's words, involves ‘the discovery of the latent potentials in situations on which to build political and social progress’, as opposed to putting forward utopian arguments that are not realizable. Or, as Booth wryly observes, ‘this means building with one's feet **firmly on the ground**, not **constructing castles** in the air’ and asking ‘what it means for real people in real places’.96 Rather than simply critiquing the status quo, or noting the problems that come from an un-problematized acceptance of the state, a ‘critical’ approach must, in my view, also concern itself with offering concrete a**lternative**s. Even while historicizing the state and oppositional violence, and challenging the state's role in reproducing oppositional violence, it must wrestle with the fact that ‘the concept of the modern state and sovereignty embodies a coherent response to many of the central problems of political life’, and in particular to ‘the place of violence in political life’. Even while ‘de-essentializing and deconstructing claims about security’, it must concern itself with ‘how security is to be redefined’, and in particular on what theoretical basis.97 Whether because those critical of the status quo are wary of becoming co-opted by the structures of power (and their emphasis on instrumental rationality),98 or because policy makers have, for obvious reasons (including the failure of many ‘critical’ scholars to offer policy relevant advice), a greater affinity with ‘traditional’ scholars, the role of ‘expert adviser’ is more often than not filled by ‘traditional’ scholars.99 The result is that policy makers **are insufficiently challenged to question** the basis of their policies and develop new policies based on immanent critiques. A notable exception is the readiness of European Union officials to enlist the services of both ‘traditional’ and ‘critical’ scholars to advise the EU on how better to understand processes of radicalization.100 But this would have been impossible if more critically oriented scholars such as Horgan and Silke had not been ready to cooperate with the EU. Striving to be policy relevant does not mean that one has to accept the validity of the term ‘terrorism’ or stop investigating the political interests behind it. Nor does it mean that each piece of research must have policy relevance or that one has to limit one's research to what is relevant for the state, since the ‘critical turn’ implies a move beyond state-centric perspectives. End-users could, and should, thus include both state and non-state actors such as the Foreign Office and the Muslim Council of Britain and Hizb ut-Tahrir; the Northern Ireland Office and the IRA and the Ulster Unionists; the Israeli government and Hamas and Fatah (as long as the overarching principle is to reduce the political use of terror, whoever the perpetrator). It does mean, though, that a critically constituted field must work hard to bring together all the fragmented voices from beyond the ‘terrorism field’, to maximize both the field's rigour and its policy relevance. Whether a critically constituted ‘terrorism studies’ will attract the fragmented voices from outside the field depends largely on how broadly the term ‘critical’ is defined. Those who assume ‘critical’ to mean ‘Critical Theory’ or ‘poststructuralist’ may not feel comfortable identifying with it if they do not themselves subscribe to such a narrowly defined ‘critical’ approach. Rather, to maximize its inclusiveness, I would follow Williams and Krause's approach to ‘critical security studies’, which they define simply as bringing together ‘many perspectives that have been considered outside of the mainstream of the discipline’.101 This means refraining from establishing new criteria of inclusion/exclusion beyond the (normative) expectation that scholars self-reflexively question their conceptual framework, the origins of this framework, their methodologies and dichotomies; and that they historicize both the state and ‘terrorism’, and consider the security and context of all, which implies among other things an attempt at empathy and cross-cultural understanding.102 Anything more normative would limit the ability of such a field to create a genuinely interdisciplinary, non-partisan and innovative framework, and exclude valuable insights borne of a broadly ‘critical’ approach, such as those from conflict resolution studies who, despite working within a ‘traditional’ framework, offer important insights by moving beyond a narrow military understanding of security to a broader understanding of human security and placing violence in its wider social context.103 Thus, a poststructuralist **has no greater claim** to be part of this ‘critical’ field than a realist who looks beyond the state at the interaction between the violent group and their wider social constituency.104

#### 8—We aren’t saying leaders crazy or incompetent, we just say nuclear weapons are bad. We do not endorse existing nuclear weapons – our escalation scenarios are an indictment of them.

#### 9—Arms control is peaceful action—reduces interstate conflict

Jonas Hagmann, @ Graduate Institute of International Studies (IUHEI), Geneva, 07 [Paper presented at the Sixth Pan-European Conference on International Relations, “Not whether but how: Introducing complex securitization,” http://archive.sgir.eu/uploads/Hagmann-SGIR%20Turin%20-Threats%20as%20subject%20positions-%20JHagmann%20IUHEI%20Geneva.pdf]

This paper developed two arguments. First, security concerns **are not necessarily favouring self-help responses.** This **nuances** the ‘unwanted’ characterisation of securitization: From an internationalist perspective, the potential role of shared security problems as drivers for international cooperation might indeed produce some positive effects as/if it reduces the rationales for interstate conflict. Second, the paper argued that to conceive of such possibilities, it is important to broaden the analysis framework of policymakers’ security knowledge base. In this view, securitization is not only to be understood as the identification and linkage of a threats type to a referent object. Instead, securitization should be conceived as a more ‘complex’ or more multidimensional process that includes the establishment of exclusive (‘private’) and non-exclusive (‘public’) or collective concerns on the one hand, and their grounding in state and non-state agency on the other hand. As explanations of how threats ‘work’, so-established subject-positions cast important structuring effects onto foreign and security policy making. They provide the ideational material with which policymakers can and must make meaningful policy statements for or against internationalism. Through the lens of Aristotelian causality, structuralist IR theory is predetermining security problems into self-help responses too often, and some securitization scholars stigmatise the issue probably somewhat too prematurely - the emergence of ‘new threats’ does not necessarily reinforce self-help dynamics. The understanding that security problems can be framed as the bases for international cooperation has also wider implications. Indeed, it makes it necessary to reconsider one dominant understanding in constructivist IR in particular, namely that a convergence of values leads to peace. From the perspective of this paper, the convergence of threat assessments among policymakers is probably at least as important to explanations of peace as a convergence of their values. Effectively, it even makes it possible to conceive of a situation in which there is peace without shared values – a situation which is probably also easier to empirically prove then value-based arguments. Empirical research indeed points to a possible privileged role of threat assessments over shared values as explanatory factors for, for instance contemporary European security cooperation. At best, security policy doctrines namely invoke shared values in the margins to describe the overall environment, but not to derive a need for policy from it. The Swiss 1998 Brunner Report even co-opts the value argument into the insecurity perspective: Arguing that American supremacy stimulates opposition, it sees Switzerland becoming a target of hostile backlashes because of the very values that it shares with the US (Studienkommission, 1998: 3). This latter understanding directs further research into deeper analyses of the socially dispersed construction of policymakers’ security knowledge, and it deemphasizes the view that habit and trust alone lead to ‘mutual aid’ i.e. cooperation in security affairs (Adler and Barnett, 1998: 3-28). If it is viable to construe of a convergent dislocation of threat agency away from state responsibilities and towards the securitization of universal, non-state actor-sponsored threats as a key driver for inter-state peace and cooperation, then it becomes possible to re-read the security community analyses from a different and complementary analytical ‘insecurity community’ angle. Rather than understanding the OSCE battery of seminar diplomacy (Adler, 1998) or UN arsenals of peacebuilding activities as efforts to foster shared values for instance, they could probably better be understood as efforts to dislocate threat thinking away from state-centric conceptions and towards pressing sub-state actors problems, so fostering inter-state or inter-group peace efforts through a manipulation of the security knowledge base.

8—Prolif causes extinction, that’s Heisbourg – they take non-use of nuclear weapons for granted. New nuclear weapons states destabilize the international system:

1. Geography – new nuclear weapons states proliferate in regions with multiple complex layers of international confrontation that make nuclear war likely – Middle east and Asia proves there are too many conflicting interests to ensure stability.

2. Doctrines. They don’t assume the expectation of early use – creates an incentive for force postures that make preemptive nuclear strikes more likely.

3. Non-state actors – they’ve historically served as aggravating factors that can trigger conflict when perceived in collusion with an antagonist state.

4. Empirics. India-Pakistan conflict is less stable than ever due to nuclearization – more nuclear weapons states only make nuclear conflict more likely.

5. Cold War analogy is false – the U.S. and USSR still intervened across the globe, and nuclear weapons were never positioned to directly threaten US or Soviet capitols – except during the Cuban Missile Crisis, which proves our argument. Deterrence can only break down in the long run, that’s Shultz.