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### 1

#### Procurement is not a financial incentive

Czinkota et al, 9- Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books)

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. **Fiscal incentives** are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. **Financial incentives** offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. **Nonfinancial incentives** include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

#### Voter for limits and ground—procurement dodges core market controversies and guarantees a market while making us account for every facet of government operations—creates an unmanageable prep burden

#### And, precision—compensation for service might give reason for action but is not an actual incentive

**Grant 2002** – professor of political science at Duke University (Ruth, Economics and Philosophy, 18:2002, “THE ETHICS OF INCENTIVES: HISTORICAL ORIGINS AND CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDINGS”, WEA)

The use of `incentives' to speak of market forces is also problematic,¶ though it is easy to see the logic of this development within the language¶ of economics. If one company lowers the price of its product, we might¶ readily say that other companies now have an incentive to lower theirs.¶ But we would not say that the first company offered all other companies¶ an incentive to lower their prices.55 Market forces are not conscious and¶ intentional, and their rationale is intrinsic to the economic process itself.¶ We might just as well say in this situation that the first company's lower¶ price is a good reason for other companies to lower theirs given that they¶ need to remain competitive. The term `incentive' says nothing that¶ `reason' cannot say as well in this case. A similar logic applies to¶ speaking of loan conditions as incentives. The International Monetary¶ Fund may make a loan to a nation only on condition that it alter its¶ inflationary policies. If the reason for the condition is intrinsic to the¶ IMF's own financial aims, `incentive' may be a misnomer. The situation¶ is like that of requiring a certain training as a condition for the practice of¶ medicine; we would be unlikely to refer to this as an `incentive' to go to¶ medical school for people who wish to become doctors.56 When the IMF¶ is criticized for using financial incentives unethically to control the¶ internal policies of borrowing nations, it is because the critics suspect¶ that its real purposes are political rather than strictly limited to the¶ legitimate concern to secure the financial health of the Fund.

The distinction between market forces and incentives can be¶ illustrated further by considering the difference between wages as¶ compensation and incentives as bonuses in employment. Compensation¶ means `rendering equal', a `recompense or equivalent', `payment for¶ value received or service rendered', or something which `makes up for a¶ loss' ± as in the term `unemployment compensation'. Compensation¶ equalizes or redresses a balance, and so, to speak of `fair compensation'¶ is entirely sensible. But to speak of a `fair incentive' is not. An incentive¶ is a bonus, which is defined as something more than usually expected,¶ that is, something that exceeds normal compensation. It is an amount¶ intentionally added to the amount that would be set by the automatic¶ and unintentional forces of the market. An incentive is also a motive or¶ incitement to action, and so an economic incentive offered to an¶ employee is a bonus designed to motivate the employee to produce¶ beyond the usual expectation. It should be obvious then, that compensation¶ and incentives are by no means identical. The per diem received for¶ jury service, for example, is a clear case of compensation which is not an¶ incentive in any sense.

It is not difficult to see how it might have happened that the¶ boundaries were blurred between the specific conception of incentives¶ and conceptions of the automatic price and wage-setting forces of the¶ market. Both can be subsumed under very general notions of the factors¶ that influence our choices or motivate action, and `incentives' carries this¶ general meaning as well. Nonetheless, the blurring of that boundary¶ creates a great deal of confusion. Incentives, in fact, are understood¶ better in contradistinction to market forces than as identical to them. It is¶ only by maintaining a clear view of their distinctive character that the¶ ethical and political dimensions of their use are brought to light.¶ Moreover, conceptual clarity and historical understanding go hand¶ in hand in this case. It should no longer be surprising to find that the¶ term `incentives' is not used by Adam Smith in first describing the¶ operation of the market, but appears instead at a time when the market¶ seemed inadequate in certain respects to the demands presented by¶ changing economic circumstances. Other eighteenth and nineteenthcentury¶ ideas, often taken as simple precursors of contemporary analyses¶ of incentives, can now be seen in their distinctive character as well. For¶ example, Hume and Madison offer an analysis of institutional design¶ which differs significantly from `institutional incentives', though the two¶ are often confused. These thinkers were concerned with preventing¶ abuses of power. They sought to tie interest to duty through institutional¶ mechanisms to thwart destructive, self-serving passions and to secure¶ the public good. Contemporary institutional analyses, by contrast,¶ proceed without the vocabulary of duty or public good and without the¶ exclusively preventive aim. Institutional incentives are viewed as a¶ means of harnessing individual interests in pursuit of positive goals.57¶ Similarly, early utilitarian discussions, Bentham's in particular, differ¶ markedly from twentieth century discussions of incentives despite what¶ might appear to be a shared interest in problems of social control. Again,¶ Bentham is interested entirely in prevention of abuses or infractions of¶ the rules. The rationale for his panopticon is based on the observation¶ that prevention of infractions depends upon a combination of the¶ severity of punishment and the likelihood of detection.58 If the latter¶ could be increased to one hundred per cent, through constant supervision¶ and inspection, punishment would become virtually unnecessary.¶ This is a logic that has nothing whatever to do with the logic of¶ incentives as a means of motivating positive choices or of encouraging¶ adaptive behavior.

### 2

#### USFG is the federal government of the USA, based in DC – just the three branches which they can’t meet because of their cross-x answer

**Dictionary of Government and Politics 98** (Ed. P.H. Collin, p. 292)

United States of America (USA) [ju:’naitid ‘steits av e’merike] noun independent country, a federation of states (originally thirteen, now fifty in North America; the United States Code = book containing all the permanent laws of the USA, arranged in sections according to subject and revised from time to time COMMENT: the federal government (based in Washington D.C.) is formed of a legislature (the Congress) with two chambers (the Senate and House of Representatives), an executive (the President) and a judiciary (the Supreme Court).

#### Violation – the TVA is Federal Government Corporation which is a distinct non-state actor – their inclusion explodes limits and undermines predictable ground

FROOMKIN ’96 (A. Michael; Associate Professor of Law – University of Miami, “Reinventing the Government Corporation,” <http://osaka.law.miami.edu/~froomkin/articles/reinvent.htm>)

Although federal corporations have been a part of the national life for 200 years,{9} they remain obscure--a status they no doubt find convenient. Today more federal corporations exist than ever before in peacetime, and the number keeps growing. While toiling in obscurity, they manage communication satellites, museums, railroads, and power generation. They provide specialized credit and insurance for housing and agriculture. They exist as accounting devices to hide the true size of the budget deficit, as nonprofit organizations, and as highly profitable and highly leveraged economic colossi. The most profitable corporations, which provided a total of about $5 trillion in credit and insurance in 1995, also have approximately $1.5 trillion in securities and other debt outstanding. These organizations are capable of squirreling away $2 billion for a rainy day, while pleading poverty to Congress.{10}

This article seeks to shed some light on these organizations and asks some hard questions about whether these bodies are properly accountable for the vast sums they borrow, lend, and spend, and for the public power and benefits they enjoy. More is at stake than just money. Left to run loose, government corporations threaten to infringe basic principles of democratic accountability.

Some federal government corporations are wholly owned by the government and are clearly state actors, resembling ordinary agencies in many ways.{11} Others, however, are owned wholly or partly by private persons.{12} These mixed-ownership and private corporations enjoy[ \*548] a combination of federal and private powers and obligations, and therefore may not be state actors in a constitutional sense. Thus, they may be less accountable for their actions even though they are creatures of a national policy.

By allowing private ownership and private control of publicly funded and ostensibly publicly directed activities, the structure of some federal government corporations weakens accountability. The powers granted to privately controlled federal government corporations are usually economic, but a few federal government corporations have more public functions. The uncertain legal status of some federal government corporations also raises separation of powers and nondelegation concerns because it weakens presidential, as well as congressional, control over the federal administrative machinery and over important sectors of the national economy. Placing public funds, public monopolies, or public power, in the hands of unelected, unappointed, almost certainly unimpeachable, and largely unaccountable private parties poses a serious and largely unexplored challenge to accountable, efficient, democratic national government.

The Vice President's report suggests that a government corporation can harness the efficiency of the private sector for the service of the public. Neither a privatized existing program, nor an ordinary government department, the corporation is supposed to combine the flexibility of a business with the public purpose and public duties of government. Reality is not always that simple. Federal government corporations enjoy public advantages unavailable to state-chartered firms, including national establishment, exemption from state taxes and from portions of the securities laws, privileged access to capital, and even sovereign immunity. These advantages effectively free some federal corporations from market discipline. In addition, uncertainty as to whether to characterize federal government corporations as private bodies or coordinate departments hampers federal regulation and bureaucratic control. Similarly, otherwise simple civil cases become complicated, as courts struggle to determine whether an entity is a private party, a state actor, or part of the state itself.{13}

This article concentrates on federal government corporations in which the federal government owns shares or appoints directors.{14} It[ \*549] begins with a brief description of the creation and powers of federal government corporations. The article then explains how some federal government corporations operate under a legal regime that enables them to escape accountability to Congress, the President, and the private market. As a result, their private investors, shareholders, and managers may benefit more than the public they are intended to serve. The article concludes with a critical analysis of previous regulatory reform proposals and offers alternative proposals designed to increase accountability to government discipline and market discipline, ensure that private parties do not profit at public expense, and nonetheless limit taxpayers' contingent liability if a federal corporation becomes insolvent.

I. CREATION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Today, more than forty{15} FGCs are directly chartered by Congress,{16} [ \*550] including such diverse bodies as the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae),{17} the Legal Services Corporation (LSC),{18} the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA),{19} the National Endowment for Democracy,{20} the Commodity Credit Corporation,{21} the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae),{22} and the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT).{23} The recently created Resolution Funding Corporation (REFCORP),{24} charged with borrowing funds for the use of the Resolution Trust Corporation (RTC) which is recapitalizing insolvent savings and loans, is only the latest in a line of FGCs created to channel funds to a specific sector of the economy. Indeed, from 1965 to 1988, the outstanding credit assistance and insurance provided by FGCs grew by over 1000%, to about $5 trillion.{25} The General Accounting Office (GAO) has warned that much of the hundreds of billions in direct loans by FGCs is at risk, although the Treasury takes a more nuanced view.{26}[\*551]

A. Federal Power to Create Corporations

The federal government's authority to charter corporations derives from the Necessary and Proper Clause of the Constitution,{27} as expounded in Chief Justice Marshall's decisions in McCulloch v. Maryland{28} and Osborn v. Bank of the United States.{29} McCulloch established that, despite the lack of an applicable enumerated federal power, the Necessary and Proper Clause of the Constitution allows the federal government to charter and use a private entity for the public purpose of banking. The Second Bank of the United States, the subject of both cases, was a federally chartered corporation with 80% of its stock owned by private persons and 20% by the United States. The Bank had twenty-five directors, five of whom were appointed by the President from among the stockholders, subject to Senate confirmation. The remaining twenty directors were elected by the other shareholders.{30} The Second Bank, like its precursor, had extensive power over the money supply and, consequently, over the monetary[ \*552] policy of the United States.{31} Although the President could remove any of the five directors he appointed, he had no such power over the privately elected directors who constituted a comfortable majority. The Bank, therefore, ensured that monetary policy remained in the control of the wealthy citizens and private banks, who could afford to purchase shares.{32} Neither McCulloch nor Osborn stated that Congress has a general power to create corporations for any purpose. Instead, those cases held that Congress's power to create a Bank derives from, and exists in order to effectuate, its power to manage the fiscal affairs of the United States.{33}

Today, as in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, FGCs are separate legal persons chartered directly by an act of Congress or by persons acting pursuant to congressional authorization. The statute creating the corporation may provide a federal charter or may specify incorporation under the laws of the District of Columbia.{34} Every FGC, however created and governed, enjoys a separate legal personality,{35} and, unless there is legislation to the contrary, its investors, including[ \*553] the United States, presumably enjoy limited liability.{36} Therefore, the United States is not legally responsible for the debts of even a wholly owned FGC unless there is a constitutional, statutory, or federal common-law rule to the contrary.

#### Ground – corporations circumvent legislative, agency, and judicial action – core agent ground guaranteeing perception of plan and DA links

#### Limits – hundreds of government corporations, most of them different energy utilities, overburden neg research and decimate preparation for all debates

### 3

#### Immigration reform package moving smoothly through congress now – avoiding controversy along with Obama pressure and engagement is key to maintain momentum and prevent the GOP from smothering the bill

I-Hsien Sherwood (writer for the Latino Post) March 21, 2013 “Immigration Reform 2013 News: Delays Could Hinder Reform Bill, So Speed is Necessary” http://www.latinospost.com/articles/14995/20130321/immigration-reform-2013-news-delays-hinder-bill-speed-necessary.htm

Lately, proponents of immigration reform have been optimistic about the progress of bipartisan bills in both the Senate and House of Representatives. But many pitfalls still remain, and the sooner an immigration reform bill emerges from Congress, the greater its chances of eventually passing.¶ In general, the longer a piece of legislation remains before Congress, with its partisan bickering, disparate constituencies and army of lobbyists each pursuing targeted ends, the more easily it is torn apart, poked through with exceptions and slandered in the press. A bill unsheltered is a bill likely doomed.¶ So while some conservatives opposed to immigration reform are raising policy objections, other are attempting a procedural flank.¶ Six Republican senators, led by Jeff Sessions of Alabama, sent a letter to Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) demanding that the process move more slowly and senators be given several months to review the bill.¶ In addition, the GOP is still reeling from its resounding loss in last year's presidential election, when 71 percent of Latinos voted to reelect their opponent, President Obama. That sent the Republicans into a bout of soul searching, prompting the latest openness to reform.¶ But that willingness may be short-lived, especially as the lessons of November fade and Congress gears up for primary battles from the conservative right and the Tea Party.¶ The window for reform is short, and the stakes are high, so the potential for heated arguments and tense standoffs increases, further endangering any kind of compromise bill.¶ For now, the Senate's "Gang of Eight" seems to be moving quickly and relatively smoothly toward a proposal, despite delays. They admit they'll miss their first self-imposed deadline at the end of the month, but the White House, which has been keeping the pressure on, says it is still confident they will present a worthwhile bill.¶ "The good news is that the Gang of Eight seems to be making progress. We are engaged with them. We are encouraged by their progress," Cecilia Muñoz, head of the White House Domestic Policy Council, which is spearheading the immigration initiative, said.¶ Whether Congress can maintain momentum on the issue remains to be seen.

#### TVA MOX controversial

Rob Pavey, 2011 http://chronicle.augusta.com/news/metro/2011-09-12/mox-report-congress-six-months-overdue

The mixed oxide, or MOX plant, is designed to dispose of 34 metric tons of plutonium by blending the material with uranium to make commercial reactor fuel. Efforts to find utilities willing to use the fuel have progressed slowly.¶ In June, the House Appropriations Committee expressed new concerns about the project’s escalating costs and the quest to find clients for the fuel.¶ “The costs of this program continue to escalate, with current estimates of as much as $9.7 billion, just to construct the needed facilities,” committee members wrote in the fiscal 2012 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill.¶ Although the Tennessee Valley Authority is exploring its use in as many as five of its reactors, the recent crisis with Japan’s nuclear program will make such an alliance less likely, and much more difficult, the committee wrote.¶ Josh McConaha, a spokesman for the National Nuclear Security Administration, said officials are diligently working on the report. “The MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility report is currently in progress and will be submitted to Congress as soon as it is completed,” he said.

#### **Top priority—PC stewardship key**

Shifter 12/27 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Will Obama Kick the Can Down the Road?” 2012, http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3186

Not surprisingly, Obama has been explicit that reforming the US’s shameful and broken immigration system will be a top priority in his second term. There is every indication that he intends to use some of his precious political capital – especially in the first year – to push for serious change. The biggest lesson of the last election was that the “Latino vote” was decisive. No one doubts that it will be even more so in future elections. During the campaign, many Republicans -- inexplicably -- frightened immigrants with offensive rhetoric. But the day after the election, there was talk, in both parties, of comprehensive immigration reform. ¶ Despite the sudden optimism about immigration reform, there is, of course, no guarantee that it will happen. It will require a lot of negotiation and deal-making. Obama will have to invest a lot of his time and political capital -- twisting some arms, even in his own party. Resistance will not disappear.

#### **Obama’s reform is key to all aspect of heg---[competitiveness, hard and soft power]**

Nye 12 Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University. “Immigration and American Power,” December 10, Project Syndicate, 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.

#### Global war

**Zhang and Shi, 2011** – \*Yuhan Zhang is a researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C.; Lin Shi is from Columbia University. She also serves as an independent consultant for the Eurasia Group and a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, D.C. (America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/)

This does not necessarily mean that the US is in systemic decline, but it encompasses a trend that appears to be negative and perhaps alarming. Although the US still possesses incomparable military prowess and its economy remains the world’s largest, the once seemingly indomitable chasm that separated America from anyone else is narrowing. Thus, the global distribution of power is shifting, and the inevitable result will be a world that is less peaceful, liberal and prosperous, burdened by a dearth of effective conflict regulation. Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

### 4

The United States Federal Government should initiate cooperative consultations with the Russian government over negotiating a new START treaty, altering the Eastern European missile defense arrangement, and managing Central Asia’s security transition concerning the withdrawal of US troops from Afghanistan.

#### CP solves relations

Steven Pifer (Director, Arms Control Initiative, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe at the Brookings Institute) March 2012 “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship” http://www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2012/03/21-arms-control-pifer¶

The U.S. relationship with Russia has been and will, for the foreseeable future, remain a mix of issues on which the two countries can cooperate and issues where their positions conflict. The goal for Washington should be to make progress on those issues where U.S. and Russian interests coincide while protecting American positions and managing differences where interests diverge.¶ The Obama administration’s “reset” policy has improved the U.S.-Russian relationship. By any objective measure, the relationship is stronger today than it was in 2008, the low point in U.S.-Russian relations after the collapse of the Soviet Union. This does not mean the relationship is without problems. Washington and Moscow disagree on issues such as missile defense in Europe, Syria, the post-Soviet space, and democracy and human rights within Russia.¶ On May 7, Vladimir Putin will return to the Russian presidency. This should not entail a change in the strategic course of Russian foreign policy, though the tone and style will likely differ from that of Dmitry Medvedev. Mr. Putin will have to confront domestic political and economic challenges that may affect his foreign policy choices: he could resort to the traditional Russian tactic of depicting a foreign adversary to rally domestic support as during his election campaign, or he could pursue a more accommodating foreign policy so that he can focus on issues at home. We do not yet know.¶ It remains in the U.S. interest to engage Russia where engagement can advance American policy goals. In doing so, the United States will at times have to be prepared to take account of Russian interests if it wishes to secure Moscow’s help on questions that matter to Washington. For example, U.S. readiness to accommodate Russian concerns in negotiating the New START Treaty contributed to Moscow’s decision to open new supply routes for NATO to Afghanistan and to support a UN Security Council resolution that imposed an arms embargo on Iran.¶ Looking forward in its relations with Russia, the United States should pursue further reductions of nuclear arms, including non-strategic nuclear weapons; continue to explore a cooperative NATO-Russia missile defense arrangement; seek to work jointly to deal with the proliferation challenges posed by North Korea and Iran; and consult on steps to bolster security and stability in Central Asia as the NATO coalition prepares to withdraw its military forces from Afghanistan. The United States should explore ways to increase trade and investment relations with Russia, which could help build a foundation for a more sustainable relationship. While Moscow’s decisions about its business and investment climate—for example, to strengthen rule of law and tackle corruption—are the most important factor in this regard, Congress should now graduate Russia from the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, an action that is long overdue.

#### That coop solves loose nukes

Associated Press 9.18.08

http://ap.google.com/article/ALeqM5jttDn6BPh7apBLSIhN9th0IC1udgD93929LG0

The authors of a U.S. program designed to secure weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet Union say they worry that deteriorating relations between the United States and Russia could undermine efforts to keep the weapons out of the hands of terrorists. Sen. Richard Lugar and former Sen. Sam Nunn say the two countries have continued working together to secure nuclear, chemical and biological weapons despite growing hostility after Russia's invasion of Georgia last month. They said in separate interviews with The Associated Press, however, that the spike in tensions heightens the risks of a breakdown in the arrangement under which the United States pays for the program. "The Nunn-Lugar program has survived the very bad feelings between the U.S. and Russia before," Nunn said. "History is full of examples where pride and dignity basically overruled self-interest." The Nunn-Lugar Comprehensive Threat Reduction Act is credited with funding efforts helping Russia and other former Soviet republics to destroy, dismantle and secure thousands of nuclear warheads and other weapons of mass destruction.

### 5

#### The United States federal government ought to perform a proliferation assessment of mixed-oxide fuel through the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, committing to financial support of the Tennessee Valley Authority increasing procurement contracts for mixed oxide fuel for its electricity generation in the United States.

#### Prior proliferation assessment is critical -- it strengthens US leverage and prevents global prolif.

IBT, 9-11-12

[“Laser Enrichment Technology/Dangers,” <http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/articles/20120911/laser-enrichment-technology-dangers.htm>]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is putting U.S. nuclear non-proliferation policy at risk if it decides not to require a formal nuclear proliferation assessment as part of the licensing process for a uranium laser enrichment facility in Wilmington, N.C.¶ That’s the message from 19 nuclear non-proliferation experts in a letter sent today asking the NRC to fulfill its statutory responsibility to assess proliferation threats related to the technologies it regulates.¶ Global Laser Enrichment, LLC, a joint venture of General Electric (USA), Hitachi (Japan) and Cameco (Canada), has applied for a license to operate a laser enrichment facility in Wilmington, North Carolina, based on Australian SILEX technology. The NRC licensing review schedule sets September 30, 2012 as the date of license issuance.¶ One of the authors of the letter, Catherine Thomasson, MD, executive director, Physicians for Social Responsibility, said: “It is a widely shared view that laser enrichment could be an undetectable stepping-stone to a clandestine nuclear weapons program. To strengthen US policy and protect the US and the world from nuclear proliferation, the NRC should systematically and thoroughly assess the proliferation risks of any new uranium enrichment technology BEFORE issuing a license allowing their development.”¶ Dr. Ira Helfand, co-president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, said: “If the U.S. is going to have moral authority in dealing with proliferation threats in other nations, such as Iran, it must do a better job of taking responsible steps in relation to proliferation threats in our own backyard. In fact, a persuasive case can be made that laser enrichment technology requires even more immediate action, since this is a known danger that can be addressed directly by the NRC under its existing regulatory authority.”

#### Nuclear war

**Taylor, 2002**   
[Stuart, Sr. Fellow Brookings, 9-14, “Invading Iraq Wouldn't Necessarily Make Us Safer”]

That risk dwarfs anything that Saddam Hussein could do with chemical or biological weapons. And even if he drops dead tomorrow, it is quite probable that we will experience such a catastrophe within 20 years - if not 20 months - unless we do two things that are barely on the national radar screen and that go against the grain of Republican unilateralism. The first is to spend whatever it takes to secure the vast Russian nuclear stockpile and other nuclear installations around the world. They are far more dangerous than Saddam because there is no doubt that al Qaeda (and perhaps other terrorists) will use any unsecured weapons or fissile (bomb-making) materials against us if they can get ahold of them. The second is to get much, much more serious about stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons, which is a huge threat to civilization itself. A push to end nuclear proliferation could work only if enforced by the threat or use of pre-emptive military action - not only in Iraq but also in Iran, North Korea, Libya, and perhaps others of the more than 60 nations capable of building nuclear weapons - either on our own or through an international coalition. Doing this on our own, as Bush administration hawks prefer, could mean launching bloody invasion after invasion, at enormous cost in lives, treasure and international standing, if rogue states call our bluff. Rallying a potent and determined coalition seems possible only if we stop thumbing our nose at world opinion, offer to scrap the bulk of our own arsenal and renounce first use of nuclear weapons in exchange for similar concessions by others. The truth is, no matter what we do about Iraq, if we don't stop proliferation, another five or 10 potentially unstable nations may go nuclear before long, making it ever more likely that one or more bombs will be set off anonymously on our soil by terrorists or a terrorist government. Even an airtight missile defense would be useless against a nuke hidden in a truck, a shipping container or a boat. As to Iraq, unless we can get U.N. Security Council support for whatever we decide to do (on which, more below), either a go-it-alone U.S.-British invasion or a Bush backdown from the beating of war drums would carry incalculable risks. An invasion would, of course, end Saddam's quest for nuclear weapons and probably Saddam himself. So far, so good. But some hawks greatly underestimate the costs and risks, claiming that an easy victory in Iraq will lead to a flowering of democracy that will inspire the rest of the Arab world to follow suit, destroy the appeal of militant Islam, pave the way for Israeli-Palestinian peace and make us all safer. This is a fantasy. Unless Saddam is overthrown from within, we would have to take Baghdad in house-to-house fighting, with many thousands of casualties. The task of pacifying and democratizing a nation that has never known freedom and hates our ally Israel would be at least as difficult as bringing peace and democracy to Afghanistan. And the administration has not made a very credible beginning there. The effects of a unilateral invasion on our national security would extend far beyond Iraq. Viewed optimistically, it might also - if accompanied by a credible threat to launch a succession of pre-emptive wars - convince Iran, Libya, North Korea, and other potential threats that we would do the same to them if they persist in developing nuclear weapons. But then again, rogue nations might react by hiding, rather than ending, their bomb-building programs. And as the cost of a policy of pre-emptive wars without end becomes apparent, American voters might balk. A U.S.-British invasion would also divert resources from the war against al Qaeda, especially in Afghanistan, where al Qaeda is already regrouping. It would alienate Russia and others whose cooperation we need in the vital project of securing fissile materials. It would thereby increase the danger of a nuclear attack by al Qaeda or others. By enraging hundreds of millions of Muslims worldwide, it would swell the ranks of terrorist groups - perhaps making it easier for them to recruit nuclear engineers as well as suicide bombers - and risk a militant Islamist takeover of nuclear-armed Pakistan. Years or even decades of sometimes-bloody occupation could keep the hate-America pot boiling. With Kurds in the north and Shiites in the south demanding independence, we would have to choose between crushing those movements and alienating Turkey, a vital ally with a region of restive Kurds bordering Iraq. Many in Europe and elsewhere would see the Bush administration as less interested in democratizing Iraq than in controlling the region's oil and in achieving world domination. All of this international ill will could doom any hope for support in fighting nuclear proliferation. Does all of this mean that a unilateral invasion should be ruled out as complete folly? Not necessarily. The dangers of backing down are also grave. It is foolish for doves to scoff at the risk that a nuclear-armed Saddam could or would launch what they say would be a "suicidal" attack on the United States. He seems entirely capable of smuggling a bomb into one of our cities, perhaps in league with al Qaeda, and setting it off anonymously in the hope of escaping retaliation. If we stand aside while Saddam builds or buys nuclear weapons, and if at some point thereafter a bomb takes out Washington or New York, how could we be sure that Saddam was involved? The culprits might be terrorists connected, not to Iraq, but perhaps to Pakistan, North Korea, Iran, or Libya. Against whom would we retaliate? Doves also seem disingenuous in ruling out an invasion unless and until we can produce irrefutable evidence that Saddam presents an imminent nuclear threat. Most would be no less dovish after seeing such proof than they are now. After all, once Iraq has nuclear arms, an invasion would be far more perilous. So a decision not to invade now is a decision not to invade ever - not, at least, until Saddam has actually used nuclear or biological weapons or repeated his use of chemical weapons. And a Bush backdown now would surely embolden other rogue states to accelerate their nuclear programs. In short, the future will be extremely dangerous no matter what we do about Iraq. The best way out would be to use the threat of a unilateral invasion to push the U.N. Security Council to demand that Iraq submit to unconditional, unrestricted arms inspections, as proposed by President Chirac of France, followed by military action if Saddam balks or cheats or it becomes clear that inspections cannot be effective. France and Russia might go along, suggests a former Clinton administration official, if that were the only way to get a piece of the post-invasion protectorate over the world's second-largest oil supply. We should not become so fixated on Iraq that we ignore the greater dangers: al Qaeda, loose nuclear materials in Russia and elsewhere, and nuclear proliferation. House Republicans have idiotically refused to provide adequate funding to secure nuclear stockpiles abroad. They and the Bush administration have greatly damaged the effectiveness of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty by spurning the closely related Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, without which more and more nations will be tempted to seek nuclear weapons. Unless we get serious about stopping proliferation, we are headed for "a world filled with nuclear-weapons states, where every crisis threatens to go nuclear," where "the survival of civilization truly is in question from day to day," and where "it would be impossible to keep these weapons out of the hands of terrorists, religious cults, and criminal organizations." So writes Ambassador Thomas Graham Jr., a moderate Republican who served as a career arms-controller under six presidents and led the successful Clinton administration effort to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The only way to avoid such a grim future, he suggests in his memoir, *Disarmament Sketches*, is for the United States to lead an international coalition against proliferation by showing an unprecedented willingness to give up the vast majority of our own nuclear weapons, excepting only those necessary to deter nuclear attack by others.

### 6

#### Financialization of energy production is a neoliberal tool to subvert communal agency—fuels inequality and unsustainable practices

**Hildyard et al 2012** – \*founder and Director of The Corner House, a U.K. research and advocacy group focusing on human rights, the environment, and development, co-editor of The Ecologist, \*\*co-founder of the Durban Group for Climate Justice (February, Nicholas Hildyard, Larry Lohmann and Sarah Sexton, The Corner House, “Energy Security For What? For Whom?”, http://www.thecornerhouse.org.uk/sites/thecornerhouse.org.uk/files/Energy%20Security%20For%20Whom%20For%20What.pdf, WEA)

The neoliberal market-driven approach to energy policy in Europe and¶ North America that is actively promoted throughout the world by the¶ International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and through bilateral¶ investment treaties and the Energy Charter Treaty is barely 30 years¶ old. Prior to the 1980s, energy – oil, gas, coal and electricity – was¶ largely provided either by state monopolies at prices determined by the¶ state with investment centrally planned by government bureaucracies,¶ or by private monopolies subject to government oversight and regulation to protect users from excessive charges. Markets, in which for-profit companies competed with each to generate, distribute and supply¶ “energy”, were considered “hopelessly inadequate in providing appropriate energy supplies,”¶ 3¶ considered to be “the lifeblood of the world¶ economy.”4¶ “Moving to the market,” however, was proposed as a way of ensuring¶ investment in energy infrastructure – power plants, transmission systems and storage capacity – that would not only guarantee supplies to¶ consumers at cheaper prices but would also direct investment to the¶ most cost-effective means of reducing carbon emissions.¶ 5¶ But markets have singularly failed to deliver on these promises. Directly opposed to forms of social and economic organisation that seek¶ to guarantee the shared right of all to survival, market-based energy¶ policies have led to the exclusion of those who cannot afford to pay for¶ the energy they require to meet their basic needs. The **financialisation**¶ **of “energy**”– where the production and distribution of oil, gas and electricity is mediated and shaped not just by markets in general but by¶ financial markets in particular,¶ 6¶ and where capital is accumulated primarily through financial speculation rather than production – is also¶ **jeopardising investment in the infrastructure that might enable a just**¶ **transition** to a sustainable and equitable climatic future. Investment is¶ diverted into trading on money or the products of money, often creating¶ energy shortages in the process through the speculative “gaming” of¶ energy markets. Just as energy is now “saturated with the language of¶ security”,¶ 7¶ so, too, it is “infused by the logic of finance”,¶ 8¶ even though¶ financialisation is conspicuously absent from energy security narratives.¶ Market-led policies **marginalise the role of communities** and ordinary¶ people in decision-making: instead “choices” about future energy technologies and use are left to those who have economic and political¶ power within the range of markets that affect energy. The input of¶ consumers is reduced to the (limited) decisions they can make within¶ energy retail markets based on price signals alone: the cost of electricity or gas. Debates over **how society might be differently organised** to¶ generate and use (less) “energy” in different ways are entirely sidelined,¶ except where they might provide opportunities to make money.¶ Meanwhile, efforts to address climate change through carbon trading¶ and other market mechanisms are fatally delaying the action that is¶ necessary to prevent runaway global climatic instability, whilst at the¶ same time creating new sources of conflict and insecurity.

#### The impact is extinction—focus on production and technology in the neoliberal frame generates crises and precludes other orientations

**Holleman 2012** – assistant professor of sociology at Amherst, PhD in sociology from the University of Oregon (June, Hannah, sociology dissertation, University of Oregon, “Energy justice and foundations for a sustainable sociology of energy”, https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/12419/Holleman\_oregon\_0171A\_10410.pdf?sequence=1, WEA)

As Marilyn Waring noted twenty years ago, under this system, when there is an ¶ environmental catastrophe, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska, or the current BP oil ¶ spill in the Gulf, companies make an enormous profit cleaning up, or at least professing ¶ to do so. GDP goes up. If someone is sick, if they die a long, drawn-out death from ¶ cancer, there is profit to be made. There is no money to be made in human and ecological ¶ health and well-being. If communities grow their own food, the global food market ¶ significantly decreases; if people walk rather than drive, the oil and car companies don’t ¶ make money. If education is free, who benefits? Maybe most people, and the society at ¶ large, maybe even the environment, but not necessarily the shareholders. Therefore, it is ¶ much more economically efficient to let the market shape education. Today students take ¶ out larger and larger loans to buy more expensive books, to get less education engendered ¶ by fewer teachers. This is capitalist efficiency. The surplus is efficiently transferred from ¶ one segment of the population to another, those at the top. The same goes for letting the ¶ market shape energy policy. Those arguing today for market intervention in the climate ¶ crisis often fail to mention that it is absolutely already the market shaping energy policy. ¶ This is precisely the problem. It is very efficient for the market to extract oil at bargain ¶ prices from countries without militaries to stop them. It is very efficient, in terms of ¶ profit, to have the most vulnerable in society pay the costs of energy production, and to ¶ keep polluting, all the while terrifying people that new energy developments might be ¶ their only chance of economic survival. Nevermind where the real money goes and what ¶ happens with the boom goes bust.

The current version of capitalist ideology, which absorbs energy scholars (and ¶ even environmental socialists) often unwittingly, was consciously shaped to co-opt the ¶ language of social movements seeking freedom from the yolk of capitalism and ¶ imperialism. It is no surprise that the market would co-opt green rhetoric today. ¶ Economists having the greatest ideological influence on political debates and social ¶ science today, the architects of neoliberal ideology, have sought to re-write the history of ¶ capitalist development as “the constitution of liberty,” and the basis of free society ¶ (Hayek 1960; Friedman 1962; Van Horn, Mirowski, and Stapleford, eds. 2011). There ¶ can be no acknowledgement of slavery, racism, sexism, or ecological destruction among ¶ other issues, because all of these undermine the basic thesis neoliberal writers actively ¶ promote as political ideology. To make their argument, these writers must present ¶ capitalism as raising all boats, color-blind, gender-neutral, and free of class coercion, the ¶ globalization of which results in a “flat,” happy world, even if it is hot (Friedman 2005, ¶ 2008). Unfortunately, these ideas dominate the political sphere, and contemporary ¶ notions of organizational, community, and national development. In academia, many ¶ “theorists celebrate the alleged leveling of social differences owing to globalization”¶ (Pellow 2007, 41). The blinders imposed by this view continue to infect energy studies¶ despite the work of critical energy scholars.

Spreading capitalism thus becomes the solution for poverty associated with ¶ inequalities caused by oppression based on race, class, gender, and position in the world ¶ system, as well as the solution to environmental and energy crises. This is the basic ¶ modernization thesis. The Ecological Modernization Reader (Mol, Sonnenfeld, and ¶ Spaargaren 2009) presents these systematized views regarding the environmental crisis, ¶ which are increasingly influential in environmental sociology. York and Rosa (2003) and ¶ Foster (2012) have pointed out the empirical, theoretical, and philosophical roots of, and ¶ problems associated with this perspective as a basis for understanding ecological and ¶ social crises and solutions. But, we can expect this view to persist as long as social ¶ relations remain intact because the logic of modernization is seductive precisely because ¶ it is the logic of capitalism (Foster 1999b, 2002, 2009, 2012). The processes of ¶ capitalism, including its ideological developments, are the “background conditions” in ¶ which those integrated into the market economy live, as fish swim in water, they are the ¶ “social gravity” we might naturally feel is right, but don’t necessarily see, as much a part ¶ of our lives as the air we breathe (York and Clark 2006).

In contrast to the modernization thesis, environmental justice scholars, among ¶ other critical theorists and activists have sought to expose the mythological basis of ¶ neoliberalism and transcend the system. The work of environmental justice scholars, ¶ feminist ecologists, and ecological rift theorists, marshaling the empirical evidence, ¶ represent powerful critiques of the modernization thesis. Taken together with the insights ¶ in existing critical work on energy, they provide an alternative approach to energy that¶ belies the notion that “there is no alternative.” They share a common commitment, as ¶ social scientists and activists, to reality. Part of this reality is that “actual class and racial ¶ inequalities around the global and between North and South have only worsened in the ¶ past half-century—the same period during which the late modern state of capitalism took ¶ hold” (Pellow 2007, 41). Despite views that we live in a post-racial society, (or one ¶ where “men are finished and women are taking over” [Sohn 2011]), in fact economic ¶ globalization has “seriously undermined the gains of the civil rights and labor movement ¶ and the general antiracist struggle in the United States and undercut the global benefits of ¶ the anticolonial struggles occurring throughout the global South” (Pellow 2007, 43). ¶ Moreover, economic globalization and the intensified spread of ecological destruction ¶ “are intimately linked because the TNCs [transnational corporations] themselves were¶ the ones creating and pushing both globalization and toxins on the world markets, ¶ facilitating greater control over nations, communities, human bodies, and the natural ¶ world itself”(43).

Today, neoliberal mythology has severely hindered the development of a wider ¶ environmental justice consciousness in the broader public, and amongst activists and ¶ academics. In energy studies this view is especially pronounced in the focus on ¶ technology, carbon markets, voluntary certification schemes, and alternative energies that ¶ basically allow business to continue as usual (Foster 2002, 9-25; Rogers 2010; Holleman ¶ 2012). The critical literature emerging from what I call an energy justice perspective in ¶ ecological rift theory, systems ecology, feminist and critical human ecology, and ¶ environmental justice scholarship has drawn out the social and ecological crises of the ¶ current energy regime. This is in contrast to too many well-intentioned scholars and ¶ activists who buy into the main tenets of the modernization thesis, and thus are reluctant ¶ to break with capitalism as a system, or worse, they promote it, ignoring or ignorant of ¶ the enormous costs. This has led to the view that our task as environmentalists is getting ¶ economics to “internalize the externalities,” to bring under the pricing system the work of ¶ natural systems and human services (labor). For energy this means carbon markets and ¶ trade in other forms of pollution and raising energy prices. While it is clear that as long as ¶ we have this system, goals should include wealth redistribution and businesses ¶ shouldering the costs of their polluting practices, long-term, internalizing more of the ¶ world in the market system is a total death strategy. The logic of the market is clear. An ¶ energy justice movement, with the intention of healing the ecological rift and ¶ transcending social injustice, on the other hand has as its base the goal of “externalizing ¶ the internalities.” This is an ecological and social imperative.

Understanding the nature of the current system, Daniel Yergin’s worse-than-nothing approach to energy is the logical response of capital. Carbon markets and the ¶ new biotech boom also make sense. If the point is accumulation, sources of profit must ¶ be found at every turn and crises represent especially ripe opportunities (Klein 2007). The ¶ problem today is not capitalism’s lack of response to the climate crisis, capital was never ¶ developed as a system geared toward ecological reproduction or meeting human needs. It ¶ is a system geared toward profit at all cost and can have no rational response. The ¶ problem is that capitalism organizes so many of our productive activities in the first ¶ place. The sooner this is recognized, the sooner we can start thinking of real alternatives, ¶ and understand ourselves as subjects, not merely objects of the system, as protagonists of ¶ our own future. We can move beyond playing the passive consumers of the next product¶ capitalism has on offer, green or otherwise, packaged as a solution to energy crises. ¶ Examples like the carbon market schemes, or Daniel Yergin’s view of what constitutes ¶ energy revolution, make clear “that there’s no way we can just subcontract our ¶ environmental conscience to the new breed of green marketers” (McKibben 2010).

Energy and social inequality, the challenges of our generation

The social and ecological costs of our energy regime today are clear, though the ¶ ways these are both the result of and exacerbate social inequality and oppression are often ¶ misunderstood or ignored. While the future is unwritten, projections, if business ¶ continues as usual, indicate environmental and social catastrophe with much of the ¶ damage irreversible. Without significant social change, we should prepare for, among ¶ other depredations, increased warfare to secure energy resources to meet increased ¶ demand. The most recent British Ministry of Defence Strategic Trends report suggests ¶ that nations will increasingly use energy security “to challenge conventional ¶ interpretations on the legality of the use of force” (108). Environmentally and socially ¶ destructive energy sectors are projected to grow the next thirty years, such as nuclear ¶ energy and biofuel, while expected fossil fuel demand also goes only one way, up: ¶ Global Energy use has approximately doubled over the last ¶ 30 years and, by 2040, demand is likely to grow by more ¶ than half again. Despite concerns over climate change, ¶ demand is likely to remain positively correlated to ¶ economic growth with fossil fuels, meeting more than 80% ¶ of this increase. Urban areas will be responsible for over ¶ 75% of total demand. (Strategic Trends, 106) ¶ Even a U.S. government official has recognized publicly that “our patterns of energy use ¶ create geopolitical instability. The ways we use energy are disrupting the climate system ¶ and threaten terrifying disruptions in decades to come” (Sandalow 2009).

These realities only partially illustrate energy’s extensive contribution to what K. ¶ William Kapp (1950) referred to as capitalism’s systemic “unpaid costs.” As Anderson ¶ (1976) put it: “the growth society operates as if it had tunnel vision and nearsightedness; ¶ the accumulation of capital is pursued without regard for the side-effects or for longrange consequences, leaving to nature and the larger community these uncalculated ¶ costs” (140). Prefiguring contemporary discussions and movement framing, Anderson ¶ referred to these accumulated unpaid costs, or externalities as “the ecological debt,” the ¶ result of the exploitation of both nature and humans for the sake of economic growth at ¶ all costs (142-43), undermining the natural and social conditions of production.

As indicated previously, with energy demand expected only to increase as the ¶ economy expands, the “unpaid costs” associated with its extraction and use will continue ¶ to accumulate, but on a scale heretofore unseen. The science is clear that if we do not ¶ severely curtail energy use, we will cross critical thresholds in the biosphere’s ability to ¶ recycle waste and regulate the earth’s temperature. The consequences of crossing such ¶ planetary boundaries will be irreversible (Hansen 2009; Solomon, et al. 2009; Cullen ¶ 2010; Foster 2011).

This is a new juncture in humanity’s relation to the rest of nature. However, the ¶ costs of climate change, among other environmental crises generated by energy ¶ production and use, which is driven largely by economic growth, already are visited upon ¶ communities and other social groups in a dramatically unequal way––this we may ¶ understand as a defining feature of energy injustice. This social inequality, indeed, is a ¶ necessary feature of capitalism, making human exploitation and the assault on the ¶ environment possible, and energy injustice inevitable in the current system:

“Environmental deterioration will continue so long as there is a class system, since the ¶ profits of environmental neglect accrue primarily to one class whereas the costs are borne ¶ primarily by another” (Anderson 1976, 139). Scholars studying the ecological and social ¶ rift of capitalism, including those working on environmental racism and feminist ecology, ¶ have expanded the understanding of how these processes are gendered and racialized. ¶ Work on unequal ecological exchange amply has demonstrated that inequality between ¶ nations and regions also increases the burdens of environmental injustice. Studies from ¶ all of these perspectives have drawn out inequalities embedded in our current patterns of ¶ energy decision-making, extraction, use, and waste disposal, documenting energy ¶ injustice through various theoretical lenses.

#### Vote neg to eschew neoliberal frameworks—they’re unsustainable and insulate decisionmaking from deliberation and alternative assumptions needed to solve

**Adaman and Madra** **2012** – \*economic professor at Bogazici University in Istanbul, \*\*PhD from UMass-Amherst, economics professor (Fikret and Yahya, Bogazici University, “Understanding Neoliberalism as Economization: The Case of the Ecology”, http://www.econ.boun.edu.tr/content/wp/EC2012\_04.pdf, WEA)

The reduction of ecological valuation through a market mechanism (or various techniques) to a ¶ mere aggregation of individual subjective valuations—which is the main premise of neoliberal ¶ ideology—may be inappropriate for complex and uncertain phenomena ridden with ¶ incommensurabilities and inter- and intra-generational distributional conflicts, such as global ¶ warming, where individual valuations will have clear implications for all living beings. Indeed, ¶ in making decisions with substantial consequences pertaining to our current life as well as our ¶ future (such as the overall growth rate, distributional trajectories, technological path, ¶ consumption habits, risk attitude [say, vis-à-vis nuclear energy]), the market response or the ¶ aggregation of individuals’ valuation through a set of available techniques (e.g., the contingent ¶ valuation) may substantially differ from what could be derived through collective deliberation ¶ and negotiation of various stakeholders including the scientific community (see, e.g., ¶ Özkaynak, Adaman and Devine, 2012). This criticism applies not only to neoliberal positions ¶ that favor the current unequal distribution of power but also to the Post-Walrasian one which ¶ although concerned with distributional issues keeps relying on individualist ontologies of ¶ calculative and calculable agency. Indeed, there is a growing theoretical and applied literature ¶ arguing that in incommensurable cases, where all relevant aspects cannot be captured in a single ¶ dimension (such as those derived from monetary cost-benefit analyses), a multi-criteria ¶ methodology would seem better placed, as it will be possible to involve not only economic but ¶ also political, moral, scientific and cultural inputs from a variety of stakeholders (see, e.g., ¶ Martinez-Alier, Munda and O’Neil, 1999; Munda, 2008). The key promise of the multicriteria decision-making tool and other similar participatory and deliberatory dispositifs is that ¶ rather than finding a “solution” to a conflictual decision, they shed light on the multifaceted¶ dimensions of the problem at hand and thus facilitate the consensus-building process from ¶ below (see, e.g., Adaman, 2012). In this regard, they constitute a formidable path to be ¶ explored as an alternative to the surreptitiously normative neoliberal governmental dispositifs, ¶ designed by experts from above, under the assumption that all actors are calculative and ¶ calculable.

The current indiscriminate application of neoliberal policies over the entire scope of the social ¶ field has brought about such political, economic, cultural and ecological devastation that any ¶ type of reform suggestion along the line to halt this process is met with much welcoming by ¶ many of us—even if some of them are still acting as if economic incentives are the only viable ¶ policy tool in town. Consider the case of carbon markets, for example, where the cap is ¶ decided either through a scientific body or through aggregating individuals’ preferences. The ¶ fact of the matter is that, far from addressing the inefficiencies that emanate from opportunistic ¶ and manipulative activities, these mechanisms are vulnerable precisely because they end up¶ soliciting manipulative, predatory, and rent-seeking behavior (because they are designed to ¶ function under such behavioral assumptions in the first place). In other words, these solutions ¶ subject a commons such as global climate into the economic logic of markets and ¶ “performatively” turn it into an object of strategic-calculative logic (MacKenzie, Muniesa and ¶ Siu, 2007; Çalışkan and Callon, 2009; MacKenzie, 2009; Çalışkan and Callon, 2010; see also ¶ Spash, 2011). Consider, furthermore, the case of price-per-bag policies. Laboratory ¶ experiments and anthropological evidence both suggest that charging a price for some activity ¶ that should in fact be treated as a duty or a commitment may well create perverse results (see, ¶ e.g., Campbell, 1998; Bowles and Hwang, 2008). Monetizing the pollution-generating activity ¶ instead of limiting the use of plastic bags (along with an awareness program) may well result in ¶ an increase of the unwanted activity. Similarly, while nationalization is the trend in areas of ¶ natural resource extraction and energy production, many continue to argue for privatization ¶ and private-public partnerships instead. Nevertheless, the problem with the private versus ¶ public dichotomy, given our reading of the contemporary state as an agent of economization, is ¶ precisely that both forms, to the extent that they are informed by the different variants of ¶ neoliberal reason, serve to isolate these critical areas from the deliberations and political ¶ demands of various stakeholders and the general public, limiting the only channels for ¶ communication available to them to the price (or price-like) mechanisms. However, perhaps ¶ most importantly, neither can be immune towards all sorts of rent-seeking activities that occur ¶ behind the close doors of the technocracy that operates in the area where state shades into ¶ market in the various forms of dispositifs.

Needless to say, economic activities that generate pollution and consume energy are not recent ¶ phenomena that are exclusive to what is now increasingly being called the neoliberal era. If ¶ anything, postwar Keynesian developmentalism was possible precisely because of the ¶ availability of cheap oil, and is responsible for an enormous amount of environmental pollution ¶ and ecological degradation (Mitchell, 2011). In this sense, it would be wrong to present ¶ neoliberal as being the only responsible mode of governmentality for the dual crises of climate ¶ change and natural resource depletion. Yet, this does not change the fact that the neoliberal ¶ reason (in its free-market and mechanism-design variations) is pushing its agenda in an era ¶ where both of these crises are reaching catastrophic levels, and it is highly questionable whether ¶ neoliberal methods of handling the environmental pollution and the extraction crisis will be¶ capable of addressing long-term concerns.

### India

#### No nuclear use—expert consensus

**Enders, 2002** – quoting lots of professors (David, Daily News Editor for the Michigan Daily, “Experts say nuclear war still unlikely,” http://media.www.michigandaily.com/media/storage/paper851/news/2002/01/30/News/Experts.Say.Nuclear.War.Still.Unlikely-1404620.shtml)

University political science Prof. Ashutosh Varshney becomes animated when asked about the likelihood of nuclear war between India and Pakistan. "Odds are close to zero," Varshney said forcefully, standing up to pace a little bit in his office. "The assumption that India and Pakistan cannot manage their nuclear arsenals as well as the U.S.S.R. and U.S. or Russia and China concedes less to the intellect of leaders in both India and Pakistan than would be warranted." The world"s two youngest nuclear powers first tested weapons in 1998, sparking fear of subcontinental nuclear war a fear Varshney finds ridiculous. "The decision makers are aware of what nuclear weapons are, even if the masses are not," he said. "Watching the evening news, CNN, I think they have **vastly overstated the threat** of nuclear war," political science Prof. Paul Huth said. Varshney added that there are numerous factors working against the possibility of nuclear war. "India is committed to a no-first-strike policy," Varshney said. "It is virtually impossible for Pakistan to go for a first strike, because the retaliation would be gravely dangerous." Political science Prof. Kenneth Lieberthal, a former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council, agreed. "Usually a country that is in the position that Pakistan is in would not shift to a level that would ensure their total destruction," Lieberthal said, making note of India"s considerably larger nuclear arsenal. "American intervention is another reason not to expect nuclear war," Varshney said. "If anything has happened since September 11, it is that the command control system has strengthened. The trigger is in very safe hands." But the low probability of nuclear war does not mean tensions between the two countries who have fought three wars since they were created in 1947 will not erupt. "The possibility of conventional war between the two is higher. Both sides are looking for ways out of the current tension," Lieberthal said.

#### No risk of India-Pakistan 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.

#### No loose nukes

**Rajghatta, ’07** – foreign editor and the United States correspondent for the Times of India. He did his masters in Mass Communication from Bangalore University, Bangalore (Chidanand, Nov 20, 2007, *Pak* *nukes already under US control: Report*, http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/Pak-nukes-already-under-US-control-Report/articleshow/2556824.cms)

WASHINGTON: Pakistan's nuclear weapons are already under American control even as analysts are working themselves into a lather on the subject, a well-regarded intelligence journal has said. In a stunning disclosure certain to stir up things in Washington's (and in Islamabad and New Delhi's) strategic community, the journal Stratfor reported on Monday that the "United States delivered a very clear ultimatum to Musharraf in the wake of 9/11: Unless Pakistan allowed US forces to take control of Pakistani nuclear facilities, the United States would be left with no choice but to destroy those facilities, possibly with India's help." "This was a fait accompli that Musharraf, for credibility reasons, had every reason to cover up and pretend never happened, and Washington was fully willing to keep things quiet," the journal, which is widely read among the intelligence community, said. The Stratfor commentary came in response to an earlier New York Times story that reported that the Bush administration had spent around $100 million to help Pakistan safeguard its nuclear weapons, but left it unclear if Washington has a handle on the arsenal. Over the past fortnight, even since the crisis in Pakistan broke and eclipsed every other geopolitical story, including Iraq, US officials and analysts have been speaking in different voices on the subject of a jihadi takeover of Pakistan's nuclear weapons. Some officials have expressed deep concern at the possibility and suggested US is ready with contingency plans to defang Pakistan of its nuclear weapons, while others have tried to assuage Islamabad by saying they believe the country's military rulers have good custodial control over their crown jewels. On Monday, a State Department official once again addressed the issue and hinted that Washington was in control of the situation. "... ultimately, the major responsibility for that falls with the Pakistani government. They have made public comments to the effect that the arsenal is secure, that they have taken a number of different steps to ensure that," State Department spokesman Sean McCormack said. "We ourselves see no indication to indicate to the contrary. It is secure. We obviously have an interest in seeing that it is secure," McCormack added. Stratfor , too, appears confident that the Bush administration has a handle on Pak's nukes. Not everyone is so sanguine. In a separate commentary over the weekend that had some US and Pakistani analysts blowing their gasket, two prominent Washington commentators detailed a US military action plan inside Pakistan, possibly with the cooperation of moderate Pakistani forces, to seize the nuclear arsenal if there was imminent danger of an extremist takeover.

#### Plan opens the floodgates for global prolif – and hypocrisy takes out any chance of solvency

UCS 11 – Union of Concerned Scientists, 4/5/11, “Nuclear Reprocessing: Dangerous, Dirty, and Expensive,” <http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear_power/nuclear_power_risk/nuclear_proliferation_and_terrorism/nuclear-reprocessing.html>

Reprocessing would increase the ease of nuclear proliferation.

U.S. reprocessing would undermine the U.S. goal of halting the spread of fuel cycle technologies that are permitted under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty but can be used to make nuclear weapons materials. The United States cannot credibly persuade other countries to forgo a technology it has newly embraced for its own use. Although some reprocessing advocates claim that new reprocessing technologies under development will be "proliferation resistant," they would actually be more difficult for international inspectors to safeguard because it would be harder to make precise measurements of the weapon-usable materials during and after processing. Moreover, all reprocessing technologies are far more proliferation-prone than direct disposal.

#### Limiting plutonium reprocessing is the vital internal link to stopping global prolif---the plan destroys leverage over Iran and North Korea

Bunn & Malin 9 – Matthew Bunn is an Associate Professor at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government; Martin B. Malin is Executive Director of the Project on Managing the Atom at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Fall 2009, “Enabling a Nuclear Revival—And Managing Its Risks,” Innovations, Vol. 4, No. 4, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Enabling-a%20Nuclear-Revival-and-Managing-Its-Risks.pdf

Many steps will have to be taken to limit proliferation risks. Iran and North Korea present the first and most urgent challenges. The outcome of today’s efforts to walk North Korea back from the nuclear brink and to persuade Iran to accept restraints on its fuel-cycle activities will have a major effect on whether nuclear energy will spread peacefully or will become a hedge behind which nuclear newcomers develop the necessary infrastructure to eventually build weapons. The United States and the other partners in relevant talks must engage directly with North Korea and Iran, with packages of promised benefits and punishments large enough and credible enough to convince these states that it is in their interest to give up their nuclear weapon ambitions.

Beyond those two cases, some of the most important means of limiting the risk of proliferation include phasing out the civilian use of HEU and minimizing civil plutonium reprocessing; forging new approaches to the fuel cycle that limit the spread of nationally controlled uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing facilities; building new approaches to police, intelligence, and export control cooperation to stop blackmarket transactions in nuclear technology; strengthening international safeguards; and strengthening enforcement when states violate their nonproliferation obligations.

#### Iranian prolif leads to a nuclear exchange – causes an arms race that escalates into global conflicts

**Kroenig 2012 –** Matthew, professor of government at Georgetown University and an affiliate with the Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. (Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike is the Least Bad Option, Foreign Affairs for the Council on Foreign Relations, January/February 2012, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran>, MCL)

Some states in the region are doubting U.S. resolve to stop the program and are shifting their allegiances to Tehran. Others have begun to discuss launching their own nuclear initiatives to counter a possible Iranian bomb. For those nations and the United States itself, the threat will only continue to grow as Tehran moves closer to its goal. A nuclear-armed Iran would immediately limit U.S. freedom of action in the Middle East. With atomic power behind it, Iran could threaten any U.S. political or military initiative in the Middle East with nuclear war, forcing Washington to think twice before acting in the region. Iran’s regional rivals, such as Saudi Arabia, would likely decide to acquire their own nuclear arsenals, sparking an arms race. To constrain its geopolitical rivals, Iran could choose to spur proliferation by transferring nuclear technology to its allies -- other countries and terrorist groups alike. Having the bomb would give Iran greater cover for conventional aggression and coercive diplomacy, and the battles between its terrorist proxies and Israel, for example, could escalate. And Iran and Israel lack nearly all the safeguards that helped the United States and the Soviet Union avoid a nuclear exchange during the Cold War -- secure second-strike capabilities, clear lines of communication, long flight times for ballistic missiles from one country to the other, and experience managing nuclear arsenals. To be sure, a nuclear-armed Iran would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war. But the volatile nuclear balance between Iran and Israel could easily spiral out of control as a crisis unfolds, **resulting in a nuclear exchange** between the two countries that could draw the United States in, as well.

#### Committing to reprocessing now, using MOX rather than next-gen tech, would make the U.S. look like idiots, not leaders

Matthew Bunn 7, Associate Professor at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, 11/14/7, “Risks of GNEP’s Focus on Near-Term Reprocessing,” <http://www.environment.harvard.edu/docs/faculty_pubs/bunn_risks.pdf>

Fortunately, there is no pressing need to move forward with construction of a reprocessing plant in the United States in the near term. Dry casks offer a safe and proven technology that makes it possible to store spent fuel for decades at low cost. As a result, there is no need to rush to make these decisions – we can make these decisions more responsibly in the decades to come, when technology has developed further and economic, security, and political circumstances have clarified. What is needed now is patient R&D and in-depth systems analysis, rather than a rush to build commercial-scale facilities. As Richard Garwin has put it, by picking winners prematurely, the proposed GNEP approach “would launch us into a costly program that would surely cost more to do the job less well than would a program at a more measured pace guided by a more open process.”20

It would certainly not be a sign of U.S. leadership to decide now to build a reprocessing plant little different from what France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and Japan have already built – to build, as one GNEP participant put it to me, a 1975 Cadillac. Rather, it would lock the United States in to spending many billions of dollars on decades-old technologies whose high costs and proliferation risks are already well known, and which are already failing to win contracts in the commercial marketplace. The idea of sending spent fuel from decommissioned U.S. reactors to France to be reprocessed, as DOE is reportedly considering, 21 has even less merit, and should be soundly rejected. The reprocessing would cost well over a billion dollars, far more than continuing to store this fuel where it is, and would simply add to the multi-billion dollar problem of excess plutonium the United States already has. DOE has correctly identified large global stockpiles of separated plutonium as a dangerous problem; dealing with that problem by reprocessing more plutonium is like using gasoline to put out a fire.

The recent National Academy of Sciences review has provided an excellent discussion of just how premature it would be to build commercial-scale facilities now, unanimously recommending against proceeding with a GNEP program focused on nearterm large-scale construction. As they concluded: “There is no economic justification to go forward with this program at anything approaching commercial scale. Continued research and development are the appropriate level of activity, given the current state of knowledge.” I urge the Committee to hear from the National Academy panel, to get the insights gained from their in-depth examination of the GNEP program in the context of other nuclear R&D.

### Russia

#### The plan isn’t key---joint plutonium disposal’s already legally required---nothing more the plan can do

GSN 11 – Global Security Newswire, 7/14/11, “Russian-U.S. Plutonium Disposal Pact Enters Into Force,” http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/russian-us-plutonium-disposal-pact-enters-into-force/

Russia and the United States on Wednesday brought an updated bilateral agreement on the disposal of weapon-grade plutonium into force through an exchange of diplomatic documents, the U.S. State Department announced (see GSN, June 7).

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made the exchange in Washington.

The U.S.-Russian Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement requires the nations starting in 2018 to each eliminate a minimum of 34 metric tons of processed plutonium -- enough fissile material to fuel roughly 17,000 nuclear warheads. The pact anticipates further reductions in stockpiled weapon-usable plutonium in the future, according to a State Department press release.

"Entry into force of the agreement also represents a significant milestone in U.S.-Russian cooperation on nuclear security measures, and it marks an essential step in the nuclear disarmament process by making these reductions in plutonium stocks irreversible," the release states.

Moscow and Washington are in discussions with the International Atomic Energy Agency on methods for verifying the pact's mandates are being carried out (U.S. State Department release, July 13).

"This milestone marks important progress on U.S. and Russian commitments to eliminate nuclear weapons material," Laura Holgate, National Security Council senior director for WMD terrorism and threat reduction, said in provided comments. "Such eliminations are the ultimate in improving nuclear security, as they permanently remove the threat of theft or misuse of nuclear material, at the same time reducing the burden of securing materials."

The plutonium pact was initially inked in 2000 and subsequently updated in April 2010 with a new protocol that authorized Russian to employ fast reactors to irradiate the plutonium under rigorous security standards, the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration said in a release.

Washington is to give Russia as much as $400 million for the project, with Moscow paying the remaining costs of the effort -- projected to be in excess of $3 billion. The Energy Department's semiautonomous nuclear agency and its Russian equivalent, Rosatom, are also to pursue foreign donations to defray the costs for Russia.

To carry out the disposal program in the United States, the Energy Department is supervising building of three plants at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina, including the Mixed-Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility that would convert plutonium into nuclear reactor fuel (see GSN, June 17). Russia is also developing its own plutonium conversion technologies and is building the BN-800 fast reactor (U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration release, July 13).

#### Luongo cites access and reciprocity to Russian facilities- and high-level negotiations the plan can’t fiat are key to solve

**Luongo ‘7** -- executive director of the Russian-American Nuclear Security Advisory Council (Kenneth N., “Improving U.S.-Russian Nuclear Cooperation”, Partnership for Global Security, 2007, http:~/~/www.partnershipforglobalsecurity.org/publications/Articles%20and%20Commentary/improving\_nuc\_html(%%))

Despite such accomplishments, however, some of the programs face significant problems. Milestones have been missed. Promises have been made but not kept. The political atmosphere on both sides is less friendly now than when the programs began. And in some quarters of the Bush administration, questions are being raised about the enduring importance of this cooperation. For progress to continue, two critical problem areas need to be addressed: access by each nation to the other's sensitive facilities, and Russia's current cooperation with Iran.¶ Access and reciprocity. Since the beginning of the cooperative agenda, the United States has insisted on having greater access to Russian facilities, arguing that the United States needs to make sure that its funds are being spent appropriately. For example, DOD's Cooperative Threat Reduction program requires regular audits and inspections by U.S. officials, and the Department of Energy's (DOE's) programs make use of less formal but still fairly stringent standards for inspection. In recent years, however, many clashes over access have occurred, and rigidity has replaced flexibility. Spurred by congressional requirements and bureaucratic frustration, the United States has hardened its demands for access. Russia has resisted, arguing that U.S. intrusion could compromise classified information and facilitate spying, and that Russian specialists already have less access to U.S. facilities than U.S. specialists do to Russia's facilities.¶ The administrations of both President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin are neglecting the importance of current nuclear security cooperation.¶ This tug-of-war has become a major bone of contention that has interfered with some cooperation and fed the political mistrust and resentment that still remains as an undercurrent of U.S.-Russian relations. Clearly, some balance on this issue must be found. The United States rightly desires to be assured that its funds are being used properly, and Russia has legitimate security concerns. But continuing the impasse will become destructive to the interests of both sides. Unfortunately, it is not clear that the issue is being adequately addressed. In many cases, individual programs are left free to define their own access requirements and pursue their own access methods and rules. The issue of access may need to be addressed at a higher political level and with more cohesiveness than has been exercised in the past.

#### Relations are impossible

**Migranyan**, director – Institute for Democracy and Cooperation, professor – Institute of International Relations, Moscow, **1/30/’13**

(Andranik, “Russia and Obama's Second Term,” The National Interest)

I shall begin with what I consider the most interesting viewpoint professed for many years by one of the best experts on Russian relations, Tom Graham. Back in December, he and Dmitri Trenin, director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, published an article in The International Herald-Tribune exploring the multiple problems bedeviling the U.S.-Russian relationship, such as the U.S. Congress’s Magnitsky Act, the Russian decision to cease cooperation on the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and the Russian ban on adoptions by American citizens. The authors argued that these problems stemmed from a lack of strategic dialogue and the two countries’ **inadequate understanding** of each other’s strategic interests. Placing such problems in a strategic context would improve Russian-American relations, they argued, citing as areas for potential strategic dialogue such strategic topics as China, cooperation on Arctic development and the fight against Islamist terrorism.

First, the problem here is that it is unrealistic to expect large, sovereign countries to share strategic interests with other countries that aren’t focused on a troublesome third country. Over the past fifty years, the sole example that comes to mind of a successful strategic dialogue is the American strategic outreach to China during the Nixon administration. It was initiated by Henry Kissinger, whose firm employs Tom Graham. The success of this dialogue can be explained by the perception in both the United States and China that the Soviet Union represented a threat to the existence of both; hence, their readiness to join forces against a common enemy.

Second, two countries can have convergent vital interests only if both are roughly equal in resources and power. Otherwise, the weaker one experiences a loss of sovereignty as a result of its smaller economic and military-political potential, and that negates the strategic character of the relationship.

Consider the widespread perception in the 1990s and at the beginning of the twenty-first century that Russia and the United States could forge a strategic relationship. It never happened because the United States felt it was so strong and self-sufficient that strategic cooperation came down to the American expectation that Russia should bend its own vital interests and submit to American foreign policy. Only then could peaceful, constructive and effective cooperation ensue. Graham and Trenin discuss, for example, current U.S. and Russian strategic interests with regard to China. But isn’t there a greater convergence in Russian and Chinese interests on the matter of containing Washington’s arrogant and unilateral foreign policy that attempts to dominate the world?

Regarding the development of Arctic resources, the United States’ refusal to sign the Convention on the Law of the Sea betrays a U.S. lack of interest in dividing Arctic resources in a way that coincides with international law. Rather, Washington wants to keep its hands untied for any action in the Arctic.

Strategic dialogue necessitates a certain level of trust between parties. But the talks between the two countries on the antimissile shield that the U.S. wishes to install in Europe testify to the lack of such trust. Americans insist that the shield is designed to parry hypothetical Iranian missiles; but a succession of U.S. presidents and other high-level officials also insist that the idea of a nuclear Iran is unacceptable. They declare that, should Iran continue to advance down the road to a nuclear weapon, the United States or Israel would destroy the program’s infrastructure.

With the emergence of a multipolar world, the need arises for power balances in various regions. Thus do we see countries attempting to protect their national interests by forming ad hoc coalitions instead of full-time alliances, whose time has passed, in the view of many analysts. This is why strategic dialogue, while perhaps notionally desirable, is not really feasible because it is difficult to determine which questions are tactical and which are strategic. For Moscow, a matter of strategic discussion with the United States is U.S. interference in Russia’s internal affairs. Another is America’s interference in countries in the post-Soviet sphere. But it is difficult to imagine any U.S. administration engaging in serious discussions on such matters without being attacked domestically for betraying U.S. national and geopolitical interests. It is obvious that there cannot be entirely cooperative or entirely competitive relations between two large countries with intersecting and conflicting interests.

Such a black-and-white approach can only exist between states engaged in total and open confrontation—as the Soviet Union and the West were during the Cold War—or in cases of a weaker country forced to yield its interests to the will of a stronger partner because of an economic or military-political dependency. This is the defining characteristic of the relations within NATO, whose European members depend for military protection largely on the United States. And yet within this framework there are conflicts even absent a confrontation with a third power (as with the USSR). Consider, for example, the clashes that arose with George W. Bush’s Iraq war, when Germany and France went against the wishes of the United States.

Thus, it seems inescapable that the United States and Russia will **sometimes partner** but also **sometimes have conflicting interests.**

#### Norwegian missile accident proves – no Russian dead hand.

Nikolai **Sokov**, pub. date: October 19**97**, works @ the Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute, CSIS, “Could Norway Trigger a Nuclear War? Notes on the Russian Command and Control System,” accessed: 10-2-09, <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/pm_0024.pdf>

The recently leaked information suggests that the reason for the "mistaken identity" of the Norwegian rocket was technical. The Norwegian rocket used the first stage of an old American tactical missile "Honest John." Consequently, the boost phase speed was higher than usual for previous research launches. The rocket was also unusually large, consisting of three stages and measuring 18.4 meters long and 6 tons. Apparently, it was mistaken for an American Trident IISLBM (its length is 13.4 meters without the front section). The trajectory (to the north from Russia) was also considered "legitimate," since conceivably, a real attack could be preceded by launching a missile to the north of Russia and detonating a device with an extra powerful electromagnetic impulse to knock out communications systems. The computer systems classified it as a combat missile and flashed a warning. The system was automatically activated up to the top, including Yeltsin's "nuclear briefcase." Then, in a matter of minutes, the situation was assessed and the alert status decreased back to normal. Reportedly, the alert did not even reach launch teams at missile bases. Lessons The incident tells much about the Russian command and control system:1. The "mistaken identity" resulted not from an error but from proper functioning. Evidently, the computers are programmed to alert personnel to certain types of missiles and speed is one of the criteria, as is probably size as well. Thus, a rocket that does not have the characteristics of a combat missile is unlikely to provoke an alert.2. Yeltsin's nuclear briefcase probably works only in passive mode, i.e. the whole system has to be put on alert before he issues the command to launch. This is consistent with other publicly available sources, which claim that the participation of the General Staff and/or the SRF is imperative. The military and designers have always been proud of the built-in checks: they view them as a precaution against reckless politicians. An interesting consequence is that the system might be able to function even in the event that the top leadership (the President) is incapacitated. This provides added reliability and removes the rationale for a "dead-hand" system.3. There is not a "dead-hand" system, otherwise a "response" would have followed based on perceived attack. In other words, the case of the Norwegian rocket demonstrated that detection and putting the system on a higher alert status are automated, but command to launch is made by humans. Apparently, there is at least one gap in the chain of automatic response, and the gap is at the crucial link: the decision to launch.4. The incident indirectly demonstrated that the personnel at the missile launchers are "out of the loop:" the information about the suspected attack did not reach them. This means that it is unlikely that they are able to launch weapons independently. Otherwise, they would have received information of an attack, which is vital.

#### No chance of terrorism—it’s too hard to steal nukes and usage barriers exist

**Stratfor 2009** (5/29, “Debunking Myths About Nuclear Weapons and Terrorism,” http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/20090528\_debunking\_myths\_about\_nuclear\_weapons\_and\_terrorism, WEA)

However, the effort involved in actually trying to steal a nuclear weapon would entail a significant dedication of resources and an immense intelligence effort beyond the reach of almost any terrorist organization. Indeed, the odds of a failure are high, no matter how careful and meticulous the planning. Some nuclear weapons facilities around the world are obviously not as hardened as others, but taken as a whole, they are some of the hardest targets on the planet, and the personnel better vetted than almost any other institution.

Even the lightest attempt to begin probing runs the risk of not only failing to acquire a bomb, but setting off a series of alarms and red flags that brings such an aggressive investigative and law enforcement/military response down on the terrorist organization that it could be completely wiped out before it ever attempted to target its true objectives (whatever they might be).

And even if one could be stolen or otherwise acquired, modern nuclear weapons have been designed to include a series of (highly classified) safety features. Though all nuclear weapons are not created equal, these range from permissive action links without which the device cannot be armed (a feature Pakistan is now thought to employ) to configurations that will actually render the fissile core(s) useless if improperly accessed. The security of nuclear weapons in Pakistan has long been something STRATFOR has kept a close eye on, and something we continue to monitor. The Hollywood scenario of a terrorist group stealing away with a nuclear device in the night and automatically being able to arm it at its convenience is not grounded in reality. Furthermore, the theft would be difficult to carry off without setting off the same alarms and red flags that would leave little opportunity for the device to be smuggled particularly far — much less half way around the world.

#### No arctic war- No opportunity and coop solves – prefer experts

Young, Professor – Institutional and International Governance, Environmental Institutions @ UCSB, Arctic expert, PhD – Yale, 2011

(Oran R, “The future of the Arctic: cauldron of conflict or zone of peace?” *International Affairs* 87:1, p. 185-193)

Popular accounts of the Arctic’s jurisdictional issues are regularly couched in terms of provocative phrases like the afore-mentioned ‘who owns the Arctic’ or ‘use it or lose it’. **But these** phrases **turn out to be highly misleading** in this context. **There are virtually no disputes in the Arctic regarding sovereignty** over northern lands; no one has expressed a desire to redraw the map of the Arctic with regard to the terrestrial boundaries of the Arctic states. Most of the disagreements are to do with jurisdiction over marine areas where the idea of ownership in the ordinary sense is irrelevant. While some of these disagreements are of long standing and feature relatively entrenched positions, they are not about establishing ownership, and they do not indicate that some level of ‘use’ is required to avoid the erosion of sovereignty. **There is little prospect that these disputes will spawn armed clashes.** As both Michael Byers and Shelagh Grant make clear in their excellent analyses of Arctic sovereignty, recent efforts to address matters involving sovereignty in the Arctic are marked by a spirit of rule-based problem-solving, rather than an escalating spiral of politically charged claims and counterclaims. The process of delineating jurisdictional boundaries regarding the seabed beyond the limits of Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) is taking place in conformity with the rules and procedures set forth in Article 76 of UNCLOS. Norway and Russia have signed an international treaty resolving their differences regarding jurisdictional boundaries in the Barents Sea. There are signs that Canada and the United States are interested in a similar approach with regard to the Beaufort Sea. The Russians, whose much ballyhooed 2007 initiative to plant the Russian flag on the seabed at the North Pole is widely discussed in the books under review, have acted in conformity with the relevant rules of international law in addressing jurisdictional matters and repeatedly expressed their readiness to move forward in a cooperative manner in this realm. There are, of course, significant sensitivities regarding the legal status of the Northern Sea Route and especially the Northwest Passage. But given that commercial traffic on these routes is likely to be limited during the near future, and that the use of these routes will require the active cooperation of the coastal states, regardless of their formal legal status, **opportunities arise for** devising **pragmatic arrangements** governing the use of these waterways. The progress now being made regarding the development of a mandatory Polar Code covering Arctic shipping is good news. The fact that ‘hot spots’ in the search for oil and gas in the Arctic are located, for the most part, in areas that are not subject to jurisdictional disputes is also helpful. Overall, it seems fair to conclude that the **Arctic states are living** up to their promises to deal **with jurisdictional issues in** the region in **a peaceful manner.**

#### Double-bind – Cooperation’s impossible b/c of Russian distrust

Rubin 2012 (Trudy Rubin, Inquirer Columnist, March 11, 2012, “Worldview: Putin's paranoia will make a tough customer for U.S.,” Philly, http://articles.philly.com/2012-03-11/news/31145486\_1\_carnegie-moscow-center-vladimir-putin-russian-leader)

Can Washington have a productive relationship with a Russian leader who thinks Americans are out to destroy him? After a week of listening to official anti-American rhetoric in Moscow, I find it hard to see how.¶ Vladimir Putin, newly elected to a third presidential term (after an interval as prime minister), has made clear he believes Washington has him in its crosshairs.¶ "Nobody can impose their policy on us," he proclaimed to a cheering crowd at his victory rally near the Kremlin. "Our people could recognize the provocation from those who want to destroy the country. The Orange scenario will never work here." Putin was referring to the 2004 Orange Revolution in the Ukraine, where street protests overturned a pro-Russian, antidemocratic president. The Russian leader thinks the United States directed the Orange Revolution. He also thinks that Russians protesting rigged elections are paid by the United States.¶ "Putin really believes that the United States is out to get him and intends to have a regime change in Russia," says Dmitri Trenin, director of the Carnegie Moscow Center.¶ Indeed, the depth of Putin's paranoia is more germane to future U.S.-Russian relations than whether he rigged the election (even had his margin not been padded by fraud, he still would have won).¶ Some argue Russian foreign policy won't change much under Putin 2.0. After all, President Obama's cooperative relationship with outgoing President Dmitry Medvedev - the "reset" in U.S.-Russian relations - required a green light from Putin. Moreover, U.S. officials have received assurances from high-level Russians that, with the election over, U.S.-Russian relations can return to a more even keel.¶ But it's hard to imagine cooperation on issues such as Iran and Syria with a man who feels such personal animosity toward the United States.

#### Or squo coop is resilient and sufficient

Ria Novosti 5/10/12 [“Russian, U.S. Presidents to Continue ‘Reset’,” http://en.rian.ru/russia/20120510/173351119.html]

Russian and U.S. presidents Vladimir Putin and Barack Obama on Wednesday agreed in their telephone conversation to continue the “reset” in the relations between their countries, the White House said in a statement.

“The two Presidents reiterated their interest in the sustained high-level dialogue that has characterized the reset of relations, and the substantial progress of the last three years on issues like nuclear security and non-proliferation, Afghanistan, the WTO, and increased trade and commercial ties,” the White House said.

“President Obama and President Putin noted with satisfaction the concrete achievements of the last three years and expressed their commitment to enhance bilateral cooperation on the basis of mutual strategic interests,” the statement said.

The two leaders also “commemorated the occasion of Russia’s celebration of Victory in Europe day, noting the historic war-time alliance between our two countries and underscoring their mutual commitment to strengthening the U.S.-Russian partnership.”

On Wednesday, the Kremlin reported that Putin and Obama congratulated each other on Victory Day and discussed the prospects of Russian-U.S. relations.

The White House also said Putin told his U.S. counterpart Obama on the phone that he would not attend the G8 summit at Camp David.

“Noting his responsibilities to finalize Cabinet appointments in the new Russian government, President Putin expressed his regret that he would be unable to attend the G8 Summit at Camp David on May 18-19,” it said.

“President Obama expressed his understanding of President Putin’s decision and welcomed the participation of Russian Prime Minister [Dmitry] Medvedev at the G8 Summit,” the White House said.

“President Obama and President Putin agreed to hold a bilateral meeting on the margins of the June 18-19, G20 Summit in Los Cabos, Mexico,” it said.

## 2NC

### T – TVA

#### The Supreme Court votes neg – FGCs are not the Government – sovereign immunity cases prove

FROOMKIN ’96 **(A. Michael; Associate Professor of Law – University of Miami, “Reinventing the Government Corporation,”** <http://osaka.law.miami.edu/~froomkin/articles/reinvent.htm>**)**

The Supreme Court has addressed the specific legal status of government corporations several times, starting with McCulloch and Osborn. Five years after Osborn, the Supreme Court confronted the following argument: A suit against a bank owned solely by a state government was, in fact, a suit against the state government itself and, therefore, forbidden by the Eleventh Amendment. Holding that the Eleventh Amendment did not apply, the Court ruled that the president and directors of the corporation "alone constitute[d] the body[ \*563] corporate, the metaphysical person liable to suit."{94} The presence of a (state) government among the incorporators or shareholders of a bank did not give the bank corporation immunity from suit and did not pierce the veil and transform the suit into one against the government.{95}

#### Money doesn’t even come from the budget

**Wall Street Journal 2-7-09**

The problem is that it isn't really accountable to anyone. It is not scrutinized by shareholders and, unlike traditional government agencies, it is self-funded, so it doesn't have to justify itself to Congress to win annual appropriations.

### CP – Solvency

#### Srsly it solves

Steven Pifer (Director, Arms Control Initiative, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe at the Brookings Institute) January 2013 “U.S.-Russia Relations in Obama's Second Term” <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/01/09-us-russia-relations-pifer>

The U.S.-Russia agenda holds a range of issues on which the sides’ interests appear to converge. Both have an interest in strategic stability. The levels of nuclear weapons—some 5,000 or more on each side—make little sense 20 years after the Cold War. One question thus is whether the sides can build on the New START Treaty and negotiate further reductions, including reserve strategic warheads and non-strategic nuclear weapons. A single aggregate limit could create a mechanism under which Washington could trade a reduction in its advantage in reserve strategic warheads for a Russian reduction in its advantage in non-strategic nuclear weapons. A sublimit on deployed strategic warheads, the systems of greatest concern, would make sense as well.¶ Progress on nuclear arms reductions undoubtedly will require a settlement on missile defense. U.S. and Russian military experts in 2011 reportedly found significant convergence on ideas such as transparency, joint exercises and jointly-manned NATO/Russia missile defense centers. Building on this, a solution could be possible if (1) the Russians drop their demand for a “legal guarantee” that U.S. missile defenses not be directed against Russian strategic missiles, which would never be approved by the Senate, and (2) the United States offers more transparency and flexibility on its plans, e.g., states unequivocally that, if Iran is not progressing toward an ICBM capability, deployment of the SM-3 Bloc IIB interceptor in Europe would be deferred.¶ Although Moscow is unhappy that Washington applied additional sanctions on Iran outside of the UN Security Council, Russia nevertheless toughened its stance on Tehran, including by agreeing to an arms embargo. The two countries continue to have a shared interest in working within the P5-plus-1 process to dissuade Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability.¶ Russia has proved very helpful in providing supply routes for U.S. and coalition forces in Afghanistan. As those forces wind down major combat operations, the United States and Russia still share an interest in preventing the Taliban’s return or the Afghan state’s collapse into instability.¶ Washington and Moscow have expressed a desire to increase trade and investment relations. That would benefit both economies and could also provide a measure of commercial ballast to steady the relationship when other problems arise. Russia’s entry into the WTO helps, as would reforms to promote a more normal and welcoming business climate in Russia.¶ Invariably, however, difficult problems will remain on the agenda, which is something to be expected when two countries interact on so many global issues. Syria currently poses a major problem, but the Russian position may evolve as it becomes evident that Assad’s days are numbered. The United States will continue to raise democracy and human rights concerns about Russia, which unfortunately have grown over the past year. Moscow will engage in tit-for-tat retaliation for the passage of the Magnitskiy bill, such as its reprehensible decision to ban the adoption of Russian orphans by Americans, which most of all penalizes Russian children. That will introduce new friction into bilateral relations, but it is up to the two governments to determine whether such issues derail the relationship or can be controlled.¶ The Key Question¶ The challenge for Washington and Moscow is to deepen cooperation on those issues where their interests converge while managing their differences on other questions. Direct involvement by the two presidents can be important in this regard. President Putin has invited President Obama to make an early visit to Russia, which Obama has accepted in principle.¶ The key question is how they will engage and on what. By all accounts, Obama would like his presidency to be “transformational” regarding nuclear arms control. The U.S. military can live comfortably within New START, but the president would like to reduce the levels of nuclear weapons further. Washington understands that this will require a settlement on missile defense. If Putin is prepared to deal reasonably on these issues, that would provide the basis for a presidential agenda, one that would engage Obama’s interest.

### Case – india

#### Zero chance of nuclear use

**Enders, 2002** – quoting lots of professors (David, Daily News Editor for the Michigan Daily, “Experts say nuclear war still unlikely,” http://media.www.michigandaily.com/media/storage/paper851/news/2002/01/30/News/Experts.Say.Nuclear.War.Still.Unlikely-1404620.shtml)

University political science Prof. Ashutosh Varshney becomes animated when asked about the likelihood of nuclear war between India and Pakistan. "Odds are close to zero," Varshney said forcefully, standing up to pace a little bit in his office. "The assumption that India and Pakistan cannot manage their nuclear arsenals as well as the U.S.S.R. and U.S. or Russia and China concedes less to the intellect of leaders in both India and Pakistan than would be warranted." The world"s two youngest nuclear powers first tested weapons in 1998, sparking fear of subcontinental nuclear war a fear Varshney finds ridiculous. "The decision makers are aware of what nuclear weapons are, even if the masses are not," he said. "Watching the evening news, CNN, I think they have **vastly overstated the threat** of nuclear war," political science Prof. Paul Huth said. Varshney added that there are numerous factors working against the possibility of nuclear war. "India is committed to a no-first-strike policy," Varshney said. "It is virtually impossible for Pakistan to go for a first strike, because the retaliation would be gravely dangerous." Political science Prof. Kenneth Lieberthal, a former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council, agreed. "Usually a country that is in the position that Pakistan is in would not shift to a level that would ensure their total destruction," Lieberthal said, making note of India"s considerably larger nuclear arsenal. "American intervention is another reason not to expect nuclear war," Varshney said. "If anything has happened since September 11, it is that the command control system has strengthened. The trigger is in very safe hands." But the low probability of nuclear war does not mean tensions between the two countries who have fought three wars since they were created in 1947 will not erupt. "The possibility of conventional war between the two is higher. Both sides are looking for ways out of the current tension," Lieberthal said.

#### No nuke winter from IP

**Dyer 2002** (5/24, Gwinette, Hamilton Spectator, "Nuclear war a possibility over Kashmir", Lexis, WEA)

For those who do not live in the subcontinent, the most important fact is that the damage would be largely confined to the region. The Cold War is over, the strategic understandings that once tied India and Pakistan to the rival alliance systems have all been cancelled, and no outside powers would be drawn into the fighting.

The detonation of a hundred or so relatively small nuclear weapons over India and Pakistan would not cause grave harm to the wider world from fallout.

People over 40 have already lived through a period when the great powers conducted hundreds of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and they are mostly still here.

#### No nuclear theft

**Innocent, 10** – foreign policy analyst at the Cato Institute (Malou, “Away from McChrystal and Back to the Basics,” Huffington Post, 6/28, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11934)

Pakistan has an elaborate command and control system in place that complies with strict Western standards, and the country's warheads, detonators, and missiles are not stored fully-assembled, but are scattered and physically separated throughout the country. In short, the danger of militants seizing Pakistan's nuclear weapons in some Rambo-like scenario remains highly unlikely.

#### Even if they get Pakistan’s nukes, they can’t use them

**Asia Times 10** [Asia Times Online, 4/16/10, “Terrorism: The nuclear summit’s ‘straw man’”, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/LD16Ak02.html>]

That leaves the option of stealing a weapon. But pilfering a nuclear weapon is not simply a case of planning a sophisticated smash-and-grab operation. Nuclear weapons have multi-layered security systems, both technological and human. For example, access to nuclear facilities and weapons follows strict chains of command. Warheads are usually stored in several different pieces that require a cross-expertise and technical sophistication to assemble. In addition, they employ security features called Permissive Action Links (PAL) that use either external enabling devices or advanced encryption to secure the weapon. Older security systems include anti-tamper devices capable of exploding the device without a nuclear chain reaction. Not to mention that effectively delivering a nuclear device comes with its own hefty challenges. Thus, there are many serious obstacles to terrorists actually obtaining and setting off a nuclear bomb.

## 1NR

### 2nc overview

**A) Soft power accesses all their impacts and averts nuclear war.**

**Nye and Armitage, 2007** − Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University and President of Armitage International

(Joseph & Richard, \*Note: Report was in collaboration with about 50 other congressmen, “CCIS Commission of Smart Power – A Smarter, more Secure America”, http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/071106\_csissmartpowerreport.pdf) MP

Today’s Challenges The twenty-first century presents a number of unique foreign policy challenges for today’s decisionmakers. These challenges exist at an international, transnational, and global level. Despite America’s status as the lone global power, the **durability of the current international order** is uncertain. America must help find a way for today’s norms and institutions to accommodate rising powers that may hold a different set of principles and values. Furthermore, countries invested in the current order may waiver in their commitment to take action to minimize the threats posed by violent non-state actors and regional powers who challenge this order. The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, vectors of prosperity have also become vectors of **instability**. Threats such as **pandemic disease** and the **collapse of financial markets** are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of widespread physical harm to the planet posed by **nuclear catastrophe** has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases. The potential security challenges posed by **climate change** raise the possibility of an entirely new set of threats for the United States to consider. The next administration will need a strategy that speaks to each of these challenges. Whatever specific approach it decides to take, two principles will be certain: First, an extra dollar spent on hard power will not necessarily bring an extra dollar’s worth of security. It is difficult to know how to invest wisely when there is not a budget based on a strategy that specifies trade-offs among instruments. Moreover, hard power capabilities are a necessary but insufficient guarantee of security in today’s context. Second, success and failure will turn on the ability to win new allies and strengthen old ones both in government and civil society. The key is not how many enemies the United States kills, but how many allies it grows. States and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk. Terrorists, for instance, depend on their ability to attract support from the crowd at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy’s will to fight. Exporting Optimism, Not Fear Since its founding, the United States has been willing to fight for universal ideals of liberty, equality, and justice. This higher purpose, sustained by military and economic might, attracted people and governments to our side through two world wars and five decades of the Cold War. Allies accepted that American interests may not always align entirely with their own, but U.S. leadership was still critical to realizing a more peaceful and prosperous world. There have been times, however, when America’s sense of purpose has fallen out of step with the world. Since 9/11, the United States has been exporting fear and anger rather than more traditional values of hope and optimism. Suspicions of American power have run deep. Even traditional allies have questioned whether America is hiding behind the righteousness of its ideals to pursue some other motive. At the core of the problem is that America has made the war on terror the central component of its global engagement. This is not a partisan critique, nor a Pollyannaish appraisal of the threats facing America today. The threat from terrorists with global reach and ambition is real. It is likely to be with us for decades. Thwarting their hateful intentions is of fundamental importance and must be met with the sharp tip of America’s sword. On this there can be **no serious debate**. But excessive use of force can actually abet terrorist recruitment among local populations. We must strike a balance between

**Airborne viruses mean extinction**

More 93 (Gannett News Service, January 11, p. l/n)

Preston asks an author of the report whether “an emerging virus could wipeout our species.” The virologist replies that HIV, the virus that causes AIDS, could do the job, especially if it were to mutate into an airborne diseases like influenza. “There is no reason in principle why HIV couldn’t spread by the respitory route,” he notes.

**Warming does too**

**Cole 11** – Richard P. Mitchell Collegiate Professor of History at the University of Michigan (Juan, Informed Comment, “A Hot Wet Thousand Years and 10 Green Energy Stories to Avert it”, [http://www.juancole.com/2011/11/a-hot-wet-thousand-years-and-10-green-energy-stories-to-avert-it.html?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+juancole%2Fymbn+%28Informed+Comment%29](http://www.juancole.com/2011/11/a-hot-wet-thousand-years-and-10-green-energy-stories-to-avert-it.html?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+juancole%2Fymbn+%28Informed+Comment%29" \t "_blank), WEA)

The bad news is that I’ve been reading David Archer’s The Long Thaw on climate change projections, and he thinks that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been way too conservative. As I understand him, his research shows that because of massive carbon emissions produced by human beings, by 2100 the average temperature of the earth’s surface will likely increase by 3 degrees C. But, he thinks thatthereafter it will go on up another 2 degrees, for a total of 5 over the next few generations.The last time you had a climate 5 degree C. warmer than our prehistoric climate was the Eocene, 40 million years ago. All surface ice melted and the climate was tropical all the way to the poles. We don’t actually know if there has ever been such a rapid increase in carbon in the atmosphere (there have been occasional periods in geological time when the earth warmed up similarly, as with the Eocene, but it is impossible to know at the moment over what time period that occurred). Human beings nowadays are carbon-spewers on steroids. Archer argues that the dynamics of ocean water flows and the uncertainties of how quickly the oceans will absorb some of the extra carbon mean that the worst of the climate change effects will likely be delayed beyond 2100. Typically, sea level has risen 10-20 yards / meters for every increase of 1 degree in the surface temperature. So a 5 degree rise will eventually likely mean a sea level rise of 50 to 70 meters, which would cover a third more of the land mass than currently. The rise will take place over several centuries. Kevin Costner’s Waterworld may have been a bad film, but it might be good future history. It will take about 100,000 years (the entire likely age of homo sapiens sapiens as a species) for the oceans and igneous rocks to wash the extra carbon out of the atmosphere. Since the human species and human civilization arose under very different and significantly colder conditions, it is possible that a 5 degree rise in the average earth temperature over two or three centuries could lead to severe civilizational crisis and even extinction. On past evidence, the acidification of the oceans from carbon absorption will likely kill most marine life, a major human food source. And, human agricultural techniques assume large temperate zones. Archer’s pessimism, beyond the IPCC conservative estimates also suggests a problem, which is that the worst catastrophes facing our species because of our current carbon binge may take place over centuries (apparently the first 1,000 years after the period of large carbon emissions will be the worst). If we can’t get people alarmed about 2100 because it is too far off (it is only a human lifetime off in fact), how can we excite them about 2500? Well, we’re probably screwed. But the more we move to renewable energy in this generation, the less dramatic the millennial calamity. Archer’sworst case assumes that we’ll burn all the coal now known to exist. Friends, really. We don’t need to do that. James Hansen has suggested that coal burning should be a hanging crime, like horse stealing in the old West. Anyway, here are some slim reeds of hope

#### Reforms key to nuclear power -- skilled labor shortage crushes nuclear renaissance otherwise

**COC, ‘9**

[COMPETE – Council on Competitiveness, “Mobilizing a World-Class Energy Workforce,” Dec., http://www.compete.org/images/uploads/File/PDF%20Files/CoC\_-\_Pillar\_6\_Handout\_-\_Mobilizing\_a\_World-Class\_Energy\_Workforce,\_Dec09.pdf]

America currently lacks an energy workforce of sufficient size and capabilities to meet the needs of a sustainable, secure energy system.1 With increasing demand come abundant job opportunities in both traditional and emerging energy industries. Unfortunately, U.S. workers are neither aware nor sufficiently prepared to take them. Moreover, with an aging population and the retirement of the baby boomers well under way, there is an inadequate pipeline of replacement workers, technicians and managers to succeed them. Bridge the Skills Gap and Build the Talent The Council Recommends that: • The U.S. Government offer full scholarships to U.S. graduates who commit to a minimum period of service in an energy-related career in the governmental, academic or non-profit sectors. • Congress establish a CompetePass program that will allow eligible participants to redeem the passes at U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) one-stop training centers. • The U.S. Government grant green cards to foreign students receiving undergraduate and advanced degrees in scientific and engineering disciplines from U.S. institutions. The United States stands to lose half of its electric power industry workforce within the next five to ten years due to retirement. America’s oil and gas workforce averages 50 years in age; half are likely to retire soon. Workers in these conventional energy sector jobs, from power plant operators to transmission line and pipeline workers, are retiring at a much faster rate than they are being replaced. The introduction of any new energy technologies will not compensate for this workforce shortage. For example, in the nuclear industry, the fact that there has been no new construction of a nuclear facility in the United States in over 30 years has led to the atrophy of skills, the loss of technicians, the dearth of American students in nuclear engineering and a national security risk for the primarily nuclear-powered U.S. Navy. 2 The development, installation and maintenance of new technologies require skills at all levels of educational training. Many of these jobs, such as building new power plants, cannot be exported and will remain in the United States. So-called “green collar” jobs could fill this gap over time and provide for significant domestic employment growth, but capitalizing on this opportunity will require government being proactive in developing programs to provide the necessary skills. Government should provide a 21st century education to match the 21st century job opportunities, requirements and needs. There is growing global competition for scientific and engineering talent today, and the U.S. pipeline of students is slowing.3 The private sector, where the overwhelming majority of careers will be, knows best the current opportunities that are not being met. Executives cite the lack of scientific, engineering and skilled talent as among the most serious challenges facing their businesses today.4 They know what skills will be required and can assist in developing the workforce of the future by working closely with educational institutions as well as within their own organizations.

**Solves relations and intl coop sufficiently to avoid international crises**

Joseph **Nye**, assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs, Washington Quarterly, Winter, **1996**

Although the United States cannot single-handedly resolve the many communal conflicts that have erupted, it can work to make international institutions better able to deal with these conflicts. The Clinton administration is working to create a web of security cooperation, from bilateral alliances, to regional alliances and security organizations, to global organizations like the UN. At times, this will involve building new alliance structures, as in the enlargement of NATO and the revitalization of the U.S. -- Japan alliance, or regional security organizations, as in the reinvigorated OSCE and the ARF. In other cases, it will require creating and leading ad hoc coalitions, like the Desert Storm coalition that defeated Iraq in the Gulf war. Sometimes, as in the Gulf war, the United States may work primarily through the UN to advance its diplomatic interests while at the same time retaining leadership of the military component of the operation as the leading contributor. In other cases where U.S. interests and forces are not as directly engaged, allies who have greater interests will naturally step into the lead. The key is to take the steps necessary to make ad hoc coalitions of the willing effective, such as developing agreed-upon mechanisms for burden-sharing, interoperability of forces, and decision-making mechanisms on missions and rules of engagement. This approach enables some states to act even when not all are willing to contribute, and, for those states most willing to contribute to internationally recognizcd missions, to lead the military component of the operation.

### AT: Heg D

#### Heg prevents extinction

**Lieber 2005** – PhD from Harvard, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown, former consultant to the State Department and for National Intelligence Estimates (Robert, “The American Era”, pages 53-54, WEA)

Withdrawal from foreign commitments might seem to be a means of evading hostility toward the United States, but the consequences would almost certainly be harmful both to regional stability and to U.S. national interests. Although Europe would almost certainly not see the return to competitive balancing among regional powers (i.e., competition and even military rivalry between France and Germany) of the kind that some realist scholars of international relations have predicted,21 elsewhere the dangers could increase. In Asia, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan would have strong motivation to acquire nuclear weapons – which they have the technological capacity to do quite quickly. Instability and regional competition could also escalate, not only between India and Pakistan, but also in Southeast Asia involving Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia, and possibly the Philippines. Risks in the Middle East would be likely to increase, with regional competition among the major countries of the Gulf region (Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq) as well as Egypt, Syria, and Israel. Major regional wars, eventually involving the use of weapons of mass destruction plus human suffering on a vast scale, floods of refugees, economic disruption, and risks to oil supplies are all readily conceivable. Based on past experience, the United States would almost certainly **be drawn back** into these areas, whether to defend friendly states, to cope with a humanitarian catastrophe, or to prevent a hostile power from dominating an entire region. Steven Peter Rosen has thus fittingly observed, “If the logic of American empire is unappealing, it is not at all clear that the **alternatives** are that much more attractive.”22 Similarly, Niall Ferguson has added that those who dislike American predominance ought to bear in mind that the alternative may not be a world of competing great powers, but one with no hegemon at all. Ferguson’s warning may be hyperbolic, but it hints at the perils that the absence of a dominant power, “apolarity,” could bring “an anarchic new Dark Age of waning empires and religious fanaticism; of endemic plunder and pillage in the world’s forgotten regions; of economic stagnation and civilization’s retreat into a few fortified enclaves.”23

### AT: Thumpers

#### Obama PC puts immigration at the top of the docket

Jennifer Epstein (writer for Politico) March 27, 2013 “Obama renews push on immigration reform” http://www.politico.com/politico44/2013/03/obama-renews-push-on-immigration-reform-160372.html?hp=r3

President Obama sought to refocus the political conversation on immigration reform Wednesday in interviews with two Spanish-language networks that come after weeks of news cycles dominated by discussions of guns, sequestration and same-sex marriage.¶ In interviews with Telemundo and Univision conducted Wednesday at the White House, the president stayed firm on the immigration reform timeline he set earlier this year and voiced confidence in the bipartisan group of eight senators who are negotiating a bill.¶ “I think we’ve seen enormous progress over the last month and a half,” Obama said in an interview with Telemundo. “I think both sides, Democrats and Republicans, have been very serious about the negotiations. I’m actually very optimistic that when they return in early April … we’ll see a bill ready to move through the process.”¶ "We're seeing right now a good, bipartisan spirit. I want to encourage that," he added on Univision. "Hopefully we'll be able to get it done."

#### Top of the docket and has momentum but narrow window

Justin Sink and Meghashyam Mali (writer for The Hill) March 25, 2013 “Obama: 'The time has come' to move immigration reform in Congress” http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/290129-obama-the-time-has-come-to-move-immigration-reform

Bipartisan groups in both the House and Senate are moving closer to unveiling separate immigration reform proposals, and the president is hoping to build momentum for a deal.¶ “We've known for years that our immigration system is broken, that we're not doing enough to harness the talent and ingenuity of all those who want to work hard and find a place in America,” Obama said. “And after avoiding the problem for years, the time has come to fix it once and for all. The time has come for comprehensive, sensible immigration reform.”¶ Speaking from the East Room, Obama argued that immigration strengthens the country.¶ “It keeps us vibrant, it keeps us hungry, it keeps us prosperous. It is what makes us such a dynamic country,” he said. “If we want to keep attracting the best and the brightest, we've got to do a better job of welcoming them.”¶ Advocates for immigration reform see a real chance for legislation to pass Congress this year, despite opposition from some 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.¶ Immigration reform is a potent political issue for Obama, who won more than 70 percent of the Hispanic vote in 2012. Since that showing, a growing number of conservative lawmakers have signaled they would back immigration reform, including measures to provide a pathway to citizenship.¶ Groups aligned with Obama have signaled their intention of pressuring Congress.¶ On Monday, The New York Times reported that Organizing for Action — the political group born from the president's reelection campaign — will launch a new online effort featuring the stories of some 7,000 supporters, some of whom entered the country illegally.¶ The Senate’s “Gang of Eight” introduced their framework, calling for a pathway to citizenship, heightened border security, increased high-skilled immigration and a guest worker program, in January.¶ But since then, senators have been tied down in negotiations over the details of the plan, with many key issues still unresolved.¶ Obama said he wanted to see debate begin on a congressional bill by April.¶ “We are making progress, but we've got to finish the job, because this issue is not new,” Obama said. “Everyone pretty much knows what's broken, everyone knows how to fix it.”¶ At a briefing later Monday with reporters, White House spokesman Josh Earnest insisted that the White House did not hold the event over concern with the progress of negotiations.¶ "We are pleased with the progress they are reportedly making" in the Senate, Earnest said, adding that President Obama had been in touch with members of the Gang of Eight.¶ Earnest also dismissed criticism from freshman Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas), who suggested over the weekend that Obama secretly hoped talks would fall through, so Democrats could gain a political wedge for the 2014 midterm elections.¶ "There's no evidence to support those claims," Earnest said.¶ Members of the Senate group predict their plan could move forward when legislators return from a two-week Easter break.

#### Now is key – immigration reform is politically ripe but the window is small

Mike Lillis (writer for The Hill) March 20, 2013 “Pelosi predicts passage of immigration reform bill before summer” http://thehill.com/homenews/house/289291-pelosi-predicts-passage-of-immigration-reform-bill-by-summer

Rep. Luis Gutiérrez (D-Ill.), one of the negotiators, said Tuesday that no proposal will emerge this week, but he's hopeful the group will release a plan not long after Congress returns from spring recess next month.¶ “We are under a time pressure to resolve this issue because the moment is politically ripe,” Gutiérrez said Tuesday at a breakfast in Washington sponsored by The Christian Science Monitor.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform has eluded supporters for many years, as various interest groups have jousted over provisions as diverse as border security, worker protections, family unification, gay and lesbian benefits, and human rights

### Ptx Links

#### Government support for reprocessing’s politically impossible---tech costs, environmental and prolif drawbacks

Damon Kenul 10, Research Assistant at NYU Langone Medical Center, et al., 11/29/10, “Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Future Prospects and Viability,” <http://humanities.uchicago.edu/orgs/institute/bigproblems/Team7-1210.pdf>

Of these options, we believe that the fifth has the most promise. Nuclear reprocessing is too environmentally hazardous and expensive given current technological constraints and uranium prices, although this could change in the near future with scientific improvements. Increasing government support of advancements in reprocessing in the U.S. would encourage growth and investment in this technology. Therefore, continued government commitment to researching pyroprocessing and other advanced fuel cycle technologies is vital to the nuclear industry, especially if we envision this technology maturing internationally. As unsustainable as our current nuclear waste disposal strategies are, we believe in the current political climate, commercial reprocessing in the United States are not a viable option due to high environmental and technological costs, as well as having significant nuclear proliferation threats. However, in order for the U.S. to employ pyroprocessing in the future, the government must begin now to incentivize the technology for firms and investors. As uranium prices are expected to increase in the future, as well as an increasing concern regarding the management of nuclear waste worldwide, reprocessing may become a promising solution provided investments are made to address current challenges in the field.

#### Political backlash against reprocessing turns the entire case---destroys certainty necessary for private sector involvement and kills the credibility of the plan

Damon Kenul 10, Research Assistant at NYU Langone Medical Center, et al., 11/29/10, “Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Future Prospects and Viability,” <http://humanities.uchicago.edu/orgs/institute/bigproblems/Team7-1210.pdf>

The differentiation in the U.S. and French nuclear industries was largely based on the government’s level of commitment over time. In the U.S., the government’s commitment to the industry was initially strong, but abated over time, while France’s government maintained a strong commitment over time. 55 The level of a government’s credible commitment to the nuclear energy industry and specifically nuclear reprocessing will play an important role in shaping the flow of capital into the technology. 56 As the industry is currently constructed, utilities are sensitive to licensing and construction costs, which may be difficult to predict based on a government’s ability to commit to the industry. Utilities must obtain construction licenses from regulatory bodies to build nuclear facilities. These investment decisions necessitate large sunk costs which must be incurred a number of years prior to operating the plant. The decision making process of the utility is ultimately influenced by uncertainty surrounding the regulatory process that can ease or complicate the process. This uncertainty increases the risk associated with these types of investments and disincentivizes investment in the technology. Therefore an “analysis of the differences in institutional environment attributes can further understanding of government’s credible commitment to the industry.” 57 In understanding the existing differentiation in the institutional environment for both the U.S. and France, it is possible to elucidate how these unique situations have created varying transaction costs for their respective industries.

The U.S. efforts to exploit nuclear power commercially originated as a result of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and specifically the creation of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) 58 . In 1957, the Price-Anderson Act limited utilities’ liabilities regarding nuclear accidents and helped promulgate interest in the commercial use of nuclear energy. 59 This act served an important role in relaying the government’s credible commitment to the nuclear industry. Initially, the U.S. nuclear industry was subject to the interaction of three groups; the nuclear/electric industry, the AEC, and the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (JCAE). 60 In this respect, polices regarding the nuclear industry were centralized and left to the discretion of the regulators and the regulated industries themselves. This political environment fostered the expansion of the nuclear industry and investment in the technology. However, control over commercial nuclear policy became highly fragmented: By the time the JCAE was officially disbanded in early 1977, more than a dozen committees in the House and Senate had gained some oversight over nuclear energy policy. Once the decentralization of authority had occurred, proposals to create a single House energy committee with concentrated authority were defeated. This proliferation of oversight is far more typical of the American political system than the centralized JCAE had been. 61

Further, during this period there was a significant rise in the number of anti-nuclear activists namely the Union of Concerned Scientist and the National Resource Defense Council. 62 These groups were able to utilize this fragmented political environment to undermine government commitment to the industry. The revived arrangement for nuclear industry oversight can be characterized by a subcommittee structure “open to competing interests, as well as vulnerable to changes in the composition of interest groups”. 63 Moreover, the nuclear industry was subject to an increased volume of rules and regulations as the anti-nuclear activist groups employed the independent judiciary branch for their interests. The change in the political structure confronting the nuclear industry undermined the feasibility of credible commitment of government toward the industry. Subsequently, this helped lead to the decline of the commercial nuclear industry in the U.S in addition to the Three Mile Island (TMI) accident. This situation contrasts the environment of the French nuclear industry.

The American combination of fragmented power, little reliance on bureaucratic expertise, an independent judiciary, and opposing interest groups greatly undermines the ability of the U.S. government to credibly commit to the nuclear power industry. In France, despite substantial anti-nuclear interest groups, the impermeability of the institutional setup—no division of power, weak judiciary, and reliance on bureaucratic expertise— effectively prevents activists from influencing policy outcomes.64

#### Plan drains PC

Thomas Clements 9-17, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, 9/17/12, “Plutonium Fuel (MOX) Program at Savannah River Site Hit with Major Setback,” http://aikenleader.villagesoup.com/p/plutonium-fuel-mox-program-at-savannah-river-site-hit-with-major-setback/897688

Experimental MOX made from weapons-grade plutonium has never been tested or used in a boiling water reactor (BWR) like Browns Ferry. Testing of MOX will take at least six years in one of the Browns Ferry reactors, according to an August 8 presentation to the NRC by Global Nuclear Fuel, meaning that MOX could not be used before 2025 at the earliest, resulting in a host of scheduling problems at the MOX factory, along with soaring costs which will raise the ire of Congress.

#### TVA perceived

The Tennesean 3/25 (Obama tries again with TVA nominee Marilyn Brown, drawing TN senators' criticism, http://www.tennessean.com/article/20130325/NEWS0201/303250031/Obama-tries-again-TVA-nominee-Marilyn-Brown-drawing-TN-senators-criticism)

Senators angry after blocking bid to put Brown on board WASHINGTON — Angering Tennessee’s two Republican senators, President Barack Obama again wants Senate consideration of energy-efficiency expert Marilyn Brown for a full term on the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors. The nomination, sent to Capitol Hill on Thursday night, comes more than two months after Sens. Lamar Alexander and Bob Corker used Senate procedures to block Obama’s previous attempt to appoint her to a six-year term. Brown, who came to the board in 2010 to fill out a vacated term and served through the end of 2012, is widely recognized for her expertise in energy efficiency and other sustainable-energy policies. She teaches in Georgia Tech’s School of Public Policy after formerly working for the Department of Energy at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. “This is another example of the Obama White House not listening,” Alexander said in a statement Friday. “I told the White House in advance that the TVA board needs a nominee with a better understanding of the relationship between low electricity rates and better jobs in the Tennessee Valley. The Senate now has the responsibility to exercise its constitutional role of advice and consent on the nominee.” Corker was even more critical. “TVA needs leaders who enthusiastically support the mission of producing economical electricity and have an abiding appreciation of its important economic devel­opment role and impact on the well-being of Valley residents,” he said. “Unfortunately, during my discussions with Dr. Brown, it was clear she does not share that point of view.” Despite their irritation, the senators did not say whether they would again block her name from coming to the Senate floor. But Stephen Smith, executive director of the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, said the statements leave little doubt. “I think it was a pretty clear signal,” he said in an interview. But the two senators need to be even more specific about why they don’t find her qualified, he said. “If you are not going to allow it (the nomination), you owe it to the people of the Tennessee Valley,” Smith said. “This doesn’t make any sense.” Decision applauded Alexander and Corker took Brown’s name out of a long list of presidential appointments that the Senate considered Jan. 1. Brown herself could not be reached for comment Friday. Smith and spokesmen for other energy conservation groups said Brown brought a unique perspective to the TVA board. On Friday, they applauded Obama’s decision to send her name back to the Senate. “TVA needs a fully functional board of highly qualified individuals with diverse backgrounds as the agency makes critical decisions about how energy is produced and consumed in the Tennessee Valley while protecting the region’s natural resources,” Smith said. “We reject petty politics and personality differences as legitimate reasons for blocking her confirmation.” Kateri Callahan of the Washington-based Alliance to Save Energy said she disagreed with Alexander’s contention that Brown is not familiar enough with the Tennessee Valley. “I think she has a keen understanding of electricity issues regionally and nationally,” Callahan said. “He (Obama) has picked an excellent nominee for the TVA board.” Callahan added: “She knows the region. She knows the people. She served the TVA extremely well in her first term.” Environmentalists were upset with Alexander and Corker in January because they wouldn’t explain what aspects of Brown’s background made her unqualified for a seat on the board. Energy efficiency refers to a partnership between energy companies and their customers to provide the same service through the use of less energy. Customers, often responding to financial incentives provided by utilities, take steps such as using more energy-efficient light bulbs and appliances, installing better insulation and window panes, and weatherizing doors. Utilities themselves look to run their power plants more efficiently through better maintenance and other steps. Clean energy advocates see efficiency efforts and conservation as a means of making construction of new power plants — either nuclear or fossil fuel — unnecessary, saving ratepayers billions of dollars over a decade or more. Criticisms of energy efficiency abound as well, including charges that the energy price savings achieved through efficiency measures just lead to more consumption — what’s called the “rebound effect.” Some conservatives and tea party members contend energy efficiency is a prelude to government-directed “social engineering.”

### UQ

#### This stretch is critical for immigration reform – Obama is pushing but differences could derail the bill

The Hill March 19, 2013 “Crucial stretch for Obama” http://thehill.com/opinion/editorials/289159-crucial-stretch-for-obama

President Obama has a big second-term agenda, but he faces a make-or-break stretch during the next couple of months on two big issues.¶ He has made gun control and immigration reform top priorities, but neither is close to getting to his desk.¶ By this time during his first term, Obama had signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and the stimulus package.¶ In his State of the Union address, Obama said if Congress did not move quickly on immigration, he would offer his own plan. That proposal was subsequently leaked, infuriating key Republicans.¶ But Obama deftly put out that fire by reaching out to GOP senators who are working on comprehensive immigration reform in the Gang of Eight.¶ Yet, legislative initiatives can’t be taken very seriously until there is actual legislation. During the last Congress, the fiscal Gang of Six/Gang of Eight kept promising they would release text of a bill “soon,” but it never emerged.¶ The immigration Gang of Eight this week vowed to release bill language next month. By all accounts, those promises are expected to be kept. But there has been friction on the issue between important stakeholders, the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. If those differences are not resolved, the bill will teeter.¶ Gun control advocates suffered setbacks on Tuesday when Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said an assault weapons ban and background check legislation would not be included in the Senate’s base bill that will be considered on the floor.¶ Earlier this year on NBC’s “Meet the Press,” Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) called universal background checks on firearm purchases “the sweet spot” of gun control.¶ Reid on Tuesday said the discarded gun control measures are “important,” while stressing he needs votes to pass the underlying bill.¶ The bottom line is that the Democratic-controlled Senate is willing to go further than the GOP-controlled House to increase federal limits on guns and reduce them on immigration. So if the bills stumble in the upper chamber, then they have scant chance in the House.¶ Obama last week met congressional Republicans and Democrats in an effort to improve frosty relations, and, of course, advance his agenda. The gatherings attracted good reviews on both sides of the aisle, but did next to nothing to close the huge gap between the two parties on policy.¶ After final votes on Thursday or Friday, Congress is scheduled to go on a two-week recess. Members will return in April.¶ If there has not been substantial progress on guns or immigration by Memorial Day, both legislative efforts will be deemed in potentially deadly trouble.

#### Immigration reform will pass now insiders cite substantial progress and consensus now

Meghashyam Mali (writer for The Hill) March 25, 2013 “Obama to host new citizens, push for action on immigration reform” http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/290053-obama-to-host-new-citizens-press-congress-on-immigration-reform

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.

### AT: Agencies Shield

#### Agencies don’t shield and no risk of a turn---Obama is velcro and will only get blamed---no credit

**Nicholas & Hook 10** Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.¶** Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame.¶ Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ But Obama remains **the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape¶ What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting.¶ Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."¶ Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration.¶ Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants.¶ Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole.¶ "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said.¶ But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish.¶ Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal."¶ Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise.¶ A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year.¶ At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways.¶ Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower.¶ Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize.¶ Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in.¶ "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit.¶ **Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible**. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss.¶ But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. **No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate**. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end.¶ So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: **Everything sticks to him**. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding.¶ Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times.¶ "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen."¶ A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions.¶ But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda.

#### Obama will take the fall – even if he doesn’t want to

**Politico, 1-7-10**, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0110/31259.html

Taking a decidedly different tack from his predecessor in the face of a government failure, President Barack Obama on Thursday took the blame for shortcomings that led to a failed Christmas Day bombing plot, saying, “The buck stops with me.”

Aides to Obama signaled that he was consciously seeking to be the anti-Bush, airing the administration’s dirty laundry and stepping up to take his share of the responsibility.

“The president also wanted to do something, I think, unusual today,” National Security Council Chief of Staff Denis McDonough said during a webchat after Obama’s speech. “Not only was this a very quick accounting, not only did the president accept responsibility for it, but the president also wanted to do this as transparently as possible.”

Quick, transparent, willing to take the blame — all things Obama has said President George W. Bush was not.

#### Every SINGLE MOVE Obama makes is hotly contested and intensely debated—there’s only risk of a link

**TVNZ 10/8** (Jon Johansson, 10/8/09, "A presidential chess game", http://tvnz.co.nz/world-news/presidential-chess-game-3060277)

While only his most serious chess matches have been mentioned here, numerous other games are continually taking shape, demanding his study and his response. Every single move Obama makes, in whichever game he plays, is hotly contested and intensely debated. There is no let up for him.

### AT: Public Link Turn

#### Public will backlash – no one wants to pay for it – wont buy your turns

Mariotte 6/5/12 (Michael Mariotte, Executive Director of Nuclear Information and Resource Service, “Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the polls say,” http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say)

Americans are not exactly wild about the idea of building new nuclear reactors. Polls asking the question different ways arrive at different results; at the lowest common denominator it is safe to say the country is **divided on the issue**. But Americans clearly don’t want to pay for construction of new reactors. And the reality is that no utility wants to or even can spend its own money building new reactors—they’re just too expensive. Congress, State legislatures and Public Service Commissions would do well to heed that warning, especially since it crosses all party and political lines. It is also clear that the American public does not see nuclear power as a “clean energy” source (nor, for that matter, “clean” coal or natural gas fracking). Congressional or state efforts to include these technologies in a “clean energy standard” or a clean energy bank concept are **bound to fail.**

### AT: XO Solves

#### Obama wont take unilateral action on immigration reform – fear of backlash deters him

Keegan Hamilton (writer for the Atlantic) March 26, 2013 “How Obama Could (but Probably Won't) Stop Deporting Illegal Immigrants Today” http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/03/how-obama-could-but-probably-wont-stop-deporting-illegal-immigrants-today/274352/

We have a Congress for a reason," Jacoby says. "To fix anything permanently you need to have legislation, and in order for that to happen it has to be bipartisan. My worst nightmare is the president thinking, 'I don't need bipartisan legislation. Why share credit with Republicans? I can just go on and do this myself.' I think that's a disastrous political strategy."¶ If the current congressional push for immigration reform were to fail, however, a presidential pardon for undocumented immigrants with no criminal history might be Obama's last ditch alternative to prosecutorial discretion. Rather than scaling back on detentions, Obama could instantly--and permanently-- legalize millions of illegal immigrants. Beck, the Georgia law scholar, notes that the Constitution empowers the president to "grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."¶ The question, he says, is "whether coming into the country in violation of the immigration laws or overstaying a visa could be deemed an 'offense against the United States.'" But the president has broad powers of pardon, and it seems that Obama could exercise those powers here. Beck cites United States v. Klein, an 1871 Supreme Court case that involved a presidential pardon issued during the Civil War to confederates who rejoined the union and took an oath of loyalty.¶ But even if executive-branch lawyers could put forth a legal rationale for the move, there are political reasons why Obama would likely be reluctant to make it. Although potentially cementing loyalty from a generation of Latinos, a mass pardon would likely be deeply unpopular with moderates and liberals who put faith in the legislative process, and would be considered downright treasonous by many Republicans. Obama could face Congressional censure or perhaps even impeachment if he had any time remaining in office, and the backlash against Democrats could make the Tea Party-fueled, Obamacare-inspired shellacking of 2010 look mild.¶ "If in December 2016 Obama says, 'Unconditional pardon to everybody in the country illegally,' that would totally dismantle Democratic Party governance for a generation," Mayer says. "I don't think he wants that to be his legacy."

#### Congress key—durability and will

Lerer 2/10 Lisa is a writer at Bloomberg. “Obama State of Union Means Executive Power for Defiant Congress,” 2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-11/obama-poised-to-skirt-congress-to-seal-legacy-in-new-term-agenda.html

Already, plans are being laid to unleash new executive orders, regulations, signing statements and memorandums designed to push Obama’s programs forward and cement his legacy, according to administration aides and allies.¶ “The big things that we need to get done, we can’t wait on,” said White House senior adviser Dan Pfeiffer. “If we can take action, we will take action.”¶ The tactic carries political risk, beyond the backlash it will spark from congressional Republicans. Advisers say the president -- who already faces charges from Republicans that he is concentrating too much power in the White House -- remains cautious about getting too far ahead of public opinion. And executive orders can be overturned by a future president a lot easier than can legislation.¶ What’s more, Obama will still need to work through Congress to deal with some of the nation’s biggest concerns, including tax and spending issues as well as any comprehensive changes in the immigration system.

#### Only solves border security—not our impacts

Lillis 2/16 Mike is a writer at The Hill. “Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform,” 2013, http://thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform

Not all immigration-reform supporters think Obama has so much space to move on immigration without Congress.¶ Rep. Henry Cuellar (Texas), vice-chairman of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, said the president has some license to make border security moves and spending decisions.¶ "But pretty much he's done what he can do right now," Cuellar said Friday, "and after that it's up to Congress to address the rest of the issues."

### AT: Winners Win

#### Winners lose---PC’s not renewable, is zero-sum, and diminishes fast

Ryan 9 Selwyn, Professor Emeritus and former Director, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, “Obama and political capital,” 1/18 http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article\_opinion?id=161426968

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be difficult **for him** to deliver half of what he **has** promised, let alone all of it. Reality will force **him to make** many "u" turns and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a **vast accumulation of political capital**, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and fast diminishing **asset** in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is **rarely ever renewable**. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who did not know how to husband the political capital with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, some promises have to be deferred beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that American politics **is not a winner-take-all system**. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting anything donepolitically, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, requiresgroups to negotiate, bargain and engage in **serious horse trading.** No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

#### PC is finite---fights on one issue make pushing others harder

Hayward 12 John is a writer at Human Events. “DON’T BE GLAD THE BUFFETT RULE IS DEAD, BE ANGRY IT EVER EXISTED,” 4/17, http://www.humanevents.com/2012/04/17/dont-be-glad-the-buffett-rule-is-dead-be-angry-it-ever-existed/

Toomey makes the excellent point that Obama’s class-warfare sideshow act is worse than useless, because it’s wasting America’s valuable time, even as the last fiscal sand runs through our hourglass. Politicians speak of “political capital” in selfish terms, as a pile of chips each party hoards on its side of the poker table, but in truth America has only a finite amount of political capital in total. When time and energy is wasted on pointless distractions, the capital expended---in the form of the public’s attention, and the debates they hold among themselves---cannot easily be regained. ¶ There is an “opportunity cost” associated with the debates we aren’t having, and the valid ideas we’re not considering, when our time is wasted upon nonsense that is useful only to political re-election campaigns. Health care reform is the paramount example of our time, as countless real, workable market-based reforms were obscured by the flaccid bulk of ObamaCare. The Buffett Rule, like all talk of tax increases in the shadow of outrageous government spending, likewise distracts us from the real issues.

**Winner’s win theory not true for Obama**

**American Prospect, 5-16-11**, p. http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack\_obamas\_theory\_of\_power

Obama won more legislative trophies during his first two years than Clinton did, but in many respects, they were poisoned chalices. Health reform proved broadly unpopular because of political missteps—a net negative for Democrats in the 2010 midterm. The stimulus, though valuable, was too small to be a major political plus. Obama hailed it as a great victory rather than pledging to come back for more until recovery was assured. He prematurely abandoned the fight for jobs as his administration’s central theme, though the recession still wracked the nation. And because of the administration’s alliance with Wall Street, Obama suffered both the appearance and reality of being too close to the bankers, despite a partial success on financial reform. Obama’s mortgage-rescue program was the worst of both worlds—it failed to deliver enough relief to make an economic difference yet still signaled politically disabling sympathy for both “deadbeat” homeowners and for bankers. (See this month’s special report on page A1.)