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## \*\*Top Shelf\*\*

### Jackson Vanik: 1NC Shell (1/3)

#### FIRST, Jackson Vanik will pass – bipartisan support of congress and interest groups gives momentum

Agence France Presse, 6/12 [“US senators introduce bill to end trade curbs on Russia”, Lexis]

A bipartisan group of US senators introduced legislation Tuesday that would scrap a decades-old law imposing trade restrictions on Moscow, saying it's necessary as Russia joins the WTO. Washington's former Cold War adversary has been given the green light to join the World Trade Organization, which means the Russian and US governments will need to grant each other permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) by the time the accession is complete. Washington would need to lift a 1974 law, the Jackson-Vanik amendment, under which normal trade relations are granted to Russia only on an annual basis. "This is an opportunity to double our exports to Russia and create thousands of jobs across every sector of the US economy, all at no cost to the US whatsoever," said Democrat Max Baucus, who chairs the Senate Finance Committee. "Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs," he added. Republican co-sponsor John Thune noted that presidents from both parties have been granting Russia normal trade status annually since 1992. "It is time to establish this treatment on a permanent basis so that American farmers, manufacturers, investors, and service providers will have the ability to take full advantage of the new business opportunities resulting from Russia's entry into the WTO" later this summer, he said. US business groups support the lifting of Jackson-Vanik, as Russian WTO membership will allow US companies to take advantage of additional market access, greater intellectual property enforcement and lower Russian agriculture subsidies. "Passing this bill will ensure that US businesses, ranchers, farmers and workers will not be at a disadvantage in the Russian market compared to their global competitors," US Trade Representative Ron Kirk said in a statement welcoming the legislation. US exports to Russia total about $9 billion per year, with some studies showing that the figure could double within five years after Russia earns PNTR status. Also backing the legislation were Senator John McCain as well as John Kerry, who called on Congress to pass the new bill so that the United States is not left on the sidelines while other nations benefit from favorable treatment in the Russian market. "We cannot afford to dither, delay, and deny ourselves the job creation and major export opportunities that come from passing PNTR," Kerry said.

#### AND, LINK

### Jackson Vanik: 1NC Shell (2/3)

#### AND, Political capital is key and repeal solves U.S.-Russian relations

Stokes, 1/26/2011 (Bruce, An Agenda, If You Can Keep It, National Journal, p. <http://www2.nationaljournal.com/member/daily/balance-of-payments>)

After years of relative quiescence, Congress actually has a trade agenda in 2011: possible votes on the Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements, and on Russia’s application to join the World Trade Organization. Whether, when, how, and which elements of this agenda will be completed will largely **depend on political calculations** in the White House and on Capitol Hill. “The first question,” observed William Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, “is, how many of these fights does the administration want to have?” At the top of the list will be the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, which President Obama made his own by arm-wrestling the South Koreans for fixes to benefit the American auto industry. Now, that it has the support of Ford and the United Auto Workers, most observers agree that the deal with South Korea has sufficient votes for passage. And Obama has said he wants Congress to act on it by June. But the business community also wants action on the Colombia and Panama agreements negotiated by the George W. Bush administration. “From our perspective,” said Calman Cohen, president of the Emergency Committee for American Trade, “they are like three children. We want them all to go forward.” Congressional GOP leaders agree. “I strongly believe that we should consider all three agreements in the next six months,” House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, R-Mich., said at a trade hearing this week. Objections to the Panama accord, based on tax and labor issues, seem to pose no major obstacles. Organized labor continues to highlight the murders of union organizers in Colombia and other labor-rights abuses there, but Ways and Means ranking member Sander Levin, D-Mich., a longtime critic of Colombia’s record on these issues, suggested in testimony this week that some accommodation might be possible. “I believe there is now an opportunity for the two governments to work together mutually to achieve real progress on the ground,” he said. Republican leaders in Congress have talked of voting on all three trade deals, possibly one right after the other, to facilitate the legislative calendar and, the administration suspects, to aggravate divisions among Democrats. Parliamentarians, meanwhile, will have to decide if fast-track negotiating authority still applies to the Colombia agreement. Because Congress failed to act on it when it was first submitted, the fast-track authority for the deal expired. This is not a problem in the House, where Republicans control the Rules Committee, but it is in the Senate, where fast-track is needed to facilitate a vote. Business lobbyists think that the Korea deal could move by itself before the August recess but that doing all three together will take considerably more time, contrary to Camp’s ambitions. Members of the business community are less sanguine about legislation blessing Russia’s application to join the WTO, where membership can be held up by any current member. Georgia has yet to give its assent to Russia’s application, which might make the need for U.S. action moot. To give Moscow the green light, Congress would have to accord Russia most-favored-nation trading status, thus granting it the lowest possible U.S. tariffs. That, in turn, requires waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 trade act, effectively acknowledging that emigration from Russia is no longer a U.S. concern. Although Washington has no complaints about Russian emigration policy, Jackson-Vanik has long been seen as useful leverage over Moscow that many in Congress may be loath to relinquish. Capitol Hill staffers warn that passage of Russian WTO membership will be an uphill fight. Moscow has few champions in Congress, where Senate debate late last year over the New START deal demonstrated deep-seated suspicion among conservatives. Russia’s piracy of intellectual property and its past use of health and safety standards to bar the importation of U.S. poultry have also soured business interests. Buyers’ remorse over China’s admission to the WTO fuels congressional reluctance to make the same mistake twice. And Moscow’s past history of quixotic actions—cutting off gas to Ukraine, for example—makes advocates of WTO membership wary of going out on a limb only to have Moscow cut it off. Moscow is anxious to join the WTO, however, and membership is a key element in the administration’s “**reset” of U.S.-Russia relations**. Moreover, a Russia that is subject to international rules and dispute settlement might be better than a Russia operating **outside the law**. Ever since the financial crisis began in 2008, Russia has been one of the most frequent instigators of protectionist trade practices. WTO membership could help discipline such behavior. Veterans of past trade battles on Capitol Hill advise that the administration might have to give Congress something to vote for—some new oversight or restraint—to ease the pain of voting to waive Jackson-Vanik. When China was granted admission to the WTO, for example, Congress created a commission to report on Beijing’s human-rights record. After two years of relegating **divisive trade issues to the back burner**, in 2011 the administration now has a **legislative trade agenda**. The question is **how much political capital it is willing to invest to get it through Congress**. The White House can anticipate hand-to-hand combat in budget negotiations with Republicans over discretionary spending. Such conflict will unavoidably preoccupy administration strategists, who may want to husband their resources for more electorally attractive issues. Congress could **accomplish afair amount on trade this year**, but doing so could be an uphill slog.

### Jackson Vanik: 1NC Shell (3/3)

#### AND, Relations solve multiple world problems—each risks extinction:

Jeffrey Tayler, 2008 (Atlantic staff writer, “Medvedev Spoils the Party,”

<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2008/11/medvedev-spoils-the-party/7130/>)

Like it or not, the United States cannot solve crucial global problems without Russian participation. Russia commands the largest landmass on earth; possesses vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and other natural resources; owns huge stockpiles of weapons and plutonium; and still wields a potent brain trust. Given its influence in **Iran and North Korea**, to say nothing of its potential as a spoiler of international equilibrium elsewhere, Russia is one country with which the United States would do well to reestablish a strong working relationship—a strategic partnership, even—regardless of its feelings about the current Kremlin government. The need to do so trumps expanding NATO or pursuing “full-spectrum dominance.” Once the world financial crisis passes, we will find ourselves returning to worries about **resource depletion**, **environmental degradation**, and **global warming** – the greatest challenges facing humanity. **No country can confront these problems alone**. For the United States, **Russia** may just prove the “**indispensable nation”**with which to face a volatile future arm in arm.

### 2NC Impact Overview (1/2)

#### US-Russian nuclear conflict guarantees global ecological collapse and extinction of all life on Earth

Helen **Caldicott**, President, Nuclear Policy Research Institute, “Interview: U.S., Russia Still Face Mutual Destruction Threat,” UPI, May 18, 20**05**.

Q. What kind of priority should we therefore give reducing potential nuclear tensions between the United States and other nations, especially Russia?  
A. This is the most urgent issue facing the human race. If America ever launched its 5,000 nuclear missiles and Russia its 2,500 nuclear missiles it would probably be enough to create a nuclear winter or "dark fall." So much dust, smoke, debris and burned carbon material would be thrown into the atmosphere that plants would be unable to carry out photosynthesis. Most species of life would slowly freeze to death in the dark.

#### US-Russian nuclear exchange represents the greatest risk of absolute extinction

Nick **Bostrum**, Professor of Philosophy, Yale University, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards,” 20**02**, www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html.

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### U.S.-Russian nuclear war, despite its portrayal as “obsolete”, is the most probable impact

Andreas **Umland**, DAAD Lecturer, Shevchenko University, “The Unpopular Prospect of World War III…The 20th Century is Not Over Yet,” HISTORY NEWS NETWORK, January 17, 20**09**, http://hnn.us/roundup/entries/60004.html.

That is because the darkness of a future scenario that one comes to regard as possible should be no hindrance for its full assessment and public outline. Arguably, one of the reasons that societies afford themselves the employment of social scientists at universities and research institutes is the provision of information and interpretation that goes beyond what journalists, publicists or politicians – often, more dependent on current mainstream opinion and reigning political correctness than academics – may be able to say or write. A plain extrapolation of recent political developments in Russia into the future should lead one to regard outright war with NATO as a still improbable, yet again possible scenario. It is not unlikely that Russian public discourse will, during the coming years, continue to move in the same direction in, and with the same speed with, which it has been evolving since 2000. What is, in this case, in store for the world is not only a new “cold,” but also the possibility of a “hot” and, perhaps even, nuclear war. This assessment sounds not only apocalyptic, but also “unmodern,” if not anachronistic. Aren’t the real challenges of the 21st century global warming, financial regulation, the North-South divide, international migration etc.? Isn’t that enough to worry about, and should we distract ourselves from solving these real problems? Hasn’t the age of the East-West confrontation been over for several years now? Do we really want to go back to the nightmarish visions of the horrible 20th century? A sober look on Russia advises that we better do: Carefulness may decrease the probability that a worst-case scenario ever materializes.

### 2NC Impact Overview (2/2)

#### Central Asia is the most likely candidate for nuclear escalation.

Stephen **Blank**, MacArthur Prof. Research, Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, “American Grand Strategy and the Transcaspian Region,” World Affairs, v 163 n 2, Fall 20**00**, ASP.

Thus many structural conditions for conventional war or protracted ethnic conflict where third parties intervene now exist in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia. The outbreak of violence by disaffected Islamic elements, the drug trade, the Chechen wars, and the unresolved ethnopolitical conflicts that dot the region, not to mention the undemocratic and unbalanced distribution of income across corrupt governments, provide plenty of tinder for future fires. Many Third World conflicts generated by local structural factors also have great potential for unintended escalation. Big powers often feel obliged to rescue their proxies and proteges. One or another big power may fail to grasp the stakes for the other side since interests here are not as clear as in Europe. Hence commitments involving the use of nuclear weapons or perhaps even conventional war to prevent defeat of a client are not well established or clear as in Europe. For instance, in 1993 Turkish noises about intervening on behalf of Azerbaijan induced Russian leaders to threaten a nuclear war in that case. Precisely because Turkey is a NATO ally but probably could not prevail in a long war against Russia, or if it could, would conceivably trigger a potential nuclear blow (not a small possibility given the erratic nature of Russia's declared nuclear strategies), the danger of major war is higher here than almost everywhere else in the CIS or the "arc of crisis" from the Balkans to China. As Richard Betts has observed, The greatest danger lies in areas where ( 1) the potential for serious instability is high; ( 2) both superpowers perceive vital interests; ( 3) neither recognizes that the other's perceived interest or commitment is as great as its own; ( 4) both have the capability to inject conventional forces; and ( 5) neither has willing proxies capable of settling the situation.( n77)

### 2NC Impact Add-Ons

#### Korean War risks nuclear escalation and extinction

Peter Hayes and Michael Hamel-Green, 2009 ( Professor of International Relations, RMIT University, "The Path Not Taken, The Way Still Open: Denuclearizing The Korean Peninsula And Northeast Asia," The Asia-Pacific Journal, 50-1-09, December 14, 2009, <http://www.japanfocus.org/-Michael-Hamel_Green/3267>)

At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a **holocaust of unprecedented proportions**. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming.Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

#### AND, Resource depletion risks extinction

Michael T. Klare, 2008 (professor of peace and security studies @ Hampshire College, 5/1/2008, <http://www.thenation.com/article/new-geopolitics-energy>, “ The New Geopolitics of Energy,”)

These and other efforts by Russia and China, combined with stepped-up US military aid to states in the region, are part of a larger, though often hidden, struggle to control the flow of oil and natural gas from the Caspian Sea basin to markets in Europe and Asia. And this struggle, in turn, is but part of a global struggle over energy. The great risk is that this struggle will someday breach the boundaries of economic and diplomatic competition and enter the military realm. This will not be because any of the states involved make a deliberate decision to provoke a conflict with a competitor--the leaders of all these countries know that the price of violence is far too high to pay for any conceivable return. The problem, instead, is that all are engaging in behaviors that make the outbreak of inadvertent escalation ever more likely. These include, for example, the deployment of growing numbers of American, Russian and Chinese military instructors and advisers in areas of instability where there is every risk that these outsiders will someday be caught up in local conflicts on opposite sides. This risk is made all the greater because intensified production of oil, natural gas, uranium and minerals is itself a source of instability, acting as a magnet for arms deliveries and outside intervention. The nations involved are largely poor, so whoever controls the resources controls the one sure source of abundant wealth. This is an invitation for the monopolization of power by greedy elites who use control over military and police to suppress rivals. The result, more often than not, is a wealthy strata of crony capitalists kept in power by brutal security forces and surrounded by disaffected and impoverished masses, often belonging to a different ethnic group--a recipe for unrest and insurgency. This is the situation today in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, in Darfur and southern Sudan, in the uranium-producing areas of Niger, in Zimbabwe, in the Cabinda province of Angola (where most of that country's oil lies) and in numerous other areas suffering from what's been called the "resource curse." The danger, of course, is that the great powers will be sucked into these internal conflicts. This is not a far-fetched scenario; the United States, Russia and China are already providing arms and military-support services to factions in many of these disputes. The United States is arming government forces in Nigeria and Angola, China is aiding government forces in Sudan and Zimbabwe, and so on. An even more dangerous situation prevails in Georgia, where the United States is backing the pro-Western government of President Mikhail Saakashvili with arms and military support while Russia is backing the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Georgia plays an important strategic role for both countries because it harbors the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline, a US-backed conduit carrying Caspian Sea oil to markets in the West. There are US and Russian military advisers/instructors in both areas, in some cases within visual range of each other. It is not difficult, therefore, to conjure up scenarios in which a future blow-up between Georgian and separatist forces could lead, willy-nilly, to a clash between American and Russian soldiers, sparking a much greater crisis. It is essential that America reverse the militarization of its dependence on imported energy and ease geopolitical competition with China and Russia over control of foreign resources. Because this would require greater investment in energy alternatives, it would also lead to an improved energy economy at home (with lower prices in the long run) and a better chance at overcoming global warming.

#### AND, Iran strikes cause a nuclear war

Toff Daijgneault, staff vwriter, 8-10-2011 [“Wars And Rumors of War---A Strategic View of Any Possible Future Western/israeli Military Strike in The Middle East,” Bukisa, http://www.bukisa.com/articles/369915\_wars-and-rumors-of-war-a-strategic-view-of-any-possible-future-westernisraeli-military-strike-in-the-middle-east]

Looking at any potential future strike against Iran by the West and Israel. This is a very hard issue to ultimately decide. Launching a strike against Iran could easily tip the world into another full-blown economic crises, that could make the Great Depression of the 1930s, and the 2008 economic collapse look like a cakewalk. . Besides an ensuing economic collapse, a strike of such magnitude could destabilize the entire Middle East, and ultimately the world, leading to a global thermonuclear war. Iran would instantly retaliate with everything it had; Hezbollah and Syria would become dragged in as Iran's strategic partners.

## \*\*Uniqueness\*\*

### 2NC Uniqueness: Will Pass

#### Will pass – legislative introduction gives momentum

Sacramento Bee, 6/12 [“USRBC Applauds Introduction of Russia PNTR Legislation in the U.S. Senate”, <http://www.sacbee.com/2012/06/12/4556176/usrbc-applauds-introduction-of.html>]

The U.S.-Russia Business Council (USRBC), the U.S.-based trade association leading the organized U.S. business community campaign for Russia's removal from the Jackson-Vanik amendment and enactment of Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with Russia, applauded today's introduction of legislation by Senators Max Baucus (D-MT), John Thune (R-SD), John Kerry (D-MA) and John McCain (R-AZ) on Russia's graduation from the 1970s-era Jackson-Vanik law and approval of Russia PNTR. "We are pleased to see this action by a bipartisan group of Senators. This will help ensure that U.S. businesses benefit fully from Russia's pending WTO accession," said Klaus Kleinfeld, USRBC Chairman and Chairman and CEO of Alcoa, Inc. "The timely introduction of this legislation is an important first step towards ensuring that U.S. businesses can stay competitive in the Russian market." "The USRBC and the Coalition for U.S.-Russia Trade, for which USRBC serves as the Secretariat, urges the Obama Administration and Congressional leadership to enable passage of Russia PNTR by the August recess," said USRBC President and CEO Edward Verona. "We are committed to working constructively with all stakeholders towards successful passage of this legislation."

#### Bipartisan legislative push spurs quick passage

Palmer, 6/12 [Doug, “Senators pair Russia trade, human rights bills”, Reuters, <http://news.yahoo.com/key-senators-push-russia-trade-human-rights-bills-150912361.html>]

Senior U.S. senators on Tuesday unveiled a bill to expand trade with Russia by removing it from a Cold War-era law that links trade with human rights, a move questioned by legislators worried about the country's support for the Syrian government. The four senators said they would push for a separate bill to address Russian human rights abuses. The bipartisan move begins what the U.S. business community hopes will be a quick sprint to win congressional approval of the legislation before Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization, which is expected by late August.

#### Experts agree passage is optimistic

Palmer 6/12 [Doug, “Senators pair Russia trade, human rights bills”, Reuters, <http://news.yahoo.com/key-senators-push-russia-trade-human-rights-bills-150912361.html>]

However, Romney is expected to be pressed on the issue on Wednesday when he meets with the Business Roundtable, a group of corporate executives that has been aggressively lobbying Congress for approval of the bill. The group's president, John Engler, told reporters he was "pretty optimistic" Congress would come together to pass PNTR because members increasingly realized that U.S. companies will be hurt if the bill is not approved. "We're really seeing very little pushback," Engler said, shortly before the Republican senators released their letter. Bill Lane, head of Caterpillar's Washington office, said he believed both the House and Senate could pass PNTR in "a late July vote."

#### Public support spurs congressional passage

States News Service, 6/12 [“BROAD SUPPORT FOR EXPANDING TRADE WITH RUSSIA, Lexis]

A new public opinion survey today released as Business Roundtable kicked off a "50 Days for Trade" campaign showed broad public support for expanding trade with Russia. BRT President John Engler cited the survey of 1,000 registered voters conducted May 26-27 by The Winston Group during a 55-minute briefing with trade reporters. The issue that prompts BRT's campaign, Congressional approval of Permanent Normal Trade Relations for Russia, is probably not high in the public's consciousness, but the responses still show an appreciation for the benefits of trade with Russia. To wit: A majority of registered voters supports the idea of a greater trade relationship with Russia (57 percent approve 26 percent oppose), with support increasing even further with awareness of the potential economic benefits of a greater relationship. Sixty-four percent favor a greater trade relationship with Russia, knowing that Russia will join the WTO this summer, while only 23 percent oppose. Seventy percent said they favor Congressional action to allow U.S. businesses to sell more to Russia, given that Russia is the worlds ninth largest economy yet our two countries lack a significant trade relationship, and only 21 percent oppose. The results seem a little counterintuitive. Trade (trade agreements) took a political beating in the 2008 and 2010 elections, and the Russian government is making it difficult to talk about closer ties of any kind. But the case for Russia PNTR is one about benefits to the United States, U.S. companies and employees. Russia will accede to the World Trade Organization this summer, further opening a country of 140 million people and the ninth-largest economy in the world to WTO-member countries... Except for the United States if Congress does not act on PNTR. Inaction would leave the 1974 Jackson-Vanick amendment in place, the law that used trade to pressure Russia to allow Jewish emigration. WTO rules requiring its members to treat each other equally would then preclude the U.S. companies from taking advantage of such things as lower tariffs. BRT's new website, www.brt.org/russia, provides a wealth of materials that make the powerful economic case for Congressional approval of PNTR for Russia. Every state stands to benefit, as our state data sheets document. There's a "Take Action" page that allows the public to contact members of Congress. The need for action is pressing. BRT's campaign urges Congress to enact PNTR by August to allow the United States to move quickly once Russia accedes to the WTO. As BRT President John Engler told reporters:

### 2NC A2: Thumpers (Generic)

#### Obama has made Jackson-Vanik part of the jobs push:

Josh Rogin**,** 10/12/2011 (staff writer, “McFaul: We must give Russia privileged trade status,”

<http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/10/12/mcfaul_we_must_give_russia_privileged_trade_status>)

But the Obama administration has decided to make the termination of Jackson-Vanik a jobs issue, thus placing the GOP in the position of being against American workers.

## \*\*Links\*\*

### Link: High Speed Rail (Congress)

#### High speed rail funding being cut now – Congressional opposition

Engineering News-Record, ’12 [Tom Ichniowski, “Federal Dollars Get Tighter,” March 26, 2012, lexis]

So far, spending results have varied from program to program, with some programs getting cut more than others. For example, high-speed rail has been hammered. The program received $2.5 billion in 2010 appropriations but was zeroed out in 2011 and 2012. Congress also rescinded $400 million of high-speed rail's 2010 funds.

#### High speed rail unpopular – budget constraints

The Washington Post, ’12 [Ashley Halsey III, “Amtrak touts purchase of new engines, railcars,” The Washington Post, January 1, 2012, lexis]

The Obama administration's proposal to build a national network of high-speed rail service has been caught in the maw of Congress amid budget cutting and the aversion of some Republicans to the $1.5 billion annual Amtrak subsidy. The House has proposed reductions in Amtrak's subsidy.

### Link: High Speed Rail (Republicans)

#### High speed rail unpopular – Republicans

The Washington Post, ’12 [Ashley Halsey III, “Amtrak touts purchase of new engines, railcars,” The Washington Post, January 1, 2012, lexis]

House Transportation Committee Chairman John L. Mica (R-Fla.) takes delight in referring to Amtrak as the "Soviet-style" rail service. He has advocated splitting a proposed $117 billion high-speed rail system for the Northeast away from Amtrak in favor of an un-subsidized corporation. Unions and other Amtrak advocates have said that would rob the rail company of its only profitable route and leave it saddled with money-losing lines that span the rest of the country.

"While some of our detractors expect us to fold our tent, we're not going to do that," Boardman said. "Uncertainty in federal funding and budget cuts are not new to Amtrak. Things are different now because of the financial difficulties and the pressures that are on absolutely everybody, from Amtrak all the way through every program."

### Link: Transportation Infrastructure (Bipartisan)

#### Bipartisan opposition to transportation bills

The Washington Times, ’12 [Sean, “Road, rail bill hailed, scorned; Unlikely allies oppose $260B project package,” The Washington Times, February 6, 2012, lexis]

A House Republican's transportation bill aimed at dealing with the nation's crumbling road, bridge and rail systems has been attacked not only by Democrats but some conservatives and government watchdogs who say it amounts to another government stimulus package. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John L. Mica last week introduced the $260 billion measure to fund federal highway, surface transit and transportation safety programs for five years at levels he touted are consistent with current funding. "No other bill this Congress will create jobs, lower energy costs or improve our deteriorating infrastructure as effectively as this legislation," the Florida Republican said on Friday after his committee voted to approve the bill and send it to the full House for consideration. But the conservative anti-spending group Club for Growth has denounced the bill, calling it a "remarkably bloated and inefficient piece of legislation" and has urged lawmakers to vote against it. "Simply put, this is a massive 846-page bill that doesn't cut any spending at all," said a statement from the group. "It spends at least $30 billion more by supplementing fuel taxes with additional revenue from other sources." Club for Growth, which has pushed for greater state control of highway projects and an end or significant reduction of the federal gas tax, says the bill does neither. The group said the measure would bring a "slowing down (of) reform agenda so that business-as-usual can resume sometime in the near future when nobody is looking." Taxpayers for Common Sense, a nonpartisan government watchdog, said a Republican plan to pay for spending projects in the bill with future royalties from the development of oil shale on public lands and offshore drilling "is nothing more than a budget gimmick that could exacerbate future budget deficits." "The royalty collection system is broken," said a statement from the group. "It must be fixed before taxpayers can feel confident they are getting a fair return for the resources they own." Environmental and transportation safety groups have lashed out at the measure on several fronts, including its call for changes in the way transportation projects must comply with environmental regulations and provisions that could lead to increased oil drilling offshore and in Alaska's Arctic wildlife refuge. The measure also would slash gas tax subsidies for local transit programs such as buses, subways and commuter rail lines, and Amtrak. "This bill is loaded with giveaways to road builders, shortchanging transit, anyone who walks or bikes, as well as public health and the environment," Deron Lovaas, federal transportation policy director for the Natural Resources Defense Council, said in a statement.

#### Bipartisan opposition to infrastructure projects – elections

Ngai, ’12 [Catherine Ngai, “Dredging, infrastructure spending must top US priorities: AAPA chief,” Metal Bulletin Daily Alerts, January 23, 2012, lexis]

But with the nation headed towards federal elections in November, it will be difficult to convince Congress that investments in infrastructure projects are a necessity, Nagel said. "We're making some significant inroads, but we're faced with the upcoming elections and the federal budget situation. We live in an environment where the question is always 'Where do we cut?' because no one wants to spend."

In a World Economic Forum study, the United States last year fell one place to 23rd for worldwide port infrastructure quality.

### Link: Transportation Infrastructure (Congressional Backlash)

#### Ramming the plan through Congress causes heavy backlash

Schulz, ‘10, Contributing Editor -- Logistics Management (John D., “Transportation infrastructure: Is a U.S. Infrastructure Bank an idea whose time has come?”. April 2. <http://www.logisticsmgmt.com/article/455228-Transportation_infrastructure_Is_a_U_S_Infrastructure_Bank_an_idea_whose_time_has_come_.php>)

"The needs are great, and getting greater-and more funding is not coming," said Norman Y. Mineta, who was Transportation Secretary in the first Bush administration. Mineta is currently vice chairman of global communications consultancy for Hill & Knowlton, a public relations firm. Can the United States create an infrastructure bank? There are hurdles, Mineta said, but they are not insurmountable. Chief among them is how financially "score" such projects so they are fiscally responsible and paid for without increasing the national debt. First, Congress must maintain the primary role in funding, Mineta said. Transferring large amounts of discretionary funding from Congress to another entity has "very little chance of approval," Mineta said. Mineta said that while he was transportation secretary "I would have loved to have access to a large amount of discretionary funding," but Congress would never go for it. Instead, it must work with private funding sources, which increasingly are being seen as an answer to U.S. infrastructure funding needs. "I believe we can create a national infrastructure bank if its primary purpose is to leverage private investment into projects that are critical to our national infrastructure," he said. Giving states and regions access to such funds "should not threaten" Congress, said Mineta, a former congressman from California and mayor of San Jose. "We should look at it as a bank, not a funding arm of the U.S. government," Mineta said. He favored creating a separate entity, with a board that sets lending policy, but lets the decisions on which projects gets funding to experts. It should not be a profit-making venture, he said. "The bank should not be seen as a ‘Trannie Mae,'" he said, referring to the scandal-ridden Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which required billions in bailout money to help rescue the federally backed home loan sector. Still, a U.S. transportation infrastructure bank "has the potential to play a powerful role to meet the unmet transportation needs while providing new jobs and economic stimulus," Mineta said. It should provide investment that is not currently available in current capital markets, Mineta said. A U.S. national infrastructure bank must have sufficient reserves to do expensive projects and thus would require the full backing of the U.S. government. A blueprint would be the U.S. Export-Import Bank, which helps facilitate trade among countries. Infrastructure banks are commonplace in other countries, especially in Europe where they are supported by dedicated funding sources. They make low-interest loans directly to localities for infrastructure projects. Supporters say they eliminate time and red tape from the funding process. Their appeal may be catching on in this country. Already, some in Congress are calling for their creation in this country. Infrastructure banks could also be used to expand telecommunications, broadband capacity, wastewater distribution facilities and improving other U.S. projects' needs. President Barack Obama's proposed 2011 budget includes $4 billion to create a national infrastructure bank to provide a source of funding for infrastructure needs. This comes at a time many experts are saying the U.S. must start thinking outside the box of traditional funding. "This is something holding up a major surface transportation bill," Mineta said. "We can't have these two-, three-, five-month extensions. The critical factorin moving that surface transportation bill forward is how is it going to be funded." But as the recent health care debate showed in an increasingly polarized political landscape, change does not come easily in Washington. "Forcing change in the infrastructure community has rarely been successful," Mineta admitted. "It is now time for a collaborative effort. We should look at a comprehensive set of solutions."

#### FAA Spending triggers Congressional backlash

HIAR ’11 - D.C. bureau news editor at The Huffington Post and as a reporting editor at PBS MediaShift (“Controversial FAA program serves just 153 communities at a cost of $200 million”. September 11. <http://www.iwatchnews.org/2011/09/15/6542/controversial-faa-program-serves-just-153-communities-cost-200-million>)

The latest short-term funding extension for the Federal Aviation Administration leaves intact a small but costly program that has been criticized for decades by government auditors. Created in 1978 as a part of the Airline Deregulation Act , the Essential Air Service subsidy was designed as a 10-year initiative to help rural airports likely to be left without routes as commercial aviation converted to a market-driven system. In most cases, the program limits assistance to isolated communities more than a 70-mile drive from the nearest major hub airport, which could be subsidized at a rate of less than $200 per passenger. But EAS has persisted almost 25 years past its original congressionally mandated expiration date. It now serves 153 communities and costs some $200 million a year. With growing political and economic pressure to reduce spending, some in Washington are focusing renewed attention on a subsidy program that, for example, has allowed constituents of Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., to fly from Ely, Nev., to Denver for as little as $70 — even though the cost of each ticket to taxpayers is reportedly $4,107 . A standoff over the program was at the root of a two-week FAA shutdown this summer and threatened earlier this week to shutter the agency again. A clean extension of the FAA passed the Senate Thursday night, averting the potential for a second shutdown. “The effectiveness of [EAS] as anything other than enabling commercial airports to remain afloat is questionable, since the goal of the program was to help airports transition away from federal subsidies for air carrier service,” said Sen. Tom Coburn, R-Okla., in his “Back in Black” deficit reduction plan , published in July. “Taxpayers should not be expected to subsidize air service indefinitely.” While EAS is a vital support program for Alaska communities with no other transportation options, there are also 109 airports in the lower 48 states that still benefit from the long-lived subsidy. These include Hagerstown, Md., an hour and a half drive from both Washington and Baltimore with a reported per ticket subsidy of $191, and Jonesboro, Ark., where the Transportation Department estimates taxpayers are on the hook $840 for every ticket even though it's only 79 miles from Nashville. The persistence of the subsidy “is a classic example of a small but vocal constituency trumping a large and unfocused majority – most folks don’t know about the Essential Air Service,” said Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the conservative American Action Forum and a former chief of the Congressional Budget Office. “Every administration knows this is a bad policy, but it’s not worth all the political pain you have to go through to [cut it]. It’s exactly the right size to live on like this.” But others contend that current political realities may have altered the dynamic. “By any standard, you can’t justify the cost to benefit ratio here,” said Norman J. Ornstein, an expert on congressional politics at the conservative American Enterprise Institute. Although this is not “a program in the billions,” he said, “the pressure and the squeeze on almost every area of discretionary spending is such that even the smaller items are going to come under more scrutiny.”

### Link: Transportation Infrastructure (Controversial)

#### Transportation investment's massively controversial - budget concerns and public opposition - our evidence assumes your link turns

Lovaas 4/24 (Deron, Writer for National Resource Defense Council's Switchboard Blog, " Failing to Communicate the Promise of Transportation Investments," 2012, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlovaas/failing_to_communicate_the_pro.html>)

The report also usefully distills the sobering clash that has overcome renewal of transportation law: Two imperatives have collided: on the one hand the imperative to invest in a transportation system that will continue to grow our nation’s economy, create jobs, and enhance U.S. competitiveness; on the other hand, the imperative to come to grips with the nation’s short- and long-term fiscal problems, including especially the federal treasury’s unsustainable and still growing level of debt. In short, it’s not that our political leaders don’t agree that transportation is important or that infrastructure investments are needed; rather they can’t agree on whether or how to fund those investments given the current budget situation. This massive clash is exacerbated by other tensions noted in the report. A Rockefeller Foundation poll found that while 80 percent of voters agree that transportation improvements “will boost local economies and create millions of jobs” fully 71 percent of voters “oppose an increase in the federal gas tax with majorities likewise opposing a tax on foreign oil, the replacement of the gas tax with a per-mile-traveled fee, and the imposition of new tolls to increase federal transportation funding.” So we the voters want transportation investments yet oppose all the tools that enable such things.

#### Budget deficits make the plan politically infeasible

Baliles 11 (Gerald, Director of the Miller Center of Public Affairs @ the University of Virginia, "Are We There Yet? Selling America on Transportation," David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference, <http://web1.millercenter.org/conferences/report/conf_2011_transportation-Miller-Center.pdf>)

“Sit still,” however, is more or less what Washington has done on transportation issues for 15 months since that Rose Garden ceremony. Amid an increasingly polarized debate over how to deal with the nation’s long-term debt and deficit problems, and despite the recent emergence of transportation bills from the House and Senate, discussions about transportation reform have been largely sidelined. Today, with the stimulus funding of the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act all but exhausted, with revenues to the Highway Trust Fund projected to remain flat or decline, and with not only federal but also local and state budgets still stretched tight by the lingering effects of the recession, the outlook for future investment in the U.S. transportation system and for needed policy reforms is far from clear.

#### No link turns - people who support transportation won't lobby for it - it's MASSIVELY controversial and trades off with pushing other issues

Mineta and Skinner 11 (Norman Mineta, 14th U.S. Secretary of Transportation, and Samuel Skinner, 10th U.S. Secretary of Transportation, "Are We There Yet? Selling America on Transportation," David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference, <http://web1.millercenter.org/conferences/report/conf_2011_transportation-Miller-Center.pdf>)

To set change in motion, however, there must first be public pressure for transportation investment and reform. Despite broad support in principle, however, active public engagement on these issues has been elusive. While many Americans experience the inefficiencies of our current transport systems on a daily basis, other impacts—such as the impact of lost productivity on the broader economy or the impact of high transportation costs on the price of goods—are less immediately obvious. Faced with other urgent concerns and economic challenges, many Americans believe we simply can’t afford to invest in transportation repairs and upgrades given our country’s current budget situation. Many also do not have faith that money allocated to transportation projects will be used in the most efficient and effective ways possible. Simply put, there is a lack of confidence and trust in the ability of policymakers to make good decisions in transportation policy and planning. And without a mandate from the broader public, most policymakers don’t want to risk reforming the current system in a political landscape fraught with many other challenges and competing demands.

#### Theoretical popularity means nothing - debate over transportation will become controversial

Mineta and Skinner 11 (Norman Mineta, 14th U.S. Secretary of Transportation, and Samuel Skinner, 10th U.S. Secretary of Transportation, "Are We There Yet? Selling America on Transportation," David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference, <http://web1.millercenter.org/conferences/report/conf_2011_transportation-Miller-Center.pdf>)

Note: Chart called "Successful Execution: The Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project" was omitted

The “can-do” spirit and bipartisan agreement that has driven transportation policy for so much of America’s history, however, has changed during the past several years. Today’s debates, in stark contrast to those of an earlier era, are taking place in an atmosphere of paralysis. And while a number of complex factors are at work, the reasons for the underlying impasse are not difficult to discern. Two imperatives have collided: on the one hand the imperative to invest in a transportation system that will continue to grow our nation’s economy, create jobs, and enhance U.S. competitiveness; on the other hand, the imperative to come to grips with the nation’s short- and long-term fiscal problems, including especially the federal treasury’s unsustainable and still growing level of debt. In short, it’s not that our political leaders don’t agree that transportation is important or that infrastructure investments are needed; rather they can’t agree on whether or how to fund those investments given the current budget situation. The fact that the current impasse has already lasted several years suggests that there is no obvious resolution close at hand. Comprehensive reauthorization of the federal surface transportation program last occurred in 2005. It expired in 2009. With reauthorization now more than two years late, the federal program has had to rely on short-term extensions. These have happened nine times thus far, and we may see even more. The situation was even more serious on the aviation side where efforts by Congress to pass a comprehensive reauthorization of the federal aviation programs took 22 short-term extensions before a long-term reauthorization was achieved. In August 2011, the program was actually allowed to expire, leaving 4,000 Federal Aviation Administration employees out of work for two weeks—an unprecedented occurrence in the history of the program. Moreover, the current impasse has persisted despite broad agreement among lawmakers, stakeholders, and the general public about the need for infrastructure investment. In joint public appearances before key congressional committees, non-traditional allies like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO have called for action on transportation infrastructure, emphasizing its nonpartisan nature and its central place in our nation’s an nature and its central place in our nation’s economy. Meanwhile, recent public-opinion surveys have found overwhelming support for the idea of infrastructure investment. In a 2011 survey conducted by the Rockefeller Foundation, for example, two-thirds of voters said that improving the nation’s infrastructure is important, and 80 percent agreed that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation “will boost local economies and create millions of jobs from construction to manufacturing to engineering.” Similarly, a poll conducted by CBS News and The New York Times between October 19 and October 24, 2011 showed that eight in ten Americans “approve of government spending for roads and bridges as a way to boost employment.” 2 However, in these times of lagging public investment in many policy areas, transportation is not seen as the top investment necessity. 3

### Link: Transportation Infrastructure (Republicans)

#### Republicans reject bills for transportation infrastructure – spending concerns

CSM, 5/21 [David Grant, “US Chamber to Congress on transportation bill: You’re doing it wrong,” The Christian Science Monitor, May 21, 2012, lexis]

The Chamber of Commerce's top brass has a message for Congress on transportation: You're doing it wrong. "What we lack is anybody of any party willing to address the fundamental problem called money," said Bruce Josten, the chamber's executive vice president for government affairs, during a breakfast for reporters sponsored by the Monitor Monday. Mr. Josten and Chamber CEO Tom Donohue expressed exasperation at how Congress has attempted to fund long-term investments in America's infrastructure and said congressional delay is costing jobs. Members of the House and Senate are currently attempting to put together a compromise bill to extend transportation funding before a 90-day funding fix lapses at the end of June. "Nothing happens in the states and in the communities when you've got a 90-day or a 120-day extension," Mr. Donohue said. Governors and mayors "can't write a contract [to build transportation infrastructure] in that amount of time, and jobs that could be had are not going to be had." While congressional staffers have been meeting to lay the groundwork for a deal, Josten said that Congress would likely seek another, longer extension to push the bill to year's end or beyond. The Senate passed a two year, $109 billion transportation bill by a 74-to-22 margin in March. The bill relies on a hodge podge of funding measures, such as tapping a trust fund for cleaning up leaks from underground storage tanks, to make ends meet. House Speaker John Boehner (R) of Ohio favored a five-year transportation measure linking transportation to increased energy production. When House Republicans balked at the bill's cost, they instead passed a 90-day extension of current transportation funding levels. The measure was little more than a vehicle to get the two houses to a conference committee.

#### GOP won’t have it – this evidence assumes the AFF’s link turns

Drutman ‘10 - senior fellow and the managing editor for the Progressive Policy Institute (Lee, “Financing Future Growth: How Do We Pay For New Projects?”, October 4, <http://progressivepolicy.org/financing-future-growth-how-do-we-pay-for-new-projects>)

And yet, Rep. DeLauro’s bill to create a National Infrastructure Bank and turn a chaotic ad-hoc infrastructure appropriations process into a rational national strategy has attracted only 60 co-sponsors – and *not a single Republican*. “Resistance is internal to Congress,” said Hindery. “They would give up so much grant and earmark authority. Members are hesitant to see that move into an independent entity.” Hindery argued that the key was leadership, and that the President wasn’t doing enough of it. “It has to be a stated priority,” he said. “It can’t be a proffered idea with tepid support.” Ehrlich, who wrote a PPI Policy Memo on how an infrastructure bank should operate, was optimistic that this is an idea whose time has come. “This is a remarkable moment in infrastructure,” he said. “We are finally at a place where all the communities know the current programs are brain-dead…Local planners are wondering where the funds are going to come from, private investors are circling around the periphery of the area, looking for a way in.” Hindery also noted that both the Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable – both of whom have been largely resistant to any form of domestic spending – have come out in favor of an infrastructure bank. However, DeLauro said her Republican colleagues in Congress were not hearing this.

### Link: TSA (Bipart/Public)

#### Bipartisan and Public opposition to TSA – Republicans calling for privatization

The Washington Post, 5/9 [Ashley Halsey III, “TSA equipment is gathering dust, say House investigators,” The Washington Post, May 9, 2012, lexis]

The Transportation Security Administration has shelved $184 million in security equipment in a Texas warehouse rather than in the airports for which it was bought, according to a report compiled by House Republican investigators. When House investigators sought information about the stored material, the TSA "provided inaccurate, incomplete, and potentially misleading information . . . to conceal the agency's mismanagement of warehouse operations." TSA operations have come under repeated fire from Rep. John L. Mica (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, who advocates scaling down the agency and farming out many of its duties to private contractors. Central to Mica's criticism has been the contention that the TSA has wasted money on equipment that wasn't fully tested and did not live up to expectations. He also has questioned the speed with which new devices are deployed to airports. The report is consistent with his belief, saying the TSA "is wasting millions of taxpayer dollars by inefficiently deploying screen equipment." The agency, which had not been provided with a copy of the report, did not respond to a request Tuesday afternoon for comment. The TSA, charged with protecting travelers from terrorist attacks, has become the agency that many Americans and members of Congress love to hate.

## \*\*Internal Links\*\*

### Internal Link: Business Lobby

#### And business lobby support means it will be repealed now--

Vicki Needham, 12/16/2011 (staff writer, “Russia takes next step toward WTO membership,”

<http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/199933-russia-takes-next-step-toward-wto-membershp>)

Business organziations also back the move. “Business Roundtable supports Russia joining the WTO and becoming part of its multilateral, rules-based system,” said Jim McNerney, Business Roundtable chairman and Boeing chief executive. “This important milestone will further strengthen our trade and investment ties, promoting economic growth and job creation in both of our countries.” The BRT also urged Congress to move quickly to approve legislation granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to Russia to expand trade relations while furthering U.S. competitive interests. "As Russia moves forward to complete its domestic process for joining the WTO, Business Roundtable is committed to working with the administration and Congress to quickly pass Permanent Normal Trade Relations legislation for Russia,” said Doug Oberhelman, chief executive of Caterpillar, who is the chairman of BRT’s International Engagement Committee. “The legislation is needed so that U.S. exporters and workers can enjoy all of the benefits of Russia’s accession to the WTO — the same opportunities available to all WTO member countries competing to sell their products and services to Russia.”

#### Business push will cause Jackson-Vanik to be repealed

Andrew Roth, staff writer, 11-1-2011, “The Baby with the Bathwater,” Russia Profile, <http://russiaprofile.org/politics/48337.html>

Yet Samuel Charap, director for Russia and Eurasia at the Center for American Progress, said that pressure from business lobbies would likely play an important role in influencing lawmakers to lift the sanctions. “Once the deal is done in Geneva it’s going to be a matter of American businesses making the case to Congress about the benefits to the U.S. economy from Russia’s WTO accession and the negative impact of keeping Jackson-Vanik on the books,” he said.

### Internal Link: Political Capital

#### Ending Jackson-Vanik is a tough fight on Capitol Hill

Vicki Needham, 12/16/2011 (staff writer, “Russia takes next step toward WTO membership,”

<http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/199933-russia-takes-next-step-toward-wto-membershp>)

Obama has said he wants to work with Congress to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to Russia — a 37-year-old provision crafted to put pressure on communist nations for human-rights abuses and emigration policies, which has been "a symbol of lingering tensions in the U.S.-Russia relationship," according to the Council on Foreign Relations. Most experts argue that the amendment isn't relevant anymore. "We know it will not be an easy fight on the Hill for many reasons, but we will make the case why it's the right thing to do,"Wenk wrote.

#### Political capital is key

RIA Novosti, 11-10-2010, “Georgia could delay Russia's accession to WTO - finance minister,” <http://en.rian.ru/world/20101011/160917700.html>

On October 1, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and his U.S. counterpart Barack Obama confirmed in a telephone conversation that bilateral talks on Russia's admission to the WTO are complete. "Now, thanks to the agreement between Obama and Medvedev, and their fixing the deadline, we have achieved positive results in our bilateral relations. It appears to me that should this **political will** remain, everything is possible," Kudrin said.

### Internal Link: Presidential Leadership

#### Obama pushing to end Jackson-Vanik now

Voice of America, 1/4/2012

(“Gordon On U.S.-Russian Relations,” <http://www.voanews.com/policy/editorials/americas/Gordon-On-US-Russian-Relations--136702383.html>)

The United States and Russia still need to expand their economic ties. While two-way trade grew last year, they still reached just $31 billion – less than one percent of total U.S. trade. Russia received its invitation to accede to the World Trade Organization in December and is expected to join the organization this year. “For American companies to take advantage of [Russia’s] market opening, Congress must terminate the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment and extend permanent normal trading relations to Russia,” Assistant Secretary Gordon said. President Obama is committed to working with the U.S. Congress to achieve this goal.

#### Obama will push to end Jackson-Vanik:

Vicki Needham**,** 12/16/2011 (staff writer, “Russia takes next step toward WTO membership,”

<http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/199933-russia-takes-next-step-toward-wto-membershp>)

Obama has said he wants to work with Congress to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to Russia — a 37-year-old provision crafted to put pressure on communist nations for human-rights abuses and emigration policies, which has been "a symbol of lingering tensions in the U.S.-Russia relationship," according to the Council on Foreign Relations.

#### Obama is calling for the end of Jackson-Vanik:

David Jolly**,** 12/16**/**2011 (staff writer, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/17/business/global/wto-accepts-russia-bid-to-join.html>)

The Obama administration has called for the repeal of Jackson-Vanik, saying trade with Russia would have a positive effect on its human rights record. The law is in conflict with U.S. international obligations, as W.T.O. rules require that nations extend most-favored nation status to all members. Asked if he thought the amendment would prove a lasting impediment to U.S.-Russian trade relations, Ron Kirk, the U.S. trade representative, said, “We hope not.”

#### Obama will push to end Jackson-Vanik now:

Anna Borshchevskaya, 12/6/2011 (assistant director of the DinuPatriciu Eurasia Center at Atlantic Council, “Human Rights, Russia, and the WTO,” <http://www.american.com/archive/2011/december/human-rights-russia-and-the-wto>)

That same day, President Obama declared he would seek to overturn the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which, since 1975, has required freedom of emigration in Russia in order for the United States to offer Russia “most favored nation status,” or equal treatment in trade. “I now look forward to working with Congress to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia,” Obama said. He reaffirmed his commitment to lifting the Amendment at the APEC summit four days later, when he met Russian President Dmitry Medvedev.

## \*\*Impacts\*\*

### A2: Relations Resilient

#### Your evidence is from 08 and doesn’t assume Russian ascension to the WTO which makes Jackson Vanik a greater point of contention

#### Ending Jackson-Vanik necessary for a full re-set in relations—it has a massive symbolic effect and is the litmus test for relations:

Finlay **Lewis,** 8/10/20**08** (Congressional Quarterly Weekly, <http://www.ncsj.org/AuxPages/081009CQ_Jackson-Vanik.shtml>, “Russia Longs to Graduate At the Top of Trade Class”)

President Obama has repeatedly stressed that he intends to “**reset**” the relationship between the United States and Russia. **But for that to happen**, he first needs to perform a rewind-and-erase task that has eluded his two immediate predecessors: ditching the Jackson-Vanik amendment, a Cold War relic that used trade to punish totalitarian regimes if they denied their citizens emigration rights. The law held out the most-favored-nation trade status (i.e., non-discriminatory access to vast and lucrative U.S. consumer markets) as an inducement to enact more liberal emigration policies. China, another Communist power that fell under the law’s strictures, received annual presidential waivers to bypass its conditions until 2002, when trade relations were formalized after China won entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001. But similar progress has been stymied for Russia. The measure was enacted as an amendment to a 1974 trade law under the sponsorship of two Democrats, Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington (House 1941-53; Senate 1953-83) and Rep. Charles A. Vanik of Ohio (1951-81), and the Kremlin has been in full compliance since at least 1994, three years after the Soviet Union collapsed. But Congress never managed to get a floor vote for a bill to formalize Russia’s release from the strictures of Jackson-Vanik, a process known as graduation. Bids by Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush to get such a measure on track proved to be poorly timed. The first Clinton effort, in 1999, coincided with a major showdown between Russia and NATO over the Kosovo invasion. Bush tried again in the months after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, but he dropped the plan when Russia angered American farm groups by erecting trade barriers against U.S. poultry products. The idea resurfaced in 2003 but fizzled after U.S. troops discovered Russian military supplies in the hands of Saddam Hussein’s forces following the invasion of Iraq — hardly an optimal time to shop a Russia trade measure in Congress. Bush pledged to push for Russia’s graduation at summits with President Vladimir V. Putin in 2006 and 2008, but alleged unfair Russian trade practices in the marketing of some agricultural products, combined with ongoing violence in the Russian republic of Chechnya, discouraged the administration from trying to persuade a manifestly reluctant Congress. Perhaps mindful of these past miscues, Obama has kept almost entirely quiet — in public, anyway — about any plans for a Jackson- Vanik repeal. However, senior Russian officials have not been shy about putting words in his mouth. After Obama met separately with Putin, now the prime minister, and President Dmitry Medvedev in Russia last month, Sergey Lavrov, Russia’s minister of foreign affairs, told a TV interviewer that Obama “understands the awkwardness of — let’s put it mildly — this situation for the American side and has given an assurance that removal of this amendment will be one of the priorities of his administration.” Still, the status quo clearly rankles — especially since not only China, but also lesser economic powers such as Mongolia and Vietnam got clean Jackson-Vanik bills of health. In January, Putin went out of his way as he spoke at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, to mock U.S. lawmakers who argued to keep Russia under Jackson-Vanik because of Russian trade barriers against American poultry. To underline how little such objections had to do with the amendment’s original intent, Putin quoted former dissident NatanSharansky, saying that he “had not served time in a Soviet prison for chicken meat.” Sharansky, who eventually emigrated to Israel, has emerged as a high-profile supporter of Russia’s graduation. Symbolic Politics But more than standard trade sniping — or unfortunate timing — has stayed Congress’ hand in lifting the Jackson-Vanik strictures, observers say. The law stands as a landmark in the battle to secure human rights legislation and has compiled a remarkably successful track record. Alan P. Larson, then undersecretary of State for economic, business and agricultural affairs, told lawmakers on the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade in 2002 that about 1 million Russian Jews had made their way to Israel between Jackson-Vanik’s enactment and the date of his testimony. Some 573,000 refugees, including Jews, evangelical Christians and Catholics, had left the old Soviet Union for the United States during the same period. Russia and Israel now authorize visa-free travel between the two nations — an unthinkable development when Jackson-Vanik was signed into law 35 years ago. Indeed, since Russia has long fulfilled the liberalization criteria of the law, the endurance of the trade penalty is not a question of policy, observers say. “Above and beyond anything else, **it is symbolic politics**,” said James F. Collins, the U.S. ambassador to Russia from 1997 to 2001. “This is seen as a kind of slight of Russia — a treatment of Russia that doesn’t accept its proper international standing . . . that doesn’t recognize that Russia is not the Soviet Union.” During his visit to Russia, Obama affirmed that his administration accords Russia the full respect due a great power and said he looks forward to building a deeper commercial relationship. But Obama’s powerful Russian audience probably won’t take such reassurances to heart **until Jackson-Vanik is off the books**. As Vladimir Lukin, then-deputy speaker of Russia’s lower house of Parliament, told The Wall Street Journal prior to a 2003 Bush visit to Russia, “This whole history of Jackson-Vanik is already so laughable, it’s legendary.” That perception is precisely why unshackling Russia “**has an outsized importance**,” said Stephen E. Biegun, executive secretary of Bush’s National Security Council and now Ford Motor Co.’s vice president for international affairs. “This one is low-hanging fruit. It is a tangible sign beyond good wishes and rhetoric that the United States is interested in investing in a constructive relationship with Russia. That makes it **bigger than just Jackson-Vanik**. There are very few issues we and Russia work on . . . that **we can make progress on as dramatic as this.”** Sandy Berger, Clinton’s national security adviser, likewise acknowledges that Jackson-Vanik remains freighted with symbolic importance, for better and worse. It has “become the Rorschach test for **everything** involved in the U.S.-Russia relationship,” he said.

#### US-Russian relations remain fragile and prone to risks:

Sergey **Karaganov**, Dean of the School of the World Economy and International Affairs at the National Research University–Higher School of Economics (NRU-HSE), Мarch**2011**, “analytical report by the russian Group of the Valdai international discussion club”, <http://vid-1.rian.ru/ig/valdai/US-Russia%20relations_eng.pdf>

1.2. However, the U.S.—Russian relations have not yet reached a state of stable partnership; they remain fragile and are prone to many risks of both home- and foreign-policy nature. Prospects for preserving even the current level of partnership efficiency depend on the political positions of the Obama administration.

#### US-Russian relations are fragile—new events can cause them to downgrade

Sergey **Karaganov**, Dean of the School of the World Economy and International Affairs at the National Research University–Higher School of Economics (NRU-HSE), Мarch**2011**, “analytical report by the russian Group of the Valdai international discussion club”, <http://vid-1.rian.ru/ig/valdai/US-Russia%20relations_eng.pdf>

3.2.8. Therefore, despite the past two years of improvements, the U.S.— Russian relations remain fragile and unstable in the face of international political and especially domestic political risks. The relations may worsen if Russia and the U.S. again change the priorities in their foreign-policy interests and downgrade the significance of those of them that have ensured their political will to cooperate and minimize the negative impact of their disagreements. It may occur as a result of a sharp aggravation of one or several contradictions between Russia and the U.S. (i.e. escalation of violence in the Caucasus), changes in domestic policies in one or both countries, or a failure of the current U.S. «Big Strategy» and a change to the «new-old» foreign-policy course.

## \*2NC Impact Modules\*

### Russia-US Relations Good: Accidental Launch

#### Relations key to prevent accidental launch.

David E. **Mosher**, Senior Policy Analyst, Expert BMD and Nuclear issues, Lowell H. Schwartz, is an associate international policy analyst, David R. Howell, associate Dean and Professor of Economics and Public Policy, Milano Graduate School of Management Lynn E. Davis, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs, “Beyond the Nuclear Shadow: A Phased Approach for improving nuclear safety and US—Russian Relations,” Rand National Security Devision, 20**03**, http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1666/index.html.

The phased approach to the Nuclear Safety Initiative that we recommend here is based on the premise that nuclear safety, U.S.- Russian relations, and U.S. security more broadly are inextricably linked. Progress in one area will improve the situation in another. Given the improving relations between Russia and the United States and the emerging security context for the United States, there is now a historic opportunity to address one of the more vexing problems left from the Cold War: how to reduce the risk of accidental or unauthorized nuclear use to as close to zero as possible.

#### Accidental launch kills billions

**PR NEWSWIRE**, staff, April 29, 19**98**, LN.

An 'accidental' nuclear attack would create a public health disaster of an unprecedented scale, according to more than 70 articles and speeches on the subject, cited by the authors and written by leading nuclear war experts, public health officials, international peace organizations, and legislators. Furthermore, retired General Lee Butler, Commander from 1991-1994 of all U.S. Strategic Forces under former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, has warned that from his experience in many "war games" it is plausible that such an attack could provoke a nuclear counterattack that could trigger full-scale nuclear war with billions of casualties worldwide. The authors describe the immediate effects of an "accidental" launch from a single Russian submarine that would kill at least six to eight million people in firestorms in eight major U.S. cities. With hospitals destroyed and medical personnel killed, and with major communications and transportation networks disrupted, the delivery of emergency care would be all but impossible, according to Forrow and his colleagues.

### Russia-US Relations Good: Multiwarrant

#### U.S.-Russian relations solve nuke war, enviro collapse, reactor explosions, terrorism, prolif, CBW attack, Russian civil war, regional conflict and dictatorship.

Stephen **Cohen**, professor of Russian studies at NYU, Failed Crusade: America and the Tragedy of Post-Communist Russia, 20**00**, p. 196-205.

In public as in private life, failure ought to be followed by a rethinking of what led to it. That has not been the case with U.S. failures in post-Communist Russia. Instead, it is increasingly argued in policy circles that those failures do not really matter, because Russia, pitiably weak at home and abroad, no longer really matters. A former U.S. intelligence chief and specialist on the region tells us, to take an influential example, that Russia is "virtually irrelevant" and "ain't worth worrying about."36 In this view, the product of misconceived Cold War triumphalism and frustrated expectations rather than rational thought, our onetime superpower adversary now requires no special priority in American foreign policy. The United States can operate for the most part in "a world without Russia." It can adopt "a minimal­ist policy," even "do little more than watch ... from the sidelines. "37 There could hardly be a worse misperception, larger analytical mistake, or graver political folly. Russia not only still matters; it matters even more than it did as Soviet Russia during the Cold War in at least three cru­cial respects. Above all, the greatest potential threat to American and international security, in the most essential sense of physical safety, is located inside post-Communist Rus­sia. Ever since the early 199os, the Clinton administra­tion, as well as many academics and journalists who should know better, has alleged that the United States and the world are much safer from nuclear and other lethal disasters than they were when the Soviet Union existed. Architects of the administration's missionary crusade boast that "the American people are safer as a result of our policy"-indeed, "immeasurably more secure." According to a prominent journalist and Russia expert, we can now worry "considerably" less about "being vaporized into radioactive mist" or, as another puts it, about "a nuclear holocaust." A leading policy intellectual tells us that "American security is vastly improved," and an academic specialist that as a result of post-Communist reform, we have been "liberated from thinking about worst-case sce­narios."o8 These assurances are manifestly untrue and, coming from U.S. officials, editorialists, and scholars, inexplica­bly myopic and irresponsible. Even leaving aside post­Soviet Russia's enormous stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, "all of the major fault lines of nuclear danger are growing," as we learn from a num­ber of largely unheeded experts, and U.S. policy "simply has not kept up with the expansion of nuclear dangers inside Russia. " The truth may not be politically correct or palatable, but the breakup of the Soviet state and Russia's "transition" have made us immeasurably less safe than we have ever been. To understand how unsafe, we must explore more fully a generalization made earlier in this book: What does it mean for our security when a nuclear-laden nation state is, depending on how we choose to charac­terize Russia's condition today, disintegrating, collaps­ing, or merely "highly unstable',?,Hl The short answer is, no one fully knows, because it has never happened before, which itself means that compared with the rel­ative predictability of the Soviet system and the Cold War, we now live in an era of acute nuclear uncertainty. The longer answer is that any significant degree of disintegration, instability, or civil warfare, all of which exist in Russia today, creates not one but several unprecedented nuclear dangers. The most widely acknowledged, almost to the point of obscuring the others, is proliferation-the danger that some of Russia's vast accumulation of nuclear weapons, components, or knowledge might be acquired by non-nuclear states or terrorist groups through the and black-market transactions, scientific brain drain, or a decision by a money -starved Moscow regime to sell them. The threat derives primarily from Russia's decade long economic collapse. The government has lacked sufficient funds to safeguard storehouses of nuclear materials properly or to pay maintenance personnel and scientists adequately, even regularly. (Nuclear workers actually went out on strike over unpaid wages several times ill the 1990S and again in 2000, even though it is againsL Russian law.) Almost all of the existing U.S. programs to reduce nuclear threats inside Russia focus on proliferation. But even here, according to their official sponsors and other experts, the programs are "woefully inadequate" if we are "to prevent a catastrophe." By the end of 2000, for example, barely one-sixth of Russia's weapons-usable materials will be considered secure, and the "risks of 'loose nukes' are larger today" than they were when the programs began. Moreover, Moscow seems to have no full inventory of such materials or perhaps even of its thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, and thus no sure way of knowing whether or not something is missing.41,/! ~ Proliferation is the pinup of Russia's nuclear dangers, the subject of Western novels and movies, but it may not be the most serious. If a nuclear explosion is wait­ing to happen, it is probably somewhere among Russia's scores of Soviet-era reactors at electrical power stations and on decommissioned submarines. Reactors, we are told, can be "no less dangerous than nuclear weapons." And as the Senate's leading expert informed his col­leagues in 1999, Russia's "reactors suffer from defi­ciences in design, operator training, and safety procedures." Indeed, according to a Russian specialist, "none of our nuclear stations can be considered safe. "42 The bell began tolling loudly on reactor catastrophes with the explosion at Chernobyl in 1986, the worst nuclear accident in history. Releasing more than a hun­dred times the radiation of the two atomic bombs dropped on Japan in 1945, its lethal consequences are still unfolding fourteen years later. Since the early 199os, many reports, including one by the Russian gov­ernment itself in February 2000, have warned of the possibility of another "Chernobyl-type disaster" or, more exactly, of several accident-prone Russian power stations, even faulty research reactors.43 (The world's most dangerous nuclear plants are said to be located ill post-Communist Russia and other former Soviel republics. )44 , Scores of decommissioned but still not denuclearized Soviet-built submarines decaying in the far north greatly worsen the odds in this new kind of Russian roulette. Here too firsthand reports of "a nuclear accident wait ing to happen" are increasingly ominous. Ill-maintained floating reactors are highly vulnerable, and many sub marines are already leaking or dumping radioactive materials into the seas "like little Chernobyls in slow motion. "45 Active-duty Russian nuclear ships also pose il serious threat, their aging missiles susceptible to explosions, one likely to detonate others. If that happens, il Russian expert warns, "We can end up with hundreds of Chernobyls."46 Why, then, all the U.S. official and unofficial assurances that we are "immeasurably more secure" and can stop worrying about "worst-case scenarios"? They clearly derived from the single, entirely ideological assumption that because the Soviet Union no longer exists, the threat of a Russian nuclear attack on the United States no longer exists and we need now worry only about "rogue states." In truth, the possibility of such a Russ­ian attack grew throughout the 1990’s and is still grow­ing. Leave aside the warning that "a Russian version of Milosevic ... armed with thousands of nuclear war­heads" might come to power and consider the pro­gressive disintegration of the country's nuclear-defense infrastructure. Russia still has some six thousand war­heads on hair-trigger alert. They are to be launched or not launched depending on information about actIvIty at U.S. missile sites provided by an early-warning net­work of radars, satellites, and computers that now functions only partially and erratically. Russia's command-and-control personnel, who are hardly immune to the social hard­ships and pathologies sweeping the nation, have bare­ly a few minutes to evaluate any threatening information, which has already been false on occasion. (In 1995, a Norwegian weather rocket was briefly mistaken by Russian authorities for an incoming enemy mis­sile.) These new post-Soviet technological and human cir­cumstances of the nuclear age are, as American scien­tists have warned repeatedly, "increasing the danger of an accidental or unauthorized attack on the United States" from Russian territory. It is "arguably already the greatest threat to U.S. national survival." Assurances to the contrary, scientists e!ilphasize, are "a gross mis­representation of reality. " Readers may choose to believe that intentional nuclear war nonetheless remains unthinkable. In post­-Soviet Russia, however, it has become not only increas­ingly thinkable but speakable. The Kremlin's new security doctrine expanding conditions in which it would use such weapons may be merely semantic and nothing really new. But Russia's ferocious civil war in Chechnya, which did not end with the destruction of Grozny in 2000, is, as I have pointed out before, the first ever in a nuclear country. It has not yet included nuclear warfare, but both sides have crossed a rhetorical Rubicon. Since 1999, sev­eral Russian deputies and governors, and even a lead- ing "liberal" newspaper, have proposed using nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons against Chechnya. Said one, "I think nuclear weapons should stop being virtual." Russian military spokesmen, we are told, "do not exclude that a nuclear attack could be carried out against the bases of international terrorists in Chechnya. " And with that tiny republic in mind, the military has officially adopted a new concept of "limited" nuclear warfare in a single region, a threat against the Chechen resistance still being discussed in May 2000. From the other side, there were persistent reports that terrorists serving the Chechen "holy war" might blow up Russian nuclear power plants or weapons sites. The reports were serious enough to cause Moscow to redouble security at its nuclear facilities and 90 percent of Russians surveyed to say they fear the possibility.5l Such threats on both sides may also be merely rhetorical, but it is an exceedingly dangerous rhetoric never before heard, if nothing else, there has been more loose talk in Russia since 1999 about using nuclear weapons than measures to prevent loose nukes. And it will likely increase if the Chechens expand their new guerrilla tactics farther into Russia itself, as they have promised to do. And so, post-Soviet Russia still matters to America in the most fateful of ways. The Clinton administration has worsened the dangers incalculably by taking step after step that pushes a Russia coming apart at the nuclear seams to rely more and more on its nuclear stockpiles and infrastructures by making financial aid conditional on economic "reforms" that impoverished and destabilized the state; by expanding NATO's mili­tary might virtually to Russia's borders; by provocatively demonstrating during the bombing of Yugoslavia the overwhelming superiority of U.S. conventional weapons; and more recently by threatening to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in order to build a missile defense system. Rarely, if ever, has there been such a reckless official disregard for U.S. national security or leadership failure to tell the American people about growing threats to their well-being. The Clinton administration and its many supporters in the media, think tanks, and acade­mia never seem to connect the dots between their mis­sionary zeal in Russia and the grave dangers being compounded there. In early 2000, one of the crusade's leading policymakers suddenly told us, after seven years of "happy talk," that "disasters are inescapable in the short run." He neglected to say that the disaster is unfolding in a country laden with twentieth-century devices of mass destruction and regressing toward the nineteenth century. 52 Russia's potential for lethal catastrophes is the most important but not the only reason it still matters. Even in crises and weakness, Russia remains a great power because of its sheer size, which stretches across eleven time zones from Finland and Poland (if we consider Belarus) to China and nearby Alaska; its large portions of the world's energy and mineral reserves; its long his­tory of world-class achievements and power; its highly educated present-day citizens; and, of course, its arse­nals. All this makes Russia inherently not only a major power but a semi-global one. A "world without Russia" would therefore be globalization, to take the concept du jour, without a large part of the globe. Nor can many large international problems and conflicts be resolved without Russia, especially in a "post-Cold War order" that has at least as much inter­national anarchy as order. From the Balkans and the Caspian to China and Iraq, from nuclear proliferation to conventional-arms transfers, from the environment and terrorism to drug trafficking and money laundering, Russia retains a capacity to affect world affairs for bet­ter or worse. On the one hand, it was Moscow's diplo­matic intervention in Yugoslavia in 1999 that enabled a desperate Clinton administration to avoid sending American ground troops to Kosovo. On the other, the 1990S also brought the passage of narcotics westward across Russian territory, a flood of illegal Russian money into U.S. banks, and growing markets for Moscow's weapons and nuclear capabilities among states that already worry Washington.53 And then there are the vast geopolitical ramifications of developments in what is still the world's largest ter­ritorial country. Nearly a fourth of planet Earth's pop­ulation lives on the borders of the Russian Federation, including most of its major religions and many of its ethnic identities. Many, if not all, of these nations and peoples are likely to be directly or indirectly affected by what happens in post-Communist Russia, again for bet­ter or worse--first and forenlOst the "near abroad," as Moscow calls the other fourteen former Soviet republics, but not them alone. (Finally, there is a crucial futuristic reason why U.S. policy toward Russia must be given the highest priori­ty and changed fundamentally. Contrary to those Amer­icans who have "rushed to relegate Russia to the archives," believing it will always be enfeebled and may even break into more pieces, that longtime super­power will eventually recover from its present time of troubles, as it did after the revolution and civil war of 1917-21, indeed as it always has.54 But what kind of political state will rise from its knees? One that is democratic or despotic? One open to the West and eager to play a cooperative role in world affairs-or one bent on revising an international order shaped during its weakness and at its expense? One safeguarding and reducing its nuclear stockpiles or one multiplying and proliferating them among states that want them? The outcome will depend very significantly on how Russia is treated during its present-day agony, particu­larly by the United States. Whether it is treated wisely and compassionately or is bullied and humiliated, as a growing number of Russians believe they have been since the early 199os. The next American president may make that decision, but our children and grandchildren will reap the benefits or pay the price.

### Russia-US Relations Good: Prolif

#### Strong U.S.-Russian cooperation checks WMD proliferation and regional war risks

Robert **Levgold,** Professor of Political Science, Columbia University, “U.S.-Russian Relations Ten Months After September 11,” THE NATIONAL INTEREST, Winter 20**03**, ASP.

From there, they envisage the United States and Russia as partners managing what Dmitri Trenin calls “strategic stability” in the twentyfirst century: no longer so much to make safe the nuclear balance between themselves, but to counter “the growing danger of further proliferation of WMDs and their use in regional crises,” most of which are nearer Russia than North America. Trenin would define cooperation between the United States and Russia in developing theater missile defense as part of this effort, and, on this score, trends in official circles appear to be moving in his direction.

#### Proliferation risks extinction

Stuart **Taylor** Jr., journalist, LEGAL TIMES, September 16, 20**02**, LN.

The truth is, no matter what we do about Iraq, if we don't stop proliferation another five or ten potentially unstable nations may go nuclear before long, making it ever more likely that one or more bombs will be set off on our soil by terrorists or terrorist governments. Even an airtight missile defense will be useless against a nuke hidden in a truck, a shipping container, or a boat.  
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.

### Russia-US Relations Good: Terrorism

#### US-Russian Relations are key to prevent nuclear terrorism

Dmitry V. **Suslov**, 2-28-**05**. Deputy Director on Research at the Council on Foreign and Defense Policy, “US-Russia Relations Saved for Now” http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/display.article?id=5348

This basic mistrust explains the patchy Bratislava accord: selective cooperation in some areas (nuclear terrorism, arms control), confrontation on the other (democracy, CIS, Iran), and mutual alienation on the majority of issues. If the agenda is not broadened in a coherent fashion, it has poor chance of success. Russia's modernization is impossible without the United States. Decision-making in world policy is also dependent on relations with Washington. For the United States, a declining agenda with Russia will sooner or later result in overextension of US resources and global disaster. Short- and middle-term reasons for engaging Russia lie in policy toward North Korea, Iraq, Iran, and China, and the long-term - in the broader Middle East. Russia, with its imperial history, vast experience, and readiness to invest in security, is the only US ally capable of collaborating to bring about Mideast stability- a rather imperial, but necessary mission. Neither Europe nor the southern CIS have the resources to accomplish the task. Despite an EU presence in Afghanistan and some contribution to Iraq, Europe's political culture and growing Muslim populations do not allow for serious investments in missions like occupation and state-building.

#### Extinction.

Harvey **Gordon,** Visiting Lecturer, Forensic Psychiatry, Tel Aviv University, “The ‘Suicide’ Bomber: Is It a Psychiatric Phenomenon?” PSYCHIATRIC BULLETIN v. 26, 20**02,** pp. 285-287. Available from the World Wide Web at: http://pb.rcpsych.org/cgi/content/full/26/8/285

Although terrorism throughout human history has been tragic, until relatively recently it has been more of an irritant than any major hazard. However, the existence of weapons of mass destruction now renders terrorism a potential threat to the very existence of human life (Hoge & Rose, 2001). Such potential global destruction, or globicide as one might call it, supersedes even that of genocide in its lethality. Although religious factors are not the only determinant of ‘suicide’ bombers, the revival of religious fundamentalism towards the end of the 20th century renders the phenomenon a major global threat. Even though religion can be a force for good, it can equally be abused as a force for evil. Ultimately, the parallel traits in human nature of good and evil may perhaps be the most durable of all the characteristics of the human species. There is no need to apply a psychiatric analysis to the ‘suicide’ bomber because the phenomenon can be explained in political terms. Most participants in terrorism are not usually mentally disordered and their behaviour can be construed more in terms of group dynamics (Colvard, 2002). On the other hand, perhaps psychiatric terminology is as yet deficient in not having the depth to encompass the emotions and behaviour of groups of people whose levels of hate, low self-esteem, humiliation and alienation are such that it is felt that they can be remedied by the mass destruction of life, including their own.

## \*\*\*Aff Answers\*\*\*

## \*\*Link Answers\*\*

### A2 Link: Conservatives Support

#### Conservatives and the transportation industry support expansion

The Washington Times, ’12 [Sean, “Road, rail bill hailed, scorned; Unlikely allies oppose $260B project package,” The Washington Times, February 6, 2012, lexis]

Mr. Mica's bill did generate support from some conservative allies and transportation industry groups, including the American Trucking Associations and the American Road and Transportation Builders Association. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports the measure, saying it encourages private-sector investment by eliminating many mandates, consolidating programs and cutting significant red tape. The Americans for Tax Reform also applauded the bill, saying that "new spending on transit and pet projects does little to yield economic prosperity."

### A2 Link: Democrats Support

#### Democrats support transportation investment – highways and Amtrak

Rep. Nick J. Rahall II of West Virginia, the senior Democrat on the House transportation panel, also said the bill flat-lines highway funding at a time when greater investment is needed to upgrade the nation's aging road systems.

"It signals a retreat from creating greater transportation opportunities by short-changing transportation funding under highway, and transit programs and Amtrak," he said.

### A2 Link: Nonpartisan

#### Plan is popular inside and outside Congress- multiple sources

Shatz et. al ’11 (Howard J. Shatz, Karin E. Kitchens, Sandra Rosenbloom, Martin Wachs, RAND, “U.S. Should Drive Highway Funding Toward Projects — and Benefits — of “National Significance,” Says Study”, <http://www.rand.org/publications/randreview/issues/2011/winter/news2.html>, Winter 2011-2012)

Despite the more recent focus of policymakers on transportation infrastructure and the economy, President Dwight D. Eisenhower did not cite the promotion of economic growth in his original letter calling for the creation of an interstate highway system. Rather, he cited benefits to highway safety; savings to vehicle maintenance—and with them, savings on the costs of transported goods to consumers; mobilization of defense forces in the case of an atomic attack; and congestion relief as the economy grew (Eisenhower, 1955). The law authorizing the interstate system, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, focused on defense as a justification more than on other benefits. It formally changed the name “National System of Interstate Highways,” as authorized in 1944, to “National System of Interstate and Defense Highways” (Public Law 627 Title I §108(a)). In more recent decades, promoting economic growth has occupied an important place in federal statements about transportation infrastructure. This is particularly so in the major transportation program reauthorization bills that Congress considers approximately every six years. In the transportation authorization act approved in 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), Congress found that the construction of the interstate highway system “greatly enhanced economic growth in the United States” and that many parts of the nation still require “further highway development in order to serve the travel and economic development needs of the region” (Public Law 102-240 §1105(a)(1) and (2)). Indeed, “regional and rural economic development were invoked during Congressional hearings as reasons for adopting this legislation” (Rephann and Isserman, 1994). Nearly seven years later, in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), Congress found that it is in the national interest to “encourage and promote the safe and efficient management, operation, and development of surface transportation systems that will serve the mobility needs of people and freight and foster eco nomic growth and development” (Public Law 105-178 §1203(a) and §1204(a)). Approved in 1998, it also authorized the Secretary of Transportation to fund a documentary that would “demonstrate how public works and infrastructure projects stimulate job growth and the economy and contribute to the general welfare of the Nation” (Public Law 105-178, §1212(b)(1)).1 More recently, in 2005, a new transportation reauthorization law (Public Law 109-59, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, or SAFETEA-LU) found that the benefits of major national and regional projects included “improving economic productivity” (Public Law 109-59 §1301(a)(4)). It further found that construction of such projects would “improve the health and welfare of the national economy” (Public Law 109-59 §1301(a)(6)). Calls to Reform U.S. Transportation Policy Calls for the reform of U.S. transportation policy have been mounting since Congress approved the reauthorization of transportation funding for the nation’s surface transportation network from 2005 to 2009, in SAFETEA-LU, a $286.4 billion law. In part, this stemmed from the law itself. Among its many measures, the law mandated the creation of two study commissions to consider the future of the U.S. transportation system. Congress established the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission to study the revenue needs of the U.S. surface transportation system over a 30-year period and to develop a plan to ensure that the system would continue to serve U.S. needs, including making recommendations about federal policies and legislative changes (Public Law 109-59, §1909(b)(3)). In addition, Congress established the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission to focus on the future financing needs of the transportation system and, in particular, on alternative approaches for funding the federal Highway Trust Fund (HTF) (Public Law 109-59, §11142(b)(1)). The HTF, historically funded with federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes, has been the federal government’s main financing vehicle for surface transportation. But Congress did not provide the only impetus for reconsidering U.S. transportation policy. Voices both inside and outside the government also made such calls. Inside the government, the independent Government Accountability Office (GAO) has been particularly clear about the need for reconsideration. For example, the GAO has found that many current federal transportation programs are “not effective at addressing key transportation challenges such as increasing congestion and growing freight demand because federal goals and roles are unclear, many programs lack links to needs or performance, and the programs in some areas do not employ the best tools and approaches to ensure effective investment decisions” (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2008, p. 3). Outside the government, the Bipartisan Policy Center, in a 2009 report by its National Transportation Policy Project, noted that although the U.S. transportation system has changed dramatically since the 1950s, the federal government has not substantially reformed its policies and programs since then, although those policies and programs have proliferated in the government’s attempt to respond to changing priorities (National Transportation Policy Project, 2009). The time is ripe to reconsider federal roles because the federal government is once again debating a major transportation funding bill. SAFETEA-LU lasted through federal fiscal year 2009 (ending September 30, 2009). Although there is not yet a new law, as of late March 2011, Congress had extended SAFETEA-LU seven times, most recently through September 30, 2011 (American Public Transportation Association, 2011).

#### Transportation spending is nonpartisan

The Washington Times, ’12 [Sean, “Road, rail bill hailed, scorned; Unlikely allies oppose $260B project package,” The Washington Times, February 6, 2012, lexis]

Transportation spending bills typically are among the most nonpartisan on Capitol Hill, as Democrats and Republicans alike pack such measures with pet spending projects. But Democrats bitterly have opposed this year's version, which is free of earmarks, complaining it was crafted without their input.

## \*\*Internal Link Answers\*\*

### Internal Link Defense: Relations High/Resillient

**US strengthening ties with Russia already**

**VOA News,** 1/4/12 “Gordon On U.S.-Russian Relations,” <http://www.voanews.com/policy/editorials/americas/Gordon-On-US-Russian-Relations--136702383.html>

We recognize that the United States and Russia have many common interests, and we remain guided by the belief that we can engage effectively with Russia’s government and civil society ... without checking our values at the door,” U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs Philip Gordon said recently in his testimony to the U.S. Congress. “Our aim now is to deepen . . . and widen the arc of our cooperation.   At the same time, the United States will continue to be outspoken about areas where we disagree with Russia, such as human rights and democracy concerns.”

**Foreign policy ties maintain US-Russia relationship**

**VOA News,** 1/4/12 “Gordon On U.S.-Russian Relations,” <http://www.voanews.com/policy/editorials/americas/Gordon-On-US-Russian-Relations--136702383.html>

Assistant Secretary Gordon concluded his testimony noting, “We expect to continue our successful approach of cooperating with Russia when it is in our interests, addressing our disagreements honestly, building links to Russian society and government, and maintaining the United States’ long-held commitment to keep our values at the center of our foreign policy.”

## \*\*Impact Answers\*\*

### No Impact: Trade

**Jackson Vanik is only a technicality now – we’ll still trade with Russia**

**David Jolly, 12-16**-11, “W.T.O. Grants Russia Membership”, New York Times,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/17/business/global/wto-accepts-russia-bid-to-join.html>, ACC: 12.16.11, p. online

The Obama administration has called for the repeal of Jackson-Vanik, saying trade with Russia would have a positive effect on its human rights record. The law is in conflict with U.S. international obligations, as W.T.O. rules require that nations extend most-favored nation status to all members. **Asked if he thought the amendment would prove a lasting impediment to U.S.-Russian trade relations, Ron Kirk, the U.S. trade representative, said, “We hope not.”** Mr. Slepnev said the Jackson-Vanik obstacle was “a technical question. **We believe the American administration will work out an agreement with Congress in the next half-year.”**

**Trade will not significantly effect Russia’s economy**

David **Jolly**, **12-16**-11, “W.T.O. Grants Russia Membership”, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/17/business/global/wto-accepts-russia-bid-to-join.html>, ACC: 12.16.11, p. online

**Russia’s odyssey to join the W.T.O. began in 1993**, when Boris N. Yeltsin was president. Ambivalence and outright opposition in Russian government and business circles led the process to drag on as the country slowly moved away from its Soviet-style planned economy. War with Georgia in 2008 and an unsuccessful attempt to jointly enter the W.T.O. with Kazakhstan and Belarus further delayed Russia’s accession. The final breakthrough came in November with an agreement between Russia and Georgia, under which the uneasy neighbors agreed that a Swiss company would monitor trade between them. **Economists expect membership to have only a limited effect on the domestic economy in the short term, as the government has said that it will invoke rules allowing a transitional period to protect strategic industries**, including automaking, from foreign competition.

**Trade with Russia inevitable – they’re in the WTO**

**AFP**, **12-16**-11, FabriceCoffrini, <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20111216/170311686.html>, ACC 12.16.11, p. online

**WTO trade ministers on Friday accepted Russia’s bid to join the World Trade Organization**. The accession protocol was signed for Russia by Economic Development Minister Elvira Nabiullina and for the WTO, by its Director General Pascal Lamy. Russian Deputy Prime Minister Igor Shuvalov, President of the Swiss Confederation MichelineCalmy-Rey, and **WTO ministers attended the ceremony of signing the accession protocol. Russia has been working to join the WTO since 1993**. The last remaining obstacle for its entry has been Georgia, which has refused to approve Russia's entry ever since the two countries fought a brief war in August 2008 when Georgia attacked South Ossetia to bring it back under Tbilisi's central control. After the war, Russia recognized the independence of South Ossetia and another ex-Georgian republic, Abkhazia.