### Topical Affs must offer incentives throughout the U.S. 1NC

#### “In” means “throughout”

Words and Phrases 8 (Permanent Edition, vol. 20a, p. 207)

Colo. 1887. In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout” such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

#### “The” means all parts

Webster’s 8 (Merriam-Webster's Online Collegiate Dictionary, 08, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/the)

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### In the US means the aff must happen in every state

EPA 6 (EPA, US Environmental Protection Agency Terminology Reference System, 2-1-2006, <http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.alphabet?p_term_nm=U>)

United States

When used in the geographic sense, means all of the States. [Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics](http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.org_info?P_REG_AUTH_ID=1019&P_LIST_OPTION_CD=ORG) : [Commercial Chemical Control Rules](http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.org_info?P_REG_AUTH_ID=1&P_DATA_ID=11722&P_VERSION=1&P_LIST_OPTION_CD=INFO) [Term Detail](http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.navigate_term?p_term_id=292529&p_term_cd=TERMDIS)

#### Violation: The plan doesn’t happen in every state and territory

#### AND EEZ is not in the United States

**US Department of State Manual ’12**

“7 Fam 1113 Not Included in the Meaning of “in the United States” http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/86755.pdf

7 FAM 1113 NOT INCLUDED IN THE ¶ MEANING OF "IN THE UNITED STATES"¶ (CT:CON-314; 08-21-2009)¶ a. Birth on U.S. Registered Vessel On High Seas or in the Exclusive ¶ Economic Zone: A U.S.-registered or documented ship on the high seas ¶ or in the exclusive economic zone is not considered to be part of the ¶ United States. Under the law of the sea, an Exclusive Economic Zone ¶ (EEZ) is a maritime zone over which a State has special rights over the ¶ exploration and use of natural resources. The Exclusive Economic Zone ¶ extends up to 200 nautical miles from the coastal baseline. A child born ¶ on such a vessel does not acquire U.S. citizenship by reason of the ¶ place of birth (Lam Mow v. Nagle, 24 F.2d 316 (9th Cir., 1928)).

#### Vote Negative

#### 1. Limits --- they allow “region of the week” Affs that target specific states or localities --- unique areas like Puerto Rico, federal lands, or “Indian Country” open up huge new research burdens --- limits are key to preparation and clash

#### 2. Ground --- national change is key to quality of disads links --- specific regions give the Aff unpredictable angles against core generics --- core ground is key to fairness

#### 3. Topicality is a voting issue for fairness and education

### ENERGY SHELL

#### THEIR PORTRAYAL OF NATURE AS AN ENERGY RESERVE FROM WHICH WE MUST DRAW OUR FUTURE ENSURES THE REDUCTIONF OF EVERYTHING TO STANDING RESERVE.

stoekle 2k7

[allen, “bataille’s peak: energy, waste, and postsustainability” p. 131]

Nature has lost what we might call its autonomy; its model is no longer the bringing-forth of the flower bud, or the energy of the windmill (which
“does not unlock energy from the wind currents in order to store it” [14]), but the violent, commandeering, ordering, and stockpiling of energy by the human as challenging-forth. The human, now revealed as a sort of martial monster, is opposed, in its actions, to the bringing-forth that best characterized poeisis (a causal model in which the human plays only a part).
And, Heidegger makes clear in another essay, “The Age of the World Picture,” reality itself in and through technology can only be grasped as a standing reserve, ripe for quantification, stockpiling, use, and disposal, if it is isolated in an objective “picture,” a coherent, passive, inert totality whose only aspect is that it can be brought-forth, by man, violently, in techned. “To represent” objectively (as the Rhine is represented by those who would harness its energy) is “to set out before oneself and to set forth in relation to oneself” (Heidegger 1977, 132). “That the world becomes picture is one and the same even with the event of man’s becoming suiectum in the midst of that which is” (132).
The rise of subjectivity, of the isolated, active self, conquering nature, storing its energy, is inseparable from the appearance of an “anthropology” through which “observation and teaching about the world change into a doctrine of man” (133). Or, we might say, observation and teaching about the world become observation and teaching about man: the measurement of nature’s resources and their stockpiling—and wanton expenditure—are inseparable from the stockpiling and wastage of the human in techno-scientific methods. Man the subject for whom the objective world exists as a resource is quickly reversed and becomes man the object who, under the right conditions, is examined, marshaled, and then releases a specific amount of energy before he himself is definitively depleted. Although Heidegger does not stress this point in “The Age of the World Picture,” he does make this point elsewhere, noting what for him is the inevitable link between the transformation of the world into a giant energy reserve and the transformation of man into a resource to be exploited in, for example, concentration camps.8

#### THIS RESULTS IN THE UTTER DESTRUCTION OF LIFE IN MASS GENOCIDE AND INSTRUMENTALIZATION.

stoekle 2k7

[allen, “bataille’s peak: energy, waste, and postsustainability” p. 131-3]

Subject/object; this is the infernal duo that, for Heidegger, characterizes modernity. The world is quantified in order to be exploited by “man,” but man himself is a consequence of this mode of expenditure. The man who hoards, who works to preserve his individual existence and protect it from all threats, is inseparable from a natural world completely transformed and rendered “monstrous” by a kind of instrumental mania. Man himself becomes a resource to be scientifically investigated, frilly known, perfected, made fully human (with an identity and consciousness) and put to use.9
This brief excursion through Heidegger on technology is useful, I think, to put the work of ideologists of suburbia and car culture, like Lomasky and Brooks, in perspective. We could argue, following Heidegger, that their version of car culture inevitably entails a subjectivity; one that, as in Heidegger, is both produced by their model and in turn produces it. The illusion “Man” derives his “freedom” from the quantification and commodification of natural resources: oil, to be sure, but also the steel, plastics, and other materials that go to make up the “autonomist” lifestyle. Utility as the autonomists conceive it is inseparable from a freedom that wastes, though they are notably reticent when it comes to discussing the consumption of resources on which their favorite lifestyle depends. Heidegger, although he does not explicitly pose the question of waste, certainly implies it: the Rhine, ruined by all those who exploit it, is a “resource” that has been squandered for the self-satisfied pleasures of domestic life and tourism.
I have discussed the analyses of Lomasky and Brooks at such length because they are the most articulate and coherent defenders of the current culture in which we (attempt to) live. These proponents of the ideology of the current American fossil fuel regime valorize a lavish and ruinous wastage but do so in a way that masks it, invoking as they do utility: the squandering of vast amounts of wealth is necessary, indeed is a given, because we are challenged in developing to the fullest our nature as autonomous, free, individuals. As those free individuals we are the highest being on the earth (as Aristotle would remind us), the most developed. And as such we can be expected to reject any calls to conservation or sustainability. Heidegger, however, would note that our being, our subjectivity, is a quantifiable term that is a function of the very same movement, the very same bringing forth as techné that renders the world a quantifiable mass ripe for exploitation. And such a subject, immediately transformed into an object, a stàñding reserve, warehoused in an institution (concentration camp, prison, army, hospital, school, freeway, suburb), is itself ripe for use and disposal.

#### AND, THE ALTERNATIVE BEGINS BY REFUSING THE AFFIRMATIVES DESCRIPTION OF THE FUTURE IN FAVOR OF THE PRODUCTION OF NON-KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE ENERGY REGIMES IN WHICH WE ARE ENMESHED.

stoekle 2k7
[allen, “bataille’s peak: energy, waste, and postsustainability” p. 205]

I would argue that while cheap energy is not the sole cause of the fablous increase in population and wealth that the world has seen in the last century and a half, it is nevertheless inseparable from it. Bataille, in *The Accursed Share,* has indicated, correctly I think, the centrality of energy and its “uses” (or wastage) to the establishment and maintenance of any cultural formation. Likewise, the depletion of cheap energy will be inseparable from a return to a “sensation of time,” to bodily expenditure (not least as “work”), and a charged, insubordinate matter. But at the same time it is the very “cursedness,” the unknowability, of this matter that prevents its incorporation in a simple reverse dialectic. We cannot simply flip over the dialectic and predict a decline where previously there had been an advance. Our right hands don’t know. The death of Man, of the certainties of Law and hierarchy, the atheism of God himself, the known finitude of “useful” energy, indicate that the unknowable future will not be conceivable as the simple downside of a bell curve, the simple disarticulation of a social dialectic, moving us backward from globalization to monopoly capital, from there to robber baron exploitation, from there to feudalism, centrally organized agriculture (employing slaves), and then maybe even back ftirther, to a hunter-gatherer society. We cannot assume that we will be forced into any given social regime by any given energy regime. The moment of depletion is the fall of knowledge, of utility, of meaning “built up” through successive certainties. It will not necessarily entail a fundamentalist unity of God and creation (as I have tried to show), or a rationalist governance in which every “tendency to expend” is analyzed, known, and controlled for the benefit of Man. What separates the downside of the bell curve from the upside, then, is not only the refusal of any easy prediction, but also the fact of knowledge. Non-knowledge is not simple ignorance, but the following-through of the consequences of attained knowledge; in our case, this implies a full understanding of the energy regime of modernity, the benefits and pitfalls of rationalism and humanism. Reason, as applied to the understanding and governance of society, will not simply be forgotten. As we saw in *The Accursed Share,* the highest knowledge of society is the consequence of following through a reasoned analysis and understanding of societal drives, both rational and profoundly irrational, to their end. By the same token, however, non-knowledge means the impossibility of predicting a practical future whose sole beneficiary or victim is iVian. A society that recognizes that the ultimate signified (God, Man) is heterogeneous in the most basic sense of the term is one that recognizes that its own impulses are both inescapable and profoundly gratuitous. Following Bataille, we can argue that the future, the fall into the void of certainties (God, Man, quantifiable and usable energy) may lead to another kind of spending, “on the scale of the universe,” which, in spite of itself, would entail what I have called postsustainability. We do not know; what is clear is that one kind of matter, one energy, one plenitude, is dying; another, monstrous, already here, already burning, announces itself. Hub- bert’s peak announces it, yet betrays it, for Hubbert envisaged only one version of energy. Up until now the development of thought, of philosophy, has been inseparable from the fossil fuel—powered growth curve, from “civilization.” The downside of the bell curve is non-knowledge because the event of the decline of knowledge, the disengagement of philosophy from economic and social growth, cannot be thought from within the space of knowledge growth (the perfection of modern truth) or its concomitant absence. We are in unknowable, unthinkable territory—an era of disproportion, as Pascal might call it. The era of Bataille’s peak.
“I love the ignorance concerning the future,” wrote Nietzsche, and Bataille seconded him. For Bataille, any assurances concerning the future, either good or bad, were beside the point, even silly; instead, there was the play of chance, the affirmation of what has happened, what will happen. -The left hand in gay blindness as well as science, and the future is affirmed, in the night of non-knowledge.36 [STOKELE, ENERGY ALT]

Does this mean that we should despair, and use this “ignorance” as an excuse to do nothing? Not at all; we know the difference between sustain- ability and catastrophic destruction; we know the difference between global warming and a chance for some, even limited, species survival. But we also recognize, with Bataille, the inseparability of knowledge and non-knowledge, the tipping point at which, rather than cowering in fear, we throw ourselves into the future, accepting whatever happens, embracing everything, laughing at and with death. We will a return of recalcitrant bodily and celestial energy, of the sacrifice of the logic of the standing reserve; we bet against the vain effort to will an endless autonomist freedom. We know that sustainability if such a thing ever were to come about, would be inseparable not from simple calculation and planning but from the blowback of the movement of an embrace of the transgressed limit, the intimacy of the world willed to ritual consummation, the embrace of death-bound bodies: post-sustainability. 37 In other words, after Bataille, we refuse to take the downside of the bell curve is a simple and inevitable decline into feudalism, fundamentalism, extinction. We understand all that depletion implies and we embrace it, affirming the movement of expenditure at its Varda-esque heart.38 Who is this “we”? Not the self-satisfied “we” of a closed community or multitude, jealous of its rights and serene in its self-reflection. Rather, a not-we, emptied of meaning, unjustified—a community of those with nothing in common (Lingis 1994).

### Production 1NC

#### Obama will win- Polls and economic rebound

Cook 9-22

Charlie is the director of the Cook Political Report and a Columnist for National Journal, “Obama’s Uptick,” <http://nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-s-uptick-20120920>

Reality is often more complicated than conventional wisdom would have you believe, a point underscored in the latest NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll. The survey showed President Obama with a 6-point lead among all registered voters, a 7-point edge among registered voters in 12 swing states, and a 5-point advantage among likely voters nationally. The Obama lead in the survey, no matter which set of numbers you focus on, is wider than in many other public polls, including the widely watched automated robo-polls, which are not allowed to dial cell phones. Such robo-polls miss entirely the 30 to 40 percent of the electorate who don’t have land-line phones or rarely use them. The robo-polls rely on respondents who are not representative of the broader public and undercount young and minority voters, who are more likely than other demographic groups to have only cell phones.¶ As widely different as the NBC/WSJ poll is from many other public polls, the numbers are very close to the 4- or 5-point Obama lead I have been picking up in recent days from top pollsters and strategists from both parties. Of course, this shouldn’t be too much of a shocker, as the NBC/WSJ poll is conducted jointly by Peter Hart, the preeminent Democratic pollster (although Hart no longer does political campaigns), and Bill McInturff, a founder and partner of Public Opinion Strategies, a highly respected Republican polling firm.¶ To be sure, other highly regarded polls showed Obama with a smaller lead. The Gallup tracking poll conducted Sept. 11-17 had the race narrowing to a single point, 47 percent to 46 percent, down from a 3-point Obama lead from the two previous days, and a separate Sept. 11-17 Gallup poll in 12 swing states showed Obama up by 2 points, 48 percent to 46 percent. The most recent CBS News/New York Times national poll put the Obama edge at 3 points, 49 percent to 46 percent. Fox News had it at 5 points, 48 percent to 43 percent. The debate is over the margin, not over who is ahead.¶ There has been a lot of news in the past few weeks with the potential to affect the presidential race, including the party conventions and the anti-American violence in the Middle East. Obama’s job-approval rating in the Hart/McInturff survey, conducted Sept. 12-16 among 900 registered voters (including 270 cell-phone-only respondents), ticked up by 2 points since the August survey, from 48 percent to 50 percent, with his disapproval number dropping by a point to 48 percent. Not a big shift, but if you are an incumbent seeking reelection, it’s nice to have a job-approval rating of 50 percent or higher.¶ Three sets of numbers in other questions might explain the uptick. In the key “right direction/wrong track” question, called the “Dow Jones indicator of American politics” by the late Dick Wirthlin, President Reagan’s pollster, the “right direction” jumped up 7 points since August, from 32 percent to 39 percent; the “wrong track” dropped 6 points, from 61 percent to 55 percent. Obama’s job approval on handling the economy ticked up 3 points to 47 percent, while disapproval dropped 3 points, to 51 percent, perhaps driven by stock-market gains and more optimism about housing. In other words, Obama went from a net minus 10 points in August to a net minus 4 points in September. When asked, “During the next 12 months, do you think that the nation’s economy will get better, get worse, or stay about the same?” the percentage of respondents saying they expected the economy to get better increased 6 points, to 42 percent; the “get worse” remained the same at 18 percent; and the share saying “stay about the same” declined to 32 percent. In another question, 51 percent said they thought that the economy is recovering (up a point from August) and those saying that it isn’t dropped a point, so the net responses citing economic recovery shifted slightly from a net 4 to a net 6 points. These aren’t big changes, but they are an improvement on what had been Obama’s biggest liability: the state of the economy and the public’s perception of his stewardship of it.¶ While all of this modestly good news for the president was occurring, however, his approval rating on handling foreign policy dropped 5 points in a month, from 54 percent to 49 percent, with his disapproval number rising from 40 percent to 46 percent. Clearly, what is happening abroad is making an impression on voters, but it is being offset by a cautiously improving view of where the country and economy are going.¶ Central to Mitt Romney’s challenge is that too many Americans either don’t like him or can’t figure out if they do. Only 38 percent of registered voters had a positive view of Romney (the same as last month), while 43 percent had a negative view, 1 point down from August. Romney’s underwater ratings—minus 6 points in August, minus 5 points in September—compare with Obama being plus 5 points in August and plus 6 points this month.¶ Equally dispiriting for Republicans are the responses to questions about which candidate would be better in dealing with three subjects: Medicare, taxes, and the economy. On Medicare, 47 percent said that Obama would be better, while 37 percent chose Romney. On taxes, Obama had a 6-point edge, 45 percent to 39 percent. And on the economy, the two men are now tied at 43 percent, compared with a 6-point Romney edge in July.¶ With six weeks to go before the election, this contest is certainly not over. But it is becoming increasingly clear that Romney needs something to happen to change the trajectory of this race. Right now, it isn’t heading in a good direction for him.

#### Obama’s base hates increased oil production

Prandoni 3-30

“Democrat Policies Threaten to Starve American Refiners,” <http://m.atr.org/article.php?id=6823>

With the 2012 election cycle in full swing, yesterday Obama took to the stump calling for job-killing tax increases on nefarious oil companies. Although nothing gets the Democrat base excited like demonizing oil and natural gas producers—an industry responsible for over 9 million American jobs, mind you—raising taxes on the oil industry will necessarily stymie American production of our natural resources.¶ What those hoping “Big Oil” topples over don’t realize is that thousands of American manufacturers rely on the oil and natural gas industry—businesses sell equipment to oil and natural gas producers and also transform crude oil into fuel and a variety of other useful products. One industry that would be hardest hit from a reduction in oil and natural gas production would be America’s refiners. Already struggling for a variety of mostly government-induced reasons, further reductions in crude would literally starve America’s robust refining sector of its lifeblood.¶ I say further reductions because the Obama Administration is already inhibiting domestic oil and natural gas production wherever possible. Cancelling lease sales on the Atlantic coast, delaying lease sales for nearly a year in the gulf, and increasing the amount of time it takes companies to receive requisite permits have all immediately impacted domestic oil production, and intern, America’s refiners.¶ To learn more, check out the House Natural Resources Committee’s depressing compilation of all the ways Democrats have attempted to impede domestic energy.¶ Over in the other chamber, the Republican Energy and Natural Resources staff created this great chart illustrating how difficult it became for job creators to receive an Application for Permit to Drill (APD) under Obama’s tenure:But it doesn’t end there. The most explicit attack on refiners from the Obama Administration thus far must be the decision to kill the Keystone pipeline. As most people know by now, the Keystone Pipeline would have delivered around 800,000 barrels of Canadian crude oil to, you guessed it, America’s refiners. Creating tens of thousands of construction jobs and ensuring that America’s refiners have crude oil to manufacture into other products, the Keystone pipeline would have been a shot of life for the recession weary construction and refining industries. Unfortunately, Obama’s decision to kill the pipeline is indicative of the Administration’s antagonistic stance towards anyone involved in the oil and natural gas supply chain.¶ So while oil production on federal lands will in all likelihood continue to decline as long as Obama is in the White House, America’s refiners will have to rely on oil production from private lands. Instead of using oil and natural gas companies as an applause line, the Obama Administration should look to increase American jobs and energy security—it sure would make life for America’s refiners a whole lot easier.

#### The environmental vote will decide the election

Lehrer, 12

(Eli, "How Mitt Romney can win the environmental vote", 6/11, Huffington Post,¶ http://rstreet.org/op-ed/how-mitt-romney-can-win-the-environmental-vote/-http://rstreet.org/op-ed/how-mitt-romney-can-win-the-environmental-vote/

Since the (few) positives in Obama’s record and the incumbency are unalterable, the Romney camp can only win by shaving parts of Obama’s base.¶ And environmentalists are one place big place where it could work. Stanford University researchers have found that about 38 million Americans care a lot about the environment and might vote on it. Assuming that environmental voters turn out at roughly the same rate as other citizens who can vote, this means that somewhere between 15% and 19% of the electorate will vote partly on environmental issues.¶ Although there’s no current, detailed polling, it’s likely that Obama currently stands to get around 75% of this group — taking 50% of it would probably be enough to put Romney over the top. So how can he do it?

#### China label kills relations and the economy

Roach 8-28

Stephen is a lecturer at Yale University’s School of Management and Jackson Institute for International Affairs. He is also a Senior executive with Morgan Stanley, “How Romney Could go Wrong from Day 1,” <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/c74802de-f0f9-11e1-89b2-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25ue916Yz>

True to his word as a candidate, a few hours after taking office as US president on January 20, 2013, Mitt Romney issued his first executive order, declaring China guilty of currency manipulation. In accordance with the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, President Romney’s act triggered immediate negotiations between US and Chinese officials. But the negotiations stalled and both parties blamed the other in press releases.¶ In early February, in his first State of the Union address, Mr Romney said: “Enough is enough. It is high time for China to play by our rules.” Congress roared its approval and within a week, overwhelming bipartisan majorities of both houses passed the Defend America Trade Act of 2013. Modelled on the currency manipulation “remedies” of countervailing tariffs first proposed in 2005, DATA was signed into law on President’s Day, February 18 2013. China was quickly deemed to be in violation of the new statute.¶ More¶ At that point negotiations took on a new urgency. But the new leaders in both countries were in no mood for compromise and the talks failed. In accordance with the provisions of DATA, Washington slapped immediate tariffs of 20 per cent on all Chinese products entering the US.¶ As plants shut down across China, Beijing declared this to be an act of economic war and filed a complaint with the World Trade Organization. Li Keqiang, newly installed as premier, announced after the National People’s Congress in March that China had no patience to endure a WTO dispute process that could take anywhere from two to five years to run its course.¶ China’s Ministry of Commerce then announced retaliatory tariffs of 20 per cent on all US exports to China. This hit growth-starved America right between the eyes. With $104bn of American-made goods sold in Chinese markets in 2011, China had become the US’s third-largest and its fastest-growing export market. To add insult to injury, China-dependent Walmart announced average price increases of 5 per cent. Other retailers followed suit. Talk of stagflation was in the air and hard-pressed American consumers hunkered down further.¶ US financial markets swooned. The stock market was hit by pressures on profit margins, growth and inflation. The bond market was also unnerved by the realisation that the Federal Reserve was seriously behind the curve. With good reason. After its meeting in June 2013, the Fed reaffirmed its ever-extending commitment to keep its benchmark policy rate near zero through 2015, and even dangled the possibility of yet another round of quantitative easing, QE4. Yields on 10-year Treasuries moved back above 4 per cent and stocks fell sharply further.¶ Feeling the heat from financial markets, Washington turned up the heat on China. Mr Romney called Congress back from its Independence Day holiday into a special session. By unanimous consent, Congress passed an amendment to DATA – upping the tariffs on China by another 10 percentage points.¶ At that point an indignant China turned to its own version of the big bazooka. The biggest foreign buyer of US debt was nowhere to be seen at the Treasury’s August 2013 auction. Long-term interest rates spiked and within weeks yields on 10-year Treasuries hit 7 per cent. The dollar plunged and the US stock market went into free fall.¶ Just like that, the so-called exorbitant privilege of the haven asset vanished. When asked at a press conference why China would willingly engage in actions that would undermine the value of more than $2tn in Treasuries and other dollar-based holdings, Zhou Xiaochuan, retiring governor of the People’s Bank of China, said: “This is not about risk-adjusted portfolio returns. We are defending our people against an act of economic war.”¶ By the autumn of 2013 there was little doubt of the severity of renewed recession in the US. Trade sanctions on China had backfired. Beleaguered American workers paid the highest price of all, as the unemployment rate shot back up above 10 per cent. A horrific policy blunder had confirmed that there was no bilateral fix for the multilateral trade imbalance of a savings-starved US economy.¶ In China, growth had slipped below the dreaded 6 per cent threshold and the new leadership was rolling out yet another investment stimulus for a still unbalanced and unstable Chinese economy. As the global economy slipped back into recession, the Great Crisis of 2008-09 suddenly looked like child’s play. Globalisation itself hung in the balance.¶ History warns us never to say never. We need only look at the legacy of US Senator Reed Smoot and Representative Willis Hawley, who sponsored the infamous Tariff Act of 1930 – America’s worst economic policy blunder. Bad dreams can – and have – become reality.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Harris and Burrows, 09 –

 PhD in European History @ Cambridge and Counselor of the US National Intelligence Council AND Member of the National Intelligence Council’s Long Range Analysis Unit (Mathew J. and Jennifer, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis,” April, Washington Quarterly, <http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr_Burrows.pdf>)

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the **Great Depression** is not likely to be repeated, the **lessons** to be drawn from that period **include the harmful effects on** **fledgling** **democracies** and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) **and** on the sustainability of **multilateral institutions** (think League of Nations in the same period). **There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first** as much as in the twentieth **century.** For that reason, the ways in which **the potential for greater conflict could grow** would seem to be even more apt **in a** constantly **volatile economic environment** as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. **Terrorism**’s appeal **will decline if** economic **growth continues** in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the **diffusion of technologies** and scientific knowledge **will place** some of **the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach**. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity **conflict** and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella **could lead to an unintended escalation** and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close **proximity of** potential **nuclear rivals** combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions **may place more focus on preemption** rather than defense, potentially **leading to escalating crises**. 36 Types of **conflict** that the world continues to experience, such as **over resources, could reemerge,** particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. **Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity** will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this **could result in interstate conflicts** if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, **cooperation** to manage changing water resources **is** likely to be increasingly **difficult** both within and between states **in a** more **dog-eat-dog world.**

### Oil DA

#### The plan collapses oil prices overnight

Poruban 12

Steven Poruban "API: Raising US oil supplies key to lowering gasoline prices" 3/26 [www.ogj.com/articles/print/vol-110/issue-3c/general-interest/api-raising-us-oil.html](http://www.ogj.com/articles/print/vol-110/issue-3c/general-interest/api-raising-us-oil.html)

A major component to relieving upward pressure on gasoline prices in the US will come from increasing domestic oil production and not from raising taxes, American Petroleum Institute Pres. and Chief Executive Officer Jack Gerard told reporters Mar. 20 during a conference call from Washington, DC.¶ Gerard said President Barack Obama’s administration needs a “reality check” as well as a revision to the unclear signals it is sending the market. This is something that US voters understand as well, Gerard noted, citing statistics from a poll conducted earlier this month by Harris Interactive on behalf of API among 1,009 registered voters in the US.¶ “Voters understand that raising taxes is not a solution for high gasoline prices,” Gerard said, adding, “A true all-of-the-above energy strategy would include greater access to areas that are currently off limits, a regulatory and permitting process that supported reasonable timelines for development, and immediate approval of the Keystone XL pipeline to bring more Canadian oil to US refineries. This would send a positive signal to the market and could help put downward pressure on prices.”¶ A large majority of these polled voters, API said, “also believe that more US oil and natural gas development could reduce gasoline prices (81%), lead to more American jobs (90%), and enhance America’s energy security (84%).”¶ Market perception¶ The very notion that the Obama administration is proposing the release of oil supplies from the nation’s Strategic Petroleum Reserve or asking other countries, such as Saudi Arabia, to boost oil production, is a “clear admissions that supply matters” in the case of relieving gasoline price pressure, Gerard said.¶ Markets are largely driven by perception, Gerard said, and when Obama in his early days in office sent out the message to the market that oil and gas production from the Gulf of Mexico, for example, would be higher today than it was then, that is part of the reason we’re experiencing higher gasoline prices in the US.¶ To illustrate this point about clear market signals, Gerard recalled the example of when US gasoline prices were surpassing $4/gal during George W. Bush’s presidency, his administration lifted the moratorium on offshore drilling and in a matter of days, oil prices fell by $15-16/bbl.

#### Oil dependence key to Middle East engagement and Saudi relations

Gonzalez 12

Angel Gonzalez is Houston Bureau Chief for Dow Jones Newswires, "Expanded Oil Drilling Helps U.S.Wean Itself From Mideast" June 27, 2012 online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304441404577480952719124264.html

Still, growing domestic energy production could allow the U.S. to lessen its focus on the unpredictable region over time. Dependence on Middle East oil has shaped American foreign, national-security and defense policies for most of the last half century. It helped drive the U.S. into active participation in the search for Arab-Israeli peace; drove Washington into close alignments with the monarchies of the Persian Gulf states; compelled it to side with Iraq during its war with Iran; prompted it to then turn against Iraq after its invasion of Kuwait, bringing about the first Persian Gulf war; and prompted Washington to then build up and sustain its military presence in the region.

#### The accesses all impacts—-terrorism, econ, Iran, Middle Eastern war

Cordesman 11

(Anthony Cordesman - Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS, national security analyst for ABC News, served as director of intelligence assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and as civilian assistant to the deputy secretary of defense, "Understanding Saudi Stability and Instability – Cordesman" Saudi-US Relations Information Service, March 1, 2011www.susris.com/2011/03/01/understanding-saudi-stability-and-instability-cordesman/)

History scarcely means we can take Saudi stability for granted. Saudi Arabia is simply too critical to US strategic interests and the world. Saudi petroleum exports play a critical role in the stability and growth of a steadily more global economy, and the latest projections by the Department of Energy do not project any major reductions in the direct level of US dependence on oil imports through 2025. Saudi Arabia is as important to the region’s security and stability as it is to the world’s economy. It is the key to the efforts of the Gulf Cooperation Council to create local defenses, and for US strategic cooperation with the Southern Gulf states. It plays a critical role as a counterbalance to a radical and more aggressive Iran, it is the source of the Arab League plan for a peace with Israel, and it has become a key partner in the war on terrorism. The US strategic posture in the Middle East depends on Saudi Arabia having a friendly and moderate regime.

### CP

#### Text- In a relevant test case, the Supreme Court of the United States should rule the moratorium on oil drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf is unconstitutional as applied.

#### Counterplan competes: "The" means whole USFG

Merriam-Websters, 2010 (Online dictionary)

used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole

#### Solves the aff. They have authority to rule on it.

Spakosvky & Loris 8/13

Offshore Drilling: Increase Access, Reduce the Risk, and Stop Hurting American Companies

By Hans von Spakovsky and Nicolas Loris

August 13, 2012

http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/08/offshore-drilling-increase-access-reduce-the-risk-and-stop-hurting-american-companies

Hans A. von Spakovsky is a Senior Legal Fellow in the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, and Nicolas D. Loris is the Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, at The Heritage Foundation

But while this sale was a positive development for American energy production, the Obama Administration is doing everything in its power to prevent companies that obtain offshore leases from actually drilling and producing oil—a fact evidenced by a new lawsuit recently filed in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims by an independent U.S. oil and gas company.¶ Preparing for Growth¶ By March 2010, ATP Oil & Gas Corporation had obtained oil leases and necessary permits to drill in the Gulf of Mexico. In fact, after installing state-of-the art drilling and processing equipment, ATP was poised to double its oil production.¶ This massive increase in production was made possible, in part, by the ATP Titan—a platform in 4,000 feet of water in the Gulf of Mexico that was designed to allow ATP to safely drill deeper into already-penetrated oil reservoirs. The first, and only, deepwater platform built entirely in America by a U.S. labor force, the Titan was constructed over the course of three years, creating a number of much-needed jobs in the process. And while the Titan’s price tag was steep—ATP secured $1.5 billion in financing from J.P. Morgan—the ability to safely and securely drill into already-penetrated oil reservoirs promised to produce a steady stream of oil and revenue for the company, thereby allowing ATP to pay back this enormous investment.¶ On April 20, 2010, however, America’s offshore drilling industry was thrown in chaos when, while drilling an exploration well into an unknown reservoir, the BP-operated Deepwater Horizon rig exploded. This explosion occurred when BP was drilling a wildcat well with a dynamically positioned, semi-submersible rig, in formations never before explored—an operation that, according to ATP, is completely distinct from development drilling into already-penetrated reservoirs, a process where complete information is available about every aspect of the area being explored, from pressure gradients to rock properties.¶ But in the aftermath of the BP explosion, the Obama Administration arbitrarily ordered the entire deepwater industry to cease drilling, issuing two industry-wide moratoria on drilling activities and barring consideration of new permits. Even though ATP not only had no connection to the BP rig or any of the equipment being used there, but was proposing to drill in an entirely different area of the Gulf than where the BP disaster occurred, the Titan operation was shut down.¶ ATP’s Litigation and the Cost to the American Economy¶ Development of offshore oil and gas takes years of operational and financial planning. As illustrated by ATP’s Titan project, labor and equipment must be secured far in advance of actual drilling, and enormous investments are required before a single dollar is earned through production of oil and gas. While the government’s moratorium curtailed ATP’s ability to generate revenue, it did not reduce ATP’s costs or expenses. In fact, for ATP—which had already borrowed $1.5 billion and spent years preparing to drill these deepwater wells and constructing the safety-redundant Titan platform—the nightmare had just begun: In addition to the expensive ATP Titan platform, the company was burdened with paying for two other drilling rigs idled by the government’s arbitrary moratoria.¶ As a result of the government’s actions, ATP filed suit in federal court. In ATP Oil & Gas Corporation v. U. S., ATP alleges that the Interior Department:¶ Improperly and illegally suspended all deepwater offshore drilling activities and imposed two illegal moratoria on the deepwater drilling permit application process and then unreasonably and unlawfully delayed the issuance of drilling permits after the lifting of the formal moratoria.¶ Essentially, ATP is asserting that the government breached its offshore leases with ATP by violating the Administrative Procedure Act in two ways: 1) by issuing overbroad moratoria; and 2) by manipulating seven experts from the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) to bolster a recommendation for the moratoria.¶ ATP’s prospects for legal vindication appear strong: All seven of the NAE experts denied supporting moratoria recommendations and, in Hornbeck Offshore Services v. Salazar, a case addressing the government’s first six-month moratorium, the court concluded that “a White House official had changed” the report on which the moratorium was based “which created the misleading appearance of scientific peer review.” ATP also says the government “breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing” under the leases that ATP paid the government when it prevented ATP from exploring, drilling, and producing oil.¶ Furthermore, in Hornbeck Offshore Services, a federal district court concluded that the government’s first six-month moratorium was “arbitrary and capricious” and, therefore, illegal, and found the government in contempt for issuing a second moratorium after the court had ordered the first one dissolved.[1] As a result of the Administration’s defiant behavior, taxpayers ended up paying more than half a million dollars in attorneys’ fees awarded to the plaintiffs.¶ In another case involving ATP and other oil industry vendors, the same federal court in Louisiana also found that the Interior Department acted unlawfully by unreasonably delaying the processing of drilling permits in Ensco Offshore Company v. Salazar.[2] The court held that the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA), in addition to the Administrative Procedure Act, “establishes a nondiscretionary duty on the Department of the Interior to act on OCSLA drilling permit applications within a reasonable time.” Yet, despite this duty, the court determined that the Obama Administration had “unreasonably delayed” action on nine different permit applications from the various companies that had sued Ken Salazar, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.[3]

#### Court action induces legislative change.

Devins, ‘92

(William and Mary Associate Poli Sci Prof, July, 80 Calif. L. Rev. 1027)

**Courts matter. They matter a lot.** Sometimes their orders set in motion market mechanisms which guarantee their effectiveness. n199 Sometimes the threat of judicial action prompts either settlement or **legislative initiative.** n200 **Their opinions influence legislative deliberations** n201 **and change the status quo**. n202 Occasionally, they trump agencies and interpose their normative views into the law. It may be that these influences sometimes result in unwise policy decisions and sometimes exceed the proper judicial role in our system of separated powers, but they are judicial influences nonetheless

#### Courts don’t link to elections- shielded from political pressure

Ward ‘9

(Artemus Ward, Professor at NIU, Political Foundations of Judicial Supremacy, Congress and The Presidency, pg. 119)

After the old order has collapse the once- united, new-regime coalition begins to fracture as original commitments are extended to new issues. In chapter 3 Whittington combines Skowronek's articulation and disjunctive categories into the overarching "affiliated" presidencies as both seek to elaborate the regime begun under reconstructive leaders. By this point in the ascendant regime, Bourts are staffed by justices from the dominant ruling coalition via the appointment process - and Whittington spends time on appointment politics here and more fully in chapter 4. Perhaps counter-intuitively, affiliated political actors - including presidents - encourage Courts to exercise vetoes and operate in issue areas of relatively low political salience. Of course, this "activism" is never used against the affiliated president per se. Instead, affiliated Courts correct for the overreaching of those who operate outside the preferred constitutional vision, which are often state and local governments who need to be brought into line with nationally dominant constitutional commitments. Whittington explains why it is easier for affilitated judges, rather than affiliated presidents, to rein in outliers and conduct constitutional maintenance. The latter are saddled with controlling opposition political figures, satisfying short-term political demands, and navigating intraregime gridlock and political thickets. Furthermore, because of their electoral accountability, politicians engage in position-taking, credit-claiming, and blame-avoidance behavior. By contrast, their judicial counterparts are relatively sheltered from political pressures and have more straightforward decisional processes. Activist Courts can take the blame for advancing and legitimizing constitutional commitments that might have electoral costs. In short, a division of labor exists between politicians and judges affiliated with the dominant regime.

### Oil Dependence

#### The Unipolar Moment is over and can’t be recovered – 08 financial crash means the US can’t prevent competition

Rachman 11

(Gideon Rachman, Financial Times chief foreign affairs commentator, Zero-Sum Future, 2011, pp 3-4)

But the economic crisis that struck the world in 2008 has changed the logic of international relations. It is no longer obvious that globalization benefits all the world's major powers. It is no longer clear that the United States faces no serious international rivals. And it is increasingly apparent that the world is facing an array of truly global problems-such as climate change and nuclear proliferation-that are causing rivalry and division between nations. After a long period of international cooperation, competition and rivalry are returning to the international system. A win-win world is giving way to a zero-sum world. Both as individuals and as a nation, Americans have begun to question whether the "new world order" that emerged after the cold war still favors the United States. The rise of Asia is increasingly associated with job losses for ordinary Americans and with a challenge to American power from an increasingly confident China. The crash has heightened awareness of American economic vulnerability and the country's reliance on continued Chinese and Middle Eastern lending. Of course, even after the crash, the United States remains the most powerful country in the world-with its largest economy, its most powerful military, and its leading universities. But the United States will never recover the unchallenged superiority of the "unipolar moment" that began with the collapse of the Soviet Union

#### Entitlement spending makes hege collapse inevitable

Cohen ‘12

[Michael A. Cohen is a regular columnist for Foreign Policy's Election 2012 Channel and a fellow at the Century Foundation. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting_from_the_inside_out?page=full> ETB]

There is, however, one serious problem with this analysis. Any discussion of American national security that focuses solely on the issue of U.S. power vis-à-vis other countries -- and ignores domestic inputs -- is decidedly incomplete. In Kagan's New Republic article, for example, he has little to say about the country's domestic challenges except to obliquely argue that to focus on "nation-building" at home while ignoring the importance of maintaining U.S. power abroad would be a mistake. In fact, in a recent FP debate with the Financial Times' Gideon Rachman on the issue of American decline, Kagan diagnoses what he, and many other political analysts, appear to believe is the country's most serious problem: "enormous fiscal deficits driven by entitlements." Why is this bad? It makes it harder, says Kagan, for the United States to "continue playing its vital role in the world" and will lead to significant cutbacks in defense spending. However, a focus on U.S. global dominance or suasion that doesn't factor in those elements that constitute American power at home ignores substantial and worsening signs of decline. Indeed, by virtually any measure, a closer look at the state of the United States today tells a sobering tale of rapid and unchecked decay and deterioration in a host of areas. While not all of them are generally considered elements of national security, perhaps they should be.

#### Heg not solve war –

#### A. No threats require primacy and other factors ensure security.

Friedman and Preble 10 (Benjamin Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at the Cato Institute, Christopher Preble is director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, Budgetary Savings from Military Restraint, September 22, 2010 Cato Policy Analysis No. 667 September 23, 2010 <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA667.pdf>

The United States confuses what it wants from its military, which is global primacy or hegemony, with what its needs, which is safety. Our leaders tend to exaggerate the capability of the enemies we have and invent new enemies by defining traditional foreign troubles —geopolitical competition among states and instability within them, for example—as pressing threats to our security. Geography, wealth, and nuclear weapons provide us with safety that our ancestors would envy. Our hyperactive military policies damage it by encouraging rivalry and resentment. Global military primacy is a game not worth the candle.56

#### B. No war – States have an incentive to avoid it.

Zakaria 08 (Fareed Zakaria, editor of Newsweek International, 2008, The Post-American World, p. 244)

In certain areas – the South China Sea, for example – U.S. military force is likely to be less relevant than that of China. In international negotiations, America will have to bargain and compromise with the others. Does all this add up to instability and disorder? Not necessarily. Two hundred years of Anglo-American hegemony has in fact created a system that is not as fragile is it might have been in the 1920s and 1930s. (When British power waned, American power was unwilling to stip in, and Europe fell through the cracks). The basic conception of the current system – an open world economy, multilateral negotiations – has wide acceptance. And new forms of cooperation are growing. Ann-Marie Slaughter has written about how legal systems are constructing a set of standards without anyone’s forcing them to do so—creating a bottom-up, networked order. Not every issue will lend itself to such stabilization, but many will. In other words, the search for a superpower solution to every problem may be futile and unnecessary. Small work-arounds might be just as effective.

#### No evidence that credibility is key to influence others—prefer our ev because its based on psychological studies and not economic based models

Fettweis 7—Professor of Political Science @ Tulane

Christopher J., Credibility and the War on Terror Political Science Quarterly. New York: Winter 2007/2008. Vol. 122, Iss. 4; pg. 607, 27 pgs

Since Vietnam, **scholars have been generally unable to identify cases in which high credibility helped the United States achieve its goals. The shortterm aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis**, for example, **did not include a string of Soviet reversals, or the kind of benign bandwagoning with the West that deterrence theorists would have expected**. In fact, the perceived reversal in Cuba seemed to harden Soviet resolve. As the crisis was drawing to a close, Soviet diplomat Vasily Kuznetsov angrily told his counterpart, "You Americans will never be able to do this to us again."37 Kissinger commented in his memoirs that "the Soviet Union thereupon launched itself on a determined, systematic, and long-term program of expanding all categories of its military power .... The 1962 Cuban crisis was thus a historic turning point-but not for the reason some Americans complacently supposed."38 The reassertion of the credibility of the United States, which was done at the brink of nuclear war, had few long-lasting benefits. The Soviets seemed to learn the wrong lesson. **There is actually scant evidence that other states ever learn the right lessons. Cold War history contains little reason to believe that the credibility of the superpowers had very much effect on their ability to influence others**. Over the last decade, a **series of major scholarly studies have cast further doubt upon the fundamental assumption of interdependence across foreign policy actions**. **Employing methods borrowed from social psychology** rather than the economics-based models commonly employed by deterrence theorists, Jonathan **Mercer argued that threats are far more independent than is commonly believed and**, therefore, **that reputations are not likely to be formed on the basis of individual actions**.39 While policymakers may feel that their decisions send messages about their basic dispositions to others**, most of the evidence from social psychology suggests** otherwise. **Groups tend to interpret the actions of their rivals as situational**, dependent upon the constraints of place and time. Therefore, **they are not likely to form lasting impressions of irresolution from single, independent events**. Mercer argued that the interdependence assumption had been accepted on faith, and rarely put to a coherent test; when it was, it almost inevitably failed.40

#### ( ) No impact to Iran Prolif –

#### A. Impact overblown and MAD solves.

Sadr 05 [Ehsanah I., graduate student in the department of government and politics at the University of Maryland, College Park, Middle East Policy, Summer]

If Iran is successful in its nuclear quest, Israel might feel compelled to begin diverting more of its resources to ensuring a significant nuclear edge over its regional rival. A serious and costly arms race may ensue. While this legitimate concern ought not be brushed aside, it is important to note that many years are likely to pass before Iran comes close to parity with Israel’s weapons stockpile.60 During this time, domestic politics and international interactions are likely to change in unforeseen ways that have implications for whether or how an arms race between Iran and Israel might be managed. CONCLUSION In an article on U.S. options for a post- Cold War nuclear policy, Charles Glaser criticizes the work of foreign-policy analysts who “focus on a single criterion for evaluating U.S. security – the damage United States society would suffer in a war – but overlook other criteria for measuring U.S. security**, specifically those criteria that measure the likelihood of war**.”61 The same criticism might be leveled at Israeli security analysts whose preoccupation with the devastation a nuclear Iran could inflict upon the Jewish nation clouds their evaluation of the ways in which the acquisition of nuclear weapons affects the likelihood that Iran would initiate hostilities in the first place. The above analysis indicates that a nuclearized Iran **is extremely unlikely** to pose an existential threat to Israel. The doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction holds in the Iranian context: Iran’s clerical rulers, anxious to protect their own power, citizens and civilization, **will not launch a war** that will lead to **their own destruction**. Iran’s rulers are extremely unlikely to pass nuclear material on to terrorist actors whose loyalty they cannot ensure. They are also unlikely to step up conventional or terrorist harassment of Israel **for fear of the escalation** of hostilities to nuclear warfare. The impact of Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons upon Israel’s regional interests is less problematic than one might think. Although the regime-change option would be off the table, it is not clear that it has ever been a feasible alternative given current geopolitical realities. Any increase in domestic political support for the Iranian regime is likely to be temporary. Iran may indeed be empowered to pursue its own regional interests, but such pursuit is not necessarily bad for Israeli interests. Finally, it will be many years before Iran’s weapons stockpile begins to approach Israel’s and the latter is compelled to engage in an expensive arms race. Indeed, there is reason to believe that Iran’s access to nuclear weapons may increase the prospects for **regional stability and even Mid**dle **East peace**. Given the horrendous consequences of an accidental nuclear war, it will be imperative that Iran and Israel develop some sort of ability to communicate with one another directly. It is not outside the realm of possibility that the institutionalization of such communications may be the first step in the normalization of relations between the two countries and the future integration of Israel into its neighborhood. This is not to say that Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is a good thing for Israel, the United States or the world as a whole. There are many legitimate reasons to be concerned about nuclear proliferation in any country, and the international community should do all it can to dissuade Iran and other nations from their nuclear aspirations and encourage current members of the nuclear club to reduce and even eliminate their stockpiles. The analysis presented above does suggest, however, that the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the Islamic Republic is **not likely to lead to any more nuclear events** than the world has witnessed since Hiroshima and Nagasaki **– that is, zero**.

#### B. No impact for multiple reasons.

-Iran already a challenge to US ME Heg -No Iranian adventurism -No Mid East Arms Race

-No Suit Case Bomb, CBW’s prove -Won’t increase Iranian influence in OPEC

-Won’t attack – deterrence sovles

Amuzegar 06 [Jahangir, Finance Minister and Economic Ambassador in Iran’s Pre-1979 Government, Middle East Policy, Summer]

Questioning the validity of objections to a nuclear-powered Iran, however, are a large number of experts who find the threats somewhat exaggerated, if not largely based on hysteria. First, the Islamic Republic’s challenge to Washington’s interests and power in the region needs no bomb for leverage, as U.S. interests and influence have already been effectively threatened since 1979 through conventional means and via financial support to groups in Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere. Second, the chances of the Islamic Republic’s engaging in adventurism or naked aggression against its neighbors **are far-fetched**. The last time Iran started a war was back in 1850 to liberate Herat; its last invasion of another country was in 1738. In the immediate past, even when Afghan Taliban challenged the Tehran government both militarily and ideologically, **the clerical leadership showed an astonishing restraint**. Third, the possibility of the Iranian nuclear program spawning a Middle East arms race is indeed ominous, but that race started decades ago**, and Iran was not the one to launch it.** Furthermore, Israel, Pakistan and India are already nuclear powers. Iraq, Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf emirates all enjoy U.S. or NATO presence, alliance or protection and, thus, **have no need of a nuclear defensive shield**. **No Iranian government,** no matter how belligerent or stupid, would dare provoke or challenge American or NATO forces. Still further, potential candidates for the race — Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Turkey — present technical, financial, political and security problems of their own, and their foray into the nuclear bazaar is **highly circumstantial**. 46 Finally, Iran might hesitate to start a regional nuclear arms race because it would lose its current superiority in conventional weapons. Fourth, there is the straw-~~man~~ issue of a “bold Iran” engaging in nuclear coercion through the so-called “suitcase bomb.”47 But chemical and biological weapons would be much cheaper to produce, less cumbersome to pack and carry, easier to handle and more devastating in effect. Fifth, Iran’s influence in OPEC, whatever it might be, will be **neither augmented nor diminished** by possession of the bomb, but rather by its own oil-capacity limitations. Last, and most crucial, Washington’s concern about the Islamic Republic’s posture toward the Jewish state seems to be a bogus argument to neutral observers. The esteemed Israeli military historian Martin van Creveld believes that, “given the balance of forces,” it cannot be argued that a nuclear Iran will threaten the United States **or even Israel**.48 Since the chances of mutual annihilation loom large in any nuclear first strike, a nuclear Iran **would not dare initiate such an attack**. Visiting the Natanz centrifuge facility, President Ahmadinejad told the staff, “What enemies fear is not production of an atomic bomb because in today’s world atomic weapons are not efficient.”49 The new president may be a political amateur, occasionally making dimwitted statements, but he is neither a fool nor a suicide bomber. Some pundits argue that a Shiite belief in martyrdom, coupled with the Iranian regime’s extremist ideology, could render deterrence meaningless. 50 Such people know neither Shiite martyrdom nor the regime leaders’ instinct for self-preservation, nor even the mullahs’ bazaari habit of always looking for the best deal.

#### Iran won’t attack Israel – it would be suicidal.

Carpenter, 07 (Cato Institute, Mediterranean Quarterly 18.1)

Most people who reject a strategy of acceptance and deterrence tacitly acknowledge the improbability that Iran would launch a suicidal attack on the American homeland. Instead, a majority of the objections focus on other fears about Iranian misconduct. Those objections are based on several assumptions of varying plausibility. Advocates of a hard-line policy toward Tehran argue that if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, it will use those weapons against its hated adversary, Israel. Fears of such a scenario have risen sharply in the past years following comments by Ahmadinejad that it would be a good thing if Israel were wiped off the map. Such a comment is certainly reprehensible, but does it negate the long-standing realities of deterrence? Israel has between 150 and 300 nuclear weapons of its own. Even if Iran can go forward with its nuclear program, it will not be able to build more than a dozen or so weapons over the next decade—even assuming that the most alarmist predictions of the current state of the program prove valid. Moreover, Israel is moving to expand its submarine fleet to have at least one nuclear-armed submarine on station at all times, giving the country a secure second-strike capability.15 Once that process is complete, Tehran could not hope to launch a "decapitation" sneak attack based on the (already remote) possibility that Israel would be unable to retaliate. As in the case of contemplating an attack on the United States, it would be most unwise for Iran to contemplate attacking Israel. The same realities of deterrence apply, albeit on a smaller scale. In all likelihood, Iranian rhetoric about wiping Israel off the map is merely ideological blather. Israel has more than a sufficient capability to deter an Iranian nuclear attack.

#### Israel wouldn’t launch a unilateral strike – fear the US reaction.

Kemp, 03 (Director of regional strategic programs at the Nixon Center, 10-9, "Considering the Options," The Washington Institute for Near East Policy)

This time around, Sharon would never do anything like that—ever. To launch an attack on Iran without clearing it with Bush is not going to happen. Therefore, it would be seen as a joint American- Israeli strike. We would be implicated up to the hilt. I would not say it can’t be done, and I would not say it’s not something we should think about. But I’m just saying that I think it’s very difficult to foresee a situation where this Prime Minister would jeopardize his relationship with this President over something as dramatic as this.

### Econ

#### Oil production doesn’t create jobs – land isn’t used and it steals from other avenues

Karlamangla 8/14/12

Soumya Karlamangla is a Summer 2012 intern at The Nation. She has written on climate change and the environment for the Thomson Reuters Foundation's AlertNet news site in London, and was most recently a news editor at The Daily Californian, UC Berkeley's student newspaper. August 14, 2012 “The Top 5 Myths About the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act”

http://www.thenation.com/article/169392/top-5-myths-about-domestic-energy-and-jobs-act#

House Republicans have consistently used the term “job creation” as a smokescreen for increasing oil production while trying to sell the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act. When the bill was first introduced to the House it was called the “Strategic Energy Production Act,” and there was no mention of jobs at all.¶ These legislators argue that an increase in drilling on federal land will create jobs. But as California Democrat John Garamendi pointed out, job creation is merely a possible, and unlikely, byproduct of bills that are actually focused on putting more land in the hands of oil companies. Representative Garamendi explained on the House floor that acquiring land is a financial game for oil companies to make it appear like they have more assets. ¶ In March 2011, there were 38 million acres of land under lease for drilling, but 22 million of those acres were inactive, meaning more than half was unused. A similar 70 percent of offshore acres were also inactive. These companies aren’t getting more land to get men to work on or even increase drilling, they’re doing it just for the sake of having more assets. Even if these bills go into effect and more land is opened, much of the land will likely remain untouched, netting few jobs. ¶ Beyond that, these bills actively shut down many other avenues that could also lead to jobs. As Representative Waxman pointed out, thousands of jobs are delayed because the GASP Act halted environmental standards that would have created new jobs.

#### Boosting manufacturing isn’t key to economic growth – experts agree

Nash-Hoff 12

Michele Nash-Hoff Author and president of the San Diego Electronics Network“American Manufacturing Has Declined More Than Most Experts Have Thought”¶ 03/28/2012 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michele-nashhoff/manufacturing-jobs\_b\_1382704.html

For years, most economists, experts, and government officials have said that the decline in manufacturing is a natural outcome of our transformation from an industrial society to a post-industrial society.¶ "This decline is often cited by defenders as 'normal' and in line with what is happening in other countries. In this 'post-industrial' view, advanced nations are transitioning from factories to services; the greater and faster the loss of manufacturing, the more successful nations are in mastering the transition."¶ The authors concede that there is:¶ "Some truth to the post-industrialists' view. Advanced economies naturally see manufacturing jobs contribute to a smaller share of total employment, since manufacturing productivity is typically higher than non-manufacturing productivity. But normally the loss is modest and gradual, in contrast to the United States where in the last decade it was sudden and steep."¶ In addition:¶ "Advanced nations do lose some lower-value-added, lower-skill, commodity-based manufacturing to lower-wage nations. But ... they also increase their demand for the higher-value-added products that developed nations should naturally produce ... the process of global integration does not and should not naturally lead to the deindustrialization of developed economies, but rather to the transformation of their industrial bases toward more complex, higher-value-added production."¶ These same experts have denied that manufacturing has been in decline, arguing that manufacturing became incredibly productive just like agriculture did a century earlier so that fewer workers are needed in the industry. The authors state that:¶ "Virtually everyone makes the argument that massive manufacturing job decline is a sign of success: manufacturers are using technology to automate work and to become more efficient ... Manufacturing is like agriculture has been the dominant story. The United States produces more food than ever, but because farming has become so efficient, it requires a very small share of U.S. workers to grow and harvest the food. So while manufacturing productivity growth may be tough on workers, job loss is seen as a sign of strength, not weakness."

#### Oil production doesn’t change international markets and is not extensive enough to save the economy

Jones, 12

(Forrest, March 16, 2012, “Krugman: More Oil Drilling Won't Help Economy by Creating Jobs” http://www.moneynews.com/Markets/Krugman-Oil-Drilling-Economy/2012/03/16/id/432834, 8/1/12, atl)

Drilling for more oil in the United States won't lower prices at the pump and won't create jobs, says Nobel economist Paul Krugman. Demand for oil is growing worldwide, and drilling in U.S. territories won't produce enough oil in a global market to lower prices at the pump, Krugman writes in his New York Times column. "Oil prices are up because of rising demand from China and other emerging economies, and more recently because of war scares in the Middle East; these forces easily outweigh any downward pressure on prices from rising U.S. production," Krugman writes. Meanwhile, the oil industry wouldn't create more jobs. Take North Dakota, where an energy boom is playing out. Proponents of more drilling argue low unemployment in North Dakota should serve as model for overall U.S. energy policy. "Yes, the oil boom there has pushed unemployment down to 3.2 percent, but that’s only possible because the whole state has fewer residents than metropolitan Albany — so few residents that adding a few thousand jobs in the state’s extractive sector is a really big deal," Krugman says. Natural gas fracking, meanwhile, hasn't made much of a dent in Pennsylvania's employment rates. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner has said oil prices serve as a hurdle to U.S. economic recovery, especially with Europe's fate remaining murky. "We're going to need to keep a close eye on oil and Iran and gas prices plus we've got to make sure Europe keeps moving to sustain its progress," Geithner told the Economic Club of New York, according to Reuters.

#### The US maintains a robust SPR to hedge against volatility

Barnes Et Al 4

Joe Barnes, research fellow at the Baker Institute for Public Police at Rice, Amy Jaffe, Fellow for Energy Studies at the Baker Institute, and. Edward L. Morse, Executive Adviser at Hess Energy Trading Company and was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Energy Policy in 1979–81, Winter 2003/2004, originally printed in National Interest, http://www.saudi-us-relations.org/newsletter2004/saudi-relations-interest-01-06.html

No one is satisfied with the current energy policy status quo; but few seem willing to make the hard decisions and uncomfortable compromises necessary to do anything about it. And no party has sole ownership of the status quo. It represents a continuation of **the policy of successive administrations** in Washington over the past quarter century in encouraging diversity of global oil production, cooperation with major oil producers -- especially Saudi Arabia -- to ensure stable markets, research in alternative fuels as a hedge against long-term price increases and reliance on a robust strategic petroleum reserve for use in cases of extreme market volatility.

### Solvency

#### No solvency – massive delays and refining issues

Conathan, 12

(Michael, Director of Ocean Policy at Center for American Progress, March 1, 2012, “[More Drilling Won’t Lower Gas Prices](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/01/435330/more-drilling-wont-lower-gas-prices/)”, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/01/435330/more-drilling-wont-lower-gas-prices/, 8/1/12, atl)

Pumping oil takes time. Opening new offshore areas will take seven years to produce any new oil, and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will take 10 years to produce a single drop of oil. Even if more production would lower prices, it wouldn’t happen tomorrow. And the Energy Information Administration finds that even if we wave the green flag for our entire exclusive economic zone, it will do nothing more than [reduce the cost of gasoline by two cents](http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/aeo/otheranalysis/aeo_2009analysispapers/aongr.html), and not until 2030.¶ You can’t put crude oil in your tank. Ultimately, gasoline supply is constrained not by oil production but by refining capacity. More than half of the nation’s refineries are controlled by five companies, and last spring, as gas prices surged close to $4 per gallon, the Los Angeles Times [reported domestic refineries](http://articles.latimes.com/2011/apr/28/business/la-fi-oil-refineries-20110429) were “operating at about 81 percent of their production capacity,” and that exports of refined products such as gasoline were increasing because foreign buyers were “willing to pay a premium.” Take one look at [gas prices in Europe](http://articles.businessinsider.com/2011-11-15/markets/30400587_1_gas-prices-gasoline-gallon) and you’ll understand why.

#### Natural Gas competition brackets out economic benefits of increased oil production

Auer, 12

(Matthew, dean of the Hutton Honors College and professor at the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University, March 4, 2012, “Without a surge in demand, drilling for oil won't help economy” http://www.deseretnews.com/article/765556024/Wiithout-a-surge-in-demand-drilling-for-oil-wont-help-economy.html?pg=all, 8/1/12, atl)

Why? Natural gas prices are near 10-year lows and some wells are losing money. Breakthroughs in gas extraction — in particular, hydraulic fracturing or "fracking" — have made gas cheap and abundant. Gas inventories are piling up, and if reserves go unsold, expect prices to fall further.¶ The natural gas glut has repercussions in other parts of the energy sector. Comparatively expensive solar has lost its luster and cheap gas could knock the wind out of wind — especially if Congress allows tax credits for wind energy to expire. Dirtier parts of the national energy portfolio are suffering, too. Cheap gas is partly to blame for recent layoffs in Appalachian coal mines.¶ Cheap energy for the ethylene industry — or any industry — is wonderful, so long as there is sustained consumer demand.¶ What ails the economy isn't solved by new investments in coal mines, oil fields, and gas wells unless people are consuming.¶ Post-recession personal consumption has badly lagged the previous two economic recoveries. Stubbornly high unemployment rates are a big part of the problem. So is a deflated housing market and feeble levels of residential investment.¶ Meanwhile, prospective full-bore development of American offshore oil won't have a major dampening effect on gas prices nor will the modest additions to our crude oil supply from TransCanada's currently-stalled Keystone XL pipeline project.¶ Drill all you want, baby. But don't be a cry baby when gas prices stay high. What works to make natural gas affordable currently doesn't work the same way for oil. Gas injection and other enhanced oil recovery methods are more complicated and costly to deploy than fracking.¶ Let's assume for the sake of argument that a big burst of investment — public, private or both — in fossil fuel production really shifts our economy into high gear in 2012.¶ Can't complain, right? Wrong, once the long-term costs are accounted for. A fossil-fuel intensive economic recovery may generate jobs in areas we never really intended: experts at repairing groundwater fouled by fracking, doctors skilled at treating asthmatics, idled fishermen donning hazmat suits, scrubbing oil off the beaches, and so on.¶ Fossil fuels are the engines of our economy. We are dumb to develop and bring these fuels to market in the absence of robust demand. We are dirty and dumb if we extract and burn these fuels without anticipating the public health and environmental consequences.