Russia – US cooperation is the largest impact – failure of relations collapses the NPT and great power war. Also solves terrorism, and regional conflicts – only cooperation solves escalation – that’s Arbatov

Impact

Obama reelection key to a global climate deal and alternative energy – Romney wrecks chances for success – also rolls back the plan

Geman 12

Ben Geman, The Hill, “Report says global climate deal hinges on Obama reelection” 01/05/2012, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202539-report-global-climate-deal-hinges-on-obama-reelection

Prospects for striking a binding global climate deal by 2015 are probably toast ifPresidentObama loses in November. That’s among the conclusions in a wide-ranging, new climate and green energy outlook from banking giant HSBC’s research branch. A major outcome from the United Nations climate talks in December was a plan to craft a deal by 2015 — one that would include big, developing nations such as China — and have it come into force by 2020. But Obama’s main Republican White House rivals are critical of emissions limits and skeptical of climate science. HSBC predicts an international agreement by 2015 is highly unlikely if Obama loses the election. From their research note: [T]he prospects for a new global climate deal in 2015 depend considerably on the election of a pro-climate action president. The election of a President opposed to climate action will not only damage growth prospects for low-carbon solutions in the USA itself, but will make the hard task of negotiating a new global agreement by 2015 almost impossible**.**

Uniqueness

They can’t say Romney and Obama will both win – this isn’t just contradictory – this is tautological. You should let the 2nr have new answers to whichever direction they go – if they can’t pick one, probably proves that their evidence is not conclusive

Uniqueness doesn’t overwhelm the link – 1NC Lapidos says – polls show Obama’s winning but he could still lose. Approval is key – especially in last few months - that’s Cook

Their Francis evidence isn’t good enough – says issues like the economy help Obama, but if he made a blunder it could obviously turn the tide of the elections

Energy could be a game changer for Romney

Jelenik 12

Libby Jelenik 8/29/2012 Gingrich Says Energy Policy A Potential Game Changer http://www.talkradionews.com/news/2012/08/29/gingrich-says-energy-policy-a-potential-game-changer.html

During his presidential campaign, Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich attempted to energize voters by promising to bring gasoline prices down to $2.50 a gallon. On Tuesday, Gingrich emphasized that he still believes energy will be a key concern for voters and may even help tilt the election toward Romney. “Energy has the potential to be a game changer in this election,” Gingrich said during a session of Newt University, a seminar series coinciding with the Republican National Convention in Tampa, Florida.

Obama will win now

Obama is winning in silver’s model – highest spread yet

LoGiurato 9-27

Brett LoGiurato | Sep. 27, 2012, NATE SILVER: Obama's Odds Of Winning The Election Are Higher Than Ever http://www.businessinsider.com/nate-silver-obama-odds-romney-win-election-prediction-five-thirty-eight-2012-9

President Barack Obama's odds of winning the election have reached new highs in Nate Silver's polling forecast. Silver's Election Day forecast gives Obama an 81.9 percent chance of winning. The previous high came after the Democratic National Convention on Sept. 12, when Silver gave Obama an 80.8 percent chance of winning. In the past week, that number has jumped 6.7 percent. If the election were held today, meanwhile, Obama has an astounding 97.8 percent chance of winning, according to Silver.

FiveThirtyEight is the gold standard for elections predictions

Harris 12

Derrick Harris a technology journalist since 2003 and has been covering cloud computing, big data and other emerging IT trends for GigaOM since 2009.has a law degree from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Aug 1, 2012 5 sites that crunch data to help you predict the president gigaom.com/cloud/5-sites-thatll-help-you-predict-the-presidential-election/

This New York Times blog manned by expert statistician Nate Silver might be the gold standard for predicting elections. FiveThirtyEight is updated multiple times a week, usually tied to the release of poll data or economic numbers, and follows a consistent model for generating its forecast. The blog includes some easy-to-follow visualizations, including each candidate’s chances in each state. Also nice is that Silver gives some analysis of why the forecast is shaping up the way it is rather than just presenting the result. Latest prediction (July 31): Obama (69 percent chance of winning).

The polls aren’t oversampling democrats, there are simply more of them

LAPIDOS 9-27

JULIET LAPIDOS September 27, 2012, It Must Be the Polls http://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/27/it-must-be-the-polls/

One common kvetch is that polling organizations (with the exception of Rasmussen) are over-sampling Democrats, and therefore don’t accurately reflect the electorate. Hugh Hewitt, the radio host, yesterday tweeted “NYT/Quinnipiac is junk, with +9 Ds in Ohio and FLA samples and +11Ds in PA in sample.” A Tuesday Fox News segment on how to read “the fine print on political polls” referred to a “continuing discussion” on whether recent surveys include “too many Democrats.” Pollsters counter that it would be unscientific to take an otherwise random sample, and then adjust it to achieve a target partisan split (50-50 Democrat-Republican, for instance). Swing voters, moreover, often identify with whichever party they favor at the moment (they’ll call themselves Democrats if they’re planning to vote for a Democrat). And as Chris Cillizza wrote recently in The Washington Post, “the simple truth is that Democrats have long enjoyed an edge on the party ID question…[E]ven in very good Republican years nationally (2004 and 2010 being obvious examples) more people still identify themselves as Democrats than Republicans.”

They say Romney enthusiasm but – it’s from a month ago

Obama will win the critical swing states – he has a significant edge

Whitesides 9-21

John Whitesides Sep 21, 2012 Analysis: Romney can still win, but it won't be easy http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/21/us-usa-campaign-romney-analysis-idUSBRE88K06G20120921

Democratic President Barack Obama has opened a slight lead over Romney in national polls, and new surveys indicate that Obama has a significant edge where it matters most: in Ohio, Virginia and Florida, the most coveted of nine politically divided "swing" states that are crucial to cobbling together the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.

Doing PTC Now

Filter their thumpers – the public and media only tune in after passage

PEJ New Media 10

PEJ New Media (Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism) Index: March 22-26, 2010 The Debate over Health Care Reaches a New Level Online http://www.journalism.org/index\_report/debate\_over\_health\_care\_reaches\_new\_level\_online

With the passage of legislation in Congress, social media devoted more attention to the health care reform last week than it had at any point since the legislative battle over the issue began last spring. On blogs, Twitter, and YouTube, the issue overwhelmed all other subjects as Internet users shared their reactions to the bill and then focused on the heated discussions that surrounded the protests. From March 22-26, fully 61% of the week's links in the blogosphere concerned health care, according to the New Media Index from the Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. That was the largest level of attention the subject has received since PEJ began monitoring social media in January 2009 and was five points higher than the week before, which had been the previous high. On Twitter, 26% of the links were about health care, also the most attention to the subject on that platform since PEJ started tracking the site in June 2009. The issue was also the subject of three of the top five most-viewed news videos on YouTube. The pattern mirrors, incidentally, what we found in traditional media-that the debate over health care reform received its highest attention following the bill's passage.

Colorado

Going to win - Latinos

**Lightman 12**

David Lightman, is a reporter based in Washington, D.C. He covers Congress and politics for McClatchy Newspapers September 16, 2012 Battleground: 10-state brawl http://www.commercialappeal.com/news/2012/sep/16/the-fall-brawl-begins-in-10-battleground-adv09-9/

Young voters and Latinos helped Obama win Colorado by 9 percentage points in 2008, with rapidly changing demographics turning the once reliably Republican state into a tossup. The state's voters are nearly evenly split — about one-third each Republican, Democratic and unaffiliated.

Latino voters, who could make up 8 percent or more of the electorate this year, are likely to be critical to the outcome, as are suburban women. Obama did well with Latinos and women voters in 2008, said Saunders, a political science professor at Colorado State University.

Evidence that Colorado is key assumes winning all states he’s winning now – which he wouldn’t

No evidence that the plan is key – about clean energy – all our arguments proves why it wouldn’t be perceived that way

Link debate

Environmentalist opposition constrains renewable expansion.

IBD 8/9 [JOHN MERLINE, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY, Do Greens Have A None-Of-The-Above Energy Policy?, 08/09/2012, http://news.investors.com/article/621692/201208091842/environmentalists-have-none-of-the-above-energy-policy.htm?p=full]

But national and local environmental groups are fighting to block or delay many solar plants, wind farms, hydropower and biomass plants and other forms of "clean" energy, along with new transmission lines needed to bring that energy to customers. The effect, observers say, is to slow green energy growth. Even if renewable production rose at three times the overall energy output pace, it would still make up just 16% of domestic supplies by 2035, from 10% now, according to the Energy Department. Greens Vs. Green Energy Solar plants can disrupt fragile desert ecosystems, wind turbines can slaughter endangered birds and bats, biomass plants can emit pollution and threaten forests, hydroelectric dams can disrupt fish habitats, and the transmission lines that renewables need pose various local issues. And all tend to require huge amounts of land. "We are starting to see that all renewable energy projects, no matter how well-planned, are being questioned," Mike Garland, CEO of Pattern Energy Group, said after his company settled a fight with greens over a Nevada wind farm. An extensive U.S. Chamber of Commerce report — "Project No Project" — found 140 renewable projects that had been delayed or killed, many after fierce opposition from environmental groups. An analysis in the journal Policy Review found that every one of the nearly two dozen solar, wind and geothermal projects under development review in the desert Southwest faces "varying degrees of opposition from environmental groups." Earlier this year the Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council and Defenders of Wildlife filed suit to stop the 4,600-acre Calico solar plant northeast of Los Angles, calling it one of the most ecologically damaging renewable energy projects in the state. "Calico will irreversibly harm the sensitive Pisgah Valley and the desert tortoise," said the Defenders of Wildlife's Kim Delfino. Environmentalists also succeeded in blocking GreenHunter Energy's 500-megawatt wind project for a remote part of Montana near the Canada border. GreenHunter Chairman Gary Evans told the AP at the time that "if you have opposition (to a wind farm) in Valley County, I don't know how you could build one." Environmentalists filed suit against a 100-turbine wind farm in Kern County, Calif., saying it threatens endangered condors, golden eagles and other birds. And they've fought wind farms in western Maryland, West Virginia, Southern California, Vermont and elsewhere.

MLP Link

MLP’s unpopular- uphill against fossil fuels for election

Randall 9/12 (Richard Randall, managing director and head of power and project finance at RBS Global Banking, and Carl Morales, a director at Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation. The moderator is Eli Katz with Chadbourne in New York.)

 (Chadbourne & Parke LLP USA September 12 2012   <http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=434877e3-1fe5-48d6-9a82-7c807e43f63f>  )

MR. KATZ: Dan Reicher wrote an op-ed piece in the New York Times recently pointing out that renewable energy is at disadvantage because it does not have access to retail investors like the oil and gas industry has with master limited partnerships and the real estate industry has with real estate investment trusts. Are a lot of people talking about opening renewable energy to retail investors? What would that do to pricing if those markets could open up?  MR. RANDALL: There has been talk for several years now about using MLPs or REITs. However, use of MLPs requires a statutory change by Congress and people see such a change as an uphill battle, especially in an election year. For quite a while, people in the industry have said if you can get those tax credits in the hands of retail investors, then the market would become much more efficient. I believe that, too. The efficiency will drive down the cost of tax equity. MLPs would simplify a lot of the capital structure.

Fossil fuel interests will drowned the aff in spending on spin control & campaign contributions – renewables advocates just don’t have the money

Lipton & Krauss 12

Eric Lipton and Clifford Krauss The New York Times 14 Sep 2012 Fossil Fuel Industry Ads Dominate TV Campaign http://www.cnbc.com/id/49032461

When Barack Obama first ran for president, being green was so popular that oil companies like Chevron were boasting about their commitment to renewable energy, and his Republican opponent, John McCain, supported action on global warming. As Mr. Obama seeks re-election, that world is a distant memory. Some of the mightiest players in the oil, gas and coal industries are financing an aggressive effort to defeat him, or at least press him to adopt policies that are friendlier to fossil fuels. And the president’s former allies in promoting wind and solar power and caps on greenhouse gases? They are disenchanted and sitting on their wallets. This year’s campaign on behalf of fossil fuels includes a surge in political contributions to Mitt Romney, attack ads questioning Mr. Obama’s clean-energy agenda, and television spots that are not overtly partisan but criticize administration actions like new air pollution rules and the delay of the Keystone XL oil pipeline from Canada. “Since Obama became president, gas prices have nearly doubled,” said one advertisement by the American Energy Alliance, a group financed in part by oil executives. “Tell Obama we can’t afford his failing energy policies.” With nearly two months before Election Day on Nov. 6, estimated spending on television ads promoting coal and more oil and gas drilling or criticizing clean energy has exceeded $153 million this year, according to an analysis by The New York Times of 138 ads on energy issues broadcast this year by the presidential campaigns, political parties, energy companies, trade associations and third-party spenders. That tally is nearly four times the $41 million spent by clean-energy advocates, the Obama campaign and Democratic groups to defend the president’s energy record or raise concerns about global warming and air pollution. The Times rated presidential campaign and national policy ads by whether they promoted fossil fuels or pushed clean energy and conservation, regardless of their sponsors, using ad and spending data compiled by Kantar Media, a company that tracks television advertising. The lopsided nature of the energy messages this year contrasts sharply with 2008. Back then, global warming was a top public concern, and green ads greatly outnumbered those for fossil fuels, $152 million to $109 million, according to the analysis by The Times, which looked at 184 energy-related ads. In 2008, Chevron [CVX Loading... () ], one of the nation’s leading oil companies, trumpeted its investments in geothermal power, and Mr. McCain spent millions of dollars on ads featuring solar panels and wind farms as part of a solution to global warming. But climate change legislation died in Congress, Republicans gained a majority in the House, and pocketbook issues like the price of gasoline began dominating public discussion. After imposing a yearlong oil and gas drilling moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico in response to the disastrous BP spill in 2010, President Obama recast himself as favoring an “all of the above” energy strategy, allowing the industry to drill offshore as deep as ever and moving to open up new regions like Alaska’s Arctic waters. The shift left many fossil fuel critics disillusioned and unwilling to do much to support the president. “It’s hard to think of any environmental activist who is enthused about anything Obama does these days,” said Brendan Cummings, senior counsel for the Center for Biological Diversity, which challenges the industry on drilling plans. “Obama’s explicit embrace of fossil fuels and implicit embrace of all the environmental degradation that entails are almost indistinguishable from the policies of the Bush administration.” Mr. Obama’s policy decisions on the Keystone pipeline and clean air rules did not win him friends in the fossil fuel world, either. Many of the industry’s titans are going all out to elect Mr. Romney, who has promised to open up more land and coastline to oil and gas drilling, end wind and solar power subsidies and curb regulations that discourage burning coal for electricity. “The stakes are high,” said Steve Miller, the recently retired president of the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, which has spent about $12 million on pro-coal television ads, according to the Kantar data. “Our goal is to assure that whoever is elected will have seen a groundswell for coal in swing states.” The Times analysis shows that ads with energy themes have played an outsized role in the 2012 campaign season, with energy earning more frequent mentions than every other issue except jobs and the economy. Energy first emerged as a major advertising topic during the last presidential election. Back then, one of the biggest spenders was the Alliance for Climate Protection, an environmental group backed by former Vice President Al Gore that spent an estimated $32 million on ads urging legislation to combat global warming. This year, the alliance, now called the Climate Reality Project, is not buying television ads at all, focusing instead on social media, training and organizing. “Whatever we would spend, it would just be washed away in this sea of fossil fuel money,” said Maggie L. Fox, the group’s chief executive. Other clean-energy players, particularly from the solar industry, are also keeping a low profile after Solyndra, a California solar module manufacturer that received half a billion dollars in federal loans, declared bankruptcy and became a favorite Republican target. Certain environmental groups, like the Sierra Club, are still running their own television commercials this year in support of Mr. Obama’s policies. And the wind industry is on a campaign to win renewal of a major tax credit. But “we are being outgunned by orders of magnitude,” said Michael Brune, executive director of the Sierra Club. “There is just no way we can compete with some of the richest companies in the history of the world.” The Ame

rican Petroleum Institute, backed by the nation’s largest oil and gas companies, is the top energy spender this year with its “I’m an energy voter” campaign. Although the ads avoid explicitly endorsing any candidate, they clearly echo policy stands taken by Mr. Romney and the Republicans: opposing regulations that might slow down drilling and denouncing Mr. Obama’s proposal to eliminate oil industry subsidies. “New energy taxes could hurt drivers and families,” one ad says. “Better to produce more energy here, like oil and natural gas. That will help the economy. That’s good for everyone.” The petroleum institute has spent an estimated $37 million so far on television ads, according to the Kantar data, more than it spent in all of 2008. And it is just one of nearly two dozen groups — including Americans for Prosperity, backed by the oil billionaire David H. Koch, and Crossroads GPS — that are running advertisements this year advocating more fossil-fuel production or condemning spending by the Obama administration on solar and wind projects. “These are companies and industries that clearly feel threatened,” said Ken Goldstein, president of Kantar Media’s Campaign Media Analysis Group. “And when companies and industries with resources feel threatened, they air advertisements.” The fossil fuel industries have also used more subtle tactics, like mobilizing miners to wear pro-coal hats and shirts at candidate events and placing a coal industry logo on the cars for Dale Earnhardt Jr.’s Nascar team. Their trade associations have targeted swing states like Ohio, Colorado, Virginia and Pennsylvania, where there are established operations like coal mines or fast-growing new efforts, like fields where natural gas is extracted through hydraulic fracturing, a technique that could face new restrictions from regulators. “President Obama has placed a de facto embargo on energy production on American lands and shores,” said Benjamin Cole, a spokesman for the American Energy Alliance, which expects to spend $7 million on television ads and other media to defeat Mr. Obama. “It’s irresponsible and overzealous.” The imbalance in spending shows up on the campaign finance side as well. Mr. Romney, the Republican National Committee and Mr. Romney’s political action committee have taken in at least $13 million in campaign contributions from oil, gas and coal industry executives or their related groups. By comparison, Mr. Obama and the Democratic National Committee have received less than $950,000 from the fossil fuel industry over the past two years, according to data from the Center for Responsive Politics. The clean-energy industry has hardly made up the difference, with Mr. Obama directly collecting only about $78,000 from it so far, according to the center’s data.

Wind – Unpopular – “Picking Winners”

The GOP will label the plan as picking winners

UPI 12

UPI.com 30 Mayo 2012 Obama pushes for wind power tax credit http://greenagenda.org.mx/es/articulos/finanzas-verdes/item/157-obama-pushes-for-wind-power-tax-credit

But Republicans and wind power critics say the PTC is too expensive to support. "Especially given our debt situation, the government has no business picking winners and losers -- in the energy markets or any other -- using taxpayer dollars," said Rep. Mike Pompeo, R-Kan. "I am confident that wind can survive without a government handout."

Relations

Larison

Obama reelection is key to Russia relations

Weir 12

Fred Weir, Christian Science Monitor 03/27/12 Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection#

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

Romney & Ryan can’t moderate their stance on Russia

Larison 12

Daniel Larison August 21, 2012 “Romney-Ryan and the “Reset”” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/romney-ryan-and-the-reset/?print=1

Romney and Ryan would be well-advised as a matter of policy to drop their Russophobia, which isn’t in the interests of the U.S. and frequently has no grounding in reality, but they didn’t start their Russia-bashing on a whim. Even if Romney’s foreign policy were nothing more substantial than rejecting whatever Obama supports, he could not credibly change his position on Russia at this point. He could stop talking about his Russia views, but no one would take seriously the idea that Romney has suddenly discovered the value of U.S.-Russian cooperation after spending years mocking the “reset” as appeasement. The about-face would be no easier for Ryan, who has also gone on the record [4] to describe the “reset” as appeasement. Had Romney and his party not chosen to make Russia policy into a political football for the last three years, he might be able to do what James recommends, but they burned that bridge a long time ago.

US Russian relations key to solve warming

Graham 8 (Thomas Graham, foreign service officer on academic leave with RAND in Moscow from 1997 to 1998. He previously had several assignments in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, including head of the Political/Internal Unit and acting political counselor. Between tours in Moscow, he worked on Russian/Soviet affairs as a member of the policy planning staff of the State Department and as a policy assistant in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. Mr. Graham has a Ph.D. in political science from Harvard University and a B.A. in Russian studies from Yale University. July 2008 http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/080717\_graham\_u.s.russia.pdf)

What trends? Simply put, the world has entered a period of great flux and upheaval of uncertain duration. We are witnessing an historic shift in global dynamism from Europe to the Asia-Pacific region, initially in the economic realm, but one that will eventually reorder the geopolitical realm. The middle east – or more broadly the Muslim world – is engaged in an epic battle between tradition and modernization that jeapoardizes global energy sucirty**.** Although the nation-state, the fundamental unit of the international system since the westphalian peace of 1648, is thrivi ng in East Asia and the United states , it is under mounting strain as Europe seeks to create a supranational structure and artifical states in the Middle East begin to break down along sectarian and ethnic lines. Globalization has fueled an unprecedented period of economic growth around the world while unleashing the forces of disorder – terrorism, transnational crime – and raising challenges beyond the capacity of individual states or current international organizations to manage – global warming, pandemic diseases, proliferation of the materials and know how to build weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). With the economic growth has can a historic transfer of wealth from the West to energy exporters, such as russia, and rising manufacturing powers, such as China. In this uncertain world, the US and russia are not strategic rivals, and neither poses a strategic threat to the other ( despite some overwrought Russian rhetoric to the contrary) , in contrast to the situation during the cold war. Rather, they share a set of common strategic challenges. Russia, by virtue of ite geographic location, and the US, by virtue of its global role, must build new relationships with a Europe that is expanding and deepening; they both must find a way to cope with the growing instability in the middle east, the challenge to energy security that implies, and, at least for Russia, the threat that that instability will infect Russia’s southern reaches ; and they both must manage relations with a rising china. In addition, both countries must deal with the dark side of globalization, and both have a keen interest in the role and effectiveness of the instituions of global governance, such as the UN and G8 the world bank and the IMF. Given their standing as the world’s two leading nuclear powers, the United States and Russia are each Indispensable to dealing with the problems of proliferation of WMDs, nuclear terrorism and strategic stability. The US, as the world’s largest consumer of energy, and Russia, as the largest producer of hydrocarbons

, are essential to any discussion of energy security and energy’s future. Global economic dynamics and transfers of wealth will require bringing Russia, along with china, india, and others, into a more central role in managing the global economy, a service long performed by Europe and the United States. In east asia, to create a favorable new equilibirum, Russia has an interest in a strong power – that is, the US – acting as a moderating influence on China, and the US has no interest in a weaking russian presence in Siberia and the Russian far east, regions rich in the natural resources that fuel modern economies. In the Middle East, both the US and russia have levers that could help promote stability, if the two countries were working in concert, or fuel conflict, if they were not. In europe, Russian energy is critical to economic well-being and the US remains essential to security and stability. On a range of other issues – for example, civil nuclear energy, pandemic diseases, climate change – each country is capable of making a major contribution, given the vast scientific talent of each. In the former soviet space, both countries will be critical to building lasting security economic structures.