#### Obama losing over Hagel crushes his perception of resolve abroad

Financial Times December 27, 2012 “Hagel for defence” http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/ad8eba06-503d-11e2-9b66-00144feab49a.html#axzz2HH2u4ZZI

Yet ever since Mr Hagel emerged as the clear frontrunner, he has come under a barrage of criticism. Sadly, his critics have mostly overlooked his sensible views on the future of the US military and focused on some remarks he made several years ago about the “Jewish lobby”. These comments may have been ill-judged but there is nothing in Mr Hagel’s record on Israel that suggests bias or hostility, still less anti-Semitism. He has shown support for a two-state solution – which Israel also favours – and the necessity for the US to play an even-handed role in fostering it. The whispering campaign against him is obnoxious. By choosing Mr Hagel, Mr Obama would not just make a welcome bipartisan appointment. He would also show some political muscle. While he has not yet nominated Mr Hagel, the White House has floated his name for weeks. Were the US president to prompt Mr Hagel to withdraw his name now, it would signal a big retreat. It would also come just weeks after Susan Rice, US ambassador to the UN, stepped aside in the race for secretary of state despite being the president’s preferred candidate. Two successive withdrawals would send a message at home and abroad that Mr Obama lacks resolve.

#### Makes laundry list of global conflicts inevitable

-China/Taiwan

-Latin America

-North Korea

-Pakistan

-Syria

-India/Pak

-Russia

**Hanson 09** – Senior Fellow in Residence in Classics and Military History @ Hoover Institution, Stanford University [Dr. Victor Davis Hanson, “Change, Weakness, Disaster, Obama: Answers from Victor Davis Hanson,” Interview with the [Oregon Patriots](http://www.resistnet.com/group/oregon), Resistnet.com, December 7, 2009 at 3:52pm, pg. http://www.resistnet.com/group/oregon/forum/topics/change-weakness-disaster-obama/showLastReply.]

BC: Are we currently sending *a message of weakness to our foes and allies*? Can anything good result from President Obama’s marked submissiveness before the world? Dr. Hanson: Obama is one bow and one apology away from a circus. The world can understand a kowtow gaffe to some Saudi royals, but not as part of a deliberate pattern. Ditto the mea culpas. Much of diplomacy **rests on** public **perceptions**, however trivial. We are now in a great waiting game, as regional hegemons, wishing to redraw the existing landscape — whether **China,** **Venezuela, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Syria**, etc. — are just **wait**ing to see who’s going to be the first to **try Obama** — and whether Obama really will be as tenuous as they expect. **If he slips***once****, it will be*** 19***79*** ***redux***, when we saw the rise of radical Islam, the Iranian hostage mess, the communist inroads in Central America, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, etc. BC: With what country then — **Venezuela, Russia, Iran**, etc. — do you believe his global repositioning will cause **the most damage**? Dr. Hanson: I think all three. I would expect, in the next three years, Iran to get the bomb and begin to threaten ever so insidiously its Gulf neighborhood; Venezuela will probably cook up some scheme to do a punitive border raid into Colombia to apprise South America that U.S. friendship and values are liabilities; and Russia will continue its energy bullying of Eastern Europe, while insidiously pressuring autonomous former republics to get back in line with some sort of new Russian autocratic commonwealth. There’s an outside shot that **North Korea** might do something really stupid near the 38th parallel and China will ratchet up the pressure on Taiwan. **India**’s borders with both Pakistan and China will heat up. I think we got off the back of the tiger and now no one quite knows whom it will bite or when.

#### The all escalate to nuclear war – US resolve controls the direction of all conflicts

David Bosco (a senior editor at Foreign Policy magazine) July 2006 “Forum: Keeping an eye peeled for World War III” http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/06211/709477-109.stm

The understanding that small but violent acts can spark global conflagration is etched into the world's consciousness. The reverberations from Princip's shots in the summer of 1914 ultimately took the lives of more than 10 million people, shattered four empires and dragged more than two dozen countries into war. This hot summer, as the world watches the violence in the Middle East, the awareness of peace's fragility is particularly acute. The bloodshed in Lebanon appears to be part of a broader upsurge in unrest. Iraq is suffering through one of its bloodiest months since the U.S.-led invasion in 2003. Taliban militants are burning schools and attacking villages in southern Afghanistan as the United States and NATO struggle to defend that country's fragile government. Nuclear-armed India is still cleaning up the wreckage from a large terrorist attack in which it suspects militants from rival Pakistan. The world is awash in weapons, North Korea and Iran are developing nuclear capabilities, and long-range missile technology is spreading like a virus. Some see the start of a global conflict. "We're in the early stages of what I would describe as the Third World War," former House Speaker Newt Gingrich said recently. Certain religious Web sites are abuzz with talk of Armageddon. There may be as much hyperbole as prophecy in the forecasts for world war. But it's not hard to conjure ways that today's hot spots could ignite. Consider the following scenarios: Targeting Iran: As Israeli troops seek out and destroy Hezbollah forces in southern Lebanon, intelligence officials spot a shipment of longer-range Iranian missiles heading for Lebanon. The Israeli government decides to strike the convoy and Iranian nuclear facilities simultaneously. After Iran has recovered from the shock, Revolutionary Guards surging across the border into Iraq, bent on striking Israel's American allies. Governments in Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia face violent street protests demanding retribution against Israel -- and they eventually yield, triggering a major regional war. Missiles away: With the world's eyes on the Middle East, North Korea's Kim Jong Il decides to continue the fireworks show he began earlier this month. But this time his brinksmanship pushes events over the brink. A missile designed to fall into the sea near Japan goes astray and hits Tokyo, killing a dozen civilians. Incensed, the United States, Japan's treaty ally, bombs North Korean missile and nuclear sites. North Korean artillery batteries fire on Seoul, and South Korean and U.S. troops respond. Meanwhile, Chinese troops cross the border from the north to stem the flow of desperate refugees just as U.S. troops advance from the south. Suddenly, the world's superpower and the newest great power are nose to nose. Loose nukes: Al-Qaida has had Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf in its sights for years, and the organization finally gets its man. Pakistan descends into chaos as militants roam the streets and the army struggles to restore order. India decides to exploit the vacuum and punish the Kashmir-based militants it blames for the recent Mumbai railway bombings. Meanwhile, U.S. special operations forces sent to secure Pakistani nuclear facilities face off against an angry mob. The empire strikes back: Pressure for democratic reform erupts in autocratic Belarus. As protesters mass outside the parliament in Minsk, president Alexander Lukashenko requests Russian support. After protesters are beaten and killed, they appeal for help, and neighboring Poland -- a NATO member with bitter memories of Soviet repression -- launches a humanitarian mission to shelter the regime's opponents. Polish and Russian troops clash, and a confrontation with NATO looms. As in the run-up to other wars, there is today more than enough tinder lying around to spark a great power conflict. The question is how effective the major powers have become at managing regional conflicts and preventing them from escalating. After two world wars and the decades-long Cold War, what has the world learned about managing conflict? The end of the Cold War had the salutary effect of dialing down many regional conflicts. In the 1960s and 1970s, every crisis in the Middle East had the potential to draw in the superpowers in defense of their respective client states. The rest of the world was also part of the Cold War chessboard. Compare the almost invisible U.N. peacekeeping mission in Congo today to the deeply controversial mission there in the early 1960s. (The Soviets were convinced that the U.N. mission was supporting a U.S. puppet, and Russian diplomats stormed out of several Security Council meetings in protest.) From Angola to Afghanistan, nearly every Cold War conflict was a proxy war. Now, many local crises can be handed off to the humanitarians or simply ignored. But the end of the bipolar world has a downside. In the old days, the two competing superpowers sometimes reined in bellicose client states out of fear that regional conflicts would escalate. Which of the major powers today can claim to have such influence over Tehran or Pyongyang? Today's world has one great advantage: None of the leading powers appears determined to reorder international affairs as Germany was before both world wars and as Japan was in the years before World War II. True, China is a rapidly rising power -- an often destabilizing phenomenon in international relations -- but it appears inclined to focus on economic growth rather than military conquest (with the possible exception of Taiwan). Russia is resentful about its fall from superpower status, but it also seems reconciled to U.S. military dominance and more interested in tapping its massive oil and gas reserves than in rebuilding its decrepit military. Indeed, U.S. military superiority seems to be a key to global stability. Some theories of international relations predict that other major powers will eventually band together to challenge American might, but it's hard to find much evidence of such behavior. The United States, after all, invaded Iraq without U.N. approval and yet there was not even a hint that France, Russia or China would respond militarily. There is another factor working in favor of great-power caution: nuclear weapons. Europe's leaders on the eve of World War I can perhaps be forgiven for not understanding the carnage they were about to unleash. That generation grew up in a world of short wars that did limited damage. Leaders today should have no such illusions. The installation of emergency hot lines between national capitals was a recognition of the need for fast and clear communication in times of crisis. Diplomatic tools have advanced too. Sluggish though it may be, the U.N. Security Council regularly gathers the great powers' representatives in a room to hash out developing crises. So there is reason to hope that the major powers have little interest in playing with fire and the tools to stamp it out. But complacency is dangerous. The British economist Norman Angell once argued persuasively that deep economic links made conflict between the great powers obsolete. His book appeared in 1910 and was still in shops when Europe's armies poured across their borders in 1914.

#### Military resource scarcity causes nuclear war

**Wooldridge 2009** – political writer and former lecturer at Cornell University (Frosty, “Humanity galloping toward its greatest crisis in the 21st century”

http://www.australia.to/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=10042:humanity-galloping-toward-its-greatest-crisis-in-the-21st-century&catid=125:frosty-wooldridge&Itemid=244)

It is clear that most politicians and most citizens do not recognize that returning to “more of the same” is a recipe for promoting the first collapse of a global civilization. The required changes in energy technology, which would benefit not only the environment but also national security, public health, and the economy, would demand a World War II type mobilization -- and even that might not prevent a global climate disaster. Without transitioning away from use of fossil fuels, humanity will move further into an era of resource wars (remember, Africom has been added to the Pentagon’s structure -- and China has noticed), clearly with intent to protect US “interests” in petroleum reserves. The consequences of more resource wars, many likely triggered over water supplies stressed by climate disruption, are likely to include increased unrest in poor nations, a proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, widening inequity within and between nations, and in the worst (and not unlikely) case, a nuclear war ending civilization.

#### Smooth Afghanistan transition key to stop Pakistan collapse

Caroline Wadhams (Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress) January 7, 2013 “Managing the Political Transition Between Now and 2014” http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2013/01/07/49079/managing-the-political-transition-between-now-and-2014/

Although these military decisions often dominate headlines and congressional attention, the highest priority for U.S. policymakers and their partners leading up to 2014 and beyond should be supporting political processes that can lead to a resolution of the conflict in Afghanistan. These tasks will largely fall on Afghan and international diplomats, and not military personnel. The Obama administration should clearly articulate its expectations for Afghanistan’s political transition during Afghan President Hamid Karzai’s visit to Washington, D.C., this week. As the United States reduces and realigns its military and financial investments, Afghan stability remains a U.S. interest. A breakdown of the Afghan state or an upsurge in violence could have terrible humanitarian consequences for Afghans, create greater pressure on Pakistan as violence and refugees cross Afghanistan’s borders, and expand ungoverned spaces for terrorist groups. But preventing this breakdown will come largely through political compromises among Afghan and regional players, not via military victories. After all of the blood and treasure that has been spent in our decade-long war, Americans should care about supporting a stable Afghanistan, and U.S. policymakers should develop a drawdown plan that seeks to prevent the collapse of the Afghan government.

#### Nuclear war

Stephen John Morgan 7, Former member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee & a political psychologist, researcher into Chaos/Complexity Theory, "Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!?", http://www.electricarticles.com/display.aspx?id=639

Although disliked and despised in many quarters, the Taliban could not advance without the support or acquiescence of parts of the population, especially in the south. In particular, the Taliban is drawing on backing from the Pashtun tribes from whom they originate. The southern and eastern areas have been totally out of government control since 2001. Moreover, not only have they not benefited at all from the Allied occupation, but it is increasingly clear that with a few small centres of exception, all of the country outside Kabul has seen little improvement in its circumstances. The conditions for unrest are ripe and the Taliban is filling the vacuum. The Break-Up of Afghanistan? However, the Taliban is unlikely to win much support outside of the powerful Pashtun tribes. Although they make up a majority of the nation, they are concentrated in the south and east. Among the other key minorities, such as Tajiks and Uzbeks, who control the north they have no chance of making new inroads. They will fight the Taliban and fight hard, but their loyalty to the NATO and US forces is tenuous to say the least. The Northern Alliance originally liberated Kabul from the Taliban without Allied ground support. The Northern Alliance are fierce fighters, veterans of the war of liberation against the Soviets and the Afghanistan civil war. Mobilized they count for a much stronger adversary than the NATO and US forces. It is possible that, while they won’t fight for the current government or coalition forces, they will certainly resist any new Taliban rule. They may decide to withdraw to their areas in the north and west of the country. This would leave the Allied forces with few social reserves, excepting a frightened and unstable urban population in Kabul, much like what happened to the Soviets. Squeezed by facing fierce fighting in Helmund and other provinces, and, at the same time, harried by a complementary tactic of Al Qaeda-style urban terrorism in Kabul, sooner or later, a “Saigon-style” evacuation of US and Allied forces could be on the cards. The net result could be the break-up and partition of Afghanistan into a northern and western area and a southern and eastern area, which would include the two key cities of Kandahar and, the capital Kabul. « Pastunistan?» The Taliban themselves, however may decide not to take on the Northern Alliance and fighting may concentrate on creating a border between the two areas, about which the two sides may reach an agreement regardless of US and Allied plans or preferences. The Taliban may claim the name Afghanistan or might opt for “Pashtunistan” – a long-standing, though intermittent demand of the Pashtuns, within Afghanistan and especially along the ungovernable border regions inside Pakistan. It could not be ruled out that the Taliban could be aiming to lead a break away of the Pakistani Pashtuns to form a 30 million strong greater Pashtun state, encompassing some 18 million Pakistani Pashtuns and 12 Afghan Pashtuns. Although the Pashtuns are more closely linked to tribal and clan loyalty, there exists a strong latent embryo of a Pashtun national consciousness and the idea of an independent Pashtunistan state has been raised regularly in the past with regard to the disputed territories common to Afghanistan and Pakistan. The area was cut in two by the “Durand Line”, a totally artificial border between created by British Imperialism in the 19th century. It has been a question bedevilling relations between the Afghanistan and Pakistan throughout their history, and with India before Partition. It has been an untreated, festering wound which has lead to sporadic wars and border clashes between the two countries and occasional upsurges in movements for Pashtun independence. In fact, is this what lies behind the current policy of appeasement President Musharraf of Pakistan towards the Pashtun tribes in along the Frontiers and his armistice with North Waziristan last year? Is he attempting to avoid further alienating Pashtun tribes there and head–off a potential separatist movement in Pakistan, which could develop from the Taliban’s offensive across the border in Afghanistan? Trying to subdue the frontier lands has proven costly and unpopular for Musharraf. In effect, he faces exactly the same problems as the US and Allies in Afghanistan or Iraq. Indeed, fighting Pashtun tribes has cost him double the number of troops as the US has lost in Iraq. Evidently, he could not win and has settled instead for an attempted political solution. When he agreed the policy of appeasement and virtual self-rule for North Waziristan last year, President Musharraf stated clearly that he is acting first and foremost to protect the interests of Pakistan. While there was outrageous in Kabul, his deal with the Pashtuns is essentially an effort to firewall his country against civil war and disintegration. In his own words, what he fears most is, the « Talibanistation » of the whole Pashtun people, which he warns could inflame the already fierce fundamentalist and other separatist movement across his entire country. He does not want to open the door for any backdraft from the Afghan war to engulf Pakistan. Musharraf faces the nationalist struggle in Kashmir, an insurgency in Balochistan, unrest in the Sindh, and growing terrorist bombings in the main cities. There is also a large Shiite population and clashes between Sunnis and Shias are regular. Moreover, fundamentalist support in his own Armed Forces and Intelligence Services is extremely strong. So much so that analyst consider it likely that the Army and Secret Service is protecting, not only top Taliban leaders, but Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda central leadership thought to be entrenched in the same Pakistani borderlands. For the same reasons, he has not captured or killed Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda leadership. Returning from the frontier provinces with Bin Laden’s severed head would be a trophy that would cost him his own head in Pakistan. At best he takes the occasional risk of giving a nod and a wink to a US incursion, but even then at the peril of the chagrin of the people and his own military and secret service. The Break-Up of Pakistan? Musharraf probably hopes that by giving de facto autonomy to the Taliban and Pashtun leaders now with a virtual free hand for cross border operations into Afghanistan, he will undercut any future upsurge in support for a break-away independent Pashtunistan state or a “Peoples’ War” of the Pashtun populace as a whole, as he himself described it. However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a "Pandora's box" for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US. What is at stake in "the half-forgotten war" in Afghanistan is far greater than that in Iraq. But America's capacities for controlling the situation are extremely restricted. Might it be, in the end, they are also forced to accept President Musharraf's unspoken slogan of «Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!

### 2NC - A2 UQ o/w Link

#### First, even if he was overwhelmingly winning now – making the vote closer cripples his effectiveness and triggers our impacts

Plus Media Solutions January 20, 2013 “California: Battle over Hagel’s Nomination Shouldn’t Threaten His Clout in Office” Lexis

Chuck Hagel’s path to confirmation to be the next defense secretary may seem rocky now, but if the former Republican senator from Nebraska wins the approval of the Senate, his ability to advance his priorities for the Pentagon on Capitol Hill should not be diminished, according to CQ.¶ Most analysts contacted by CQ believe Hagel will receive support from about 70 senators, a threshold which should offer him solid footing at the helm of the Defense Department. Opposition to Hagel over fears that he wants to slash the size and scope of the military, though, may be trickier to overcome.¶ And if the fight over his nomination continues to be contentious and he is approved by only a handful of votes, Hagel likely would find himself in a more precarious position when approaching Congress.

#### Left and right anti-Hagel forces are ramping up now – opposition isn’t backing down without a fight

Josh Rogin (writer for Foreign Policy) January 25, 2013 “Anti-Hagel grassroots campaigns come from right and left” http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/01/25/anti\_hagel\_grassroots\_campaigns\_come\_from\_right\_and\_left

Groups on the right and the left of the political world are mounting new and aggressive campaigns to try to exert pressure on senators from both parties to oppose the nomination for Chuck Hagel to become the next secretary of defense.¶ Hagel's confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee is scheduled for Jan. 31, and the conventional wisdom holds that his chances for confirmation were largely secured when Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-NY), endorsed the nomination after meeting with Hagel last week. Schumer said Hagel had "convinced me that he had changed his views," on subjects like the influence of the "Jewish lobby," and Schumer said Hagel "satisfied my concerns," but "I'll be watching him like an eagle."¶ Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY) eventually followed suit 10 days later and announced her support for the Hagel nomination Thursday. Hagel continues to meet with senators from both sides of the aisle. He met with Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) this week as well, although McCain has not decided yet whethr to support the nomination.¶ But a host of groups that oppose Hagel's ascendancy, some from the right and some from the left, are not backing down. In addition to the usual suspects, like the Emergency Committee for Israel, multiple new anti-Hagel grassroots campaigns are ramping up their well-funded activities, focusing on Democratic senators who are up for reelection in 2014, senators from states that have large defense industries, and senators from states with large LGBT communities.¶ "We live in a dangerous world," begins a new television ad that started running last week in several states. "But Barack Obama's nominee for secretary of defense wants America to back down. An end to our nuclear program. Devastating defense cuts. A weaker country. Call [your senator] and tell [them] to say no to Chuck Hagel -- before it's too late."¶ The ad was produced by the group Americans for a Strong Defense, which didn't exist until this month. The group is registered as a non-partisan 501c4 non-profit organization, but is led by Danny Diaz, former communications director for the Republican National Committee, and Brian Hook, former senior advisor to Tim Pawlenty and then Mitt Romney.¶ The group's spokesman Ryan Williams told The Cable the ad is just the beginning of a larger campaign. Right now, the ads are being tailored to target specific senators: Mark Pryor (D-AR), Mary Landrieu (D-LA), Mark Begich (D-AK), Michael Bennet (D-CO), Mark Udall (D-CO, and Kay Hagan (D-NC). But that list is set to expand.¶ "The states we are targeting have senators who have not yet made a commitment either way on the Hagel nomination," said Williams. "We're going to be mobilizing grassroots efforts in a number of states. We might expand based on how the nomination process progresses."¶ ASD is arguing that Hagel's views are out of the mainstream on issues like Iran, Israel, and Cuba. They are also targeting states with big defense-industry constituencies, making the argument that Hagel supports budget cuts that could hit home in military communities.¶ Williams said that the group also plans to deploy teams to each of the target states to do direct outreach to voters and encourage them to contact their senators in opposition to the Hagel nomination. They are also taking out ads in Capitol Hill newspapers and are planning a national TV ad as well.¶ "We think once people learn more about Hagel's out of the mainstream views and troubling record, there will be a ground swell of opposition to his nomination and senators will get that message loud and clear and take that into account," Williams said.¶ Meanwhile, another anti-Hagel campaign is ramping up, this time from the left, attacking Hagel for his previous anti-gay comments.¶ "From the left, there's a lot of consternation about the Hagel nomination," said Bradley Tusk, former campaign manager for New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg and founder of Tusk Strategies, which is helping coordinate the campaign. "A lot of people worked hard to reelect the president, believe in the president, and don't feel like they raised money and knocked on doors to then have him nominate a defense secretary who is clearly is anti-gay and anti-choice. I think what you hear a lot from the progressive community is: Couldn't he find someone who is just as qualified on defense issues who doesn't have these other views that we find abhorrent?"¶ "You also hear, if you've got to choose someone from the other party in a nod towards bipartisanship, why choose someone who clearly has issues with their own party?" he said. "Where's the logic of picking a Republican who doesn't seem to get along with Republicans."¶ A number of LGBT supporters and donors have come together to initiative a "seven-figure campaign" from the left, he said, that will include TV ads on CNN, NBC, and to run during Meet the Press on Sunday. The campaign also includes phone calls and direct voter outreach, a Twitter campaign, and outreach to the LGBT community. The donors are "mostly Democrats, prominent New Yorkers who care about LGBT issues," Tusk said, but are undisclosed, as are the donors for the anti-Hagel campaigns coming from the right.¶ This campaign is targeting Democratic senators including Robert Menendez (D-NJ), Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), Richard Blumenthal (D-CT), Bob Casey (D-PA), Max Baucus (D-MT), Ben Cardin (D-MD), Tammy Baldwin (D-WI), and Hagan.¶ The LGBT campaign claims to have already connected several thousands of calls to senators and plans to ramp up its activity leading up to next week's hearing and beyond. Tusk said that the fact that so many Democratic senators have not yet come out in support of Hagel, despite the Schumer endorsement, tells them that the nomination fight is not over.¶ "For all the Democratic senators, it was a clear moment to support Hagel and they chose not to do so. That clearly shows that everything we are doing is having an impact," he said. "This isn't what Democrats voted for and we can do better."

#### The fight will be huge – new lobbying organization targeting vulnerable democrats now

Jeremy Herb (writer for The Hill) January 22, 2013 “New anti-Hagel group targets vulnerable Senate Democrats with TV ads” http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/278555-new-anti-hagel-group-targets-vulnerable-dems

A new group that’s joined in the campaign against former Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.), President Obama’s nominee to be the next Defense secretary, is airing TV ads targeting vulnerable Democratic senators.¶ Americans for a Strong Defense, which launched last week, released five television ads on Tuesday in states where Democrats are running for reelection in 2014, urging them to vote against Hagel's confirmation.¶ The ads will run in the states of Sens. Mark Pryor (D-Ark.), Mary Landrieu (D-La.), Kay Hagan (D-N.C.), Mark Begich (D-Alaska) and Mark Udall (D-Colo.).¶ The group's spokesman, Ryan Williams, would not say how much money was going into the ad campaign, but said the ads will run on broadcast and cable in each state.¶ Americans for a Strong Defense is the latest anti-Hagel group to jump into the campaign against his nomination. The American Future Fund, Emergency Committee for Israel and Log Cabin Republicans have all run advertisements against the former Nebraska senator.¶ About a half-dozen Republican senators have said they will oppose his nomination. No Democrats have come out against Hagel, but many have raised concerns about his positions on Israel, Iran and gay rights.

#### Hagel confirmation will be a huge fights – GOP unified against and democrats are wavering

Jennifer Rubin (writer for the Washington Post) January 18, 2013 “As the right gets its act together on Hagel, the White House scrambles” ProQuest

 In the Chuck Hagel confirmation battle, the right has demonstrated remarkable unity. If the vote on Hagel were taken today, there likely would be 35 to 40 Republican "no" votes, perhaps more. Diverse interests (support for Israel, defense of defense spending), carried by an array of entities (Americans for a Strong Defense, The American Future Fund, Emergency Committee for Israel, Christians United for Israel, Republican Jewish Coalition) and representing different segments of the party (Christian Zionists, hawks), have come together in a remarkably short period of time. The Republican National Committee has stepped up as well, providing data on Hagel's record.¶ Usually in these fights, the left drives the message, greatly aided by the liberal media. We have seen in Robert Bork and Samuel Alito's Supreme Court confirmation hearings how the left gathers an array of organizations. In this case, however, the president's team grossly underestimated the opposition. Perhaps the White House did not imagine that a band of right-leaning groups could emerge so swiftly and provide so much fodder for senators opposed to the Hagel nomination.¶ The president made a content-less speech introducing the nominee as an injured vet. Beyond that, the Hagel handlers have been perpetually on the defensive. As Paul Bedard reported, citing Senate Democratic sources, "some members are complaining that President Obama has yet to explain to them why he picked the gruff Nebraska Republican and why the White House hasn't supplied them with extensive talking points to use to support him." Bedard quotes a key Dem aide: "All he has to do is tell us why he picked him, and he hasn't done that. It makes it hard to fight for Hagel." Perhaps beyond his Vietnam status, there isn't much of a positive case to be made.¶ Some of these anti-Hagel groups are targeting red-state senators whose vote for Hagel will energize evangelicals to oppose them and leave them open to attacks on defense and defense jobs. Others exert pressure on GOP stragglers, to remind them how central support for Israel is to the Republican Party. Still others hope in vain for blue-state Democrats who put principle before fidelity to the White House. It is not a matter of the "vast right-wing conspiracy," for this effort is neither vast nor, in many cases, all that right-wing; nor do these groups sit in a war room together mapping out the next move.¶ Rather, it is a recognition that on the war on terror, support for Israel, and determination to confront the Iranian threat, the GOP can show rare unanimity and make a clear demarcation: This is what we believe; this is what they do. It is very conceivable that the number of "yes" votes for Hagel on the Democratic side is nearly matched by the "no" votes on the Republican side, and vice versa.¶ Part of the energy is no doubt also fueled by the conviction among Republican senators that the pick was a deliberate attempt to provoke a fight, as with so many post-election moves by the president. Sen. Roger Wicker (R-Miss.) spoke for most Republicans when he said in an interview, "I cannot imagine why [President Obama] is going to the trouble of picking Chuck Hagel when the president has received signals for weeks now from both the right and the left, from Democrats and Republicans, saying this is not a good choice. There are so many people Democrat and Republican who could sail through this process and could be confirmed 100-0, like Leon Panetta was." But of course, if you are looking to pick a fight, Hagel would be just the fellow.¶ The White House seemed to panic early, putting out letters and Dem senators to give assurance that Hagel didn't mean or no longer meant or never meant what he had been saying for years. Wicker seized on this, mocking the ridiculous flip-flops, as did Sen. John Cornyn (R-Tex.) Now Hagel has not only a slew of policy problems but a problem with his integrity. The White House-induced confirmation conversion has made things worse, not better for their nominee.¶ Events have also conspired against Hagel. He is reaching the hearing date just as the fight over the sequester reaches a fever pitch. His cheerleading for slashing defense and his flippant comment about Defense Department "bloat" now run headlong into our top military commanders pleading for an alternative to the sequester, which would gut their budgets. Robert Zarate notes that red-state senators will be waking up to the implications of Hagel's nuclear disarmament notions:¶ The sweeping recommendations of Hagel's co-authored Global Zero report were forcefully rejected by the U.S. military's Strategic Command, which oversees the command and control of the nuclear arsenal. As Air Force Gen. C. Robert Kehler, who heads U.S. Strategic Command, told reporters in August 2012, "Regarding the Global Zero report, in my view we have the force size, force structure, and force posture today that we need for our national security needs."¶ As senators and their staff prepare to examine Hagel's nomination to the Pentagon, it is critical that they closely and carefully scrutinize Hagel about the implications of his public proposals to slash the U.S. nuclear arsenal for their states--and, most importantly, for America's national security. Understanding these implications are all the more important, given that President Obama still has not fully lived up to his 2010 promise to Congress to modernize the U.S. nuclear deterrent, the ultimate guarantor of America's national security.¶ Then there is the president's remark that Israel doesn't understand what its interests are, rekindling the conviction that the president harbors animosity (which Hagel will only exacerbate) toward Israel's elected government. If possible Hagel's nomination suggests the acrimonious relations between Israel and the U.S. will only get worse.¶ On Iran, those not known for hyperbole worry that Hagel's nomination, as Robert Satloff writes in The Post, "ironically, has made conflict with Iran more likely by raising doubts about Washington's commitment to the administration's stated policy." Because Hagel has criticized "key elements" of the policy seeking to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear capability, Satloff concludes, the pick "raises doubts among allies and adversaries alike that Obama may not be nearly so committed to using all means necessary to prevent Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon as he pledged during his reelection campaign."¶ Then there are the events in Libya and now Algeria. Plainly, the war against Islamic terrorism is far from over and in fact is spreading through Africa. This calls into question Hagel's enthusiasm for slashing our defense capabilities and his bizarrely indifferent stance toward terrorist groups.¶ He refused repeatedly to brand Yasser Arafat a terrorist, declined to join in a condemnation of the 2000 intifada against Israel, pushed for direct negotiations with Hamas, voted against branding the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps a terrorist group, backed Hezbollah's call for an immediate cease-fire in the Lebanon War and declined sign a letter asking the European Union to declare Hezbollah a terrorist organization. He remained until very recently an apologist for Bashar al-Assad, voting against sanctions and continuing to call for dialogue with the Syrian strongman.¶ Is this really the man to deal with the shadowy al-Qaeda-related terrorist groups, communicate to the Palestinian Authority that it must break its relationship with Hamas and be unequivocal in his denunciation of the Assad bloodbath and possible use of chemical weapons? Even if he is now serious, why should all of these groups take him seriously?¶ In sum, both unexpected pressure from anti-Hagel groups and the passage of events have refocused the concerns somewhat away from purely his anti-Israel views: Does Hagel have the credibility and determination to deal with the array of national security issues (Is his heart really in his newfound positions?) or will, given his about-face on most every issue, instead signal to friends and foes that this is an unserious official, selected by a president unserious and unfocused on the threats America faces? The more we know about Hagel the worse the nomination looks.¶ You can bet the anti-Hagel forces will continue to plug away at his record and continue to dig deeper before the hearing on Jan. 31. By then, his handlers better come up with an argument for his nomination, and he will need something more convincing than "changed my mind!" for the interrogation.

#### Huge defense lobby backlash to Hagel

Ted Carpenter (Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute) January 17, 2013 “Why Hawks Fear Chuck Hagel” http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/01/17/why-hawks-fear-chuck-hagel

President Obama's nomination of former Republican senator Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense has ignited a firestorm of controversy. Most of the heat so far involves Hagel's views on U.S. policy toward Israel. His (relatively mild) apostasy on that issue has produced innuendos of anti-Semitism from Weekly Standard editor William Kristol and other outspoken neoconservatives. That campaign of character assassination is one that would have made even Sen. Joseph McCarthy blush. Prominent political and policy figures familiar with Hagel and his views have ably rebutted such unjust accusations. Most recently, Richard Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, rebuked one of the council's own scholars, Elliott Abrams, for using the anti-Semitic smear against Hagel. On Tuesday, Sen. Charles Schumer voiced his support for Hagel, increasing the probability of his confirmation.¶ The underlying reason for the shrill opposition to his appointment, though, is that Chuck Hagel threatens a large herd of defense and foreign policy sacred cows. He dares to question the conventional wisdom on issues including the efficacy of economic sanctions (against Cuba, Iran, and other countries), the need to approve every item on the Pentagon's wish list, the prudence of reflexive U.S. support for the hard-line policies of Israel's Likud government, and the supposed benefits of nation-building ventures around the world.

#### Poor electoral performance by Netanyahu is fracturing the opposition now

IEDE (Independent European Daily Express) January 24, 2013 “Kerry Gets a Pass as Factions Gear Up for Hagel Fight” http://www.iede.co.uk/news/2013\_737/kerry-gets-pass-factions-gear-hagel-fight

Once Obama formally nominated him, leaders of mainstream Jewish organisations, some of whom had initially joined the neo-conservative campaign, declared their neutrality.¶ Moreover, the poor performance by the right-wing coalition of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who is closely allied to the neo-conservatives opposed to Hagel, in the Israeli elections Monday may also reduce resistance to his nomination among right-wing forces here.

#### Will barely inch by the vote – the plan crushes support

NBC News January 8,, 2013 “First Thoughts: No margin for error in Hagel nomination” http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/01/08/16412788-first-thoughts-no-margin-for-error-in-hagel-nomination?lite

\*\*\* No margin for error in Hagel nomination: Yesterday’s official rollout of Chuck Hagel for defense secretary went about as well as it could have for the Obama White House. Statements of praise for Hagel by folks like Colin Powell and Robert Gates? Check. A statement of past praise from John McCain (who said in 2006 Hagel would make a “great secretary of state”), even though McCain is now taking a skeptical look at the nominee? Check. And getting Chuck Schumer, perhaps the Democratic senator with the most reservations about Hagel, to issue a non-committal statement? Check. So the White House feels pretty good about where things stand, although this won’t be an easy fight. Yet what Team Obama can’t afford is any new negative information, any other shoe to drop. Bottom line: There is no margin for error from this point onward. Hagel’s support, at best, in the Senate is an inch deep and that “inch” would get him the votes he needs. But it wouldn’t take much for the bottom to, well, fall out. This is going to be a precarious few weeks. Very few senators are in D.C. right now, so the interest groups will be front and center. Hagel needs his confirmation hearing sooner, rather than later, but right now, it’s unclear when those hearings will be scheduled. Hagel also needs FACE time with senators, and he won’t have that opportunity for a good week or so.

#### Political landmines like the plan can derail the effort

Josh Levs (writer for CNN politics) January 7, 2013 “Sparks could fly in Hagel confirmation hearings” http://www.cnn.com/2013/01/07/politics/hagel-defense/?hpt=hp\_t1

He would also be one of the few defense secretaries who was wounded at war, President Barack Obama said Monday, announcing his selection to take over for outgoing Defense Secretary Leon Panetta. If Hagel is confirmed, the president said, it will be "historic." But for Hagel, the road from nomination to confirmation is packed with obstacles -- political landmines that could derail the effort.

## A2 hagel not key

#### He determines success of Obama’s defense and foreign policy decisions

Juliette Kayyem (Writer for The Boston Globe) January 19, 2013 “The Hagel policy myth” Lexis

In response, allies of the former Republican senator from Nebraska have now settled on an alternative myth, almost as removed from reality as the ones being promoted by neocons. Their argument, reiterated on the airwaves and in newspapers, is clearly part of the approved talking points by those in the Obama admin-istration who want to placate any substantive concerns by members of both parties: The secretary of defense, Hagel's defenders assert, does not set foreign policy. But have we learned nothing? Of course he does.¶ Any president has a number of tools in the realm of international relations. They include soldiers, diplomats, spies, and lawyers. As Obama faces unknown challenges in the years ahead, the relative capability of each tool - military power, international cooperation, covert operations, or legal proceedings - will drive his foreign policy options as much as the ideological course set by the White House.¶ The decisions ahead for Hagel are all about foreign policy. Military readiness is the animating concern in figuring out how to right-size the military budget and cut expensive weapons contracts. There were discussions last week, during Afghan President Hamid Karzai's visit, about how large a US force should remain in Afghanistan after next year; the answer depends on the ability of the military to stop the Taliban without an in-country presence. The question of what to do about Iran's nuclear program will not be decided in some locked situation room, but by the Pentagon's assessment of the chances that an air strike would significantly delay Iran's nuclear ambitions. The possibility of intervention in Syria will be ruled in or out based on Pentagon predictions about how it would be able to handle the strength of Bashar Assad's military and the disarray among the rebels.¶ As a political strategy to get Hagel confirmed, this "he doesn't mean much in policy terms, so let him through" message might work. But it is a complete fallacy.¶ While the president is the foreign-policy "decider," there's more to the story. First, there are all sorts of decisions that never reach the president himself. To have confidence in that process, presumably, the president appoints people like Hagel who represent his agenda.¶ More significantly, the president's decisions are made from a range of choices that are provided to him by the defense secretary, as well as other advisers. The question for a president isn't just what he might want as a policy matter, but what the agencies can deliver, given their own legal, regulatory, and operational capabilities. A Pentagon chief who promised that war would be "shock and awe" was as much responsible for the decision to invade Iraq as the policy advocates in the White House.¶ The decision to portray the defense secretary as limited in power and scope is a concession to a confirmation process that is all but broken. Not too long ago, it was the Democrats who were scoffing, as John Roberts, in his confirmation hearings, implied that the chief justice doesn't influence the philosophical direction of the Supreme Court. To quell concerns about judicial activism, he maintained that judges are mere "umpires" who don't make the rules, but only "apply them."¶ The idea that high-level officials, like Roberts or Hagel, merely administer rules set forth by others is a fiction. The secretary of defense has an incredibly powerful position. Indeed, it was the triumph of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's ideology over other alternatives that led to the mess Obama inherited four years ago. Hagel, presumably, has a different approach to matching operational capacity with policy decisions. That is why Obama picked him in the first place.

#### Hagel is key to give Obama political cover to implement his military agenda

Bill Keller (writer and former executive editor of the New York Times) January 21, 2013 “Chuck Hagel's War” Lexis

Hagel's wartime service, which earned him awards for valor and two purple hearts, was unquestionably honorable. No doubt he has a deeper awareness than most people that wars are messy, which is not without value. His tour as an infantry squad leader, even more than his Republican Party card, provides useful political cover for a president who favors a less interventionist foreign policy and a smaller defense budget. But the notion that experience of war imparts a special wisdom is one of our enduring fallacies.

## A2 schumer

#### Schumer took some steam out of the opposition but it is still substantial

Jonathan Tobin (writer for Commentary Magazine) January 21, 2013 ‘A Liberal Argument Against Hagel” http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/01/21/a-liberal-argument-against-chuck-hagel-vietnam-syndrome/

Chuck Schumer’s decision to give Chuck Hagel a kosher seal of approval last week seemed to take a lot of the steam out of the growing movement to stop his confirmation as secretary of defense. But, as Alana noted last week, there is still plenty of opposition to President Obama’s choice to head the Pentagon, and yesterday one of the more prominent liberal voices in the media voiced his doubts about the former senator. Former New York Times editor Bill Keller is as reliable a font of liberal conventional wisdom as can be found, but to his credit, he rejects as absurd the argument that Hagel’s military service during Vietnam qualifies him to lead the defense apparatus.

### A2 thump

#### The hearing is next Thursday

Donna Cassata (writer for Capital Hill Blue) January 25, 2013 “Democratic support growing for Hagel nomination” http://www.capitolhillblue.com/node/46165

“When we are faced with unpredictable national security crises, we can’t afford to have a secretary of defense who has unpredictable judgment,” Barrasso wrote.¶ Other lawmakers have said they are waiting for Hagel’s confirmation hearing next Thursday in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

#### Hagel nomination is at the top of the agenda – it will be an uphill battle but they will get 60 votes now

Mark Landler (writer for the New York Times) January 22, 2013 “First Test of New Term Comes in Cabinet Hearings” http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/23/us/politics/first-test-of-new-term-comes-in-cabinet-hearings.html?\_r=0

For President Obama, the first test of his second term will come quickly this week when Chuck Hagel and John Kerry, his nominees for the two biggest national-security posts, take critical steps toward winning Senate confirmation. They are likely to get very different receptions.¶ Senator Kerry, the Massachusetts Democrat whom Mr. Obama selected to succeed Hillary Rodham Clinton as secretary of state, is expected to breeze through his hearing on Thursday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which he still leads.¶ Mr. Hagel, the president’s nominee to succeed Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta, has begun the uphill task of winning over hostile Republicans. The Senate Armed Services Committee has set Jan. 31 for Mr. Hagel’s hearing, but in one of the most important steps of that campaign, he is scheduled to meet on Tuesday afternoon with a vocal skeptic and former close friend, Senator John McCain of Arizona.¶ But while Mr. McCain continues to express misgivings about Mr. Hagel’s positions on the Iraq war and Iran, officials note he has not declared he would vote against Mr. Hagel, a Republican former senator from Nebraska who, like Mr. McCain, is a Vietnam veteran.¶ White House officials say they are increasingly sanguine about Mr. Hagel’s chances to win confirmation. Democratic senators have fallen into line since he won the blessing of Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, the most influential Jewish member of the Senate. The endorsement was viewed as crucial by the White House because it allayed concerns among Democrats about Mr. Hagel’s positions on Israel and his use of the phrase “Jewish lobby” to refer to pro-Israel lobbying groups.¶ Privately, administration officials figure that Mr. Hagel could get as many as 60 votes, a threshold that would allow him to overcome a filibuster. Even with a few votes shy of 60, Congressional aides said, it is not clear Republicans will try to block his confirmation.

#### Removing restrictions on oil drilling is a loss for Obama – hurts his AE platform

Global Insight, 11 (Global Insight – Worlds Market Research, US President Announces Measures to Boost Domestic Oil Production in Response to Mounting Pressure, May 16 2011, Lexis) AC

US president Barack Obama has announced several measures to boost domestic oil production in light of increasing pressure from record gasoline (petrol) prices, which are dampening an already soft economic recovery in the United States. The news comes as a Democratic president who is beginning to campaign for his 2012 re-election has been cornered by fervid Republican demands for increased domestic oil and gas production following the Macondo interruption. As a first, immediate measure, the Obama administration is granting explorers affected by last year's Gulf of Mexico (GOM) moratorium and its implications a one-year lease extension, which will also apply to certain leases in Alaska. Moreover, Obama announced that lease sales for the National Petroleum Reserve (NPR) in Alaska would commence this year. He further aims to speed up environmental assessment procedures for the mid- and South Atlantic as well as open up new areas in the GOM for drilling. Strategic Campaign Move or Republican Victory in Disguise? The news marks a significant diversion from the US administration's long-term goal of reducing oil demand by supporting alternative energy. Rather the newly announced plans will increase supply, catering to Republican demands for more drilling. Indeed, President Obama had announced plans to open up parts of the Atlantic as well as new areas in the GOM and Alaska for oil and gas exploration just three days before the fatal Macondo well blow-out that idled the industry for about nine months. However, this offer was initially intended in exchange for Republican support for comprehensive climate change legislation, which has since failed in Congress. Now, Obama's overture must be seen rather in light of the mounting pressure that high gasoline prices are putting on a fragile US economic recovery and hence on the president's chances of re-election next year. Hence, this is a Republican victory, not a Democratic one. The Macondo incident and the 2008/09 financial crisis have inadvertently helped Republicans in the US not only to push through lease sales in previously inaccessible areas, but also to avoid climate change legislation on the back of public concern over ever-increasing energy costs.

#### Offshore drilling empirically angers environmentalists and the Democratic base

Drennen 10 Kyle is a writer at NewsBuster. “CBS 'Early Show' Hits Obama From Left on Offshore Drilling,” April 1, http://newsbusters.org/?q=blogs/kyle-drennen/2010/04/01/cbs-early-show-hits-obama-left-offshore-drilling

Introducing a segment on Thursday's CBS Early Show about President Obama's decision to open up some new areas to offshore oil drilling, fill-in co-host Jeff Glor warned that some of Obama's "closest allies are especially unhappy." In a report that followed, White House correspondent Bill Plante noted "Environmental groups are disappointed." ¶ However, Plante also touted the idea that the move could help pass unpopular cap and trade legislation, a long-held liberal goal: "Many in Washington see this as a strategy to win Republican support for a climate bill aimed at slowing global warming." He later concluded: "The conventional political wisdom is that this is not the time to have another rancorous nasty debate, like the one over health care, on a climate change bill. But the betting here is that the President's energy policy may make it easier to have that debate." ¶ At the top of the show, co-host Maggie Rodriguez proclaimed: "President Obama's controversial offshore drilling proposal is making big waves. Critics say the risks are obvious, but not the rewards." In a discussion with CBS political analyst John Dickerson after Plante's report, she did little to hide her displeasure with the proposal: "Let's establish right off the bat that this will not---not even remotely free us from our dependence on foreign oil." Dickerson agreed: "You're exactly right." ¶ At the same time, Rodriguez wondered why Republicans were not on board with the decision: "You would think that Republicans, the 'Drill, Baby, Drill' crowd, would be ecstatic over this. This is something they want. Why didn't they seem too overwhelmed?" Dickerson explained: "this is not a drill everywhere plan, it's quite limited, and that's why their support for him has been limited." Rodriguez replied: "Still, it's still a step in their direction, a step to the Right." ¶ Rodriguez then fretted if that supposed "step to the Right" would hurt Obama with the Left: "Is he doing that at the risk of alienating his Democratic base?" Dickerson shared her concern: "You're right, it is a step to the Right and the Democratic base and progressives are angry with him. Some of the Democratic senators were quite fulsome in their denunciation of this plan."

#### Environmental groups oppose any plans for new drilling – they’ll fight in Congress.

Kovner 12 (Guy Kovner – Staff Writer for the Press Democrat, “Reference to oil drilling in Obama's speech worries local environmentalists”, Press Democrat, January 25 2012, <http://www.pressdemocrat.com/article/20120125/ARTICLES/120129672>) AC

Jan. 25--Environmentalists scrambled Wednesday to determine if President Obama's reference to offshore oil drilling in his State of the Union speech posed a new prospect for oil rigs along the North Coast.¶ It didn't, but activists said the reference underscores the need to achieve permanent protection from oil and gas drilling for the rugged coast that supports the region's fishing and tourism industries.¶ "Our coast has become a political football -- and we are in overtime," said Richard Charter of Bodega Bay, a veteran anti-drilling advocate.¶ Obama's statement that he will open "more than 75 percent of our potential offshore oil and gas resources" essentially affirmed the Department of Interior's five-year oil and gas leasing program announced in November.¶ The plan calls for 15 potential lease sales in 2012-17 period, 12 in the Gulf of Mexico and three off the coast of Alaska.¶ The Pacific Coast was not included, the plan said, in deference to a 2006 agreement by the governors of California, Oregon and Washington opposing energy development off their coasts.¶ But after 2017, "all bets are off for California," said Charter, a senior fellow with The Ocean Foundation, a nonprofit environmental group.¶ The oil industry, in an effort to rebound from the gulf oil spill of 2010, has mounted an aggressive promotional campaign featuring posters on Washington, D.C. subway cars and on television, Charter said.¶ A bill by Rep. Lynn Woolsey's, D-Petaluma, to double the size of two marine sanctuaries would permanently ban drilling off the Sonoma coast and up to Point Arena in Mendocino County.¶ "It's my highest priority," said Woolsey, who is retiring this year. "It just has to happen."¶ Woolsey said she was surprised by Obama's comment, and said it amplifies the Interior Department's plan.

#### Keeping democrats in line is key

Scott Wong and Manu Raju (writers for Politico) January 6, 2013 “Chuck Hagel takes fire from Capitol Hill” http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/chuck-hagel-takes-fire-from-capitol-hill-85805.html?hp=t1

Hagel will have an easier time winning confirmation if all Senate Democrats unite to support him. Democrats expanded their majority by two seats in the November election, and hold a 55-to-45 advantage over Republicans. In that scenario, the White House would need just five Republican votes to defeat a GOP filibuster and confirm him. And it would be rare for Republicans to reject the president’s pick for defense secretary — especially a Republican — just a month after voters handed him a second term. Plus, there are a number of Republicans who are quick to give deference to a president to choose members of his own Cabinet.

## A2 ww

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

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

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

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

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

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

## case

### A2 Pre-July 2012 Evidence

#### Old evidence doesn’t apply – new president and agenda after elections will change the game

Joao Peixe 7-15-2012; writer for Oilprice.com Can Enrique Peña Nieto's Energy Reforms Make Mexico a Major Oil Exporter? <http://oilprice.com/Latest-Energy-News/World-News/Can-Enrique-Pea-Nietos-Energy-Reforms-Make-Mexico-a-Major-Oil-Exporter.html>

Mexico’s latest presidential elections have been making headlines around the world due to charges of corruption, yet for all intents and purposes Mexico has elected its next President. We must now look to how Enrique Peña Nieto and his PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional) government can realise the ambitious reforms that he promised. Peña Nieto promised that he would make Mexico more productive and more competitive in order to create faster economic growth and development; throughout his campaign he said that this will start with the nation’s energy sector.

### A2 Reforms Ineffective

#### Reforms allow foreign tech and efficiency that solves rising PEMEX costs

Santamarina-Steta 3-1-2011; (law firm), Legal Update March 1, 2011 A New Legal Framework on Oil Matters? <http://www.theworldlawgroup.com/files/file/docs/Mexico%20Oil.pdf>

The Mexican government pushed for an energy reform, ideally allowing for private participation -both domestic and foreign- in aspects of crude oil extraction and production. On November 28, 2008, seven decrees forming the so called energy reform were published in the Federal Official Gazette, including amendments to existing regulation, a new law for PEMEX and new statute for the use of renewable energy, among others. As a consequence of the above, there is some room for the private sector to participate with PEMEX in its modernization process, as a contractor of the Mexican oil company. Such participation has by no means been as fast and as open as required; new regulations were enacted by the executive branch in an effort to implement the purposes of the reform, affording the possibility for PEMEX to improve and somehow soften its contracting ability with the private sector. This includes the possibility for PEMEX to enter into incentivized contracts with players offering high performance through the use of **high-technology, greater efficiencies and lower costs**, among others.

### A2 Hurts Revenue

#### High prices overcome investor confidence issues

Market News International 5-9-2011; High Oil Prices Lift Pemex Profits, Challenges Remain http://imarketnews.com/node/30466

MEXICO CITY (MNI) - State oil company Petroleos Mexicanos (**Pemex) is reaping huge earnings due to rising world oil prices**, but analysts and company officials agree that steep challenges remain due to the government's tax take, meeting promised production increases, money losing subsidiaries and attracting companies via its new contract model. Mexico's basket of oil sold at $110.86 late last week, up from $80.60 at the end of last year, and $71.45 in early May 2010. But the increase was largely caused by **factors which have little to do with Mexico**. Investors are stampeding into commodities as low interest rates allow them to borrow in developed economies and park the money in appreciating goods. Meanwhile, the Pemex quarterly report released last week showed production, at 2.57 million barrels per day actually fell 1% compared with the first quarter of 2010, although average exports rose 10% to 1.37 million bpd. **Still, with prices on the rise**, the company posted net earnings of 4.2 billion in the first quarter, up from 1 billion during the same period year earlier.

### A2 No Investor Interest

#### Everybody wants in – privatization would invite a wave of investors

Eric Martin and Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, 7-13-2012; reporters for Bloomberg Businessweek in Mexico City, Mexico May Finally Get a Modern Oil Industry http://interamericansecuritywatch.com/mexico-may-finally-get-a-modern-oil-industry/

Incoming President Enrique Peña Nieto has declared that overhauling Pemex will be his “signature issue.” His Institutional Revolutionary Party-led alliance wants outside oil companies to invest in Pemex’s exploration and development activities. “He knows it would be an extraordinary step forward, as extraordinary as was Nafta,” says historian Enrique Krauze, referring to the North American Free Trade Agreement, which was implemented in 1994. Nafta spurred a sixfold increase in Mexican sales to the U.S. The prospect of Peña Nieto allowing outside investment in Mexico’s oil fields has caught the attention of companies such as ExxonMobil (XOM). Mexico needs to open up to “partnerships and collaborations and bringing technology” to bear on its resources, ExxonMobil chief Rex Tillerson said on June 27. “The interest would be huge from the international standpoint, similar to Iraq,” says Jeremy Martin, an oil specialist at the Institute of the Americas in La Jolla, Calif.

### A2 No Two-Thirds Majority

#### Pena Nieto can get the PAN on board – it was their idea in the first place

Eric Martin and Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, 7-13-2012; reporters for Bloomberg Businessweek in Mexico City, Mexico May Finally Get a Modern Oil Industry http://interamericansecuritywatch.com/mexico-may-finally-get-a-modern-oil-industry/

It will not be easy for Peña Nieto to pull off an ambitious reform of Pemex. The alliance led by his party, known in Mexico as the PRI, will have 240 seats in the 500-seat lower house. That leaves the PRI well short of the two-thirds majority needed for constitutional changes to open up the oil industry to private investment. One thing in Peña Nieto’s favor: The National Action Party, or PAN, of outgoing President Felipe Calderón may back his plans to reform Pemex. PAN Senator Rubén Camarillo said on July 3 that his party favors opening the energy industry and will support reforms that benefit Mexico **regardless of who proposes them.**

### A2 Public Opposition

#### Public wants reforms – Brazil made it look easy and they don’t want America getting their oil first

Eric Martin and Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, 7-13-2012; reporters for Bloomberg Businessweek in Mexico City, Mexico May Finally Get a Modern Oil Industry http://interamericansecuritywatch.com/mexico-may-finally-get-a-modern-oil-industry/

Popular opinion is also starting to shift in favor of big changes at Pemex. Brazil’s success in turning around its oil industry and mastering the art of deepwater drilling has Mexicans wondering why Pemex can’t do the same. Then there’s fear of the so-called straw effect (efecto popote), in which some oil deposits that straddle international boundaries in the Gulf might be exploited first from the U.S. side, leaving no crude by the time Pemex manages to obtain the technology and experience it needs to produce from those depths.

### A2 PEMEX/Union Opposition

#### PEMEX already likes the reforms – they want outside investment to prevent unemployment

Eric Martin and Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, 7-13-2012; reporters for Bloomberg Businessweek in Mexico City, Mexico May Finally Get a Modern Oil Industry http://interamericansecuritywatch.com/mexico-may-finally-get-a-modern-oil-industry/

Peña Nieto has said he may present the needed constitutional changes after the new congress begins work on Sept. 1 and before he takes office on Dec. 1. He may have gone some way toward building consensus for the constitutional changes within the PRI party by consulting with Pemex’s powerful oil workers’ union and other labor groups, which have traditionally supported the party. “More investment means more jobs,” Pemex labor union leader and PRI Senator-elect Carlos Romero Deschamps said in a June 19 interview.

### A2 PRI Opposition

#### Pena Nieto can knock heads to get his own party on board

Eric Martin and Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, 7-13-2012; reporters for Bloomberg Businessweek in Mexico City, Mexico May Finally Get a Modern Oil Industry http://interamericansecuritywatch.com/mexico-may-finally-get-a-modern-oil-industry/

The president-to-be also has to woo holdouts in his own party, which created Pemex. “Support from PRI factions is fundamental to pass reform,” says Jorge Chabat, a political science professor at the Center for Economic Research and Teaching in Mexico City. “There may be some PRI members left [who are] against the idea of opening the sector to foreign investment, but at the end of the day they will fall into line.”

### Second Adv

#### Dead zones are inevitable and natural

**Lewis, 07 –** senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute (Marlo, “XII. Algae, Ticks, Mosquitoes, and Germs,” http://cei.org/pdf/ait/chXII.pdf)

Comment: A global warming link to toxic algae blooms is plausible, because algae- forming bacteria only produce blooms in warm water. But global warming is at most an aggravating factor. Mass fish kills associated with red tide algae blooms have been reported in Florida for hundreds of years. Indeed, reports the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, “There is evidence that red tides have always existed in Florida’s waters. Scientists who study red tides globally consider Florida red tides to be unique because they are natural events which existed long before Florida was settled.”1 Similarly, dead zones are naturally occurring phenomena in the Baltic Sea, which has had algae blooms since the last ice age, as shown by sediment cores.2 In both the Baltic Sea and the Florida coast, sea surface temperatures in late summer are naturally high enough to support algae blooms, with or without global warming.

#### No impact or spillover—no broader environmental harm or domino effect. Low resilience claims are false

**Ridder 2008** – PhD, School of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania (Ben, Biodiversity And Conservation, 17.4, “Questioning the ecosystem services argument for biodiversity conservation”) \*ES = environmental services

The low resilience assumption

Advocates of the conservation of biodiversity tend not to acknowledge the distinction between resilient and sensitive ES. This ‘low resilience assumption’ gives rise to, and is reinforced by the almost ubiquitous claim within the conservation literature that ES depend on biodiversity.

An extreme example of this claim is made by the Ehrlichs in Extinction. They state that “all [ecosystem services] will be threatened if the rate of extinctions continues to increase” then observe that attempts to artificially replicate natural processes “are no more than partially successful in most cases. Nature nearly always does it better. When society sacrifices natural services for some other gain… it must pay the costs of substitution” (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1982, pp. 95–96). This assertion—that the only alternative to protecting every species is a world in which all ES have been substituted by artificial alternatives—is an extreme example of the ‘low resilience assumption’. Paul Ehrlich revisits this flawed logic in 1997 i nhis response (with four co-authors) to doubts expressed by Mark Sagoff regarding economic arguments for species conservation (Ehrlich et al. 1997, p. 101).

The claim that ES depend on biodiversity is also notably present in the controversial Issues in Ecology paper on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning (Naeem et al. 1999) that sparked the debate mentioned in the introduction. This appears to reflect a general tendency among authors in this field (e.g., Hector et al. 2001; Lawler et al. 2002; Lyons et al. 2005). Although such authors may not actually articulate the low resilience assumption, presenting such claims in the absence of any clarification indicates its influence.

That the low resilience assumption is largely false is apparent in the number of examples of species extinctions that have not brought about catastrophic ecosystem collapse and decline in ES, and in the generally limited ecosystem influence of species on the cusp of extinction. These issues have been raised by numerous authors, although given the absence of systematic attempts to verify propositions of this sort, the evidence assembled is usually anecdotal and we are forced to trust that an unbiased account of the situation has been presented. Fortunately a number of highly respected people have discussed this topic, not least being the prominent conservation biologist David Ehrenfeld. In 1978 he described the ‘conservation dilemma’, which “arises on the increasingly frequent occasions when we encounter a threatened part of Nature but can find no rational reason for keeping it” (Ehrenfeld 1981, p. 177). He continued with the following observation:

Have there been permanent and significant ‘resource’ effects of the extinction, in the wild, of John Bartram’s great discovery, the beautiful tree Franklinia alatamaha, which had almost vanished from the earth when Bartram first set eyes upon it? Or a thousand species of tiny beetles that we never knew existed before or after their probable extermination? Can we even be certain than the eastern forests of the United States suffer the loss of their passenger pigeons and chestnuts in some tangible way that affects their vitality or permanence, their value to us? (p. 192)

Later, at the first conference on biodiversity, Ehrenfeld (1988) reflected that most species “do not seem to have any conventional value at all” and that the rarest species are “the ones least likely to be missed… by no stretch of the imagination can we make them out to be vital cogs in the ecological machine” (p. 215). The appearance of comments within the environmental literature that are consistent with Ehrenfeld’s—and from authors whose academic standing is also worthy of respect—is uncommon but not unheard of (e.g., Tudge 1989; Ghilarov 1996; Sagoff 1997; Slobodkin 2001; Western 2001).

The low resilience assumption is also undermined by the overwhelming tendency for the protection of specific endangered species to be justified by moral or aesthetic arguments, or a basic appeal to the necessity of conserving biodiversity, rather than by emphasising the actual ES these species provide or might be able to provide humanity. Often the only services that can be promoted in this regard relate to the ‘scientific’ or ‘cultural’ value of conserving a particular species, and the tourism revenue that might be associated with its continued existence. The preservation of such services is of an entirely different order compared with the collapse of human civilization predicted by the more pessimistic environmental authors.

The popularity of the low resilience assumption is in part explained by the increased rhetorical force of arguments that highlight connections between the conservation of biodiversity, human survival and economic profit. However, it needs to be acknowledged by those who employ this approach that a number of negative implications are associated with any use of economic arguments to justify the conservation of biodiversity.