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Trade war turns their impacts – no disincentive for countries to go to war, which means conflicts escalate faster – their evidence

**GOP victory causes Syrian invasion and destabilizes Afghanistan, Pakistan and the Middle East**

**NPR 8/31**

("The Nation: Model Behavior? Libyan Ideas in Syria", www.npr.org/2011/08/31/140084052/the-nation-model-behavior-libyan-ideas-in-syria//ghs-avi)

President Obama is not President Bush, and I don't think that for a moment that Obama is seeking excuses to bomb and invade Middle East countries, as Bush was. Not do I think that Obama, preoccupied with the dismal economic mess that threatens to elect Rick Perry, wants to make foreign policy adventures his chief concern, although the White House might welcome a war or two to take Americans' minds off unemployment and stagnation. But there's a kind of inexorability to these things. Just as Obama intervened reluctantly in Libya, only after he came under intense pressure from neoconservatives and humanitarian interventionists, it's all too possible that an intensified crisis in Syria, and even Iran, could lead Obama to seek NATO support for things like no-fly zones, blockades of shipping, and even air strikes. What if, say, one of Syria's major cities, say, Hama, was taken over by rebels, à la Benghazi? Or what if one of Iran's cities, say, Shiraz, was seized by anti-regime forces there? It's fair to say that Syria and Iran are far more difficult cases than Libya, a empty desert nation whose civil conflict was likely not to spread. By contrast, war in Syria could affect Iraq, Turkey, Lebanon, Israel and Jordan, and war in Iran could have incalculable consequences from Pakistan and Afghanistan to the Persian Gulf. Still, you can already imagine the drumbeat from neocons and liberal interventionists that the United States cannot allow Syrians, or Iranians, to be massacred.

Drawn out Syrian civil war escalates.

Alhomayed 1/19/2012 Tariq Alhomayed is the Editor-in-Chief of Asharq Al-Awsat 01/19/2012 (The cost of the fall of al-Assad http://www.asharq-e.com/news.asp?section=2&id=28152)

The press report that was published by our newspaper yesterday, in cooperation with the British newspaper “The Guardian”, addressed this question, conveying a number of viewpoints attributed to different personalities inside Syria, including Alawites, reflecting the almost unanimous conviction that it will be difficult for the al-Assad regime to continue, but everyone fears the price of its downfall. This is compounded by the al-Assad regime’s current state of weakness, with the Muslim Brotherhood recently rejecting an Iranian offer to grant the Brotherhood representation in government on the condition that al-Assad remains in power! Why would al-Assad do that if he was in a position of strength, especially as he described the Muslim Brotherhood in his latest speech as the “Devil’s Brotherhood”? Hence, concerns over the potential costs of the fall of al-Assad must be reflected at the regional and international levels. Delaying the fall of al-Assad will entail subsequent security and economic complications, not only for Syria, but for the region as a whole. Of course, in the event of al-Assad remaining in power, the price will also be high for the Syrians and the region, specifically Turkey, as at this point al-Assad would be far more dangerous than Saddam Hussein following the liberation of Kuwait. Therefore, simply expecting, or waiting for the al-Assad regime to collapse on its own, without any significant effort to accelerate this process from our regional states and the international community, means that the interests and stability of the region and world at large is being put at risk. This is not to mention the dangers that threaten Syria itself, and also the complications of the post al-Assad phase. Waiting for the “expected” moment of collapse is dangerous, and costly, for everyone. The true cost of delaying the fall of al-Assad is that the Syrian crisis will deepen, and a civil war will be fuelled. As one Western diplomat said in “The Guardian”: “if you shoot at people for months, you shouldn't be surprised when they start shooting back”, and this is what is happening in Syria today. Prolonging the life of the al-Assad regime also means further complicating the solutions for the post al-Assad phase, and it is inevitable that those who will pay the highest price will be the Turks, not the Iraqis. The Baghdad regime, for example, has concerns regarding the Syrian revolution because it could awaken the Sunni giant, particularly as the Iraqi regime is a sectarian system par excellence. Whilst the Turks are concerned about the future of Syria following the revolution, out of fear for their commercial interests and security. Ankara is not a sectarian regime, it is a democracy, and the survival of the ruling elite there depends on providing economic accomplishments to the Turkish people, rather than sectarian promises cloaked in deceptive slogans such as “resistance” and so on, along the lines of what is repeated by the al-Assad regime and Iran’s allies in the region. Hence, it is dangerous to merely wait for the fall of the al-Assad regime without doing anything to accelerate this process. This is what those concerned with the stability of our region must be aware of, whether we are talking about the Saudis or the Turks, or even the Europeans and the Americans

Israel alone has enough to cause extinction.

Casey ’6 — Mingus Casey, Scoop News, 10-9-6 “On the History of Nuclear Arms, the Arms trade, and one very small very vulnerable very beautiful planet” online

The ecological effects of nuclear testing are massive, with the vast majority of nuclear armed states (USA, Russia, England, France, China, Israel) possessing more than enough nuclear weapons to send the world into a fatal nuclear winter, the only countries in the world with out sufficient nuclear weapons to do so at this point in time are North Korea (1-15), Pakistan (40-50) and India (40-50). If only two hundred nuclear weapons are used (a successful first strike scenario against a first world nation), that is sufficient to release enough dust and radioactive fallout into the atmosphere to reduce the worlds temperature by five to twenty degrees centigrade. Two hundred nukes is unrealistically low, a lot more would be used. If this happens, humanity and the majority of vegetable animal and sea life will probably die out.

## Uq

#### --our evidence cites the Purple Poll and this only includes likely voters in the closest states

**Usher, September, 12** – PhD, director of Purple Insights, a polling firm (Doug, September 2012 edition Purple Poll, <http://www.purplestrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/PurplePoll-9.21.12.pdf?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=PurplePoll+Sept+2012-+from+Doug&utm_content=PurplePoll+Sept+2012-+from+Doug+CID_3d908eaa034685f378af8d464ed685de&utm_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm_term=For%20much%20more%20read%20the%20full%20poll%20and%20our%20analysis%20here>)

In 2012, a dozen states will decide whether President Obama is elected to a second term. The PurplePoll focuses exclusively on the Purple Electorate - likely voters only in these swing states. Updated regularly throughout the 2012 election cycle, the PurplePoll offers a unique lens through which you can gather original insight into this critical election.

#### It’s not over – Romney can still recover

**Thrush and Tau, 9/18/12 -** covers the White House for Politico.(Glenn and Byron, “Romney RIP — not so fast” Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/81369.html?hp=t1_3>)

Caution is not the message emanating from the Washington echo chamber or from giddy Democrats — and depressed Republicans — who are drafting Romney’s political obituary with nearly 50 news cycles before Election Day.

But Romney, however humbled, has nearly 50 more chances to change the narrative. Despite his stunning missteps, his failure to articulate an attractive rationale for his candidacy, a growing GOP pessimism and tales of corrosive internal dissent, he remains within easy striking distance of Obama in most polls and is showing no signs of imminent collapse.

His support isn’t likely to dip much below 45 percent to 47 percent largely because nine in 10 Republicans are backing him.

“President Obama may make major strategic decisions in response to two tough days in the fishbowl — but that’s not how Crossroads rolls,” said Jonathan Collegio, spokesman for the Rove-linked groups American Crossroads and Crossroads GPS. “Every state where Romney needs to win is tight — we know this; our donors know this; and we’re continuing with our plan to end this train wreck of a presidency that has been Obama’s last four years.”

There aren’t a lot of raging optimists in Obama’s inner circle anyway, and now, they are being very careful, in private, to moderate their glee with a realism.

“Democrats should just remember Florida 2000 before they get cocky,” veteran Democratic strategist Karen Finney said. “It’s the stuff you don’t see that goes under the radar — the robocalls … flyers and mailings. … That’s the kind of stuff you can’t detect. Karl Rove knows how to win,” she said.

#### It will be close and Romney can recover if Obama’s approval rating slips

**Usher, September, 12** – PhD, director of Purple Insights, a polling firm (Doug, September 2012 edition Purple Poll, <http://www.purplestrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/PurplePoll-9.21.12.pdf?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=PurplePoll+Sept+2012-+from+Doug&utm_content=PurplePoll+Sept+2012-+from+Doug+CID_3d908eaa034685f378af8d464ed685de&utm_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm_term=For%20much%20more%20read%20the%20full%20poll%20and%20our%20analysis%20here>)

Six weeks is a lifetime in politics, particularly in an election as closely monitored as this year’s presidential race. While Obama has gained momentum, there is a small but significant window of opportunity for Romney. First, the President’s approval rating and vote level indicate that voters remain hesitant

to re-elect him. Second, the Romney campaign has had a string of difficult events (some self-inflicted), and as the campaign rights its ship the polls may tighten again. Finally, the upcoming debates provide a level of exposure (and risk) for both candidates. A strong showing by Governor Romney could turn the race around once more.

#### Minds aren’t made up – it can still change

**Trende, 9/20**/12 – Senior Elections Analyst for RealClearPolitics (Sean, “State of the Race, Part 2: Why Romney Wins”, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/20/state_of_the_race_part_2_why_romney_wins_115513.html>)

8) People haven’t made up their minds. Finally, it is important to remember that all the claims about people’s minds being set in stone don’t jibe with what respondents tell pollsters. Table 3 shows when voters have made up their minds over the past four elections. Though the percentage of late-undecideds is diminishing, unless there is a major drop-off this cycle, we can safely say that the decisions of a fairly wide swath of the electorate are not yet firm.

So if the election were held today, President Obama would probably win comfortably. But the election isn’t today. In the next seven weeks, the economy, the president’s tepid job approval ratings, and Romney’s spending campaign will continue to exert gravitational forces on Obama’s re-election efforts, along with the typical gravitational forces that drag down a post-convention bounce. Can these forces move things three points in seven weeks? It’s not a particularly tall order.

#### Obama’s lead is narrowing

**Thrush and Tau, 9/18/12 -** covers the White House for Politico.(Glenn and Byron, “Romney RIP — not so fast” Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/81369.html?hp=t1_3>)

And that support among white men is one key aspect of the tape that’s been overlooked: A lot of voters, especially white, working-class men, basically agree with Romney’s portrait of a country overrun by tax deadbeats and spongers.

As of Tuesday morning, Obama’s post-convention bump was starting to fade, and RealClearPolitics’s summary of polls had him up, on average, by only three points nationally. Its average of state-by-state polls showed growing but still modest Obama leads in the critical battlegrounds — up three in Nevada, four in Ohio, ahead by barely a point each in Florida and Virginia, although a Washington Post/NBC poll released Tuesday showed Obama with a widening lead of eight points in Virginia.

## 1nr at: plan popular

#### Obama is promoting an “all of the above” energy strategy – this allows him to distance himself from prior renewables scandals. The plan makes Obama a target and will cost him the election

**Farnam, 12** (T.W., Washington Post, 6/27, “Energy ads flood TV in swing states,”

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/energy-ads/2012/06/27/gJQAD5MR7V_story.html>

Energy issues don’t spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit — not to mention jobs and the economy.

And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads on energy policy. Particularly in presidential swing states, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama for his support of green energy. The Cleveland area alone has heard $2.7 million in energy-related ads.

The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they’re seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry.

Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president’s record and tying Republican candidate Mitt Romney to “Big Oil.”

Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag.

In an election focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this attention to energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general election got underway.

When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy.

Still, so much spending focused on a topic low on the public agenda should not be a surprise, given the interest of the ad sponsors, said Bob Biersack, a senior fellow at the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics.

“It’s always been true that people’s financial involvement in politics tends to reinforce their self-interest,” he said.

The policy debate coincides with a flurry of criticism of the Obama administration’s loan guarantee for Solyndra, a bankrupt solar-power company that defaulted on more than $500 million. Among the company’s investors was the family foundation of a major donor to Obama.

“Half a billion in taxpayer money gone, and Obama said this was a model of growth,” says an ad from the conservative group Americans for Prosperity. “Tell President Obama that workers aren’t pawns in your political games.”

Obama spokesman Ben LaBolt said the campaign welcomed the fight over the administration’s energy policies, saying the president can win on the merits.

“This debate has offered us the chance to highlight the success of the president’s all-of-the-above energy strategy – domestic oil production at a 12-year high and our dependence on foreign oil at a 16-year low, domestic natural gas production at an all-time high and doubling our renewable energy production,” LaBolt said.

Republicans are also attacking Obama for rejecting permits for the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, which would carry oil from tar sands in Canada to refineries on the Gulf Coast. Romney opened the general election with an ad prominently featuring the Keystone issue, with the candidate saying he would reverse Obama and approve the pipeline on his first day in office.

Americans for Prosperity, one of the major funders of the ads, has sponsored five television spots against Obama, two of them focused on Solyndra and another critical of government spending on clean energy.

The organization, which has promoted tea party candidates, has devoted more than 90 percent of its ad spending to energy-related commercials, according to Kantar.

The Obama campaign and other Democrats have been critical of the group, saying, among other things, that its billionaire backers, brothers Charles and David Koch, are using it to promote the interests of the chemical conglomerate they own. David Koch is a founder and chairman of the organization. A Koch spokesman declined to comment.

Obama answered Americans for Prosperity’s message in his first ad of the campaign.

“Secretive oil billionaires attacking president Obama with ads fact checkers say are not tethered to the facts,” a narrator says in the spot.

Tim Phillips, president of Americans for Prosperity, said the group focused on Solyndra because the firm’s federal loan guarantee exemplifies cronyism and big government, with bureaucrats choosing economic winners and losers in the way they dole out public money.

“To us, Solyndra encapsulates everything that’s wrong with the economic policies of President Obama,” Phillips said. “It’s not just the energy, although the energy is important.”

The group also ran millions of dollars of advertising in 2009 and 2010 opposing the president’s health-care plan, Phillips said.

All of these messages could very well do what their funders have in mind and shape public opinion, tarring renewable energy as a government boondoggle, said Kathleen Hall Jamieson, director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

“Ads can create an agenda-setting effect and frame an issue,” she said. “If renewable energy comes to be seen as Solyndra, that’s a problem for that sector, not simply for future government investment in that sector.”

#### Renewables are massively unpopular –Budgetary concerns

**Von Schirach, 12 -** International Economic Development Consultant

(Paolo, International Affairs Commentator and Writer, May 11, “[Renewable Energy In The US – Subsidies Politically Unpopular – Natural Gas A Much Cheaper Alternative – USG Should Focus On R&D](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/),”

<http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/>, d/a 7-20-12

American enthusiasm for renewable energy, not too deep [to begin](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/)with, has gone away. In part this has to do with loss of interest in “climate change” and its dire consequences. Unfortunately, climate change has been and is mostly an issue of political belief, rather than upholding science. And as the intensity of the political fervor somehow waned, in large part replaced by more immediate economic fears, so did political support for all the renewable energy technologies that were supposed to create, relatively quickly it was thought, workable alternatives to carbon based energy. An additional reason for waning support is that keeping renewable energy alive means also subsidizing it for a few more years. And this is less and less politically palatable at a time of budgetary constraints at every level. Paying more for electricity simply because this kind is clean looks like an unaffordable luxury, whatever the consequences of burning more (cheaper) fossil fuels may be.

# At: Clinton

#### Energy policy will determine the election

**Gardett, 8/23/12** (Peter, “As Voters Focus on Energy, API Chief Begs: 'Turn Us Loose',” <http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/23/as-voters-focus-on-energy-api-chief-begs-turn-us-loose/>)

The US oil and natural gas business has been an unusual bright spot for the American economy over the past four years, and that success has helped highlight energy issues as a major factor in the 2012 election cycle.

Energy has not traditionally been a focus of electoral politics beyond prices at the gasoline pump, but this year the broader focus on the economy and the government's role in directing it have brought to light the successes, the potential and the risks of energy development in the US.

"We're only in the early stages of a very robust debate on energy issues," American Petroleum Institute (API) CEO Jack Gerard told AOL Energy in a recent interview.

API has played its part in surfacing energy and the sector's role as an economic engine in a large awareness building campaign called Vote4Energy, revealed in Washington, DC to great fanfare at the beginning of this year. Unlike many industry group-led campaigns, API has implemented a long-term and fully committed strategy across the year as part of the campaign, and will be present at the upcoming Presidential nominating conventions planned for Tampa, Florida and Charlotte, North Carolina over the coming weeks.

The campaign will intensify over the remaining months of 2012 with particularly robust outreach planned for voters in five key states, including Virgina, Ohio, Florida, Colorado and North Carolina.

"We've broken through to a new means of engaging with the public," Gerard said, adding that he thinks the Vote4Energy campaign has been "wildly successful" so far. A recent poll conducted by API demonstrates what it says is broad-based and bipartisan support for the economic issues that in turn underpin the group's pro-energy development agenda.

#### Energy will be the deciding factor in the election

**Belogolova 12 –** reports on energy and environment policy for National Journal and manages the bi-monthly Energy and Environment Insiders Poll, holds bachelor’s degrees in Journalism and European Studies from Boston University. She studied abroad at Oxford University, was one of 10 American journalism students selected for a press trip to Jordan. (Olga, May 17th, “Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama” http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517) Jacome

“It may be harder now for Republicans to land punches related to oil and gas, because the administration has called off the dogs, but many voters still think the president would like to thwart production and consumption of fossil fuels,” said one Insider. “Every time the president singles out the oil and gas industry for unfavorable tax treatment, voters are reminded of the White House's true goals."

Insiders said that energy issues will continue to be a sticking point in this election — to the very end.

“Energy is one of the president's biggest vulnerabilities. From Solyndra to 'cap and tax,' the administration has pursued one energy flop after another. The president's campaign team must agree, since their first ad was a defensive spot on their energy record, and the follow-up was a campaign swing through the country's energy heartland,” said another Insider. “Republicans are going to continue to pound away on the president's energy record to make sure he doesn't get away with trying to mask it.”

#### Energy policy will determine the election

**Handley, 8/21/12 -** business reporter for U.S. News & World Report (Meg, “3 Energy Issues No One's Talking About,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/08/21/3-energy-issues-no-ones-talking-about>)

If recent campaign events by both the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates are any indication, energy policy is going to be a major political chip in the race for the White House.

President Obama and Mitt Romney have diametrically opposed views on energy security, efficiency, and innovation. That brings seemingly minute issues such as a wind tax energy credit (crucial to Iowans, coincidentally) to the forefront as well as more philosophical issues such as whether the government should subsidize companies researching and producing renewable energy sources.

# Internal link

#### Only 9 states matter

**Giroux, 9/12**/12 – Bloomberg (Greg, “Republicans End Michigan Ads While Pushing Wisconsin Onto Map,” <http://www.sfgate.com/business/bloomberg/article/Republicans-End-Michigan-Ads-While-Pushing-3859230.php>)

The American presidential campaign has become a contest that will be decided in as few as nine states, creating a narrower and less-forgiving path for Republican Mitt Romney to secure the 270 Electoral College votes he needs to oust incumbent President Barack Obama.

The former Massachusetts governor and his allies have shifted television advertising dollars to reflect the state of play following the two parties’ nominating conventions.

“We all know the presidential campaign is not a national election; it’s an election in individual states,” said Alex Vogel, a Republican consultant who isn’t working with Romney. “Around this time, the focus shifts from how much money the campaigns are raising to where they are spending and not spending.”

Romney’s campaign spent $4.2 million this week on its first advertising blitz after the Republican convention in Tampa, Florida and the Democrats’ nominating session in Charlotte, North Carolina, according to a media buyer who tracks such purchases. His 15 different commercials, which carry messages tailored to each region, are airing in Florida, Ohio, North Carolina, New Hampshire, Virginia, Nevada, Iowa and Colorado. This week, he reserved time for a 16th ad in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, according to Federal Communication Commission records.

Outside groups helping Romney, including Americans for Prosperity and American Crossroads, also have trained their advertising firepower on those same states, according to a review of data from New York-based Kantar Media’s CMAG, which tracks advertising.

Electoral Math

Obama and supportive Democrats have scaled back resources in states where Romney and his backers aren’t advertising, suggesting both sides have settled on the same nine states, which have a combined 110 electoral votes.

In this environment, Obama could secure re-election just by winning Florida and one of the remaining eight battleground states. That’s because the president is favored to win the 207 electoral votes from states that he carried four years ago by at least 15 percentage points. Michigan is among those. He also has the edge in Minnesota, which has 10 votes, and Pennsylvania, which has 20. That would bring Obama to 237 electoral votes.

#### Only 9 states matter

**Mahtesian, 9/10/12 –** Politico’s National Politics editor (Charles, Politico, “9 states where the race will be won,”

http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/80971.html?hp=t1)

The presidential race has narrowed to a core of nine states, a collection of margin-of-error battlegrounds spread across nearly every region.

From New Hampshire in the Northeast to Nevada in the Rocky Mountain West, there is little disagreement between the two campaigns about the places where the election will be won and lost. Aside from those two swing states, there are seven others: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin.

Some of them are familiar presidential battlegrounds, accustomed to playing a pivotal role every four years. Others are relative newcomers to the swing state roster. Every one of them was carried by President Barack Obama in 2008.

# At: lashout

**No lashout**

**Jenkins-Smith 04** – professor of government at Texas A&M (Hank, “U.S. Public Response to Terrorism: Fault Lines or Bedrock,” http://www.spp.gatech.edu/current-students/exams/Fall-2004\_reviewmanuscript.pdf)

Our final contrasting set of expectations relate to the degree to which the public will support or demand retribution against terrorists and supporting states. Here our data show that support for using conventional U.S. military force to retaliate against terrorists initially averaged above midscale, but did not reach a high level of emotional demand for military action. Initial support declined significantly across all demographic and belief categories by the time of our survey in 2002. Furthermore, panelists both in 2001 and 2002 preferred that high levels of certainty about culpability (above 8.5 on a scale from zero to ten) be established before taking military action. Again, we find the weight of evidence supporting revisionist expectations of public opinion.

Overall, these results are inconsistent with the contention that highly charged events will result in volatile and unstructured responses among mass publics that prove problematic for policy processes. The initial response to the terrorist strikes, in the immediate aftermath of the event, demonstrated a broad and consistent shift in public assessments toward a greater perceived threat from terrorism, and greater willingness to support policies to reduce that threat. But even in the highly charged context of such a serious attack on the American homeland, the overall public response was quite measured. On average, the public showed very little propensity to undermine speech protections, and initial willing-ness to engage in military retaliation moderated significantly over the following year.

# 1nr attack won’t happen

**The high difficulty means they won’t try**

**Harper, 09** – Director of Information Policy Studies, Cato Institute (Jim, Testimony before the Subcommittee on Technology & Innovation Committee on Science and Technology United States House of Representatives “Assessing Cybersecurity Activities at NIST and DHS,” 6/25, http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-jh-20090625.html)

Take cyberterrorism. With communications networks, computing infrastructure, and data stores under regular attack from a variety of quarters—and regularly strengthening to meet them—it is highly unlikely that terrorists can pull off a cybersecurity event disruptive enough to instill widespread fear of further disruption. Fear is a necessary element for terrorism to work its will, of course. The impotence of computer problems to instill fear renders "cyberterrorism" an unlikely threat. This is not to deny the importance of preventing the failure of infrastructure, of course.

**This is not “War Games” ---- their scenario is utterly impossible**

**Green ‘2** (Joshua, Editor, Washington Monthly, “The Myth of Cyberterrorism”, November, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0211.green.html>)

Air gapping

Security status quo solves

**Literally, their impact is threat construction**

**Conway, 05** – School of International Relations, University of St. Andrews (Maura, “The Media and Cyberterrorism: a Study in The Construction of ‘Reality’” Paper presented at the First International Conference on the Information Revolutionand the Changing Face of International Relations and Security

What this paper has sought to show is how the cyberterror threat has been amplified in the US media. It is generally difficult to unravel how news frames shape the social construction of reality from the ‘actual’ reality of events. This is especially true in cases where the ‘events’ do not yet have a reality, as is the case with cyberterrorism, and presents particular difficulties if a “consensual interpretation” (Kern, Just, Norris 2003, 281) predominates so that a one-sided frame becomes uncritically taken for granted by politicians, journalists, and the public. ‘Terrorism’ is generally conceived as physical acts of violence intended to produce fear, and conjures up images of exploding bombs and mutilated bodies. The cyberterror threat image builds upon this aspect of terrorism by seeking to convince the public that cyberterrorism will ultimately result in mass casualties. There is another dimension to terrorism, however: the information dimension. And terrorists exploit it every bit as much as the physical. Death and destruction is not terrorists’ ultimate goal; it is power and influence. Terrorists seek political and social change, and their objective is to influence populations in ways that support that change. To accomplish this, they engage not just in physical, but also information operations, and the integration of these.

# 1nr grid resilient

**Their impact is overstated—resilience and adaptation check**

**Farrell et al, 02 -** research engineer in the Department of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon University and the executive director of the Carnegie Mellon Electricity Industry Center (Alexander, “Bolstering the Security of the Electric Power System,” Issues in Science and Technology, Spring, http://www.issues.org/18.3/farrell.html)

Turning out the lights

Many terrorism scenarios involve disruption of electric service, or "turning out the lights." Whether this would allow terrorists to create widespread fear and panic is open to question. In the United States, households lose power for an average of 90 minutes per year. For the most part, individuals and society cope with these outages well, and power companies respond rapidly to restore service. Facilities that have special needs for reliability, such as hospitals and airports, typically have backup generators.

The local distribution system is the source of most outages; these affect relatively small numbers of people. The bulk power (generation and transmission) system causes only a few outages each year. In its most recent report on failures in this part of the electric power system, the North American Electricity Reliability Council (NERC) identified 58 "interruptions, unusual occurrences, demand and voltage reductions, and public appeals" in 2000. Of these events, almost half (26) were due to weather, mostly thunderstorms. Operator or maintenance errors accounted for 12 events, another 12 were due to faulty equipment, and 2 (including the largest single event) were due to forest fires. Six outages occurred simply due to failure to have sufficient power to meet demand. Not all of these 58 events caused the lights to go out, but when they did, many customers were affected. Even so, recovery was typically swift. The largest single outage in 2000 affected more than 660,000 customers in New Mexico but lasted for less than four hours.

Natural challenges of even larger scale have been met. For example, in January 1998 an ice storm struck Southern Canada and New York State, felling 1,000 transmission towers and 30,000 distribution poles while sending thousands of tree branches into power lines. This event left 1.6 million people without power, some for more than a month. Almost a quarter-million people were forced to leave their homes. Insurance claims reached about $1 billion (Canadian). This event was disruptive and costly, but it did not create terror or significant loss of life.

**attacks won’t have a major impact on electricity reliability–redundant transmission and generation reserves**

**Michaels, 8** – Adjunct Scholar at CATO and Research Fellow at the Independent Institute (Robert J., Electricity Journal, “A National Renewable Portfolio Standard: Politically Correct, Economically Suspect,” April 2008, vol. 21, no. 3, Lexis-Nexis Academic)

National security and "energy independence." There are few if any important relationships between renewables and energy security for the nation. Security centers on oil, but only 2 percent of the nation's power comes from it and some oil-fired plants can also burn gas. Interruptions of conventional fuel supplies are rare and usually local, but intermittent renewables have their own reliability risks. Some advocates see a national RPS as deterring terrorist attacks on large power plants, but there are surely cheaper ways to achieve this end.59 Security is better addressed directly by facility owners and government formulating a national policy on infrastructure. Electricity requires redundant transmission and generation reserves to maintain reliability, whether outages are caused by lightning or bombs. The destruction of an isolated wind farm achieves less than that of a large generator, but in most scenarios the loss of either will have little effect on reliability.

# 1nr bureaucratic hurdles

**Local opposition and permit hurdles prevent upgrades**

**Wald, 9** (Matthew, “Hurdles (Not Financial Ones) Await Electric Grid Update” New York Times, lexis)

But it will take a lot more than money to transform the grid from a form that served well in the last century, when electricity was produced mostly near the point of consumption, and when the imperative was meeting demand, no matter how high it grew.

Opposition to power lines from landowners and neighbors, local officials or environmental groups, especially in rural areas, makes expansion difficult -- even when the money for it is available. And some experts argue that in the absence of a broader national effort to encourage cleaner fuels, even the smartest grid will do little to reduce consumption of fuels that contribute to climate change.

In fact, energy experts say that simply building a better grid is not enough, because that would make the cheap electricity that comes from burning coal available in more parts of the country. That could squeeze out generators that are more expensive but cleaner, like those running on natural gas. The solution is to put a price on emissions from dirtier fuels and incorporate that into the price of electricity, or find some other way to limit power generation from coal, these experts say.

The stimulus bill passed by the House includes $6.5 billion in credit to federal agencies for building power lines, presumably in remote areas where renewable energy sources are best placed, and $2 billion in loan guarantees to companies for power lines and renewable energy projects. The bill also includes $4.4 billion for the installation of smart meters -- which, administration officials say, in combination with other investments in a smart grid, would cut energy use by 2 percent to 4 percent -- and $100 million to train workers to maintain the grid.

About 527,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines stretch across the United States, most installed many decades ago.

Everyone agrees that more lines are needed. But some industry experts argue that the problem of making the grid greener goes well beyond upgrading and expanding the existing power lines. The grid, they say, was set up primarily to draw energy from nearby plants and to provide a steady flow of electricity to customers. It was not intended to incorporate power from remote sources like solar panels and windmills, whose output fluctuates with weather conditions -- variability that demands a far more flexible operation.

The experts say that the grid must therefore be designed to moderate demand at times when there is less wind or sun available -- for example, by allowing businesses or residential customers to volunteer to let the local utility turn down air-conditioners in office buildings or houses, when hourly prices rise.

An even more significant problem is that utilities increasingly face opposition to expansion and must fight for years for permits.

Jose M. Delgado, president and chief executive of the American Transmission Company, which operates in four Midwestern states, said his firm's last major project, a line of about 220 miles from Duluth, Minn., to Wausau, Wis., took two years to build but eight years before that to win the permits. The federal Interior Department took a year to approve the line crossing a wild river and required a $5 million contribution to a national park, but the one-year delay raised costs by an additional $12 million, for a total of $440 million, Mr. Delgado said.

Loan guarantees will not help this problem, he said. ''We have had wonderful access to the private bond market,'' he added.

The International Transmission Company, a Michigan company, is trying to build a 26-mile line that, had it been in place, would have prevented the great Eastern blackout of 2003, said Joseph L. Welch, president and chief executive. The State of Michigan has approved it, but a homeowner is challenging it in court, Mr. Welch said.

''We burn up three years on a line that will take two months to build,'' he said.

But, he added, ''We absolutely have no problem -- underscore, no problem -- financing our transmission grid.''

Other companies said the same, although a few said the loan guarantees in the House bill would be helpful.

As power lines lengthen, the number of approvals they require increases, the complications of dividing the costs become greater and the difference among national interests and local interests becomes starker, said Dan W. Reicher, a former assistant secretary of energy who was a member of President Obama's transition team.

**Transmission upgrades are too expensive**

**Katsua, 09 –** Chief Strategist, Casey Research Energy Team(Marin, “How Obama Will Influence Energy Stocks”, 2/2, Space Daily, lexis)

Offshore projects raise another hurdle: transmission lines. For fun, let's run some numbers for President Obama.

For wind power to supply 20% of America's power by 2030, the country would need to build an estimated 12,000 miles of 765 kV transmission lines.

At a cost to generate power of $0US.06 - about the same as geothermal - the transmission lines would cost $2.6 million per mile (in today's money), or $31 billion total. That figure would account for 21% of the total budget for clean energy alternatives, or to put it another way, two years' funding for NASA.

**It will cost at least a 100 billion and lawsuits block it**

**Smith, 09** (Rebecca, Wall Street Journal, “New Grid for Renewable Energy Could Be Costly,”

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123414242155761829.html

A substantial increase in the amount of electricity produced from renewable energy would require building a transmission system that would carry a price tag of up to $100 billion, according to a new study.

The new system would be needed because the existing eastern grid couldn't handle the volume of power coming from the wind-producing states. In addition, the new grid would need to be able to handle the fluctuating nature of wind power, which can surge at some moments and drop sharply at others.

There is strong political and public support for increasing production of renewable energy, and Congress is considering enacting a nationwide standard that would require utilities to garner more of their power from renewable sources. However, there is only an emerging understanding of how new standards would affect the country's existing electricity infrastructure.

The study, sponsored by some of the nation's biggest grid-running organizations east of the Rockies, is the most comprehensive attempt by the industry to figure out what kind of infrastructure upgrades would be needed if the U.S. attempts to sharply increase the amount of power it gets from sources such as wind and solar. In 2007, according to the Energy Information Administration, about 7% of the nation's electricity came from renewable sources, including less than 1% from wind.

If the U.S. wants to get 20% of its electricity from renewable energy by 2024, the study says, it would be necessary to build a new electricity circulatory system, including 15,000 circuit miles of extremely high voltage lines. The system, which would be laid alongside the existing electric grid infrastructure, would start in the Great Plains and Midwest -- where the bulk of the nation's wind resources are located -- and terminate in big cities along the East Coast.

The transmission system would cost up to $100 billion. Building the wind turbines needed to generate the desired amount of power would cost about $720 billion, the study estimates -- making the total investment about equal to the size of the current stimulus bill. The money would be spent over a 15-year period, and would be financed primarily by utilities and investors.

The purpose of the study was "to make clear that if you need large sums of energy that's not carbon-based, these are the kinds of numbers involved" to achieve it, said Clair Moeller, head of transmission planning for the Midwest Independent System Operator.

The report was prepared by organizations responsible for electric-system reliability in roughly half the states, including the Midwest Independent System Operator, SERC Reliability Region, PJM Interconnection LLC, the Southwest Power Pool, the Mid-Continent Area Power Pool and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The projected cost of the system is only one hurdle. Getting the high-voltage power lines build across the country would require the assent of local authorities and landowners, and might require federal intervention. "For that 15,000 miles of lines, I promise about 15,000 lawsuits," said Mr. Moeller.

**Planned investments empirically fail – and construction times are way too long to solve in time**

**Apt et al, 08** - executive director of the Electricity Industry Center at Carnegie Mellon University’s Tepper School of Business and Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Engineering and Public Policy (Jay, Issues in Science and Technology, “A National Renewable Portfolio Standard? Not Practical,” Fall, http://www.issues.org/25.1/apt.html)

The timeframes for reaching these production goals are very short. Eighteen states require that by 2015 at least 10% of their electricity must come from renewable sources. California and New York require 25%. Satisfying the state mandates would require the production and siting of hundreds of thousands of wind turbines. Because there is little wind power near large population centers, tens of thousands of miles of new transmission lines would have to be built within the next few years. Not only can transmission costs double the cost of delivered power, but the median time to obtain permission and build long-distance transmission lines has been 7 years—when they can be built at all. A Wall Street executive responsible for financing transmission lines stated that of 35 lines he has been involved with at an advanced stage, 80% were never built.

**Even if transmission upgrades occur, it won’t solve the intermittance problem and it will risk the grid’s integrity**

**Wald, 09** (2/7, Matthew, “Hurdles (Not Financial Ones) Await Electric Grid Update” New York Times, lexis)

Everyone agrees that more lines are needed. But some industry experts argue that the problem of making the grid greener goes well beyond upgrading and expanding the existing power lines. The grid, they say, was set up primarily to draw energy from nearby plants and to provide a steady flow of electricity to customers. It was not intended to incorporate power from remote sources like solar panels and windmills, whose output fluctuates with weather conditions -- variability that demands a far more flexible operation.