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#### The aff must be a restriction on the volume of oil that is extracted- not the location

EIA No Date [EIA Glossary “Production” http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm]

Production, crude oil: The volumes of crude oil that are extracted from oil reservoirs. These volumes are determined through measurement of the volumes delivered from lease storage tanks or at the point of custody transfer, with adjustment for (1) net differences between opening and closing lease inventories and (2) basic sediment and water. Crude oil used on the lease is considered production.

#### Our interp is preferable

#### Key to preserving limits- the topic can get huge if anything relating to energy production is topical- there are millions of restrictions that could indirectly prevent us from getting oil out of the ground

#### EIA is the most predictable and precise definition- defining topic actor means our interpretation should be preferred as the least arbitrary- requiring the restriction to be on production is the most grammatical interp of the resolution as well
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#### Fiscal cliff deal now- insiders agree- PC is key to maintain compromise- failure collapses the economy

Hall and Lightman 11-8 [Kevin G. Hall and David Lightman 11-8-2012 Kansas City Star “Put up or shut up time for Congress, Obama on fiscal cliff” http://www.kansascity.com/2012/11/08/3907178/put-up-or-shut-up-time-for-congress.html]

Lawmakers sent mixed signals this week about serious negotiations vs. driving briefly off the cliff’s edge before settling.¶ Tuesday’s election results kept the same power players in place, the same group that went to that edge repeatedly during budget and debt ceiling negotiations over the last two years.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said Wednesday that he was ready to “find the common ground that has eluded us” and talk to Democrats, even about raising revenue.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., also talked conciliation, promising not to draw “any lines in the sand.”¶ The election’s status quo result – the same president, Republicans still controlling the House of Representatives and Democrats remaining in charge of the Senate – suggests the public “is obviously saying work together, meet halfway, come together,” said Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., usually a fierce partisan.¶ The rank and file may feel less sanguine. The election solidified conservatives’ hold on the House and liberals’ strength in the Senate, suggesting any deal could have a difficult time winning approval.¶ The key, said Republicans, is for President Barack Obama to take the lead and offer a detailed plan.¶ “The only thing that’s changed since the election is that the president is not campaigning,” said Don Stewart, spokesman for Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky.¶ Ultimately, say insiders, the doomsday alternative to inaction will force a deal. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said in a report Thursday that failing to act on the fiscal-cliff components could shave half a percentage point off of growth in the first half of 2013, raising the jobless rate to 9.1 percent and probably would trigger another recession. The CBO also said that addressing the components of the fiscal cliff results in a 3 or 4 percentage point swing between contraction and growth.

#### Huge backlash to drilling in ANWR

NRDC 2011 [National Resources Defense Council, 12/19/2011, “Arctic Wildlife Refuge: Why Trash an American Treasure for a Tiny Percentage of Our Oil Needs?” http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/arctic.asp]

Congress has received hundreds of thousands of emails, faxes and phone calls from citizens opposed to drilling in the Arctic Refuge, an outpouring that has helped make the difference. And polls have consistently shown that a majority of Americans oppose drilling, even in the face of high gas prices and misleading claims from oil interests. A June 2008 poll by the research firm Belden Russonello & Stewart found that 55 percent of the American public supports continued protection for the Arctic Refuge, and only 35 percent of Americans believe that allowing oil companies to drill in the refuge would result in lower gas prices for American consumers.

#### Fiscal Cliff failure destroys Middle East security – impact is war

Hutchison 9/21U.S. Senator from the great state of Texas, 9/21/2012

(Kay Bailey, “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis)

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk. According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and a potentially catastrophic blow to our national defense and security capabilities in a time of increasing violence and danger. All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve. The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship. Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year. The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings. In the absence of U.S. military leadership, upheaval in the Middle East would be worse. As any student of history can attest, instability does not confine itself to national borders. Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region. Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological research, development and advantage - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities. Sequestration can still be avoided. But that will require leadership from the President that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

#### Those escalate

James A. Russell (managing editor of Strategic Insights, senior lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs at NPS, From 1988-2001 held a variety of positions in the Office of the Assistant Secretary Defense for International Security Affairs, Near East South Asia, Department of Defense) Spring 2009 “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” <http://www.analyst-network.com/articles/141/StrategicStabilityReconsideredProspectsforEscalationandNuclearWarintheMiddleEast.pdf>

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

### Off

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce restrictions on oil production on federal lands in the Continental United States.

#### The Counterplan pic’s out of restrictions on arctic drilling- that’s key to preserving biodiversity

Fiorucci 2012 [Dan Fiorucci 8-30-2012 “Shell Gets Go Ahead for Drilling in Chukchi -- With Restrictions” http://articles.ktuu.com/2012-08-30/arctic-challenger\_33506259]

Until the containment vessel can travel to the arctic, Salazar has placed restrictions on Shell's drilling. He's only given permission for the company to drill to a depth of 1300 feet. That's 4,000 feet short of the actual oil reservoir. ¶ In his opening statement today, Salazar assured the public, "Any exploratory activities will be conducted under the closest oversight -- and the most rigorous safety standards -- ever implemented in the history of the United States." ¶ Such was the diversity of opinions about what everyone agrees is an historic move in the long story of oil exploration in North America -- the move into Alaska's arctic waters. ¶ Shell predicts that if the Chukchi and Beaufort seas contain as much oil as the U.S. Geological Survey estimates they do -- 25 billion barrels -- then it will be possible to re-fill the Trans Alaska Pipeline with black gold. ¶ 25 years ago, TAPS was transporting 2 million barrels a day to the port of Valdez. These days it's transporting only about one quarter as much -- 560,000 barrels. ¶ But even if Alaska's arctic waters prove to be as rich as the U.S.G.S says, it will be a decade or more before TAPS gets re-filled. If large amounts of oil are found in the Chukchi Sea, a 400-mile-pipeline will have to be built --across the 23-million-acre National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. And despite its industrial-sounding name, the NPR-A is, in fact, the biggest unprotected wilderness anywhere in the United States. ¶ So environmentalists worry about construction of the proposed pipeline -- which compounds their fears about drilling in arctic waters. They say that -- to this day -- there is no proven technology for containing an oil-spill in ice-choked waters. In fact, they point out, oil spill recovery -- even in waters that have no ice whatsoever -- leaves much to be desired. "The Center for Biological Diversity" contends that only 3 percent of the oil was recovered in the Gulf of Mexico oil spill of 2010 -- the largest spill in U.S. History.

#### Arctic marine ecosystems are key to broader ocean biodiversity- drilling destroys it

Cunningham 2012 [Nicholas Cunningham Policy Analyst at the American Security Project July 19, 2012 The Arctic Institute, “Offshore Oil Drilling in the U.S. Arctic, Part Three: Concerns and Recommendations” http://www.thearcticinstitute.org/2012/07/offshore-oil-drilling-in-us-arctic-part\_19.html]

The Chukchi and Beaufort Seas are home to a diverse array of marine life, including salmon, herring, walrus, seals, whales, and waterfowl.5 Additionally, the Chukchi Sea is home to higher occurrences of benthic marine fauna relative to other Arctic habitats.6 Scientific understanding of these ecosystems and the anthropogenic effects on them, are both not yet sufficiently understood.¶ Oil drilling in the marine environment has been shown to have deleterious effects on the marine environment. Evidence suggests that noise from seismic surveys conducted during oil exploration damage acoustic animals such as whales, which can ultimately lead to fatalities if within close proximity.[ii] While whales can generally alter migration patterns to avoid such dangers, an increase in industrial activity may push whales further away from preferred habitats, potentially damaging feeding or spawning patterns. Increased tanker traffic associated with higher oil exploration and production will worsen noise pollution in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas.¶ Additionally, the impacts of hydrocarbon releases in the marine environment have been shown to cause detrimental impacts on reproductive health, immunological and neurological functioning, as well as higher incidences of mortality for marine wildlife.[iii] Contaminants from oil and gas drilling are also believed to travel higher up on the food chain, ultimately having cascading effects for marine ecosystems. Shell’s 2012 exploration plans include drilling exploratory wells in the Chukchi Sea, where bowhead whales migrate to during the spring months.[iv]

#### Biodiversity key to survival.

Young, 10, Dr Ruth Young, PhD specialising in coastal marine ecology. 2-9-2010, “Biodiversity: what it is and why it’s important”, http://www.talkingnature.com/2010/02/biodiversity/biodiversity-what-and-why/

Different species within ecosystems fill particular roles, they all have a function, they all have a niche. They interact with each other and the physical environment to provide ecosystem services that are vital for our survival. For example plant species convert carbon dioxide (CO2) from the atmosphere and energy from the sun into useful things such as food, medicines and timber. A bee pollinating a flower (Image: ClearlyAmbiguous Flickr) Pollination carried out by insects such as bees enables the production of ⅓ of our food crops. Diverse mangrove and coral reef ecosystems provide a wide variety of habitats that are essential for many fishery species. To make it simpler for economists to comprehend the magnitude of services offered by biodiversity, a team of researchers estimated their value – it amounted to $US33 trillion per year. “By protecting biodiversity we maintain ecosystem services” Certain species play a “keystone” role in maintaining ecosystem services. Similar to the removal of a keystone from an arch, the removal of these species can result in the collapse of an ecosystem and the subsequent removal of ecosystem services. The most well known example of this occurred during the 19th century when sea otters were almost hunted to extinction by fur traders along the west coast of the USA. This led to a population explosion in the sea otters’ main source of prey, sea urchins. Because the urchins graze on kelp their booming population decimated the underwater kelp forests. This loss of habitat led to declines in local fish populations. Sea otters are a keystone species once hunted for their fur (Image: Mike Baird) Eventually a treaty protecting sea otters allowed the numbers of otters to increase which inturn controlled the urchin population, leading to the recovery of the kelp forests and fish stocks. In other cases, ecosystem services are maintained by entire functional groups, such as apex predators (See Jeremy Hance’s post at Mongabay). During the last 35 years, over fishing of large shark species along the US Atlantic coast has led to a population explosion of skates and rays. These skates and rays eat bay scallops and their out of control population has led to the closure of a century long scallop fishery. These are just two examples demonstrating how biodiversity can maintain the services that ecosystems provide for us, such as fisheries. One could argue that to maintain ecosystem services we don’t need to protect biodiversity but rather, we only need to protect the species and functional groups that fill the keystone roles. However, there are a couple of problems with this idea. First of all, for most ecosystems we don’t know which species are the keystones! Ecosystems are so complex that we are still discovering which species play vital roles in maintaining them. In some cases its groups of species not just one species that are vital for the ecosystem. Second, even if we did complete the enormous task of identifying and protecting all keystone species, what back-up plan would we have if an unforseen event (e.g. pollution or disease) led to the demise of these ‘keystone’ species? Would there be another species to save the day and take over this role? Classifying some species as ‘keystone’ implies that the others are not important. This may lead to the non-keystone species being considered ecologically worthless and subsequently over-exploited. Sometimes we may not even know which species are likely to fill the keystone roles. An example of this was discovered on Australia’s Great Barrier Reef. This research examined what would happen to a coral reef if it were over-fished. The “over-fishing” was simulated by fencing off coral bommies thereby excluding and removing fish from them for three years. By the end of the experiment, the reefs had changed from a coral to an algae dominated ecosystem – the coral became overgrown with algae. When the time came to remove the fences the researchers expected herbivorous species of fish like the parrot fish (Scarus spp.) to eat the algae and enable the reef to switch back to a coral dominated ecosystem. But, surprisingly, the shift back to coral was driven by a supposed ‘unimportant’ species – the bat fish (Platax pinnatus). The bat fish was previously thought to feed on invertebrates – small crabs and shrimp, but when offered a big patch of algae it turned into a hungry herbivore – a cow of the sea – grazing the algae in no time. So a fish previously thought to be ‘unimportant’ is actually a keystone species in the recovery of coral reefs overgrown by algae! Who knows how many other species are out there with unknown ecosystem roles! In some cases it’s easy to see who the keystone species are but in many ecosystems seemingly unimportant or redundant species are also capable of changing niches and maintaining ecosystems. The more biodiverse an ecosystem is, the more likely these species will be present and the more resilient an ecosystem is to future impacts. Presently we’re only scratching the surface of understanding the full importance of biodiversity and how it helps maintain ecosystem function. The scope of this task is immense. In the meantime, a wise insurance policy for maintaining ecosystem services would be to conserve biodiversity. In doing so, we increase the chance of maintaining our ecosystem services in the event of future impacts such as disease, invasive species and of course, climate change. This is the international year of biodiversity – a time to recognize that biodiversity makes our survival on this planet possible and that our protection of biodiversity maintains this service.
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#### The discourse of oil independence is a vehicle to affirm American exceptionalism

Sebastian Herbstreuth is a PhD candidate in the Department of Politics and International Studies (POLIS) at the University of Cambridge April 13, 2012 “Should America Care About Energy Independence?” Politics in Spires http://politicsinspires.org/2012/04/should-america-care-about-energy-independence/

However, thinking about oil only in the language of solutions overlooks an important point: that the condition of “foreign oil dependence” and the aspiration of “energy independence” are also discourses that reflect, and serve to actualize, American culture and identity. For the past forty years, these twin notions have acted as big ideas around which all Americans could rally to affirm images of self and other. The notion of foreign oil dependence, for instance, has always been intimately connected with threats that have far exceeded the traditional realm of “national security” and include threats to American identity. One major concern has linked dependency with the continued viability of a specifically American, suburban, automotive way of life. Another is the promise of economic growth, individual opportunity, and social mobility — all encapsulated in the American dream. At the same time, the nature of the dangers inherent in foreign oil has changed with the times. In the 1970s, reliance on OPEC oil was routinely assumed to pose an existential threat to the existence of a liberal, US-led international order. In the context of a widespread sense of American decline, what seemed to be at stake was nothing less than the status of the United States as a great power and the leader of the free world. In post-9/11 energy debates, by contrast, foreign oil dependence has been linked to American identity in new ways. Middle East oil has become bound up with the notion of a clash of civilizations and the threat posed by radical Islam, both of which are said to imply a fundamental challenge to the American way of life. As George W. Bush routinely affirmed with a view to the Middle East: “it jeopardizes our national security to be dependent on sources of energy from countries that don’t care for America, what we stand for, what we love”. [3] From this perspective, what matters most about dependency is that it has constituted the basis for an encounter between the United States and oil’s foreign places of origin—an encounter that has afforded American society an ongoing opportunity for self-representation and the drawing of cultural boundaries. The notion of energy interdependence is even more powerful in this regard. The longevity and popularity of the absurd idea that the United States could ever return to the self-sufficiency of the first half of the 20th century has long puzzled energy experts. “What is it about ‘energy independence’”, wonders ex Shell-CEO John Hofmeister, “that keeps this mantra in the political rhetoric of political campaign after campaign?” [4] Perhaps, the best answer is that energy independence has never been a simple technical, economic or political solution to the problem of foreign oil dependence; rather, it has been a cultural artifact, a discourse evoking particular American notions of the exceptional nation, American innovation and ingenuity, the can-do spirit, and the very notion of “independence” on which the American national project has been built. As Hofmeister puts is: “There’s something earthy, powerful, atavistic, and pugilistic, even legitimately xenophobic about saying [energy independence]. It speaks for all Americans regardless of gender, ethnicity or age”. [4]

#### Exceptionalism leads to extinction- produces a denial of death that demands constant causalities

Peterson ‘7 (Christopher, Lecturer @ University of Western Sidney, Kindred Specters: Death, Mourning, and American Affinity, pgs. 3-8)

While this study accords with the claim that American culture disavows mortality, 1 do not argue for any simple reversal of this interdiction with an aim toward affirming finitude per se. If death is beyond our experience (as Heidegger among others has observed), if I am ultimately absent from "my" own death, then strictly speaking there is nothing for me to recognize or avow. Yet dying is something that I do every day. Indeed, it might be more accurate to say that American culture disavows dying, understood as a process that extends from our birth to our biological demise." Even with such an amended formulation, however, it is not entirely clear whether dying can ever be fully affirmed or avowed. That "we live as if we were not going to die," as Zygmunt Bauman observes, "is a remarkable achievement," especially given the ease with which we disavow dying on a daily basis." Some degree of disavowal would seem both unavoidable and necessary for our survival. Any effort to prolong one's life, from simply eating well and exercising to taking medications to prevent or treat illness, evidences this disavowal. For Bauman, however, the disavowal of dying often has violent political and social consequences. Noting the wartime imperative "to limit our casualties" for instance, Bauman remarks that "the price of that limiting is multiplying the dead on the other side of the battleline" (34). Drawing from Freud's claim that, "at bottom no one believes in his own death," Bauman argues that death is "socially managed" by securing the "immortality" of the few through the mortalization of others (35, his emphasis).8 The belief in my self-presence, which is also always a belief in my immortality, is thus dialectically conditioned by the nonpresence of others. Scholars in race and sexuality studies have done much to bring our attention to the ways in which American culture represents racial and sexual minorities as dead - both figuratively and literally. Indeed, this gesture both accompanies and reinforces the larger cultural dissimulation of mortality by making racial and sexual others stand in for the death that haunts every life. The history of American slavery tells a familiar story of how American consciousness disavows and projects mortality onto its "others." Orlando Patterson has described the institution of slavery in terms of a process of kinship delegitimation that constructs slaves as "socially dead."? For Patterson, slavery - across its various historical forms - emerges as a substitute for death a forced bargain by which the slave retains his/her life only to enter into the liminal existence of the socially dead. As a substitution for death slavery does not "absolve or erase the prospect of death," for the specter of material death looms over the slave's existence as an irreducible remainder (5). This primary stage in the construction of the socially dead person is followed by what Patterson refers to as the slave's "natal alienation," his/her alienation from all rights or claims of birth: in short, a severing of all genealogical ties and claims both to the slave's living blood relatives, and to his/her remote ancestors and future descendants. Although Patterson does not approach the problem of social death through a psychoanalytic vocabulary of disavowal and projection, one might say that the presumptive ontology of slave-owning, legally recognized kinship, was dependent on a deontologization of slave kinship that worked to deny the death that each life bears within itself. Building on Patterson's argument, Toni Morrison observes in Playing in the Dark that, "for a people who made much of their 'newness' - their potential, freedom, and innocence - it is striking how dour, how troubled, how frightened and haunted our early and founding literature truly is." For Morrison, African-American slaves came to shoulder the burden of the darkness (both moral and racial) against which America defined itself. The shadow of a racialized blackness did not so much threaten the ostensible "newness" of American life as it conditioned the latter's appearance as new and free. Hence "freedom," she writes, "has no meaning ... without the specter of enslavement" (56). Echoing Morrison, Russ Castronovo asserts in Necro Citizenship that nineteenth-century American politics constructed the citizen in relation to a morbid fascination with ghosts, seances, spirit rappings, and mesmerism. Taking his point of departure from Patrick Henry's in-famous assertion, "give me liberty or give me death," Castronovo explores how admission into the domain of citizenship required a certain depoliticization and pacification of the subject: "The afterlife emancipates souls from passionate debates, everyday engagements, and earthly affairs that animate the political field."!' From Lincoln's rumored dabbling in spiritualism, to attempts by mediums to contact the departed souls of famous Americans, to a senator's introduction of a petition in 1854 asking Congress to investigate communications with the "other side" so numerous are Castronovo's examples of what he calls" spectral politics" that we would have a difficult time contesting his diagnosis that nineteenth-century American political discourse worked to produce politically and historically dead citizens. That these citizens were constructed in tandem with the production of large slave populations- noncitizens who were urged by slavery proponents and abolitionists alike to believe that emancipation existed in a promised afterlife - would lend still more credence to the argument that nineteenth-century America propagated a dematerialized politics. One wonders, however, how Castronovo's argument sits in relation to Aries's contention that American life tends toward an interdiction of death, and if Castronovo's rejection of necropolitics, moreover, is not finally symptomatic of this very disavowal. Castronovo maintains that, "for cultures that fear death ... necrophilia promotes fascination with and helps tame an unknowable terror:' (5). American necrophilia, according to Castronovo, responds to an overwhelming fear and denial of death. Castronovo thus aims 'to turn us away from such preoccupation with ghosts, spirits, and the afterlife toward "specific forms of corporeality," such as the laboring body, the slave body, and the mesmerized body, in order to avoid "reinscrib[ing] patterns of abstraction" (17). Yet, this move away from general to specific forms of embodiment still retains the notion of "the body," and therefore of a self-contained, sell-present entity. If nineteenth-century politics required that the citizen be disembodied and dematerialized, it does not follow that a move toward embodiment remedies such a spiritualized politics. Although Castronovo cautions that recourse to the body" does not automatically guarantee resistance," the overall tenor of his project pathologizes the spectral (18). Indeed, one has the sense that Castronovo would like to untether politics from death altogether - as if political life is not always haunted by finitude. Reversing the terms of political necrophilia, he offers something like a political necrophobia that sees every intrusion of the spectral as synonymous with depoliticization. If nineteenth-century spiritualism infused American political life with a familiar set of distinctions between spirit/matter, soul/body, that says nothing about how these binaries might be displaced rather than merely reversed. A binaristic approach to the subject of mortality is also legible in Sharon Holland's Raising the Dead, which asserts that "bringing back the dead (or saving the living from the shadow of death) is the ultimate queer act."11Drawing from the activist slogan "silence = death" from the early years of the AIDS epidemic, and extending this activist imperative to address the social death of sexual and racial minorities more generally, Holland observes that the deaths of queer and racial subjects serve "to ward off a nation's collective dread of the inevitable" (38). Yet, as in Castronovo's critique of necropolitics, this imperative to "raise the dead" reverses rather than displaces the logic through which dominant, white, heterosexual culture disavows and projects mortality onto racial and sexual minorities. While we must address the particular effects that social death has on racial and sexual minorities, this social reality must also be thought in relation to a more generalizable principle of mourning. For the "shadow of death" haunts all lives, not just queer ones. The "ultimate queer act," pace Holland, would be to deconstruct rather than reinscribe the binary between life and death, to resist the racist and heterosexist disavowal of finitude. That Americanist literary criticism on the subject of mortality remains implicated in the larger cultural disavowal of dying suggests that we ought to reassess our critical energies, particularly as these powers are enlisted to address how American political ideology produces the "death" of racial and sexual others. Indeed, I would argue that such criticism remains invested - despite all claims to the contrary - in an American exceptionalist project. American exceptionalism names, in part, a fetishization of novelty and futurity that initially defined America against an ostensibly decaying and moribund Europe. As David Noble has argued, the doctrine of exceptionalism excluded America from "the human experience of birth, death, and rebirth" by figuring Europe in terms of time and America in terms of timeless space." If, as George Berkeley put it, America is "time's noblest offspring," history gives birth to its final progeny in order that the latter might escape time altogether. America thus becomes eternally present while "Europe breeds in her decay." If the "new world" qua new must deny mortality, then reanimating the excluded from within the terms of a dialectical reversal renews rather than dismantles the American exceptionalist project. Challenging the ideology of American exceptionalism is particularly crucial for a post-9/11 politics that aims to resist the transformation of American exposure to injury and death into a newly reconsolidated sense of innocence and immortality. As Donald Pease has argued, 9/11 transformed "virgin land" into "ground zero," effecting an ideological shift from a "secured innocent nation to a wounded, insecure emergency state."16 Drawing from the work of Giorgio Agamben. Pease describes the emergency state as a nation that - by exempting itself from its own democratic rules of free speech, due process, and above all, the rules of war - marks a division between those whom the state protects from injury and those whom the state is free to injure and kill with impunity (13). The reduction of the Arab other to that which cannot be killed because it is already dead works to cover over the wound that ground zero opens up under the surface of virgin land. The emergency state (or what Agamben calls the "state of exception") thus also names a nation that attempts to except itself from the universal condition of mortality. As Bauman notes, "if mortality and transience are the norm among humans, durability may be attained only as an exception" (67, his emphasis).

#### The alternative is to reject the Affirmative-Questioning American exceptionalism is key to understanding our place in the world- rejection is key to more productive politics

Walt 2011[Stephen M. Walt, an FP contributing editor, is Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international affairs at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government NOVEMBER 2011, Foreign Policy, “The Myth of American Exceptionalism” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/10/11/the\_myth\_of\_american\_exceptionalism]

Most statements of "American exceptionalism" presume that America's values, political system, and history are unique and worthy of universal admiration. They also imply that the United States is both destined and entitled to play a distinct and positive role on the world stage.¶ The only thing wrong with this self-congratulatory portrait of America's global role is that it is mostly a myth. Although the United States possesses certain unique qualities -- from high levels of religiosity to a political culture that privileges individual freedom -- the conduct of U.S. foreign policy has been determined primarily by its relative power and by the inherently competitive nature of international politics. By focusing on their supposedly exceptional qualities, Americans blind themselves to the ways that they are a lot like everyone else.¶ This unchallenged faith in American exceptionalism makes it harder for Americans to understand why others are less enthusiastic about U.S. dominance, often alarmed by U.S. policies, and frequently irritated by what they see as U.S. hypocrisy, whether the subject is possession of nuclear weapons, conformity with international law, or America's tendency to condemn the conduct of others while ignoring its own failings. Ironically, U.S. foreign policy would probably be more effective if Americans were less convinced of their own unique virtues and less eager to proclaim them.¶ What we need, in short, is a more realistic and critical assessment of America's true character and contributions. In that spirit, I offer here the Top 5 Myths about American Exceptionalism.

### Economy

#### Economy improving post election – and jobless claims are falling

JeeYeon Park , CNBC 11-9-2012 Stocks do about face and sink on 'fiscal cliff' worries http://www.nbcnews.com/business/stocks-do-about-face-sink-fiscal-cliff-worries-1C6892846

"We believe that the underlying U.S. economic fundamentals remain favorable," wrote Gary Thayer, chief macro strategist at Wells Fargo Advisors. "The economy is growing and the uncertainty of the election is behind us. If Congress and the president can find some middle ground and compromise over tax hikes and spending cuts, the outlook for the economy would be better than the worst-case scenario of allowing all the tax hikes and spending cuts to be implemented as scheduled."¶ On the economic front, jobless claims fell 8,000 to a seasonally adjusted 355,000 in the previous week, according to the Labor Department. Economists had expected a reading of 370,000. The four-week moving average rose 3,250 to 370,500.¶ And the U.S. trade deficit narrowed in September to $41.55 billion as exports increased, according to the Commerce Department, suggesting the economy expanded more than previously believed in the third quarter. Analysts expected the gap to widen to $45.0 billion.

#### Doesn’t solve government revenue

Bewig 2012 [Matt Bewig August 13, 2012 AllGov “CBO Says Drilling on Federal Land Won’t Net Much Money or Energy” http://www.allgov.com/news/top-stories/cbo-says-drilling-on-federal-land-wont-net-much-money-or-energy?news=844911]

It turns out that the slogan “drill, baby, drill” ought to be “nil, baby, nil.” According to two recent reports by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office,(CBO) opening all federal land to oil and gas drilling — including the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) — would do nothing to insulate Americans from price hikes or global supply disruptions and would yield only modest revenue to the U.S. Treasury. The reports, released in May and August of this year, drive a stake through the heart of the two primary arguments in favor of increased drilling on public lands.¶ ¶ The oil and gas industry and their congressional allies have argued for years that removing fossil fuel drilling bans that protect many public lands and waters would produce significant revenue for the federal government and help reduce the national debt. The August 9 report — which was requested by Republican vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan in his capacity as House Budget Committee chairman — concludes that opening ANWR, parts of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Florida coasts, and all other targeted public lands would yield only $7 billion over the next ten years, barely 0.1% of the deficits CBO projects for that period.

#### Drilling here makes no dent in unemployment

Krugman 2012 [Paul Krugman Nobel Prize Economist March 15, 2012, New York Times, “Natural Born Drillers” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/opinion/krugman-natural-born-drillers.html?\_r=1,%208/4/12]

Meanwhile, what about jobs? I have to admit that I started laughing when I saw The Wall Street Journal offering North Dakota as a role model. Yes, the oil boom there has pushed unemployment down to 3.2 percent, but that’s only possible because the whole state has fewer residents than metropolitan Albany — so few residents that adding a few thousand jobs in the state’s extractive sector is a really big deal. The comparable-sized fracking boom in Pennsylvania has had hardly any effect on the state’s overall employment picture, because, in the end, not that many jobs are involved.¶ And this tells us that giving the oil companies carte blanche isn’t a serious jobs program. Put it this way: Employment in oil and gas extraction has risen more than 50 percent since the middle of the last decade, but that amounts to only 70,000 jobs, around one-twentieth of 1 percent of total U.S. employment. So the idea that drill, baby, drill can cure our jobs deficit is basically a joke.

#### Econ resilient

Fareed Zakaria (editor of Newsweek International) December 2009 “The Secrets of Stability,” http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/2]

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic n this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all. A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

#### Economic collapse doesn’t cause war – no causal connection

Thomas P.M. Barnett (senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC and a contributing editor/online columnist for Esquire magazine) August 2009 “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis” http://www.aprodex.com/the-new-rules--security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis-398-bl.aspx

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: \* No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); \* The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); \* Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); \* No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); \* A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and \* No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order. Do I expect to read any analyses along those lines in the blogosphere any time soon? Absolutely not. I expect the fantastic fear-mongering to proceed apace. That's what the Internet is for.

### China Adv

#### China is working on cooperative resolution to South China Seas conflicts now

Wu Shicun Who are the real troublemakers in the South China Sea? Globaltimes.cn | 2012-11-6 21:17:06 http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/742715.shtml

China is playing a constructive role in safeguarding peace and stability in the South China Sea. Peace and stability in the South China Sea are closely related to the vital interests of China, who benefits from the safe and unimpeded navigation as well as the regional trade links and economic prosperity. China cherishes and is committed to safeguarding this hard-won situation. However, recently some foreign political figures, policy analysts and scholars condemn China's practices as "the big bullying the small, the strong domineering over the weak.”¶ They even speculate that China is taking the delaying or dodging tactics so as to dominate the resolution of the disputes when a favorable time comes. Such accusations are totally groundless. China insists on solving international disputes through peaceful negotiations.¶ China is ready to negotiate with the countries concerned to handle the South China Sea disputes in a proper manner in accordance with the universally recognized international laws including the principles and legal regime established under UNCLOS. Early in the 1980s, China proposed "shelving the disputes and seeking for joint development,” which showed its sincerity and willingness to a proper settlement of the SCS disputes.

#### Only independence causes China war- we can manage them if we are engaged- leaving encourages build up

Michael Richardson is a visiting senior research fellow at the Institute of South East Asian Studies 7 June, 2012 “Thirst for energy driving China's foreign policy” South African Foreign Policy Initiative http://www.safpi.org/news/article/2012/thirst-energy-driving-chinas-foreign-policy

As America gains energy security in a time of cost-cutting, it will have less incentive to continue expensive military protection of maritime supply lines in increasingly contested areas such as the seas off China's coast, the oil and gas-rich Persian Gulf, and around the Middle East and Africa, prompting China to extend its own military reach into the Indian Ocean, through which so much of its imported oil and gas comes. This will heighten tensions with India. Stephen Walt, a professor of international affairs at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government has projected the outcome of U.S.-China economic, military and energy trends in this way: "If China is like all previous great powers, including the U.S., its definition of 'vital' interests will grow as its power increases — and it will try to use its growing muscle to protect an expanding sphere of influence. "Given its dependence on raw-material imports (especially energy) and export-led growth, prudent Chinese leaders will want to make sure that no one is in a position to deny them access to the resources and markets on which their future prosperity and political stability depend. "This situation will encourage Beijing to challenge the current U.S. role in Asia. Over time, Beijing will try to convince other Asian states to abandon ties with America, and Washington will almost certainly resist these efforts. An intense security competition will follow."

#### Scarcity forces cooperation

Commander Jim Cooney United States Navy 18 MAR 2005 “Chinese Oil Dependence Opportunities and Challenge” USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA432502

China's dependence on oil presents both challenges and opportunities. A secure source of oil is as important to China's national interests as it is to the United States and other industrialized nations. It would be hard to overstate Oil's importance to the current regime in China. The shared interest in the security of global trade presents opportunities for increased cooperation and understanding. China's competition with the United States in gaining influence in the Middle East is actually counter productive to her interests. Straightforward U.S. negotiations with China concerning the export of weapons technology to Iran are essential to prevent long term damage to Middle East stability and Sino/U.S. relations. Finally, the United States must maintain a credible military presence in the Western Pacific to prevent any attempts at imposing a military solution on the Spratly Island issue. Oil dependence on the part of China brings her interests more in line with the global community of capitalist states. The challenge for the United States is to emphasize how this similarity presents opportunities for cooperation while at the same time applying diplomatic pressure and maintaining deterrent forces to prevent conflict over the common need for oil.

#### The aff ensures the Chinese pass us- cheaper oil is better for them than us

Hulbert 11/07 [Matthew Hulbert Lead Analyst at European Energy Review and consultant to a number of governments & institutional investors, most recently as Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations 11/07/2012 Forbes “Obama Ground Zero: Why Cheap American Energy Is The Death Of American Power” http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/11/07/obama-ground-zero-why-cheap-american-energy-is-the-death-of-american-power/2/]

Sure, access to decent U.S. technology is useful for China to take back home, but the core motivation is making sure America fulfills its liquid potential. U.S. oil becomes a ‘public good’, helping China to apply market pressures across the globe. China has seen (largely at American expense) the difficulties of dependence on Middle East oil supplies. And while nobody’s fooled that OPEC supplies are the only credible way that Beijing can meet demand in the next few years, the unconventional genie is out of the international bottle. China is better placed than any other consumer in history to reshape the counters of the energy world – and North America is the instrumental key. Prolific Chinese investment in Washington’s backyard not only offers Beijing a tactical hydrocarbon hedge against traditional petro-states such as Russia, Central Asia and the Middle East as import dependency ratios increase, it’s likely to drag down oil prices internationally. Far from the Americas becoming a ‘self- contained’ unit, trading large amounts of oil between themselves (i.e. the defunct Citigroup vision), China will use the full weight of its investments and production base in the Western hemisphere against traditional producer states. The more prices ease, the more OPEC states will be staring down the barrel of popular unrest. Some regimes will fall from two digit oil prices, and for those who survive, shifting towards a volume based system might be only realistic way they can secure overseas receipts and meet rising domestic demand. Clearly that all remains to be seen, but if holds any validity whatsoever, China will have used America’s ‘oil egg’ to make an ‘OPEC omelet’. The final kicker is that Washington loses its trump ‘external security’ card along the way. As China likes to point out, they ultimately pay the bills for U.S. naval presence in the Middle East through treasury purchases. It wouldn’t seem worth the bother if we’re left with so much oil that we don’t know that to do with the stuff.¶ So, it’s a triple whammy. China uses America to forge a cheap energy world. OPEC and Russia duly respond by shifting towards volumes based strategies, the scale of which blows the U.S. out of the water as a supposed energy heavyweight of the world. With everyone going ‘unconventional’, we end up swimming in oil; Washington loses its external energy security role in the process. It’s perhaps best left to economists what that means for the international status of the dollar, but I’m guessing it’s not good. America gets played all the way to the bottom of the barrel. China gets rich. China gets powerful.

#### Aff causes Chines expansion into the Indian Ocean- kills Sino-Indian relations

Michael Richardson is a visiting senior research fellow at the Institute of South East Asian Studies 7 June, 2012 “Thirst for energy driving China's foreign policy” South African Foreign Policy Initiative http://www.safpi.org/news/article/2012/thirst-energy-driving-chinas-foreign-policy

As America gains energy security in a time of cost-cutting, it will have less incentive to continue expensive military protection of maritime supply lines in increasingly contested areas such as the seas off China's coast, the oil and gas-rich Persian Gulf, and around the Middle East and Africa, prompting China to extend its own military reach into the Indian Ocean, through which so much of its imported oil and gas comes. This will heighten tensions with India. Stephen Walt, a professor of international affairs at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government has projected the outcome of U.S.-China economic, military and energy trends in this way: "If China is like all previous great powers, including the U.S., its definition of 'vital' interests will grow as its power increases — and it will try to use its growing muscle to protect an expanding sphere of influence.

#### Sino-India war escalates over the Indian Ocean

Dan Darling is an international military markets analyst with Forecast International Inc., an aerospace and defense research company March 24, 2010 The Faster Times “Will the Indian Ocean Become the Next Arena of Great Power Conflict?” http://www.thefastertimes.com/defensespending/2010/03/24/will-the-indian-ocean-become-the-next-arena-of-great-power-conflict/

As the global balance of power continues to shift from west to east, so too do the intermingling pressures that brought about the savage conflicts of the last century. Economic expansion, shipping lanes, geography, territorial disputes and natural resources all intermingle to form a potentially toxic environment. Avoiding the missteps that led to such catastrophes as occurred in 20th Century Europe has become something of a tightrope walk for the region’s two preeminent powers, China and India. Nestled together along the Himalayas and Kunlun mountain ranges, these economically ascendant and burgeoning military powers warily eye each others moves, hoping to prevent the other from gaining some insurmountable strategic advantage. Ambitious rivals whose five-month border war in 1962 resulted in a Chinese military victory, a disputed Indian claim to a slice of territory known as Aksai Chin, a heavily militarized border (referred to as the “Line of Actual Control”) and a traumatized psyche in India where China is concerned. Ever mindful of Chinese moves, India has watched with growing anxiety as Beijing has invested in a highway linking it to Pakistan, India’s fiercest regional rival. This land route signals an attempt by Beijing to circumvent a crucial Chinese vulnerability, one that India might exploit in the even of another outbreak of hostilities between the two nations: China’s need for secure shipping lanes which ensure its vital energy supplies from the Middle East are not disrupted. With both countries proceeding to expand their military capabilities and both heavily dependent upon Middle East oil to fuel their economic growth, maneuvering for the upper hand in the Indian Ocean has intensified. The shipping lane which stretches from the Persian Gulf into the Arabian Sea and across the Indian Ocean represents the crucial transport lifeline for 80 percent of Chinese oil and 65 percent of India’s. Disadvantaged by fate of geography, Chinese energy trans-shipment must not only wind its way along this route, but then must traverse the heavily-pirated maritime choke-point, the Straits of Malacca, before then proceeding northward through the South China Sea and into home ports. The length and delicacy of such a journey makes protection of this vital shipping lifeline a fundamental security priority for China. That India, hoping to project its power throughout the Indian Ocean region, has embarked on a naval buildup only adds to the Chinese People’s Liberation Army Navy’s (PLAN) sense of urgency regarding sovereignty over its sea lines of communication. As a result, China has launched an effort to protect its commercial interests by undertaking a series of port development and construction projects in Sri Lanka (Hambantota), Bangladesh (Chittagong), Myanmar (Kyaukphyu), Pakistan (Gwadar) and Yemen (Mukkala). The Chinese government has assiduously cultivated warm relations with Indian Ocean nations, signing friendship pacts and providing them with large amounts of aid in a bid to build up its political capital in the region. The PLAN, meanwhile, has constructed a hardened deep-water base at Sanya, on Hainan Island in the South China Sea. The base is capable of accommodating both attack and nuclear ballistic submarines, enabling these vessels to perform patrols in the northern Indian Ocean. There is also the possibility that the PLAN may begin stationing Su-30MKK fighter/attack aircraft at bases in Myanmar, providing China with an extended airborne strike range over the Bay of Bengal. China’s expansionary efforts in the Indian Ocean region have been dubbed by the Pentagon as the “string of pearls” strategy. But while the creation and development of logistical support bases represent a necessary component of this strategy, military muscle is what underwrites its execution. With an expansionary defense budget expected to reach close to $80 billion in 2010, China is the world’s second-largest military investor and has allocated more and more to naval capabilities in the past decade. Like India, the PLAN has undertaken its own blue-water naval development. This involves the continued expansion of its submarine, destroyer and oil tanker fleets, and possibly the construction of one or more aircraft carriers. India, which for the time being arguably has a naval edge on China, is pushing forward on a ten-year, $15 billion naval acquisition plan. India’s plan to grow its blue-water capabilities includes bringing three aircraft carriers into naval service by 2015. Among some of the crucial naval platforms in Indian development are six Scorpene submarines produced under license with French technologies (plus a follow-on order for six additional submarines), six improved Project 17A (improved Shivalik-class) frigates, a nuclear-powered missile submarine (the INS Arihant), and the domestically-built Project 15 (Delhi-class) destroyers. India has also introduced Russian MiG-29K jet fighters into its aircraft fleet, intending to deploy them on the carrier INS Vikramadity – formerly the Russian carrier Admiral Gorshkov – when it finally is introduced into Indian naval service. India is also taking steps to expand its air force bases in the Andaman and Nicobar island chains and plans to station Su-30MKI fighters, mid-air refuelling tankers and short- and medium-range unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) on these island bases. This dual naval build-up has become worrisome for those with vested interests in the greater Indian Ocean. The U.S. Navy had long been entrusted with protecting shipping through the region. But with China’s rise as an economic power and status as budding rival to the U.S., Beijing is unlikely to view the American 5th Fleet as some metaphorical benevolent hand helping to protect its sea lines of communication. Indeed, American efforts to court India as a foil against China’s expanding regional influence have only added to Chinese distrust regarding Washington’s intentions. Then there is Japan, which like China relies heavily upon energy transshipment through the Indian Ocean. With a heightened PLAN presence across the same shipping lane Japan uses to ferry Middle East oil to its ports, Tokyo might opt to bolster its own naval component, thus upping the naval traffic in the region and increasing the possibility for friction. The potential for a military showdown is always strong when the interests and concerns of powerful nations intersect. But so too is the potential for partnership and pragmatism. Trade between China and India has grown exponentially since 2002; in 2008, China became India’s largest trading partner. This increased trade volume helps to weave the two countries’ economic interdependence. If the 21st Century is to become the Asian Century that some predict, then China and India must carefully balance their needs and strategies against the security concerns of the other. Avoiding hazardous missteps in the Indian Ocean would be as good a place to start as any.

### Venezuela

#### US can’t isolate itself from global oil markets

**ESLC 2012** (Energy Security Leadership Council, a project of Securing America’s Future Energy, 2012, “The New American Oil Boom: Implications for Energy Security,” online)

The notion of energy independence is based on a simple idea: that the United States can regain control of its economy and its national security—at least in part—by ending its reliance on foreign oil. As discussed above, this idea has its roots in decades of American political dialogue generated during times of crisis in the global oil market. Unfortunately, this idea is fundamentally misguided and misleading. In fact, the United States has no means by which it can become independent from the global oil market or foreign countries as long as it is a large consumer of oil. Oil prices are set in open markets and are the result of a series of individual interpretations of supply and demand, as well as expectations about the future balance of supply and demand. Myriad factors play into these assessments, including oil consumption and production levels in dozens of countries, currency values, national and international economic policies, geopolitical events, improvements in technology, and even the weather. Oil prices impact Americans as consumers, both directly and indirectly. Directly, Americans consume petroleum fuels in daily transportation activities—in passenger cars and trucks as well as in other modes, such as air travel. Indirectly, Americans are exposed to petroleum prices through their impact on the final price of shipped goods—such as food—and manufactured goods that include petro-chemicals, such as plastics, fertilizers, and pharmaceuticals. In other words, as long as Americans are large oil consumers, they cannot be independent of oil markets or oil prices—at least not in any meaningful way. Americans are dependent on oil, not on foreign oil. There are four factors that characterize this dangerous dependence: the importance of oil in the economy, the lack of available alternatives, the fact that prices are set in a global market, and the volatility of oil prices.

#### China’s demand is growing- can’t take ourselves off the market to screw others

Chris Black Major, US Army April 2009 “Post Oil America and a renewable energy policy leads to the abrogation of the Middle East to China” http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a530125.pdf

All things being equal, any reduction of oil demand by the US will cause oil prices to maintain stable since China’s demand are growing. In this situation, developing and developed countries that are still dependent on oil would enjoy oil prices that remain low and would allow them to continue to grow while the US transitions its economy to a new energy source. This issue becomes particularly problematic if the US adopts policies to force the system to change to new renewable energy systems that may not be as economically viable as oil, thereby increasing the economic burden and reducing overall GDP in the US. Given the present debt and deficit the US currently holds this scenario is something the US can ill afford. Also, the oil-exporting countries that supported policies that were inimical to US interests when the US was the biggest consumer of oil will still be able to supply China and make plenty of money to continue their goals.

#### No nuclear terrorism –statistically insignificant cumulative probability

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p, 187-190

Assigning a probability that terrorists will be able to overcome each barrier is, of course, a tricky business, and any such exercise should be regarded as rather tentative and exploratory, or perhaps simply as illustrative-though it is done all the time in cost-benefit analysis. One might begin a quantitative approach by adopting probability estimates that purposely, and heavily, bias the case in the terrorists' favor. In my view, this would take place if it is assumed that the terrorists have a fighting chance of 50 percent of overcoming each of the 20 obstacles displayed in Table 13-1, though for many barriers, probably almost all, the odds against them are surely much worse than that. Even with that generous bias, the chances that a concerted effort would be successful comes out to be less than one in a million, specifically 1,048,576. Indeed, the odds of surmounting even seven of the 20 hurdles at that unrealistically, even absurdly, high presumptive success rate is considerably less than one in a hundred. If one assumes, somewhat more realistically, that their chances at each barrier are one in three, the cumulative odds they will be able to pull off the deed drop to one in well over three billion specifically 3.486,784,401. What they would be at the (still entirely realistic) level of one in ten boggles the mind. One could also make specific estimates for each of the hurdles, but the cumulative probability statistics are likely to come out pretty much the same-or even smaller. There may be a few barriers, such as numbers 13 or absolute loyalty trump the one oftechnical competence. This would increase the chances that the bomb-making enterprise would go undetected, while at the same time decreasing the likelihood that it would be successful. However, given the monumentality of the odds confronting the would-be atomic terrorist, adjustments for such issues are scarcely likely to alter the basic conclusion. That is, if one drastically slashed the one in 3.5 billion estimate a thousandfold, the odds of success would still be one in 3.5 million. Moreover, all this focuses on the effort to deliver a single bomb. If the requirement were to deliver several, the odds become, of course, even more prohibitive. Getting away from astronomical numbers for a minute, Levi points out that even if there are only ten barriers and even if there were a wildly favorable 80 percent chance of overcoming each hurdle, the chance of final success, following the approach used here, would only be 10 percent. Faced even with such highly favorable odds at each step, notes Levi, the wouldbe atomic terrorist might well decide "that a nuclear plot is too much of a stretch to seriously try." Similarly, Jenkins calculates that even if there are only three barriers and each carried a 50/50 chance of success, the likelihood of accomplishing the full mission would only be 12.5 percent.14 Odds like that are not necessarily prohibitive, of course, but they are likely to be mind-arrestingly small if one is betting just about everything on a successful outcome. Multiple Attempts The odds considered so far are for a single attempt by a single group, and there could be multiple attempts by multiple groups, of course. Although Allison considers al-Qaeda to be "the most probable perpetrator" on the nuclear front, he is also concerned about the potential atomic exploits of other organizations such as Indonesia's Jemaah Islamiyah, Chechen gangsters, Lebanon's Hezbollah, and various doomsday cults. IS However, few, if any, groups appear to have any interest whatever in striking the United States except for al-Qaeda, an issue to be discussed more fully in the next chapter. But even setting that consideration aside, the odds would remain long even with multiple concerted attempts.16 If there were a hundred such efforts over a period of time, the chance at least one of these would be successful comes in at less than one in over 10,000 at the one chance in two level. At the far more realistic level of one chance in three, it would be about one in nearly 35 million. If there were 1,000 dedicated attempts, presumably over several decades, the chance of success would be worse than one in a thousand at the SO/50 level and one in nearly 3.5 million at the one in three level.I7 Of course, attempts in the hundreds are scarcely realistic, though one might be able to envision a dozen or so. Additionally, if there were a large number of concerted efforts, policing and protecting would presumably become easier because the aspirants would be exposing themselves repeatedly and would likely be stepping all over each other in their quest to access the right stuff. Furthermore, each foiled attempt would likely expose flaws in the defense system, holes the ...,. defenders would then plug, making subsequent efforts that much more dif• ficult. For example, when the would-be peddler of a tiny amount of pur loined highly enriched uranium was apprehended in 2006, efforts were made to trace its place of origin using nuclear forensics. IS ." Also, the difficulties for the atomic terrorists are likely to increase over time because of much enhanced protective and policing efforts by ... self-interested governments. Already, for example, by all accounts Russian nuclear materials are much more adequately secured than they were 10 or ~, .-s 15 years ago.19

#### Prefer our evidence – it’s the only one based on robust empirical studies

Victor Asal and Kyle Beardsley, pub. date: 2007, Assistant Prof. Pol. Sci. – SUNY Albany, and Kyle Beardsley, Asst. Prof. Pol. Sci. – Emory Univ., Journal of Peace Research, “Proliferation and International Crisis Behavior,” accessed: 12-18-09, http://jpr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/44/2/139

Much of the literature on the impact of nuclear weapons does not empirically test the arguments made (Geller, 2003: 37; Huth & Russett, 1988: 34). Here, we strive to move beyond speculation to observe the impact of nuclear proliferation on the level of violence used in crises. We examine the relationship between the severity of the violence in crises in the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) dataset and the number of involved states with nuclear weapons, controlling for other factors that increase the likelihood of severe violence.1 We find that crises involving nuclear actors are more likely to end without violence. Also, as the number of nuclear actors involved in a crisis increases, the likelihood of war continues to drop. Drawing from Waltz (Sagan & Waltz, 2003) and the rational deterrence literature, we argue that states facing the possibility of a nuclear attack will be more willing to concede or back down from violent conflict

#### Robust statistical studies prove prolif decreases war and escalation

Victor Asal and Kyle Beardsley, pub. date: 2007, Assistant Prof. Pol. Sci. – SUNY Albany, and Kyle Beardsley, Asst. Prof. Pol. Sci. – Emory Univ., Journal of Peace Research, “Proliferation and International Crisis Behavior,” accessed: 12-18-09, http://jpr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/44/2/139

The literature on international conflict is divided on the impact of nuclear proliferation on state conflict. The optimists’ argument contends that nuclear weapons raise the stakes so high that states are unlikely to go to war when nuclear weapons enter the equation. The pessimists rebut this argument, contending that new proliferators are not necessarily rational and that having nuclear weapons does not discourage war but rather makes war more dangerous. Focusing on one observable implication from this debate, this article examines the relationship between the severity of violence in crises and the number of involved states with nuclear weapons. The study contends that actors will show more restraint in crises involving more participants with nuclear weapons. Using data from the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) project, the results demonstrate that crises involving nuclear actors are more likely to end without violence and, as the number of nuclear actors involved increases, the likelihood of war continues to fall. The results are robust even when controlling for a number of factors including non-nuclear capability. In confirming that nuclear weapons tend to increase restraint in crises, the effect of nuclear weapons on strategic behavior is clarified. But the findings do not suggest that increasing the number of nuclear actors in a crisis can prevent war, and they cannot speak to other proliferation risks

# 2NC

## T

### 2NC Grammar DA

#### ‘on energy production’ is an adjectival phrase- it must modify the financial incentive

Rozakis 2003 [Laurie E. Rozakis, Ph.D. Excerpted from The Complete Idiot's Guide to Grammar and Style © 2003 “Prepositional Phrases: The Big Daddy of Phrases” http://www.infoplease.com/cig/grammar-style/prepositional-phrases-big-daddy-phrases.html]

When a prepositional phrase serves as an adjective, it's called an adjectival phrase. (That was a no-brainer, eh? Who says you don't get a break in this English biz?)¶ An adjectival phrase, as with an adjective, describes a noun or a pronoun. Here are some examples:¶ The manager with the pink slips terrorized the employees.¶ The adjectival phrase “with the pink slips” describes the noun “manager.”¶ The price of the promotion was much too steep.¶ The adjectival phrase “of the promotion” describes the noun “price.”¶ Something in the corner of the desk was moving.¶ The adjectival phrase “in the corner” describes the noun “something”; the adjectival phrase “of the desk” describes the noun “corner.”

#### Grammar is a prerequisite to clash and creativity

**Leahy, 2005** (Anna Leahy, assistant professor at North Central College and award winning poet, Pedagogy; Vol. 5 Issue 2, p304-308, 5p, “Grammar Matters: A Creative Writer’s Argument” Spring, EBSCO)

Wallace Stegner (2002: 64–65), in On Teaching and Writing Fiction, notes, “Whether dismembered syntax has sprung from ignorance or from the lust after originality, I believe it should be questioned. After all, all a reader knows is the marks on the printed page. Those marks have to contribute meaning.” Like Stegner, I think commas matter, as do sentence structures that convey, support, or make ironic the meanings of the words themselves. Ursula Le Guin (1998: 33), in Steering the Craft, puts it slightly differently: our standards for writing, including for grammar and syntax, must be higher than in conversation, “because when we read, we don’t have the speaker’s voice and expression and intonation to make half-finished sentences and misused words clear. We only have the words. And, to be clear to as many readers as possible, they have to follow the agreed-upon rules, the shared rules, of grammar and usage.” When a student spells one word as another or misses a comma after an unwieldy clause, we can downplay its importance, having seen enough similar slips to surmise a larger idea. If pointed out to the student, she sometimes asserts, “But you know what I meant.” Do I? Does she want to relinquish control of meaning to me? I draw my references here from creative writers because I come to teaching as a creative writer. This position gives me a strange cachet in the grammar business. After all, if a poet supposedly exuding a spontaneous overfl ow of emotion cares about grammar and syntax, it mustn’t be all stifl ing regulations. So, I opt to quote to my students the likes of Tom Robbins and Stephen King instead of Strunk and White, whose work I appreciate more than I expect my students will. Grammar, according to Kim Addonizio and Dorianne Laux (1997: 171), “sounds stern, forbidding, and worst of all dull. It smacks of the elementary school classroom, of the meaningless dissection of sentences, of onerous burdens laid on the helpless shoulders of children. But if you are really interested in writing poetry, grammar can be something else: a door to rooms you might never otherwise discover, a way to realize and articulate your visions in language.” Knowing and talking about grammar, syntax, and style—recollecting in tranquillity, shall we say—is part of immersing oneself in language as a writer and is the student’s responsibility when using language to convey ideas. And I now see it more clearly as part of my responsibility as a teacher. The creative writer’s approach to grammar, syntax, and style allows me to bring import and enthusiasm to this teacherly responsibility, to assert its power and reward in writing. In Skinny Legs and All, novelist Robbins (1991: 172) includes a scene in which his characters discuss a word used sloppily, in this case neat. Can o’ Beans remarks, “Slang possesses an economy, an immediacy that’s attractive, all right, but it devalues experience by standardizing and fuzzing it. It hangs between humanity and the real world like a . . . a veil. Slang just makes people more stupid, that’s all, and stupidity eventually makes them crazy.” Fair or not, vague, confusing, or inaccurate sentences imply that those undesirable sentence qualities apply to the ideas and, in the world beyond the classroom, to the writer. Grammar and syntax indeed might allow people to articulate, as clearly as possible, the world and, perhaps, to see it clearly as well. As Le Guin notes (1998: 32), “Even with the best intentions, language misused, language used stupidly, carelessly, brutally, language used wrongly, breeds lies, half-truths, confusion.” To be lax with grammar and syntax might both reflect and cause confusion or ignorance.

### Limits

#### Limits outweigh –

#### A. Most logical—the significance of one-of-many issues is minimal. Constraints inherently increase meaning.

#### B. It’s a precursor—education is inevitable, unfocused education isn’t productive. Limits determine the direction and productivity of learning.

#### Small schools- Huge topic with constantly developing literature magnifies resource disparities- Big programs can have a new aff every other round- No topic generics sufficient to restore balance

#### Key to fairness- essential to ensure that debates at the end of the year have meaningful clash over the mechanism

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

## Econ

### Strong Now

#### Economy is recovering – employment, housing, and consumer confidence prove. Unemployment has been improving for months.

David Olive U.S. election winner will reap major economic recovery: Olive 11-5-12 http://www.thestar.com/business/article/1283005--u-s-election-winner-will-reap-major-economic-recovery-olive

• U.S. job-creation numbers have been improving for months, much faster than one would expect given the severity of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. It’s noteworthy that even construction, the hardest-hit employment sector, added a surprising 20,000 new jobs in October. All sectors except government have been posting increased job-creation numbers since the summer. Indeed, the weak jobs numbers of the summer have since been revised sharply upward. (Initial government statistical reports, in the U.S. and elsewhere, are always subject to revision.)¶ • The U.S. housing market is recovering and with increased momentum. This is surprising, given the record “overhang” of unsold new and existing homes circa 2009 that economists feared would take a decade for the market to absorb after the record over-building of the 2000s. That in turn is promising sign for Canadian raw materials exports.¶ • U.S. consumer confidence, as measured by the University of Michigan and lesser-known pulse-takers, has been rising for months. There is tremendous pent-up demand for new vehicles, appliances and other “big ticket” items – purchases that have been long delayed due to consumer worries over job security. Demand for big-ticket and other goods and services will begin soaring, in contrast with today’s tepid rate of growth, in 2014 if not earlier. That will boost Southern Ontario auto production, 85 per cent of it destined for the U.S. market.

### Jobs Solvency 2NC

#### Oil companies don’t have to add jobs to drill more

Shogan 2011 [Cindy Shogan has been the Executive Director of the Alaska Wilderness League since 1998. Cindy received the Wilburforce Foundation's Conservation Leadership Award November 3, 2011 US News and World Report “Drilling in ANWR Will Not Solve Our National Energy Crisis” http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/is-it-time-to-drill-in-the-arctic-refuge/drilling-in-anwr-will-not-solve-our-national-energy-crisis]

Any claims about job growth from domestic drilling are met with this stark reality: The top five largest oil companies have actually cut their work force by 11,200 employees in the past five years, despite the fact that this country is producing more oil and gas now than at any other time in our history. And, they are making record profits.

#### Their jobs numbers are inflated

Goodell 2012 [Jeff Goodell 9-14-2012 Rolling Stone Magazine “Mitt Romney's Disastrous Energy Plan” http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/mitt-romneys-disastrous-energy-plan-20120914]

During his speech in New Mexico, Romney claimed that expanding oil and gas production would create 3 million new jobs, including 1 million in manufacturing. "Job creation numbers are always speculative," says Sean Sweeney, head of the Global Labor Institute at Cornell University. "With Romney, it's all about voodoo accounting." In fact, the jobs-creation numbers being tossed around by Republicans are pure fantasy. Romney supporter Carly Fiorina recently claimed on Meet the Press that completing the Keystone pipeline would create "over a million jobs." But even TransCanada, the company that will build the pipeline, estimates that it will create only 6,500 jobs a year.

### No War

#### No causal relationship – ignores other variables

Niall Ferguson (Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University and a Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University) 2006 Foreign Affairs, September/October, Vol. 85, Issue 5

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### No escalation – its all just rhetoric

Charles Boehmer (political science professor at the University of Texas) 2007 Politics & Policy, 35:4, “The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict”

The theory presented earlier predicts that lower rates of growth suppress participation in foreign conflicts, particularly concerning conflict initiation and escalation to combat. To sustain combat, states need to be militarily prepared and not open up a second front when they are already fighting, or may fear, domestic opposition. A good example would be when the various Afghani resistance fighters expelled the Soviet Union from their territory, but the Taliban crumbled when it had to face the combined forces of the United States and Northern Alliance insurrection. Yet the coefficient for GDP growth and MID initiations was negative but insignificant. However, considering that there are many reasons why states fight, the logic presented earlier should hold especially in regard to the risk of participating in more severe conflicts. Threats to use military force may be safe to make and may be made with both external and internal actors in mind, but in the end may remain mere cheap talk that does not risk escalation if there is a chance to back down. Chiozza and Goemans (2004b) found that secure leaders were more likely to become involved in war than insecure leaders, supporting the theory and evidence presented here. We should find that leaders who face domestic opposition and a poorly performing economy shy away from situations that could escalate to combat if doing so would compromise their ability to retain power.

## Venezuela

### Influence Now

#### We already have it- the plan decreases our claims

Chris Black Major, US Army April 2009 “Post Oil America and a renewable energy policy leads to the abrogation of the Middle East to China” http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a530125.pdf

First, whatever energy source is chosen will always be vulnerable to attack. Terrorists can just as easily destroy nuclear plants, wind farms, hydroelectric dams, and large solar arrays. Second, the economic vitality of the global community depends on the major shipping straits in the world. A rogue state may well blockade a strait, but many straits can be circumnavigated and it is highly unlikely the world community would idly standby and allow a blockade to happen. The last issue ignores the fact that US purchasing power does have influence over the oil exporting countries of the world and it is not necessarily true that the world would be better off if the US had no influence in these oil-exporting countries. And further, it completely forgets that all of the world’s oil is traded using the US dollar and that much of the money that pays for the oil from oil-exporting nations ends up buying large volumes of American debt. Unfortunately, no one has truly explored the second and third order effects on US foreign policy in a post-oil America. What would the geopolitical implications be of a US that doesn’t need oil?

### Prolif

#### No cascade of proliferation – its all alarmist rhetoric

Muthia Alagappa, pub. date: 2008, Distinguished Senior Fellow, East-West Center, “The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia,” accesed: 1-6-09, p. 521-2, Google Books

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventative action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India’s and Pakistan’s nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran’s quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country’s security concerns about the U ntiedStates and Tehran’s regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S.-Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in it’s political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country’s decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. Through appealing, the domino theory is not predictive; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that sub region (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

## China

### Sino-India War Impact Calc 2NC

#### Escalation is likely- tensions and historical rivalries

Emmott 8 (Bill, Former Editor – Economist, “Tibet is one thing, but India and China tensions Spell Bigger Disaster”, Sunday Times, 3-30, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1993902/posts)

An array of disputes, historical bitternesses and regional flashpoints weigh down on all three countries. Conflict is not inevitable but nor is it inconceivable. If it were to occur – over Taiwan, say, or the Korean peninsula or Tibet or Pakistan – it would not simply be an intra-Asian affair. The outside world would be drawn in. Such a conflict could break out suddenly. This month’s unrest in Tibet has shown just how volatile China can be – and how easily one of those flashpoints could cause international tension. In 1962 China and India fought a border war that humiliated India and left an enduring legacy of bitterness and suspicion. Both countries are now increasing their military spending and trying to modernise their armed forces.

### SCS Coop Now

#### China is willing to settle South China Sea disputes through cooperation and negotiation

Wu Shicun the director of the National Institute for South China Sea Studies “Who are the real troublemakers in the South China Sea?” Globaltimes.cn | 2012-11-6 21:17:06 http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/742715.shtml

China adheres to the road of peaceful development, unswervingly pursuing an independent foreign policy of peace and a defense policy that is defensive in nature rather than trying to expand its sphere of influence. Never seeking hegemony is China's solemn commitment to the whole world.¶ China is a committed protector of the peace and stability of the South China Sea. It has never claimed sovereignty over the entire South China Sea, nor will it expand its current claim. The Chinese people love peace, and uphold the principle of good neighborly friendship.¶ Yet, it does not mean that China will accept its territorial sovereignty or maritime rights and interests being infringed by foreign countries. China respects other countries, and is willing to settle territorial and jurisdictional disputes with its neighbors through consultations and negotiations on a friendly and equal basis. But China’s legitimate rights and appeals must get its due respect and assurance.

### 2NC China Rise

#### China benefits way more than us

Hulbert 11/07 [Matthew Hulbert Lead Analyst at European Energy Review and consultant to a number of governments & institutional investors, most recently as Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations 11/07/2012 Forbes “Obama Ground Zero: Why Cheap American Energy Is The Death Of American Power” http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/11/07/obama-ground-zero-why-cheap-american-energy-is-the-death-of-american-power/2/]

Unfortunately, those writing this perfectly shaped script have missed a fatal subplot when it comes to cheap U.S. oil: Economic gains for America will only ever be marginal for a post-industrial country, whereas for China, it will be nothing short of an import miracle. If America forges ahead to become the world’s largest oil producer in the next five years, mirroring what’s already happened in natural gas, OPEC will have little option but give up on price, and go for enhanced volume instead. In a new world of cheap energy abundance, the only real winner is China, hands down. Far from being Washington’s global salvation, cheap energy will be its instrumental to its nadir. ‘Obama ground zero’, it starts here.¶ The clock is already ticking for the U.S., precisely because it’s seeing liquid gains that have already played out in the gas world. After a secular decline from 1986 to 2008 that left America importing over 60% of its oil, the turnaround has been staggering. Production growth has averaged 500,000 barrels per day over the past four years, with liquids output set to hit a massive 11.4 million b/d into 2013. What’s more, despite Mitt Romney’s ‘drill baby drill’ ticket, it was never really going to matter who won the White House in November 2012 – both candidates were always going to keep looking to energy as the main economic catalyst for America.¶ Some 60,000 wells have been drilled in the U.S. since President Obama first took office, and the numbers will keep going up towards 2016. This has fundamentally been driven by the private sector that went after dry gas first, and it’s now moved to wets; hardly a party that the Federal government has any interest in wrecking. American liquids production stands at a 14-year high; imports are down to 41%, figures that could drop as low as 35% in the coming years – and significantly lower – if transport efficiency and switching measures kick in. Production is still fractionally below Saudi Arabia, but few doubt that under ‘business as usual’ American production will leap towards 13-15 million barrels a day over the next five years. Uncle Sam reclaims its mantle as the largest energy producer in the world. Balance of payments improve, the deficit is fixed, oil flows North to South across the Americas, never East to West across the Atlantic. America is back. And it’s big.¶ Sounds great, and even better when the message is relayed by the energy independence ‘coterie’ dangling the prospect of ‘1.6 million’ new energy jobs; but let’s stop there for a minute and ask what really happens if America goes headlong into becoming the world’s largest oil producer? Nobody wants to think about that side of the equation when the overriding aim is securing ‘energy independence’ – but think they must – precisely because American energy gains are going to come with a wealth of downside geopolitical baggage. The most fundamental of which is that it’s neither in Washington’s transitional interests to shift the energy pendulum West, let alone forging a new energy world where hydrocarbons are structurally cheap.¶ This is a comparative game that America needs to play with China as its only rival to the global throne. Not a race to the ‘bottom of the barrel’ that delivers a pyrrhic ‘victory’ for the U.S. while handing over all the geo-economic and geopolitical keys to China.

#### Eliminates Middle East presence- that’s key to projection of power

Hulbert 11/07 [Matthew Hulbert Lead Analyst at European Energy Review and consultant to a number of governments & institutional investors, most recently as Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations 11/07/2012 Forbes “Obama Ground Zero: Why Cheap American Energy Is The Death Of American Power” http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/11/07/obama-ground-zero-why-cheap-american-energy-is-the-death-of-american-power/2/]

The second – related - fact is that it makes a total mockery of American military posture in the Middle East. It doesn’t make sense for America to spend billions of dollars providing external security guarantees across the Gulf, only to watch them internally implode under the weight of lower oil prices, directly driven by U.S. energy output. That’s not great news for the State Department, that knows full well that its presence in the Middle East has nothing to do with securing energy supplies for American consumers, and everything to do with projecting pivotal U.S. power across Eurasia, the Middle East and into Asia. Stay planted in the Gulf, and Washington can exact ‘easy’ concessions elsewhere. But unfortunately for Mrs. Clinton, the ‘Carter Doctrine’ simply isn’t going to wash with the U.S. masses when it comes to maintaining Washington’s strategic role in the world. Why ‘waste’ American treasure and blood on OPEC states when the U.S. is swimming in oil? Trying to explain the complexities of global energy markets to American voters when things turn bad – and collateral costs spiral out of control – forget it.

#### We would seriously be delivering to China the world

Hulbert 11/07 [Matthew Hulbert Lead Analyst at European Energy Review and consultant to a number of governments & institutional investors, most recently as Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations 11/07/2012 Forbes “Obama Ground Zero: Why Cheap American Energy Is The Death Of American Power” http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/11/07/obama-ground-zero-why-cheap-american-energy-is-the-death-of-american-power/2/]

But if the unconventional balance goes full circle, it will do so with a deadly twist; we’ll enter a brave new world where the aim of the game is volume, not one of price. For those confused, please don’t be. This is precisely why the U.S. needs to be very careful how it uses its energy gains in the next few years. If it opens Pandora’s Box of globally cheap energy, not only will it soon be surpassed by OPEC and Russia ramping up volumes on strategic grounds, it will have failed to grasp the biggest game of all: Washington will deliver exactly what China wants as its only contender to superpower status. The dream scenario of cheap and abundant energy supplies, handing the keys to the global economy directly over to China: Beijing gets its industrial revolution on the cheap, sourcing supplies from wherever they like in a perennial buyer’s market. It’s a very simple question, cui bono from cheap energy? Not America, they’ve had their industrial highpoint in the mid twentieth century, but China, China, China. Far from being America’s salvation, cheap energy will be the biggest strategic own goal in history.

### China Rise Impact

#### China rise causes escalation

Zbigniew K. Brzezinski (CSIS counselor and trustee and cochairs the CSIS Advisory Board. He is also the Robert E. Osgood Professor of American Foreign Policy at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, in Washington, D.C. He is cochair of the American Committee for Peace in the Caucasus and a member of the International Advisory Board of the Atlantic Council. He is a former chairman of the American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee. He was a member of the Policy Planning Council of the Department of State from 1966 to 1968; chairman of the Humphrey Foreign Policy Task Force in the 1968 presidential campaign; director of the Trilateral Commission from 1973 to 1976; and principal foreign policy adviser to Jimmy Carter in the 1976 presidential campaign. From 1977 to 1981, Dr. Brzezinski was national security adviser to President Jimmy Carter. In 1981, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his role in the normalization of U.S.-China relations and for his contributions to the human rights and national security policies of the United States. He was also a member of the President’s Chemical Warfare Commission (1985), the National Security Council–Defense Department Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy (1987–1988), and the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (1987–1989). In 1988, he was cochairman of the Bush National Security Advisory Task Force, and in 2004, he was cochairman of a Council on Foreign Relations task force that issued the report Iran: Time for a New Approach. Dr. Brzezinski received a B.A. and M.A. from McGill University (1949, 1950) and Ph.D. from Harvard University (1953). He was a member of the faculties of Columbia University (1960–1989) and Harvard University (1953–1960). Dr. Brzezinski holds honorary degrees from Georgetown University, Williams College, Fordham University, College of the Holy Cross, Alliance College, the Catholic University of Lublin, Warsaw University, and Vilnius University. He is the recipient of numerous honors and awards) February 2012 “After America” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/03/after\_america?page=0,0

China, invariably mentioned as America's prospective successor, has an impressive imperial lineage and a strategic tradition of carefully calibrated patience, both of which have been critical to its overwhelmingly successful, several-thousand-year-long history. China thus prudently accepts the existing international system, even if it does not view the prevailing hierarchy as permanent. It recognizes that success depends not on the system's dramatic collapse but on its evolution toward a gradual redistribution of power. Moreover, the basic reality is that China is not yet ready to assume in full America's role in the world. Beijing's leaders themselves have repeatedly emphasized that on every important measure of development, wealth, and power, China will still be a modernizing and developing state several decades from now, significantly behind not only the United States but also Europe and Japan in the major per capita indices of modernity and national power. Accordingly, Chinese leaders have been restrained in laying any overt claims to global leadership.¶ At some stage, however, a more assertive Chinese nationalism could arise and damage China's international interests. A swaggering, nationalistic Beijing would unintentionally mobilize a powerful regional coalition against itself. None of China's key neighbors -- India, Japan, and Russia -- is ready to acknowledge China's entitlement to America's place on the global totem pole. They might even seek support from a waning America to offset an overly assertive China. The resulting regional scramble could become intense, especially given the similar nationalistic tendencies among China's neighbors. A phase of acute international tension in Asia could ensue. Asia of the 21st century could then begin to resemble Europe of the 20th century -- violent and bloodthirsty.

# 1NR

### Impact

#### War spread regionally – everything is so interconnected that conflicts explode

The Age 9/24/2007 “Tempers must remain cool as the Middle East heats up”, http://www.theage.com.au/news/editorial/tempers-must-remain-cool-as-the-middle-east-heats-up/2007/09/23/1190486129857.html

THE torturous road to peace in the Middle East becomes more excruciating every day and the cumulative effect of events in the region over the past week offer little hope for any reduction in what appear to be increasingly flammable tensions. If anything, the talk now is of war. The match that lights the flame may well be last Thursday's assassination of Lebanese MP Antoine Ghanem, a violent murder that pitched his divided nation further into turmoil. His death was the latest in a string of attacks against prominent critics of Lebanon's neighbour and former powerbroker Syria, the most notable being the 2005 killing of former prime minister Rafiq Hariri. Mr Ghanem's death introduces an unwelcome element of instability ahead of tomorrow's crucial presidential elections, especially if an anti-Syrian candidate is elected. More importantly, any instability could fan the flames of civil war in a country that has been a pivotal test-run for democracy in the region since September 11, 2001. The killing has been widely condemned by the international community and the finger pointed, once again, at Syria, and by implication its ally, Iran. Syria has, somewhat ingenuously, denied any involvement, as it has with the other high-profile assassinations of anti-Syrian leaders in Lebanon. Calls have been made for UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to launch an international probe into the bombing, and this should be carried out with haste. Talk of war further intensified after the deputy commander of Iran's air force, General Mohammad Alavi, announced that Iran had already prepared a plan to attack Israel if it bombed his country. This war of words was further escalated when a senior commander of Iran's Revolutionary Guard chose to outline the capability of his country's ballistic missiles, which he threatened to use on American targets in the Middle East. These threats coincide with growing international pressure on Iran to abandon what is regarded by the West, and particularly by the US, as its clandestine nuclear arms program. The French also added fuel to the fire when Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner warned the world to "prepare for the worst and the worst is war". The head of the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohamed ElBaradei, quickly entered the fray and warned against the use of force against Iran, a move UN officials described as an "out of control" drift to war. This pointed admonition coincides with a string of reports emanating from Washington that the Bush Administration is running out of patience with diplomacy and is intensifying its plans for air strikes against Iran. The events in Lebanon and the debate over Iran run parallel with Israel's declaration of the Gaza Strip as "hostile territory" and Israeli opposition leader Benjamin Netanyahu's confirmation that two weeks ago Israel carried out an air attack deep inside Syria, Iran's only Arab ally, on a site that it believed was being equipped for nuclear development by North Korea. Another suggestion is that the target was Iranian weapons destined for Lebanon's Hezbollah. There has also been speculation that the raid served as a "dry run" for a possible Israeli or US attack on Iran. Meanwhile, US efforts to ensure the success of a Middle East peace conference, planned for November, remain mired in political haggling over what is to be brought to the negotiating table. In the Middle East, every event, every tension, is connected to another, more so since the Iraq war, and it is this very mutuality that can make one act, such as the murder of a Lebanese MP, have dangerous consequences for the region as a whole. The Middle East is now overheated and potentially explosive, and Australia must impress upon its allies that, in a part of the world where every action can easily be met with a disproportionate reaction, there is more mileage in diplomacy than in any military solutio

#### Goes nuclear

Yair Evron, Professor of International Relations at Tel Aviv University, ISRAEL’S NUCLEAR DILLEMA, 1994, p. 123-4

The potential risks involved in the functioning of the superpowers’ C3 may recur in the Middle East and, in some cases, with apparently greater intensity. The probability of erroneous decisions is therefore higher. These factors center on technical failures of warning systems, or the combination of technical failure and human error, deriving from misperception of the enemy’s behavior. There also exist processes of escalation that are totally distinct from technical failure, and which derive exclusively from human error. The latter case is most often the function of the erroneous interpretation of various enemy actions. These factors are liable to yield disastrous outcomes. The outcomes can be divided into two major categories of events: misperception of an enemy action that is mistakenly understood as a conventional or nuclear attack on the state’s nuclear bases or on the state in its entirety. Such a misperception could cause a rapid escalation. The second category comprises the escalation from a conventional war to the use of nuclear weapons. The persistence of intense conflicts in the Middle East will of course contribute to the potential danger of misperceptions. Hence, for example, if the Arab-Israeli peace process fails to advance and in particular were the situation to return to the level of conflict that preceded the Egyptian-Israeli peace agreement, the intensity of the conflict could reinforce the potential for errors of perception among decision-makers. A high level of conflict tends to promote the tendency of decision-makers to view the other side’s actions with great concern.

### Turns Case

#### Sequestration destroys Asian engagement

Horowitz 2012 [Michael C. Horowitz is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania August 9, 2012 “How Defense Austerity Will Test U.S. Strategy in Asia” http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/08/09/how-defense-austerity-will-test-u-s-strategy-in-asia/]

Recognizing the vital role that a peaceful and stable Asia-Pacific plays in ensuring overall global security, the United States has announced plans to rebalance its overall defense efforts toward the region. At the June 2012 Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta stated that “all of the U.S. military services are focused on implementing the president’s guidance to make the Asia-Pacific a top priority.” Unfortunately, the looming “fiscal cliff” facing the United States has large-scale implications for its role in Asia. The 2011 Budget Control Act includes almost $500 billion in automatic cuts to defense spending that will be triggered if Congress fails to pass a deficit reduction bill by January 2, 2013. These cuts would come on the heels of existing reductions of about $487 billion, intended to increase efficiency and decrease the size of ground forces over the next ten years. Consequently, U.S. decision-makers face the difficult task of both addressing current financial realities and implementing an ambitious new strategic agenda in the Asia-Pacific.¶ Decisions about defense spending are integrally linked to the United States’ overall strategy in the Asia-Pacific. Given ongoing uncertainty surrounding North Korea, China’s continuing development of anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) capabilities, and disputes over the East and South China seas, maintaining a robust presence in the region will be a high priority for any future administration. However, sequestration or other major defense cuts could undermine perceptions of U.S. resolve in the Asia-Pacific and make core U.S. allies such as Japan and South Korea doubt Washington’s willingness to invest appropriately in relevant capabilities. Concretely, such cuts could make it more difficult for the United States to maintain its current presence.

### Impact- ME

#### Sequestration wrecks military effectiveness- yellow

Eaglen and O’Hanlon 2012 [Mackenzie Eaglen is a fellow in national security at the American Enterprise Institute. Michael O’Hanlon is senior fellow at Brookings February 24th, 2012 CNN http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/02/24/the-specter-of-sequestration/]

This budget can cannot be kicked down the road. The two of us disagree about the advisability of the first round of budget cuts, as reflected in the new Obama budget. But there is widespread agreement among defense analysts that sequestration would be a nightmare. The implications of yet another round of 10 percent reductions in the military - coming on top of the 10 percent reductions resulting from the August stipulations of the Budget Control Act, yet another 8 to 10 percent that former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates had put in place during the first two years of the Obama administration, and another 20 percent resulting from the gradual winding down of the nation’s wars - would be enormous and dangerous.¶ Simply put, the cuts already baked into the cake and the sequestration that will happen without specific action to reverse it will make it nigh on impossible for the administration to maintain what it rightly considers irreducible strategic requirements for simultaneous military presence, crisis response and warfighting capability in both the Western Pacific/East Asia region as well as the broader Persian Gulf and Middle East.¶ But it’s worse than that. Sequestration will cause its greatest disruptions immediately in early 2013, when mechanistic and severe cuts have to be imposed overnight. The military can adapt to reductions that it sees coming; for all the inefficiencies of the Department of Defense, it is still one of the world’s most competent planning bureaucracies. But this is a whole different kettle of fish: Because spending would have to decline for 2013 based on cuts taking effect only in January, there would be no opportunity to use natural attrition in the force to cut personnel costs, no opportunity to use the natural annual cycle of working with defense industry to restructure contracts and keep alive those weapons programs that are needed and desired, no realistic way to scale back training carefully in a way that saves money yet keeps the military ready. And all this would happen at a time when the president’s new budget anticipates we will still have 68,000 troops in harm’s way in Afghanistan.¶ The military’s warfighting budgets would, in theory, remain untouched, but the entire institution that supports our fighting men and women would be left teetering on the brink of peril not seen since Vietnam and the immediate post-Vietnam years. The accomplishments of the last 30 years of building the world’s finest military would be at risk based on a law cobbled together in a few weeks one Washington summer that was never intended to take effect even by its proponents.¶ How do you slash 10 percent in an organization as large as the military overnight? The types of choices available are all ugly. The President could choose to cut military and civilian pay by up to 15 percent immediately (military health care costs will be hard to cut, so salaries must bear the costs disproportionately); he could chop retirement payouts; or he could cut funds for major weapons systems by up to 20 percent (as legal penalties for making unexpected cuts to contracts will cost money, too). Actually he may have to do all three.¶ Other options include nickel-and-diming combatant commanders, cutting back their training and operating budgets by up to a quarter since these are among the only accounts that can be easily accessed when immediate saving are needed. And of course, the President will be required to make these choices at just the moment we are supposedly trying to signal Iran, North Korea, and China that the United States remains as firmly committed to our interests and allies as ever.¶ Some will suggest that these choices are exaggerations or worst case scenarios to make a case. But the reality is there are no secret pots of money, trust funds, or bailout resources from which the savings can otherwise be found.

### A2 25 Thumpers

#### Fiscal cliff is before all that shit

Klein 11-8 [Ezra Klein 11-8-2012 “Wonkbook: The election is over. Now the fiscal cliff begins.” New York Times http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/11/08/wonkbook-the-election-is-over-now-the-fiscal-cliff-begins/]

25 problems for the second term: The postal service, the farm bill, cybersecurity, etc..

But the ‘fiscal cliff’ looks to be the first priority. ”The day after a hard-fought election that left Barack Obama in the White House and control of Congress divided between the two parties, the nation’s political leaders promised to try to avoid year-end spending cuts and tax increases that threaten to push the U.S. back into recession…But the pressure is on. Deep, automatic federal-spending cuts and tax increases—a combination widely known as the ‘fiscal clif’–will hit in January unless Mr. Obama and Congress agree to some other way to reduce the budget deficit….Going over the cliff, economists say, would not only risk another recession, but would intensify anxiety about the dysfunction of the U.S. political system…To tackle the fiscal cliff, Mr. Obama is expected to initiate a new round of talks with leaders of Congress. The goal would be a ‘grand bargain’ combining higher taxes and money-saving changes to federal benefit programs.” Naftali Bendavid, Damian Paletta, and David Wessel in The Wall Street Journal.

**Fiscal cliff is top of the docket**

**Mak 10/24** Tim is a writer at Politico. “W.H.: Sequester talks after election,” <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1012/82845.html>

President Barack Obama wants to get into negotiations to resolve sequestration and the fiscal cliff “right after the election,” a senior White House adviser told reporters on Wednesday, following up on the president’s assertion that Washington could reach a “grand bargain” in “six months.”¶ Adviser David Plouffe told reporters on the campaign trail about Obama’s ambitions in response to follow-up questions about an interview the president gave the Des Moines Register, in which he said he thought Washington could resolve the “fiscal cliff” early in a potential second term.¶ "The good news is that there's going to be a forcing mechanism to deal with what is the central ideological argument in Washington right now ... when you combine the Bush tax cuts expiring, the sequester in place, the commitment of myself and my opponent ... we're going to be in a position where I believe in the first six months we are going to solve that big piece of business," Obama said.

### A2 Recession Now

#### Economic recovery coming with deal- only going off the cliff can derail it

Mikolajczak 11-8 [Chuck Mikolajczak 11-8-2012 Fox Business “Wall Street falls as "fiscal cliff" concern outweighs data” http://www.foxbusiness.com/news/2012/11/08/wall-street-falls-as-fiscal-cliff-concern-outweighs-data/]

Stocks extended losses on Thursday, with the Nasdaq briefly dropping 1 percent, as investors recalibrated for upcoming negotiations over the "fiscal cliff," which overshadowed a batch of positive economic data.¶ Investors worry that if no deal is reached in Congress over some $600 billion in spending cuts and tax increases due to kick in early next year, it could derail the U.S. economic recovery and lead to a recession.¶ Data released on Thursday showed a better-than-expected drop in initial jobless claims and a rise in exports, news that had earlier been expected to bolster equity markets after steep declines a day earlier.

### Uniqueness

#### Framing- Obama & Boehner want a deal – the question is whether Obama can keep Senate Dems in line

Jennifer Rubin | 03:05 PM ET, 11/09/2012

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/post/can-obama-make-a-deal-this-time/2012/11/09/0abb179c-2aa0-11e2-96b6-8e6a7524553f\_blog.html Can Obama make a deal this time?

This is precisely where we were about 15 months ago when the grand bargain on precisely these terms broke down. It may shock dim reporters or confuse Democratic spinners, but this is nothing new. The only thing that has changed is that the president has the experience of seeing a grand bargain of historic proportions slip through his grasp. He and Boehner know precisely where the deal is to be had — where they were when Obama upped the ante on taxes and the grand bargain crumbled. The political alignment is not unlike what it was in 2011. The president and Boehner want a deal. Senate Democrats from red states who will face voters in 2014 don’t want to send the country over the fiscal cliff or be tagged as tax hikers. Senate House members and safe blue state Senate Democrats would just as soon demand a tax rate hike, let the country go over the cliff and blame Republicans. What is different today, however, is that the president really has no interest in getting pushed around by unrealistic liberals in his party. They might have to stand for reelection, but he doesn’t and it must pain him to realize the grand bargain got away last time. As for Senate Republicans they already passed the revenue-raising Rubicon in the supercommittee when Sen. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) put a deal on the table that would have increased revenue without tax hikes. There will be a Kabuki dance when everyone comes to the White House next week for a meeting on the fiscal cliff. But that said, the opportunity for a deal is very much there just as it was more than a year ago. The only question is whether the president has the nerve and skill to grab it this time.

#### Obama’s PC guarantees passage- High ground

Healey 11-9 [Jon Healey 11-9-2012 LA Times “President Obama talks tough on the fiscal cliff” http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-obama-talks-tough-on-fiscal-cliff-20121109,0,4421577.story]

Obama actually went a bit further than his Republican counterparts in trying to ratchet up the political pressure. He noted that everyone's taxes are slated to rise in January; the only disagreement between Republicans and Democrats is whether to raise rates for individuals earning more than $200,000 and couples earning more than $250,000.¶ "Now, fortunately, we shouldn’t need long negotiations or drama to solve that part of the problem," Obama said. Noting that the Senate has already passed a bill to continue the Bush-era tax cuts for everyone except those higher-income households and small businesses, Obama said, "All we need is action from the House. And I’ve got the pen ready to sign the bill right away. I'm ready to do it."¶ The president knows full well that Republicans aren't about to step into that trap; renewing the tax cuts for the middle class eliminates much of the negotiating leverage they might have for continuing the tax cuts for the upper incomes.¶ Boehner wasted little time putting a match to that proposal:¶ “The increased tax rates that would be allowed under the Senate-passed bill are part of the fiscal cliff that economists are warning us to avoid," the speaker said. "Those increased tax rates will destroy jobs in America by hurting small businesses across the country. Republicans are eager to get to work on an agreement that averts the entire fiscal cliff."¶ Still, Obama made clear Friday that he's not backing away from his campaign pledge to seek a "balanced" solution to the deficit that cuts spending and wrings more tax dollars from high-income Americans.¶ "That’s how we did it in the 1990s, when Bill Clinton was president," Obama said. "That’s how we can reduce the deficit while still making the investments we need to build a strong middle class and a strong economy. That’s the only way we can still afford to train our workers, or help our kids pay for college, or make sure that good jobs in clean energy or high-tech manufacturing don’t end up in countries like China....¶ "And I just want to point out this was a central question during the election. It was debated over and over again. And on Tuesday night, we found out that the majority of Americans agree with my approach."¶ Bear in mind that Boehner had doubled down Friday morning on his opposition to raising tax rates on anybody, including high-income "job creators." But these are just opening offers. Even with the government slated to reach the fiscal cliff on Jan. 1, it's too early for either side to make any real concessions.¶ And besides, the positions taken by each side, as far apart as they may seem, still have some overlap.¶ As The Times' editorial board observed Friday, the GOP's opening offer rules out only tax rate increases, not revenue increases achieved through tax "reform." In other words, Republicans explicitly left on the table the possibility of having high-income households pay more by eliminating some of the deductions, exemptions and other preferences that lower their tax bills.

#### Momentum

CBS Money Watch 11-8 [CBS Money Watch 11-8-2012 “Biden: Dems ready to compromise on 'fiscal cliff'” http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505245\_162-57546858/biden-dems-ready-to-compromise-on-fiscal-cliff/]

Biden's comments came as House Speaker John Boehner offered Wednesday to pursue a deal with Obama that would include increased revenues to help reduce the nation's staggering debt and put its finances in order. House Republicans want Obama to make good on a "balanced approach" that would including spending cuts and address government social benefit programs, Boehner said.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid also said he wants a quick solution to the so-called fiscal cliff, a one-two punch of expiring tax cuts and across-the-board spending cuts to the Pentagon and domestic programs that could total $800 billion next year.¶ With the election over, Biden said he is optimistic a deal can be reached. "I think we can do something on corporate taxes sooner than later. That would be positive, be a little confidence-building," he said.¶ While the president and Congress have been gridlocked for nearly two years, Biden said he thinks the election results mean that "the fever will break" in Washington. "And you know, Barack's re-elected, so this sort of (GOP) cause to keep a second term from happening" is over, Biden said. Obama "is there for four years."

#### Insiders

Sahadi 11-7 [Jeanne Sahadi 11-7-2012 CNN Money “What Obama's win means for fiscal cliff” http://money.cnn.com/2012/11/07/news/economy/obama-win-fiscal-cliff/index.html]

With the elections out of the way, the time to actually govern has arrived. And the pending fiscal cliff will test everyone's mettle.¶ The fiscal cliff is the legislative equivalent of a slow-motion train wreck that Congress and President Obama can avoid ... but only if they work together.¶ Some seasoned Washington observers think they will do just that, despite their troubled history, because they don't want to be blamed for what happens if they fail.

### Uniqueness- A2 House GOP

#### Boehner can keep them in line

Walsh 11-9 [Deirdre Walsh, CNN Senior Congressional Producer 11-9-2012 CNN “Boehner says GOP willing to compromise on fiscal cliff” http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/09/politics/boehner-fiscal-cliff/]

The speaker seemed to brush off the notion that he would have a tough time getting fellow House Republicans to sign on to whatever agreement he discussed with the White House.¶ "When the president and I have been able to come to agreement, there's been no problem getting it passed here in the House," Boehner said flatly.¶ A senior aide to a top House conservative who hasn't always agreed with Boehner told CNN, "For the most part, you're going to see people give the speaker a chance to see what he can do."

### Link

#### Nearly every Senate dem hates the plan – fiat requires getting 19 to switch votes

Jim Hoft March 14, 2012,

<http://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2012/03/senate-democrats-reject-keystone-pipeline-anwr-drilling-in-one-easy-vote/> Senate Democrats Reject Keystone Pipeline & ANWR Drilling In One Easy Vote

Senate Democrats rejected the Keystone Pipeline and drilling in ANWR yesterday in a single vote. EVERY DEMOCRAT, except for Senator Begich from Alaska, voted against the legislation that would increase American oil production. The Pioneer Press reported: The Senate on Tuesday resoundingly rejected a sweeping measure to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and other protected areas to oil drilling, as well as to approve construction of the Keystone pipeline project. Tuesday’s vote was the first time in four years that the Senate has voted on a measure including ANWR drilling, and it failed miserably. The proposal needed 60 votes to pass; it only received 41 votes in favor, with 57 senators against. Kansas Republican Sen. Pat Roberts pushed the measure as an amendment to the bill that funds transportation projects across the nation.

#### ANWR alienates Senate Dems and moderate Republicans

By: Daniel Horowitz (Diary) | March 8th, 2011

http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2011/03/08/now-is-the-time-to-pass-an-anwr-bill/ Now is the Time to Pass an ANWR Bill It's time to launch a counter-offensive and end the Democrats' war on oil once and for all.

Yet, for the past 15 years, a truculent group of Democrats, along with a handful of liberal Republicans in the Senate, has prevented another ANWR bill from making its way to the president’s desk. Now, with Obama behind the desk, he has promised to block any effort to drill in ANWR, the Outer Continental Shelf, the Rockies, and much of the Gulf coast. It is high time that we issue a direct challenge to Obama and quell his war on energy independence and productivity.

#### Plan means breaking a democratic filibuster

Senator John Thune Dec 21 2005

<http://www.thune.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/press-releases?ID=4d5a2d02-f746-4caf-a047-2870e8e0bc95> Recent Press Releases Thune: Senate Democrats Block Vote on ANWR and $2 billion for LIHEAP Funding

Senator John Thune made the following statement today regarding the Senate Democrats’ filibuster against expanding oil production in Alaska, which would provide long-term funding for LIHEAP, as well as $2 billion for immediate LIHEAP funding: "Senate Democrats are obstructing an effort to pass legislation that provides America a chance to become less dependent on foreign sources of energy. This bill would not only open ANWR for oil exploration and drilling, but it would also provide a long-term funding stream for LIHEAP," said Thune. "With energy costs at an all-time high and families going cold because of the high cost of home heating oil, it is inexcusable for the Senate Democrats to play politics with this issue." In addition to providing vital funding for our troops and opening ANWR, the Fiscal Year 2006 Defense Appropriations bill also provides $2 billion for LIHEAP. The bill includes a provision to allow lease sales to produce 10.4 billion barrels of oil from the Artic National Wildlife Refuge and direct 5% of revenues from ANWR to provide the long-term funding for LIHEAP. "This winter’s freezing temperatures are putting an enormous strain on families and current LIHEAP funds, so it is irresponsible for Senate Democrats to obstruct an issue as important as this," said Thune. "By choosing to filibuster this needed legislation, Senate Democrats are leaving South Dakota’s low income families out in the cold. I urge my Senate colleagues to put cold and freezing families ahead of protests and politics."

### A2 Olive Branch

#### The turn is a link because the timing is wrong – olive branches might work someday, but will cause a harder line Republican position in the near term – SQ executive branch approach better

Kevin Book, managing director at ClearView Energy Partners: Wednesday, November 7, 2012

http://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2012/11/07/archive/8?terms=nuclear+obama ClearView Energy's Book discusses impact of Obama re-election, congressional outcome on energy, environment policy

Monica Trauzzi: So, Kevin, a late night. President Obama retaining the presidency, the Republicans maintaining the House, and the Senate going to the Democrats. Does this mean the status quo on energy and environment policy, or did you see some sort of paradigm shift where we can expect things to change from how they've been the last four years? Kevin Book: Well, that's a, that's the kind of question that a mixed election outcome is going to bring a mixed answer. So here's your mixed answer. You have two years of a return to the regulatory agenda from 2009, which is to say that there's a lot of pent-up environmental energy, call it caged up, if you will, that is going to get released, because there's going to be lawsuits if it doesn't. So the regulatory agenda will be how energy policy moves until at least the midterm elections, and quite frankly, that regulatory policy is going to be left of center.Monica Trauzzi: So we're going to get into more specifics on that in a second. On President Obama specifically, do you think that he is going to work with congressional leadership differently now, because he doesn't have to worry about getting re-elected? Is there going to be more compromise? Kevin Book: The Bill Clinton question. Is this the moment where he can move to the center safely? And the answer is probably yes, except that he has to have somebody on the other side moving with him. If you look at the demographics of the Senate, you have another election in 2014 where the Republicans still have a chance. It may be that holding the line is the way to go. If the tea party comes in strong, and it looks like they're still holding, and we'll find out final results at the end of the day, probably, then what we'll know is that there's a, sort of a reinforced, emboldened Republican will to resist and to ask for the big deal, even though the president retained election, even though the Republicans didn't claim the Senate, because there is still a 2014 possibility. If that evaporates because Republicans are willing to do a deal in the Senate, then the centrist ovations of the president might be answered. But I wouldn't think it starts out that way.