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#### Silver supply is tight – new manufacturing demands won’t be met

Scully 1/27, Mike, mechanical engineer and product designer, January 27, 2012, The Silver Singularity Is Near, <http://community.nasdaq.com/News/2012-01/the-silver-singularity-is-near.aspx?storyid=117209>

The main way the futures market keeps down the spot price of silver is by greatly adding to the supply of silver for investment. Take the example of the COMEX which currently has 102,516 open interest contracts (512 million ounces) promised for future delivery. This compares to roughly 117 million ounces of physical silver available for investment in 2010 (Mine supplies 736 + recycling 215 + gov't. sales 45 - fabrication 879 = 117Moz.) Shorts have promised to deliver over four times the amount of physical silver available per year. In other words, **demand for silver investment at today's price is much higher than physical supply**. **This works fine as long as futures investors don't take physical delivery.** Shorts can simply settle the contract for the cash value and everybody's happy. If a small amount of investors stand for delivery, the shorts can transfer silver from their accounts at the COMEX or buy silver on the open market. **However, as more investors stand for physical delivery, things can get dicey.**¶ Kyle Bass of Hayman Capital was clearly concerned about this leverage risk in the COMEX when he said the following:¶ "My opinion is very simple as a fiduciary... to the extent that you own gold and you are going to own it a long time --it's not a trade. It costs us about 90 basis points a year to roll it through financial futures contracts," he said.¶ "And then we went and looked at the COMEX. The COMEX at the time they had about $80 billion in open interest between futures and futures options. In the warehouse they had $2.7 billion of deliverables. So $80 billion in open interest -- $2.7 billion in deliverables. We're gonna own it a long time. You're on the board, as a fiduciary, what do you do? That's an easy one. You go get it. So you go take a billion of $2.7 billion and you let them worry about the rest."¶ "When I talked to the head of deliveries at COMEX NYMEX, I was like, 'What if 4% of the people want deliveries?' He said, 'Oh Kyle, that never happens. We rarely ever get a 1% delivery.' And I asked, 'Well what if it does happen?' And he said,'Price will solve everything' And I said, 'Thanks, give me the gold.'"¶ Mr. Bass was discussing the gold futures market, but the same dynamics apply to the silver market. With silver at $33 one big fish like Bass (pun intended) could take down 30 million ounces with his billion dollars, which is 80% the entire amount of registered silver at the COMEX.¶ Thanks, give me the silver!¶ **To date, there hasn't been a failure to deliver on a futures contract at the COMEX. But that's not to say it can't happen.** **Already there are cracks appearing in the silver derivatives dam.** The silver derivatives market requires some amount of physical silver to back it up. As the physical silver available in the market decreases, the paper market becomes more and more leveraged. Many **trends are converging to remove physical silver from the market**. Here are a few industrial trends:¶ For the past decades, governments have been selling their silver stockpiles into the markets, thus adding to supply. These stockpiles are basically depleted and **governments are likely to become net buyers of silver.**¶ Photographic demand, which has been decreasing for the past decade is becoming a less significant part of demand and will soon cease to be a driver of silver demand trends. Also, as most photographic silver is recycled, photographic use approaching zero means less recycling supply moving forward.¶ Similarly, A steady decline in silverware demand is also reaching its lower bounds and at some point will cease to be a negative driver of silver demand trends.¶ According to the Silver Institute, during silver's bull market from 2001 to 2010, mine supply increased by an average of 2.2% per year, from 606 to 736 million ounces. However, **demand from industrial uses** (from which the majority of silver cannot be recycled at anywhere near today's price) **increased 3.7% per year** from 350 to 487 million ounces.¶ The trends discussed above are enough to show that we will reach a point at some time in the future where fabrication demand exceeds supply. But it is the investment trends discussed below that I believe will bring us to a supply/demand crunch much sooner than (almost) anyone expects.¶ Silver coin sales are skyrocketing.¶ During the early 2000s, global coin sales were stable at around 35-40 million ounces. Then from 2007 to 2010 coin sales increased 38% per year to 101Moz. and show no signs of having slowed for 2011. Physical coin sale could soon eat up the entire bullion supply. Silver coins are not recycled because the coin value is higher than the melt value. In case you are wondering if this trend can continue, keep in mind that 100Moz. equates to 1/68th of a coin for each person on the planet.¶ Chinese investment demand is "going parabolic" and the Chinese people seem to prefer physical.¶ In the COMEX futures markets, the multiple margin hikes by the CME in 2011 shook out a bunch of weak longs which drove down the price but decreased leverage and formed a stronger foundation for future price advances.¶ Eric Sprott's fund (PSLV) recently completed a secondary offering deal which will remove 10.6 million ounces of physical silver worth about $350k from the market. This is part of what could eventually become a $1.5B offering, so it looks like he's determined to break the paper market's back.¶ And perhaps the beginning of the end for the futures market was the bankruptcy of MF Global. From that we learned that the regulators will twist bankruptcy rules to put big banks such as J.P. Morgan ahead of regular investors. We learned new buzzwords like rehypothecation and co-mingling. We learned that leveraged accounts aren't safe, and we learned that even investors who own allocated physical bars of gold with listed serial numbers can see those bars confiscated and chopped up for distribution by a bankruptcy judge. These were valuable lessons which caused many futures investors to decrease their leverage, increase their due diligence regarding their broker, or get out of the futures markets all together and get in to physical.¶ As physical silver is removed from the foundation of the paper market, leverage will increase until a leveraged short can't get the silver and defaults on his contract. That's when promises are broken, confidence turns to panic, and the leveraged derivatives house of cards comes toppling down.¶ To continue my multiple metaphors, that's when the derivatives dam breaks. That's the 101st Elmo buyer entering Walmart with a thousand determined shoppers close behind him. That's what folks like Ray Kurzweil might call "the singularity". It's the point when all hell breaks loose and things go hyperbolic. The stampede for physical silver will begin.¶ Paper futures contract holders will increasingly stand for physical delivery, creating the ultimate short squeeze as paper shorts frantically try to acquire physical metal that is nowhere to be found to cover their positions.¶ **Manufacturers who use silver in their products will scramble to secure physical silver supply lines to prevent their manufacturing lines from grinding to a halt, buying up anything and everything they can get their hands on.**¶ **Governments who have been net sellers of silver for the past 30 years and now have virtually no silver stocks, will be competing to increase their sovereign stockpiles of this strategically critical element at any price.**¶ The general investing public will become fully aware of the incredible supply and demand story for silver that had been hidden under the surface by the murky layer of paper scum, and dive in to get a piece of the action.¶ In the words of that COMEX manager, "price will solve everything." Indeed. **A much, much higher price**.

#### Solar projects use 11% of the world’s silver

Goossens 11, Ehren, Jun 23, 2011, Silver Surge Makes ‘Headwind’ For Solar/Fossil Fuel Rivalry, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-06-22/silver-surge-makes-headwind-for-solar-in-fossil-fuel-rivalry.html>

Soaring silver prices are hampering the solar industry’s ability to compete with fossil fuels.¶ **Panel makers consume about 11 percent of the world’s supply of silver, the material in solar cells that conducts electricity.** The metal has appreciated 74 percent to $35.30 a troy ounce on average so far this year from $20.24 last year.¶ **The surge in silver prices is squeezing margins for most solar companies**, according to research by Barclays Capital. ¶ **A typical solar cell uses 0.10 grams of silver for each watt of generating capacity. That amounts to about 20 grams in a 200-watt panel**, adding $23.52 to the cost of each panel, according to New Energy Finance. ¶ Prices for solar cells have dropped about 27 percent this year and would be even lower if each panel didn’t require about 20 grams of silver, according to Bloomberg New Energy Finance. **That’s pushing back the date when companies** such as Solarworld AG (SWV) and LDK Solar Co. **can deliver solar power at prices that are competitive with traditional energy.**¶“Global silver prices have gone up a lot, and solar cells use silver paste as the front-side contact material,” Shawn Qu, chief executive of Canadian Solar Inc. (CSIQ), which is based in China, said in an interview. “The increase of the silver costs will give us a challenge in efforts to reduce solar cell costs.”¶ Prices for photovoltaic solar panels were $1.49 a watt in June, compared with about $1.80 in January, New Energy Finance estimates, as manufacturers especially in China raised production and incentives were trimmed in Europe.¶ ‘Headwind’¶ “Some companies are implementing measures to reduce silver consumption, but we believe rising silver prices could still act as a headwind,” Barclays Capital wrote in a note to clients.¶ The price of the silver paste that Canadian Solar uses to print circuits on the front of its solar cells more than tripled in the past year, Qu said. That adds about 3 cents to 4 cents a watt, or 2 percent, to the cost of the panels.¶ The company’s gross margins narrowed to about 15 percent in the first quarter from 17 percent in the prior quarter as the price of cells fell faster than the cost of production, the company based in Suzhou New District, China, reported in May.¶ A typical solar cell uses 0.10 grams of silver for each watt of generating capacity. That amounts to about 20 grams in a 200-watt panel, adding $23.52 to the cost of each panel, according to New Energy Finance. The cost for metal in each panel totals about 11 cents a watt, up from 5 cents a year ago, the London-based industry researcher estimates.

**[turns case because higher demand 🡪 higher prices, means cost parity terminally screwed]**

#### Silver is key to the US military

Savoie 4, Charles, independent researcher and author of “The Silver Stealers” chronology; masters from ISU, November 2004, WAR & SILVER, http://www.silver-investor.com/charlessavoie/cs\_nov04.htm

Let's take a look at the need for silver as a vital resource material necessary to warfare. We won't be able to examine any detailed weapons breakdown of specific items by exact silver content from one defense contractor to another on a current basis, because that information isn't readily available. I can tell you that as of January 2, 1980---nearly a quarter century past---some **84,000 military parts (aircraft, submarines, etc.) contained precious metal, mostly silver** (Wall Street Journal, January 2, 1980, page 10). American Superconductor and Intermagnetics General won't openly discuss how much silver they will need for superconducting cables. That's probably an understanding with the COMEX shorts---anything to suppress projected silver demand statistics! As you probably know, **America has been without a silver stockpile for strategic defense applications for several years.** We aren't swimming in silver as we were going into World War II. **One of the implications could be a limitation on our ability to wage war overseas; and also spell inadequacy as to our ability to defend our shores**. **Silver is the most versatile metal there is, and a strategic shortage will hurt us more so than shortages of other strategic metals** such as tantalum, platinum, chromium, vanadium and cobalt. America cannot produce enough silver to meet our internal needs, that hasn't happened in most of a century; therefore, silver imports are vital. Over 153 years ago, Merchants Magazine & Commercial Review (March 1851), page 280 spoke of--- "…the numerous uses to which we apply silver, beyond the uses to which we apply gold."

#### Hegemony solves nuke war and extinction---multipolarity is inevitable but absolute US power smoothes the transition and is empirically correlated to perpetual great-power peace

Barnett 11, Thomas P.M. Barnett, Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably **the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured**, with thishistorical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute **lack of mass violence**. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our **stunningly successful stewardship of global order** since World War II.  Let me be more blunt: As the **guardian of globalization**, the U.S. military has been the**greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation.** But the world did not keep sliding down that **path of perpetual war**. Instead, America stepped up andchanged everything by **ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace**. We introduced the **international liberal trade order known asglobalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted wasthe collapse of empires, **an explosion of democracy**, the **persistent spread of human rights**, the liberation of women, **the doubling of life expectancy**, a roughly **10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP** and a**profound and persistent reduction in** battle deaths from **state-basedconflicts.**That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of  global disorder instead of its cure.  With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force.

As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw **a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars**. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude,these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a **99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war**.  We are **clearly headed for a worldorder characterized by multipolarity**, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, **we would do well to keep U.S. power**, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.

To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far **more just form of globalization** -- one **based on actual free trade rather than colonialism**. America then successfully replicated globalizationfurther in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, **setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.**
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#### Obama’s ahead but the race is close---voters are paying attention which means the plan could cause a shift

Cooper 10/25 Michael is a writer at the New York Times’ Caucus blog. “Has Romney’s Rise in Polls Stopped?” 2012, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/25/has-romneys-rise-in-polls-stopped/?gwh=20374120E0C2B79985262EFF8E8CD19D

A debate has been raging among polling analysts and commentators about whether Mitt Romney is still gaining ground, as he did after the first debate, or if his bounce has slowed or stalled. But while some Republicans say that they still have the wind at their backs, several polling analysts weighed in recently to argue that the data suggests there is no longer a Romney surge.¶ Mark Blumenthal, the senior polling editor of the Huffington Post and the founding editor of Pollster.com, wrote a piece this morning with the headline: “Presidential Polls Counter Romney Surge Myth.”¶ “While Romney gained significantly in the wake of the first presidential debate in early October,’’ he wrote, “the lack of a continuing trend over the past two weeks helps counter a theme in some campaign coverage that Romney’s support continues to ‘surge’ nationwide.”¶ Sam Wang, who analyzes state polls at the Princeton Election Consortium, wrote this week that the Mr. Obama’s plunge after the first debate had **stopped with him still ahead**, and delivered the following verdict: “Indeed **the race is close,** but it seems stable. For the last week, there is no evidence that conditions have been moving toward Romney. There is always the chance that I may have to eat my words — but that will require movement that is not yet apparent in polls.”¶ Nate Silver, who writes the FiveThirtyEight blog in The New York Times, wrote Thursday: “Mr. Romney clearly gained ground in the polls in the week or two after the Denver debate, putting himself in a much stronger overall position in the race. However, it seems that he is no longer doing so.”¶ With the race so close in so many places, it can be difficult to assess the true state of play. ¶ Most major national polls, with the exception of a few tracking polls, have shown the race to be essentially tied for months. Some polls in crucial swing states where Mr. Obama has been leading have tightened between the two candidates since the first debate, including Ohio, which is closer than it was a month ago. And **now is the point where many voters pay more attention** to the election, **which can move the polls**. But even with the proliferation of polls and the increased reliance on aggregated polls — lumping or averaging many polls together — it can be difficult to get a realistic picture on any given day in the closing weeks, given that some polls do not reach voters who use only cellphones, and many polls have struggled in an environment where fewer people want to respond to questions.

#### The public opposes new military spending---polls prove

Rosenthal 7/17 Max is a writer for the Huffington Post. “Defense Spending Cuts Popular With Voters: Poll,” 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/17/defense-spending-cuts-poll\_n\_1680726.html

New survey data released on Monday show that voters from both parties support large cuts to the Pentagon budget, dealing a potential blow to Republicans who have sought to make reduced defense spending a campaign headache for President Obama.¶ The survey, conducted by the Program for Public Consultation, the Stimson Center and the Center for Public Integrity, revealed that 80 percent of voters in districts represented by Democrats and 74 percent in Republican districts wanted lower defense spending.¶ While Democratic districts supported larger cuts than their Republican counterparts, the latter still said they would slash defense spending by 15 percent. Such a reduction would leave the Pentagon budget almost $97 billion lower than this year's level.¶ Under the budget deal passed in 2011, the Department of Defense will face $500 billion in across-the-board cuts, known as sequestration, starting next year, unless Congress is unable to unable to agree on a different plan. Politicians of both parties, along with defense officials, have sharply criticized the potential cuts, with Defense Secretary Leon Panetta calling them a "goofy meat ax approach." But the one-year cut favored by voters in the survey was much larger than the one mandated by sequester, which would require the Pentagon to shed about $50 billion annually for 10 years.¶ Sequestration passed Congress with strong bipartisan support, but Republicans have attempted to lay the blame for the cuts and their potential impact on defense jobs at the feet of President Obama. As Obama campaigned in Virginia last week, the Romney campaign held a conference call with GOP congressmen from the area surrounding the massive Norfolk Naval Base, accusing Obama of destroying jobs in military-heavy districts.¶ "He has a huge box of pink slips that he's going to distribute across Virginia," said Rep. Randy Goode (R-Va.) of Obama. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, also from Virginia, echoed the comments in a statement released on Tuesday.¶ Sequester, along with Obama's economic policies, wrote Cantor, "will result in fewer jobs, higher taxes on small businesses and working families, and compromise the ability of the United States to defend itself at home and abroad."¶ Defense contractors have also picked up the theme, with the Aerospace Industries Association issuing a report on Tuesday saying that defense cuts could cost up to 2 million jobs. Several contractors will also testify on potential job losses before the House Armed Services Committee on Wednesday morning.¶ But according to the survey, such arguments hold little sway among voters, even ones in districts where the military and defense industry have a large presence. The Program for Public Consultation wrote that "there was no statistical correlation between the level of defense spending in a district and the level of support for defense cuts."¶ The program's director, Steven Kull, said on Monday that "the idea that Americans would want to keep total defense spending up so as to preserve local jobs is not supported by the data."

#### Romney causes massive foreign backlash and nuclear wars globally

Bandow 12 Doug is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. “Mitt Romney: The Foreign Policy of Know-Nothingism,” 5/15, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/mitt-romney-foreign-policy-knownothingism>

Republican politicians continue to **beat the war drums**. All of this cycle’s GOP presidential contenders, save Rep. Ron Paul, charged President Barack Obama with weakness, indeed, almost treason. But the public isn’t convinced. The president who increased military spending, twice upped troop levels in Afghanistan, started his own war with Libya, talked tough to North Korea, loudly threatened Iran and Syria, and oversaw the hit on Osama bin Laden just doesn’t look like a wimp.¶ In fact, a recent Washington Post-ABC poll found that Americans prefer Barack Obama to Mitt Romney on international issues by 53 percent to 36 percent. Republican apparatchiks Karl Rove and Ed Gillespie nevertheless claim, “the president is strikingly vulnerable in this area,” but so far Romney is convincing only as a blowhard with a know-nothing foreign policy. Noted Jacob Heilbrunn of the National Interest, the GOP is “returning to a prescription that led to trillion-dollar wars in the Middle East that the public loathes.”¶ Romney’s overall theme is American exceptionalism and greatness, slogans that win public applause but offer no guidance for a bankrupt superpower that has squandered its international credibility. “This century must be an American century,” Romney proclaimed. “In an American century, America leads the free world and the free world leads the entire world.” He has chosen a mix of advisers, including the usual neocons and uber-hawks — Robert Kagan, Eliot Cohen, Jim Talent, Walid Phares, Kim Holmes, and Daniel Senor, for instance — that gives little reason for comfort. Their involvement suggests Romney’s general commitment to an imperial foreign policy and force structure. ¶ Romney is no fool, but he has never demonstrated much interest in international affairs. He brings to mind George W. Bush, who appeared to be largely ignorant of the nations he was invading. Romney may be temperamentally less likely to combine recklessness with hubris, but he would have just as strong an incentive to use **foreign aggression** to win conservative acquiescence to domestic compromise. This tactic worked well for Bush, whose spendthrift policies received surprisingly little criticism on the right from activists busy defending his war-happy foreign policy. ¶ The former Massachusetts governor has criticized President Obama for “a naked political calculation or simply sheer ineptitude” in following George W. Bush’s withdrawal timetable in Iraq and for not overriding the decision of a government whose independence Washington claims to respect. But why would any American policymaker want to keep troops in a nation that is becoming ever more authoritarian, corrupt, and sectarian? It is precisely the sort of place U.S. forces should not be tied down. ¶ In contrast, Romney has effectively taken no position on Afghanistan. At times he appears to support the Obama timetable for reducing troop levels, but he has also proclaimed that “Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan under a Romney administration will be based on conditions on the ground as assessed by our military commanders.” Indeed, he insisted: “To defeat the insurgency in Afghanistan, the United States will need the cooperation of both the Afghan and Pakistani governments — we will only persuade Afghanistan and Pakistan to be resolute if they are convinced that the United States will itself be resolute,” and added, “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban.” ¶ Yet it’s the job of the president, not the military, to decide the basic policy question: why is the U.S. spending blood and treasure trying to create a Western-style nation state in Central Asia a decade after 9/11? And how long is he prepared to stay — forever? On my two trips to Afghanistan I found little support among Afghans for their own government, which is characterized by gross incompetence and corruption. Even if the Western allies succeed in creating a large local security force, will it fight for the thieves in Kabul? ¶ Pakistan is already resolute — in opposing U.S. policy on the ground. Afghans forthrightly view Islamabad as an enemy. Unfortunately, continuing the war probably is the most effective way to destabilize nuclear-armed Pakistan. What will Romney do if the U.S. military tells him that American combat forces must remain in Afghanistan for another decade or two in order to “win”? ¶ The ongoing AfPak conflict is not enough; Romney appears to desire war with Iran as well. No one wants a nuclear Iran, but Persian nuclear ambitiions began under America’s ally the Shah, and there is no reason to believe that the U.S. (and Israel) cannot deter Tehran. True, Richard Grenell, who briefly served as Romney’s foreign-policy spokesman, once made the astonishing claim that the Iranians “will surely use” nuclear weapons. Alas, he never shared his apparently secret intelligence about the leadership in Tehran’s suicidal tendencies. The Iranian government’s behavior has been rational even if brutal, and officials busy maneuvering for power and wealth do not seem eager to enter the great beyond. Washington uneasily but effectively deterred Joseph Stalin and Mao Zedong, the two most prolific mass murderers in history. Iran is no substitute for them. ¶ Romney has engaged in almost infantile ridicule of the Obama administration’s attempt to engage Tehran. Yet the U.S. had diplomatic relations with Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia. Washington came to regret not having similar contact with Mao’s China. Even the Bush administration eventually decided that ignoring Kim Jong-Il’s North Korea only encouraged it to build more nuclear weapons faster. ¶ Regarding Iran, Romney asserted, “a military option to deal with their nuclear program remains on the table.” Building up U.S. military forces “will send an unequivocal signal to Iran that the United States, acting in concert with allies, will never permit Iran to obtain nuclear weapons... Only when the ayatollahs no longer have doubts about America’s resolve will they abandon their nuclear ambitions.” Indeed, “if all else fails... then of course you take military action,” even though, American and Iranian military analysts warn, such strikes might **only delay** development of nuclear weapons. “Elect me as the next president,” he declared, and Iran “will not have a nuclear weapon.” ¶ Actually, **if Tehran becomes convinced** that **an attack** and attempted regime change **are likely**, **it will have** no choice **but to develop nuclear weapons**. How else to defend itself? The misguided war in Libya, which Romney supported, sent a clear signal to both North Korea and Iran never to trust the West. ¶ Iran’s fears likely are exacerbated by Romney’s promise to subcontract Middle East policy to Israel. The ties between the U.S. and Israel are many, but their interests often diverge. The current Israeli government wants Washington to attack Iran irrespective of the cost to America. Moreover, successive Israeli governments have decided to effectively colonize the West Bank, turning injustice into state policy and making a separate Palestinian state practically impossible. Perceived American support for this creates enormous hostility toward the U.S. across the Arab and Muslim worlds. ¶ Yet Romney promises that his first foreign trip would be to Israel “to show the world that we care about that country and that region” — as if anyone anywhere, least of all Israel’s neighbors, doesn’t realize that. He asserted that “you don’t allow an inch of space to exist between you and your friends and allies,” notably Israel. The U.S. should “let the entire world know that we will stay with them and that we will support them and defend them.” Indeed, Romney has known Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for nearly four decades and has said that he would request Netanyahu’s approval for U.S. policies: “I’d get on the phone to my friend Bibi Netanyahu and say, ‘Would it help if I say this? What would you like me to do?’” Americans would be better served by a president committed to making policy in the interests of the U.S. instead. ¶ Romney’s myopic vision is just as evident when he looks elsewhere. For instance, he offered the singular judgment that Russia is “**our number one geopolitical foe**.” Romney complained that “across the board, it has been a thorn in our side on questions vital to America’s national security.” ¶ The Cold War ended more than two decades ago. Apparently Romney is locked in a time warp. Moscow manifestly does not threaten vital U.S. interests. Romney claimed that Vladimir “Putin dreams of ‘rebuilding the Russian empire’.” Even if Putin has such dreams, they don’t animate Russian foreign policy. No longer an ideologically aggressive power active around the world, Moscow has retreated to the status of a pre-1914 great power, concerned about border security and international respect. Russia has no interest in conflict with America and is not even much involved in most regions where the U.S. is active: Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. ¶ Moscow has been helpful in Afghanistan, refused to provide advanced air defense weapons to Iran, supported some sanctions against Tehran, used its limited influence in North Korea to encourage nuclear disarmament, and opposes jihadist terrorism. This is curious behavior for America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” ¶ Romney’s website explains that he will “implement a strategy that will seek to discourage aggressive or expansionist behavior on the part of Russia,” but other than Georgia where is it so acting? And even if Georgia fell into a Russian trap, Tbilisi started the shooting in 2008. In any event, absent an American security guarantee, which would be madness, the U.S. cannot stop Moscow from acting to protect what it sees as vital interests in a region of historic influence. ¶ Where else is Russia threatening America? Moscow does oppose NATO expansion, which actually is foolish from a U.S. standpoint as well, adding strategic liabilities rather than military strengths. Russia strongly opposes missile defense bases in Central and Eastern Europe, but why should Washington subsidize the security of others? Moscow opposes an attack on Iran, and so should Americans. Russia backs the Assad regime in Syria, but the U.S. government once declared the same government to be “reformist.” Violent misadventures in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya demonstrate that America has little to gain and much to lose from another attempt at social engineering through war. If anything, the Putin government has done Washington a favor keeping the U.S. out of Syria. ¶ This doesn’t mean America should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But **treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to** act like one.Doing so especially will make Moscow more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union. Naturally, Romney wants to “encourage democratic political and economic reform” in Russia — a fine idea in theory, but meddling in another country’s politics rarely works in practice. Just look at the Arab Spring. ¶ Not content with attempting to start a **mini-Cold War**, Mitt Romney dropped his nominal free-market stance to demonize Chinese currency practices. He complained about currency manipulation and forced technology transfers: “China seeks advantage through systematic exploitation of other economies.” ¶ On day one as president he promises to designate “China as the currency manipulator it is.” Moreover, he added, he would “take a holistic approach to addressing all of China’s abuses. That includes unilateral actions such as increased enforcement of U.S. trade laws, punitive measures targeting products and industries that rely on misappropriations of our intellectual property, reciprocity in government procurement, and countervailing duties against currency manipulation. It also includes multilateral actions to block technology transfers into China and to create a trading bloc open only for nations genuinely committed to free trade.” ¶ Romney’s apparent belief that Washington is “genuinely committed to free trade” is charming nonsense. The U.S. has practiced a weak dollar policy to increase exports. Washington long has subsidized American exports: the Export-Import Bank is known as “Boeing’s Bank” and U.S. agricultural export subsidies helped torpedo the Doha round of trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization. ¶ Of course, Beijing still does much to offend Washington. However, the U.S. must accommodate the rising power across the Pacific. Trying to keep China out of a new Asia-Pacific trade pact isn’t likely to work. America’s Asian allies want us to protect them — no surprise! — but are not interested in offending their nearby neighbor with a long memory. The best hope for moderating Chinese behavior is to tie it into a web of international institutions that provide substantial economic, political, and security benefits. ¶ Beijing already has good reason to be paranoid of the superpower which patrols bordering waters, engages in a policy that looks like containment, and talks of the possibility of war. Trying to isolate China economically would be taken as a direct challenge. Romney would prove Henry Kissinger’s dictum that even paranoids have enemies. ¶ Naturally, Romney also wants to “maintain appropriate military capabilities to discourage any aggressive or coercive behavior by China against its neighbors.” However, 67 years after the end of World War II, it is time for Beijing’s neighbors to arm themselves and cooperate with each other. Japan long had the second largest economy on earth. India is another rising power with reason to constrain China. South Korea has become a major power. Australia has initiated a significant military build-up. Many Southeast Asian nations are constructing submarines to help deter Chinese adventurism. Even Russia has much to fear from China, given the paucity of population in its vast eastern territory. But America’s foreign-defense dole discourages independence and self-help. The U.S. should step back as an off-shore balancer, encouraging its friends to do more and work together. It is not America’s job to risk Los Angeles for Tokyo, Seoul, or Taipei. ¶ Romney similarly insists on keeping the U.S. on the front lines against North Korea, even though all of its neighbors have far more at stake in a peaceful peninsula and are able to contain that impoverished wreck of a country. The Romney campaign proclaims: “Mitt Romney will commit to eliminating North Korea’s nuclear weapons and its nuclear-weapons infrastructure.” Alas, everything he proposes has been tried before, from tougher sanctions to tighter interdiction and pressure on China to isolate the North. What does he plan on doing when Pyongyang continues to develop nuclear weapons as it has done for the last 20 years? ¶ The American military should come home from Korea. Romney complained that the North’s nuclear capability “poses a direct threat to U.S. forces on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere in East Asia.” Then withdraw them. Manpower-rich South Korea doesn’t need U.S. conventional support, and ground units do nothing to contain North Korea’s nuclear ambitions. Pull out American troops and eliminate North Korea’s primary threat to the U.S. Then support continuing non-proliferation efforts led by those nations with the most to fear from the North. That strategy, more than lobbying by Washington, is likely to bring China around. ¶ Romney confuses dreams with reality when criticizing President Obama over the administration’s response to the Arab Spring. “We’re facing an Arab Spring which is out of control in some respects,” he said, “because the president was not as strong as he needed to be in encouraging our friends to move toward representative forms of government.” Romney asked: “How can we try and improve the odds so what happens in Libya and what happens in Egypt and what happens in other places where the Arab Spring is in full bloom so that the developments are toward democracy, modernity and more representative forms of government? This we simply don’t know.” ¶ True, the president doesn’t know. But neither does Mitt Romney. The latter suffers from the delusion that bright Washington policymakers can remake the world. Invade another country, turn it into a Western-style democracy allied with America, and everyone will live happily every after. But George W. Bush, a member of Mitt Romney’s own party, failed miserably trying to do that in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The Arab Spring did not happen because of Washington policy but in spite of Washington policy. And Arabs demanding political freedom — which, unfortunately, is not the same as a liberal society — have not the slightest interest in what Barack Obama or Mitt Romney thinks. ¶ Yet the latter wants “convene a summit that brings together world leaders, donor organizations, and young leaders of groups that espouse” all the wonderful things that Americans do. Alas, does he really believe that such a gathering will stop, say, jihadist radicals from slaughtering Coptic Christians? Iraq’s large Christian community was destroyed even as the U.S. military occupied that country. His summit isn’t likely to be any more effective. Not everything in the world is about Washington. ¶ Which is why Romney’s demand to do something in Syria is so foolish. Until recently he wanted to work with the UN, call on the Syrian military to be nice, impose more sanctions, and “increase the possibility that the ruling minority Alawites will be able to reconcile with the majority Sunni population in a post-Assad Syria.” Snapping his fingers would be no less effective. ¶ Most recently he advocated arming the rebels. But he should be more cautious before advocating American intervention in another conflict in another land. Such efforts rarely have desirable results. Iraq was a catastrophe. Afghanistan looks to be a disaster once American troops come home. After more than a decade Bosnia and Kosovo are failures, still under allied supervision. Libya is looking bad. ¶ Even without U.S. “help,” a full-blown civil war already threatens in Syria. We only look through the glass darkly, observed the Apostle Paul. It might be best for Washington not to intervene in another Muslim land with so many others aflame. ¶ Despite his support for restoring America’s economic health, Romney wants to increase dramatically Washington’s already outsize military spending. Rather than make a case on what the U.S. needs, he has taken the typical liberal approach of setting an arbitrary number: 4 percent of GDP. It’s a dumb idea, since America already accounts for roughly half the globe’s military spending — far more if you include Washington’s wealthy allies — and spends more in real terms than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War, and real outlays have nearly doubled since 2000. By any normal measure, the U.S. possesses far more military resources than it needs to confront genuine threats. ¶ What Romney clearly wants is a military to fight multiple wars and garrison endless occupations, irrespective of cost. My Cato colleague Chris Preble figured that ¶ Romney's 4 percent gimmick would result in taxpayers spending more than twice as much on the Pentagon as in 2000 (111 percent higher, to be precise) and 45 percent more than in 1985, the height of the Reagan buildup. Over the next ten years, Romney's annual spending (in constant dollars) for the Pentagon would average 64 percent higher than annual post-Cold War budgets (1990-2012), and 42 percent more than the average during the Reagan era (1981-1989). ¶ If Mitt Romney really believes that the world today is so much more dangerous than during the Cold War, he should spell out the threat. He calls Islamic fundamentalism, the Arab Spring, the impact of failed states, the anti-American regimes of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela, rising China, and resurgent Russia “powerful forces.” It’s actually a pitiful list — Islamic terrorists have been weakened and don’t pose an existential threat, the Arab Spring threatens instability with little impact on America, it is easier to strike terrorists in failed states than in nominal allies like Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, one nuclear-armed submarine could vaporize all four hostile states, and Russia’s modest “resurgence” may threaten Georgia but not Europe or America. Only China deserves to be called “powerful,” but it remains a developing country surrounded by potential enemies with a military far behind that of the U.S. ¶ In fact, the greatest danger to America is the blowback that results from **promiscuous intervention** in conflicts not our own. Romney imagines a massive bootstrap operation: he wants a big military to engage in social engineering abroad which would require an even larger military to handle the violence and chaos that would result from his failed attempts at social engineering. Better not to start this vicious cycle. ¶ America faces international challenges but nevertheless enjoys unparalleled dominance. U.S. power is buttressed by the fact that Washington is allied with every industrialized nation except China and Russia. America shares significant interests with India, the second major emerging power; is seen as a counterweight by a gaggle of Asian states worried about Chinese expansion; remains the dominant player in Latin America; and is closely linked to most of the Middle East’s most important countries, such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq. If Mitt Romney really believes that America is at greater risk today than during the Cold War, he **is not qualified to be president**. ¶ In this world the U.S. need not confront every threat, subsidize every ally, rebuild every failed state, and resolve every problem. Being a superpower means having many interests but few vital ones warranting war. Being a bankrupt superpower means exhibiting judgment and exercising discretion. ¶ President Barack Obama has been a disappointment, amounting in foreign policy to George W. Bush-lite. But Mitt Romney sounds even worse. His rhetoric suggests a return to the worst of the Bush administration. The 2012 election likely will be decided on economics, but foreign policy will prove to be equally important in the long-term. America can ill afford another know-nothing president.

### 1NC

#### Energy production is the peak of our manipulation of the environment – rather than revealing the ontological beauty of nature, it exploits it for human utilization – this standing reserve logic obviates our relation to Earth and causes extinction – our alternative is to refuse action in this instance in favor of contemplating being – this is key to more effective environmental policies

Grego 7 – Dr. Richard Grego 7, Associate Professor, Department of Humanities/ Culture, Daytona Beach College, 2007, “Global Warming, Environmental Philosophy and Public Policy: John Dewey vs Martin Heidegger,” online: http://www.philosophos.com/philosophy\_article\_153.html

This essay compares and contrasts the views of Martin Heidegger and John Dewey with respect to environmental philosophy and the global warming issue. It examines how their respective concepts of nature, human nature, and philosophy of science, might apply to current environmental thought and policy. It argues that Heidegger's latter thought (with its rejection of modern culture's science, technology, and commercialism, as well as its quasi-mystical concepts like 'Being' and 'freedom') is generally less-suited to constructive application in environmental policy than Dewey's philosophy (which celebrates these modern institutions as a triumph of both natural and human potentials). However it is also argued in conclusion that, while the spirit of Dewey's philosophy might be better-suited to policies which entail short-term strategies regarding environmental regulations, laws, and improved technologies, the essential message of Heidegger's philosophy may be needed for **ensuring** a long-term commitment to **sustainable environmental protection**. ¶ Heidegger, Dewey, and Environmental Philosophy¶ Concern over global warming and other environmental problems has garnered a great deal of public attention recently. The February 2007 report issued by the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is controversial (and the technical scientific details of its various possible interpretations are beyond the purview of this essay), but it appears to confirm what many environmentalists have been asserting for some time now: The planet is heating up, and this phenomenon is man-made. This heating process is part of a century-long trend — likely caused in large-part by greenhouse gas emissions (CO2, methane, nitrous oxide, etc) — that is already having adverse environmental effects on many levels. Much of the scientific community agrees that its long-term consequences (which, again, cannot be detailed here but include such possibilities as heat waves, droughts, new wind patterns, melting polar ice, and species extinction) could be catastrophic for both the natural environment and human civilization. ¶ At this time therefore, environmental policy makers are attempting to answer two main questions:¶ 1) What is causing the problem? And 2) What can/should we do about it?¶ Scientists have provided some obvious technical answers here. Global warming is caused by greenhouse gas emissions and the solution to the problem of global warming is to reduce emissions via improved technologies, policies, and regulations where necessary (one of the most recent ideas in the U.S. along these lines is a change in the federal tax code to encourage the use and development of alternate energy sources by corporations). ¶ Of course philosophers , as always, tend to view both the causes and possible solutions to such problems in more complex and problematic ways than do scientists. Environmental philosophy thus encompasses things like ethics, metaphysics, and the philosophy of science, rather than just simple empirical analysis, in seeking to address issues related to environmental protection. These issues are currently being debated by any number of thinkers across academic disciplines and professions. ¶ While contemporary environmental philosophy is a rich and prolific field of scholarship, it is still sometimes instructive to take a glance at some of its intellectual origins. Though John Dewey and Martin Heidegger (as philosophers at the beginning of the 20th century) lived and thought prior to the most recent environmental concerns of our time, they nonetheless had much to say about science, nature, and humanity's relationship with the natural world. Their respective ideas on these themes have provided a firm foundation upon which much contemporary environmental thought is based. Current philosophers like Michael Zimmerman and Bruce Foltz have synthesized Heidegger's thought with environmental philosophy, while philosophers such as Andrew Light, Larry Hickman, and Anthony Weston have applied Dewey's pragmatism to environmentalism. Thus, examining some of Dewey's and Heidegger's basic concepts in comparative perspective can highlight and clarify assumptions and themes discussed/ debated by contemporary scholars — and can provide critical insight into some of the philosophical issues at stake in current environmental policy debates. ¶ In fact, although Heidegger and Dewey share certain environmentally relevant ideas, their differences are more pronounced and exemplify two distinctly different attitudes toward issues like global warming. Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) has been associated with the 20th century philosophical movements known as phenomenology and (though he disowned the label) existentialism. A student of phenomenologist Edmund Husserl, Heidegger was one of this century's most influential thinkers. His thought, as we shall discuss further, tended to assume a decidedly anti-modernist bias — leading him, especially in latter writings, to critique unfavorably such cultural institutions as technology, commercialism, and instrumental science. Since these institutions are so integral to the modern world, there is a quasi-reactionary sensibility about Heidegger's latter thought (Although in all fairness to him, he considered his critique of western civilization to be forward-looking and visionary.) ¶ American philosopher John Dewey (1859-1952) in contrast, was an unequivocally forward-looking thinker who embraced the spirit of modernism enthusiastically. Closely identified with 'pragmatism', his philosophy has also been referred to as 'instrumentalism' and 'experimentalism'. Unlike Heidegger, he saw science, technology, and commerce as creative expressions of human potentiality. He therefore tended to be more supportive of these institutions and their cultural influence than Heidegger was. ¶ The Nature of Science and the Science of Nature¶ Were they actually here to comment themselves, both thinkers would undoubtedly see deep connections between concrete problems like global warming and more abstract issues like the philosophy of science, the metaphysics of nature, and human nature. However they would also surely disagree on the character of these connections. Their philosophies agree that science and technology have shaped humankind's relationship with the natural world, but they disagree about what this relationship is, how it has come about, and what it means.¶ Heidegger's vision of science and technology is, for all practical purposes, a negative one. In his latter work especially, he portrayed the scientific legacy in western history as a manifestation of humanity's disregard for, and estrangement from, the natural world and from the very ground of existence. This legacy, beginning with the philosophy and culture of ancient Greece and culminating in the science and philosophy of modernity, is a tragic story of cultural and spiritual decline. Pre-Socratic Greeks first apprehended the awesome wonder and mystery of existence (or 'Being', as Heidegger calls it) and began to develop philosophy and science to describe this experience. However, the ultimate meaning of this experience was simply too sublime and profound for any descriptions to do justice to, so subsequent thinkers like Plato and Aristotle began to articulate philosophy and science simply as logical explanations for the natural world, rather than as poetic exclamations about the mysterious experience of Being. Such explanations **made the** natural **world** rationally **intelligible** but did so **by neglecting** a deeper **appreciation for Being**'s original revelation. This made any deep appreciation for the Being of nature impossible and led to the progressive alienation of humanity from nature in western thought and culture.¶ Thus, the development of science and technology in the modern (post-enlightenment-era) world are cultural expressions of this alienation. Science and technology have now 'enframed' (in Heidegger's terms) the natural world by turning it into a mere object of empirical study for the purpose of commercial exploitation. The natural world has become a resource 'standing reserve' for technical manipulation. Science: ¶ ...Sets upon Nature... Agriculture is now the mechanized food industry. Air is now set upon to yield oxygen, the earth to yield uranium... Even the Rhine [River] itself appears to be something at our command... the revealing that rules throughout modern technology has the character of setting upon. (QT, 320-321)¶ Hence, enlightenment philosopher Rene Descartes' belief that the scientific revolution's purpose is to accomplish '..the mastery and possession of nature' has come to full fruition in modern life. Science has transformed nature from a living revelation of Being into an intellectual/ commercial resource.¶ Dewey agrees with Heidegger that modern science has its origins in the intellectual life of ancient Greece and has since changed humanity's relationship with the natural world. However unlike Heidegger, Dewey views the legacy of science as one of liberation and enlightenment, rather than one of domination and estrangement. Though the classical founders of western philosophy and science were engaged in a futile 'quest for certainty' and search for an eternal or sacred meaning in nature , modern science since the enlightenment-era has become a more practical tool for framing open-ended questions and generating temporary hypothesis. Unlike the science, philosophy, and theology of ancient times, modern science does not see reality or nature as having any fixed or determined metaphysical or supernatural structure. Nature, as the subject-matter of current science, is a malleable and dynamic construct of the human intellect. Science, according to Dewey, has created, 'A natural world that does not subsist for the sake of realizing a fixed set of ends' and 'is relatively malleable and plastic; it can be used for this or that'. (RP, 70)¶ Heidegger agrees with Dewey that this is indeed what has happened, but thinks it is a bad thing. Dewey however, sees the advent of modern science as the great liberating event in the history of ideas and extols its possibilities for empowering human potentials------advocating: 'the transfer of the experimental method from the field of physical science to the wider field of human life'. Dewey concludes that in the contemporary world:¶ Nature as it already exists ceases to be something which must be accepted and submitted to, endured and enjoyed just as it is. It is now something to be modified, to be intentionally controlled. It is material to act upon so as to transform it into new objects which better answer our needs. (QC, 80-81)¶ — And indeed this is just as it must and should be: For nature is the source of human abilities, and the ultimate evolutionary product of nature is the human ability to transform nature itself. Our ability to bend nature to our will is an aspect of nature. The improvement of human conditions by manipulating and transforming the natural world via science, technology, commerce and the arts, is nature's own supreme achievement.¶ Heidegger, in contrast, tends to view nature more as 'something which must be accepted and submitted to...', as the unfolding of something sacred and supernatural ('Being') with which humanity loses touch when it is treated as an object of scientific knowledge or commercial exploitation. Our destruction of the natural world is symptomatic of our spiritual alienation from the ultimate source of meaning in our lives. Having reduced 'Being' to a scientific-technocratic-commercial world of objectified 'beings', humanity now finds itself alone in a trivialized world of 'resources' and 'commodities'. Having separated nature from its sacred animating ground, humanity has robbed nature (and itself, for that matter) of intrinsic value. Nature now seems lifeless and meaningless in any deep sense.¶ Thus a kind of 'Homelessness', as Heidegger calls it, 'has come to be the destiny of the world' (LH, 243), and **the only remedy** for this dilemma (which Heidegger seems dubious about, even while advocating it) **is** for humanity to reject the 'frenzy of rationalization', technology, and commercialism (QT, 449) **in favor of** 'freedom'. Heidegger describes this 'freedom' as **the** 'letting-be of beings' (ET, 125). It involves an attitude of quietism, reverence, and profound appreciation for nature as a sacred incarnation of 'Being'. In this state of mind, nature would be celebrated once again as a source of wonder, and would no longer be used merely as an object of exploitation.¶ Science, Nature, and Environmental Policy¶ Having examined Dewey's and Heidegger's contrasting views on these issues then, their possible respective answers to our original questions regarding global warming might seem obvious. Given his rather strong endorsement of an 'activist' scientific spirit, Dewey would probably see the cause of global warming as a possible miscalculation of our collective goals and methods with respect to what we currently know about our technologies and the environment. His probable solution would involve evaluating how our development (on many levels) is effected by this phenomenon and then re-evaluating how best to utilize the technologies that are responsible for it.¶ However, his radically dynamic and open-ended conception of both nature and human nature would make these evaluations quite problematic. If nature and human development are in perpetual flux, have no inherent structure, and are continually re-configured by the ever-evolving matrix of inter-relationships that they are a part of, then even defining what the natural environment 'is' — let alone what may or may not be harmful to it — becomes extremely difficult at best. There is nothing intrinsic or essential to nature in Dewey's view. It is an ever unfinished project whose limits cannot be defined and whose 'purpose' is a matter of interpretation. Whether current policies are benefiting or harming nature is therefore a matter of interpretation as well — and our interpretations are largely tentative and change with every temporary change in values, needs, and worldviews. Indeed, the spirit of Dewey's instrumentalism suggests the possibility that there may be ways still unimagined in which global warming may actually enhance human potentials and improve the environment!¶ On the other hand, Heidegger's response might not be quite as predictable — if he would choose to respond at all. Commentators have speculated widely on the reasons for an attitude of philosophical disregard and personal aloofness concerning real-world affairs that Heidegger seemed to hold throughout his life and career. Some have suggested that it had obvious origins in his rejection of science, commerce, and all such institutions of modern culture. Others have claimed that abstract quasi-mystical themes like 'freedom', 'Being',and 'nothingness' that dominated his latter writing, led to an Ivory-Tower lack of interest in worldly concerns. Still others have suggested more cynical and opportunistic motives behind his his unwillingness to risk taking personal stands on controversial issues. Whatever his reason(s) may have been, Heidegger claimed that humanity and nature have now reached the end of their potentialities, and that humanity cannot hope to 'engineer' its way out of the spiritual malaise wrought by its alienation from Being via science and technology. 'Being' has now exhausted its possibilities in 'Nothingness', which manifests itself in contemporary culture as **nihilism and meaninglessness.** World civilization is dominated by an instrumentalist mentality in which nothing is intrinsically valuable or sacred. The devaluation of nature to the status of a mere resource for technology and industry is an example of this nihilism.¶ Unfortunately, Heidegger also says that any attempt to engineer yet another scientifically calculated solution to this dilemma would be, paradoxically, a perpetuation of the very nihilistic mentality that has caused it. **Scientifically generated public policies**, ecological initiatives, and environmental regulations, are part of the mentality that 'enframes' or objectifies nature by controlling and manipulating it via science and technology. Neither humanity nor nature can be redeemed in this way. In fact, since the only hope for an authentic encounter with nature involves appreciating it in 'freedom' — which means 'letting-be', rather than trying to change or improve it — Heidegger seems to be claiming that inaction (simply doing nothing) is our best course of action. We must, he states, wait patiently for the 'soundless voice of Being' to reveal itself once again. But it must come to us during an experience of the kind of quietism in which the 'frenzy of rationalization' is finally stilled.¶ How any of this might translate into an actual environmental policy is anyone's guess (and contemporary interpreters of Heidegger are certainly doing a lot of guessing!) but some general possibilities come to mind. Environmentally, Heidegger is heir to the legacy of Medieval Christian mysticism, German idealism, and romanticism, and he is the inspiration for much contemporary thinking associated with 'deep ecology'. He encourages a heartfelt awareness of and appreciation for the natural world as a dwelling-place of the sacred. With this awareness and appreciation may perhaps come a **general shift in the public consciousness** (a renewed revelation of 'Being') that can lead, in turn, to a new way of 'dwelling authentically' or living harmoniously with the natural world. Such dwelling or living will then lead effortlessly to policies that sustain this harmony. However we cannot make these policies unless the shift in consciousness occurs first.¶ Dewey's views, in contra-distinction, are quite compatible with the spirit of instrumental science, technology and commerce and are applicable to environmentally sound policies like low-carbon technologies in industry, international regulations on greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental standards in the Kyoto Protocol. These are temporary flexible innovations made by interested political and commercial parties that are based on tentative research-findings which may be revised as circumstances change. Dewey does not share Heidegger's antipathy toward modernity and sees things like environmental problems as incentives to further research and improvement, rather than as an end to human possibilities. While Dewey endorses a kind of Heideggerian-sounding awareness and appreciation of the natural world (lauding the value of 'aesthetic experiences' in the appreciation of nature, for instance), he sees this as only one capacity among many that may be employed to protect or improve the natural environment, which humanity is an integral part of. The Global Roundtable On Climate Change based at Columbia Universities' Earth Institute in New York, in which various scientists, corporations, civic organizations, and political action groups from around the world are researching and adopting a comprehensive statement on environmental science and policy, seems like precisely the sort of initiative that Dewey would support.¶ Yet, while Heidegger's views may seem too extreme for the practical necessities of our current situation, Dewey's more practical approach is vulnerable to the Heideggerian criticism that it may be too accommodating to this situation. Heidegger would probably say that any attempt to preserve, protect, or improve nature by tinkering with it through science, defeats its own purpose — and it does appear as though every new 'solution' to ecological dangers over the past half-century has only yielded new problems — the latest of which is global warming (and some of the proposed scientific solutions to this problem are ominous themselves: From giant space shields, to spreading aerosol particles in the upper atmosphere, to spraying water-clouds into the air from the oceans). Thus perhaps the very impractically of Heidegger's ideas make them particularly worthy of consideration. It is fairly obvious that environmental degradation is largely — if not primarily — a result of the impact of science, technology and commerce on the natural world, and that the kind of reverent appreciation for nature's sanctity that Heidegger advocates would engender a deeper concern and respect for nature. What may therefore be needed for environmental protection over the long-term (as opposed to short-term fixes for temporarily 'fashionable' issues like global warming) is a Heideggerian-type transformation in the public consciousness, rather than more Deweyan technocratic innovations. A renewed experience of authentic 'freedom' and the revelation of that 'Being' which is the groundless ground that sustains both nature and humanity, might be just what is needed for the earth's sustainable future.

### 1NC

#### Text: The 50 states should procure mobile solar power systems for training exercises and operations for the The United States Army Corps of Engineers in response to emergencies in the United States.

#### State policies sustain solar power

Flott & Co PC 12 (law firm with specialized expertise in business, international commerce and tax, United States citizenship issues, business and professional immigration, and non-profit law, “State-level Policies and The Growth of Solar Power”, 1/26, http://www.doingbusinessacrossborders.com/state-level-policies-and-the-growth-of-solar-power/)

Rising fossil-fuel prices and environmental concerns have led to a growing demand for renewable energy sources such as solar power. Compared to conventional energy and other renewable energy sources, solar power has the advantage of being generated locally, which both increases efficiency and greatly reduces the costs and environmental impacts of transmission . As a result, both federal and state governments have rolled out a number of past incentives to promote solar energy. Although a number of important federal renewable energy tax incentives have expired or will expire soon, three key policies at the state-level will continue to support the growth of solar energy in the U.S. These are: mandatory renewable energy requirements, interconnection, and net metering. Mandatory Renewable Energy Requirements According to an IBISWorld Report, currently over 30 US states have renewable electricity standards that require utility companies to increase their production of renewable energy, a policy generally referred to as “Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS)”.[1] Although the design and final compliance targets of these policies vary widely among states, many of the RPS programs require that eligible forms of renewable energy contribute 15-25% of retail sales by utility companies by 2030 or sooner. Please refer to Figure below for detailed information regarding existing RPS policies. Most states that have mandatory renewable energy requirements also have an associated renewable energy certificate trading system. This system provides a mechanism to track the amount of renewable energy being sold and to reward eligible power producers. In some states the certification trading systems are used as incentives to promote solar energy, as utilities companies are buying the certificates from solar energy producers in order to meet RPS requirements.[2] In other states where no mandatory RPS exists, companies may still purchase solar certificate in order to advertise their energy supply is produced by renewable power.[3] For example, FritoLay bought enough solar certificates to claim their SunChips snack product is “powered by the sun.”[4] The solar power producers who sold their certificates to FritoLay still use the actual electricity generated form their solar systems. However, they are not allowed to claim or treat electricity coming from a solar energy source anymore.[5] Although more and more states have started implementing RPS and certificate trading systems, the federal government has not enacted similar requirements.

#### State leadership is key to the grid

Peskoe 11 (Ari, Harvard Law School, Class of 2011, “A Challenge for Federalism: Achieving National Goals in the Electricity Industry”, 18 Mo. Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 209, Lexis)

Congress has historically let states lead, generally requiring that states "consider" a federal approach only after most had already adopted it. n346 In both transmission siting and clean electricity generation, many states have made legislative and regulatory reforms to enable the construction of new infrastructure. The key task for the federal government is to articulate a goal that motivates further reform at the state level. Congress has yet to do that. But if it does pass electricity legislation it should recognize that there are many potential paths to achieving its goal. Regulatory indeterminacy is a call to let states allocate the costs of meeting a national goal to match their current situations and long-term priorities. Deferring to states and granting them flexibility will allow for a variety of approaches. Such policy diversity will enable innovation and dampen the effects of mistakes and market failures. [\*281] Congress should remain cautious as it inevitably continues to expand its jurisdiction and influence over the electricity industry.

### 1NC

#### Financial incentives include funding and loan guarantees; procurement is a non-financial incentive

Czinkota et al, 9 **-** Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books)

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. **Fiscal incentives** are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. **Financial incentives** offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. **Nonfinancial incentives** include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

#### Voting issue for limits and ground – they allow a litany of government actions that indirectly might encourage use of energy – overstretches our research burden and undermines preparedness for all debates.

### Advantage 3: Grid

#### Can’t solve—systems disconnect during grid failure

Kwartin et. al 12 (Vice president of ICF International, consulting firm that partners with government and commercial clients to deliver professional services and technology solutions in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets, Robert Kwartin, Sarah Alexander, Martin Anderson, Donald Clark, John Collins, Chris Lamson, Garrett Martin, Ryan Mayfield, Lindsay McAlpine, Daniel Moreno, Jeffrey Patterson, Craig Schultz, and Emily Stiever, “Solar Energy Development on Department of Defense Installations in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts”, January, Pdf)

Developing an on-installation generation and distribution system that can operate in islanded mode is a complex undertaking and the DoD is currently demonstrating a number of different approaches. Generation equipment connected to the installation distribution system must be capable of operating in island mode and designed so that it does not disconnect automatically when the utility grid connection fails. This is particularly the case for PV systems. Most solar PV inverters disconnect automatically for safety reasons when they sense a grid failure; among other things, this protects utility personnel working to restore the grid from getting shocked. A PV system intended for islanded operation needs to be designed so that it continues to operate even when the larger public grid is down, and all issues related to safety of operation need to be addressed.

#### Renewables don’t solve grid independence

Snider 12 (Annie, Environment & Energy Publishing, “Clean energy doesn't always bring security for military”, 1/27, http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/01/27/1)

Nellis Air Force Base's 14.2-megawatt solar power plant has been lauded by the military as a showpiece of a sweeping effort to boost energy security and resilience at bases by integrating renewable energy. Bases get 99 percent of their electricity from the commercial grid, which officials increasingly acknowledge is vulnerable to everything from storms to terrorist attacks. Wind, solar and biomass plants on military facilities can provide vital power if the local grid goes down, they say.¶ But the 140 acres of solar panels at Nellis are useless when commercial power is out, thanks to a provision in the project's agreement with the local utility that lets NV Energy turn off the array if the grid goes down.¶ The Nellis solar deal reveals some of the major hurdles facing the military as it tries to tap vast renewable energy on its lands as a buffer against the threat posed by power disruptions.¶ For NV Energy, the key issue is safety. The utility does not want the renewable power plant feeding juice to the grid if workers are repairing lines. Solar panels connected directly to houses or businesses are not a problem, but they can pose safety hazards when they are hooked to the grid.¶ There is a technological fix: a switch that would let the base disconnect from the grid and keep the solar panels up, shouldering some of the backup power burden that currently falls to the base's diesel generators when commercial power goes out.¶ But Nellis has not implemented that fix. Nor has the Navy at the Naval Air Weapons Station in China Lake, Calif., where a 270-megawatt geothermal plant makes it the only military installation that produces more power than it uses. Nor have many other U.S. military bases that are quickly amassing fields of solar panels and wind turbines.¶ To be sure, the idea of using renewable energy to power critical missions wasn't on the Pentagon agenda when the Nellis and China Lake projects were built in 2007 and 1987, respectively. But today, as the Defense Department undertakes a massive effort to build renewable energy generation for "energy security," there is still no overarching requirement that such power sources be able to support vital national missions if the local power goes out.¶ "It's not energy security if you've got renewable generation that you cannot access if the grid goes down," said Scott Sklar, a 40-year veteran of the renewable power field and a frequent consultant for the military.

#### Intermittency and can’t supply enough power

Snider 12 (Annie, Environment & Energy Publishing, “Clean energy doesn't always bring security for military”, 1/27, http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/01/27/1)

While it is widely known that renewable power is intermittent -- solar panels produce power only when the sun is shining and turbines yield juice only when the wind blows -- many people don't realize that photovoltaics won't even turn on unless they are connected to the grid or a battery.¶ "If you have a bunch of renewables, you have to have some element of standard generation" to keep feeding power to a base that is disconnected from the commercial grid, Morrissett said. "If it's not tied back ... it's just going to sit there until it sees the grid power come back on."¶ The military is keenly interested in smart microgrids that can let energy managers respond quickly to changes in renewable energy generation and send limited amounts of power to the most important facilities.¶ Consider this scenario: The commercial grid is down, so the base is running its cogeneration plant and 5 megawatts of photovoltaics at full tilt. Then, clouds pass, and suddenly 5 megawatts of power is gone.¶ "You have to be able to [manage loads] not just in a second, but in milliseconds," Morrissett said. If not, he explained, the cogeneration plant will overload and shut off automatically.¶ That is why no one at the Pentagon is publicly talking about doing away with traditional sources like commercial grid power and backup diesel generators. DOD energy officials say renewable power can be an important piece of a base's overall power portfolio, but there are limits to how much of the load it can shoulder.

#### Diesel generators solves the impact

Kwartin et. al 12 (Vice president of ICF International, consulting firm that partners with government and commercial clients to deliver professional services and technology solutions in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets, Robert Kwartin, Sarah Alexander, Martin Anderson, Donald Clark, John Collins, Chris Lamson, Garrett Martin, Ryan Mayfield, Lindsay McAlpine, Daniel Moreno, Jeffrey Patterson, Craig Schultz, and Emily Stiever, “Solar Energy Development on Department of Defense Installations in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts”, January, Pdf)

Liquid fueled reciprocating engines (e.g., diesel gen sets) are the most commonly used sources of emergency backup generation. Along with liquid or gas fired combustion turbines, they can have black-start capability and, once started, can operate indefinitely provided there is an available source of suitable fuel. Diesel gen sets can be in stationary fixed installations or trailer mounted and movable. When used for emergency supply, they are most typically directly connected to the critical loads they serve or to a local distribution panel that serves the critical loads. They may also be connected to a micro grid and serve critical and other loads through the micro grid.

Diesel gens are easy to install, easy to operate, robust, and relatively inexpensive. Because diesel engines are commonly used in military transport equipment, their routine maintenance should not be a major issue. However, it is critical that routine maintenance is performed and that the engines are routinely started and tested in order to confirm they will operate when required in an emergency. Lack of, infrequent, or poor routine maintenance is the leading cause of backup diesel generators failing to operate when required in an emergency.

#### Legal hurdles kill solvency

Kwartin et. al 12 (Vice president of ICF International, consulting firm that partners with government and commercial clients to deliver professional services and technology solutions in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets, Robert Kwartin, Sarah Alexander, Martin Anderson, Donald Clark, John Collins, Chris Lamson, Garrett Martin, Ryan Mayfield, Lindsay McAlpine, Daniel Moreno, Jeffrey Patterson, Craig Schultz, and Emily Stiever, “Solar Energy Development on Department of Defense Installations in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts”, January, Pdf)

Solar development on the nine DoD installations addressed by this study is governed by a complex web of laws, regulations, and market rules, administered by public and quasi-public entities at the Federal, State, and local levels. Few if any of these rules were designed with solar in mind; several were promulgated long before solar energy began its real penetration in the marketplace in the past 10 years. DoD staff and the private developers they increasingly work with need to fully understand these rules to avoid or mitigate policy barriers and to maximize the benefit of any available incentives.¶ The Federal Government has challenging goals for renewable energy development on DoD installations. In addition, Federal and state governments created a number of incentives for the development of solar energy. These incentives can reduce the installed cost of a solar energy facility by half or more depending upon the size and location of the facility. In addition, the DoD has more flexibility than other Federal agencies to enter into long-term contracts with thirdparties; under these contracts, the third-party developer builds, owns, and operates the solar facility, and the DoD purchases the electricity generated by the solar facility and/or leases the DoD land used for solar development. However, a number of challenges to large-scale solar development on Federal lands exist, most notably the lack of transmission capacity in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts.¶ A second challenge is the uncertainty related to developing solar projects on withdrawn lands within the boundaries of the nine installations (see Table ES.8). These lands are part of the public domain supervised by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), but have been withdrawn from the operation of public land laws to serve military mission needs. There is disagreement among the DoD, the Services, and the BLM regarding which organization has the lead for authorizing and managing renewable energy development on withdrawn lands; this creates uncertainty in the development process and leaves private-sector developers unclear as to who their counterparty is.¶ In addition, the large footprint of utility-scale solar energy facilities means that ground-mounted systems must be individually reviewed to determine their impact on biological, cultural, and visual resources and a wide variety of construction, interconnection, and other permits must be acquired before a potential solar development can move forward. Finally, there is inconsistency within the DoD, and between the DoD and other Federal agencies, in how certain laws, mandates, and processes should be applied; these inconsistencies slow the solar development process and create uncertainty for private sector solar developers.

#### Plan crushes military readiness

Kwartin et. al 12 (Vice president of ICF International, consulting firm that partners with government and commercial clients to deliver professional services and technology solutions in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets, Robert Kwartin, Sarah Alexander, Martin Anderson, Donald Clark, John Collins, Chris Lamson, Garrett Martin, Ryan Mayfield, Lindsay McAlpine, Daniel Moreno, Jeffrey Patterson, Craig Schultz, and Emily Stiever, “Solar Energy Development on Department of Defense Installations in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts”, January, Pdf)

**The military services use** the nine **military installations as key assets for training, test and evaluation, and r**esearch **and d**evelopment. Their size and relatively remote locations offer the military the ability to train personnel and conduct research and development on technology **in ways that would not be possible at other locations.** The military’s need for large, unrestricted landholdings has increased in recent years because modern systems and platforms – aircraft, missiles, sensors, etc. – have effective ranges and impacts vastly larger than their predecessors from the 1940s, when most of the installations in this study were established. Large areas are needed to test, evaluate and train with these systems, both to exploit their full capabilities, and to ensure that any unanticipated incidents occur over controlled ranges, rather than populated areas.¶ Although the effective battlespace requirement is growing, the military’s landholdings are not. Because it is unlikely that any new major installations will be created in the region, **the existing installations should be considered irreplaceable, and any degradation of their ability to perform their missions has an impact on both the near and long term capabilities of the military to protect and defend the U.S.** Any plan for large-scale solar development on these installations needs to acknowledge and start with that premise. There are two broad categories of conflict between solar technology and mission activities. The first category comprises “spectrum” issues, where the conflict between solar technology and military activities occurs through interactions in the radio frequency, infrared or visual spectra (see Table ES.2).¶ The second category comprises “physical” issues, where the conflict arises from hazardous or destructive interaction between military vehicles, ordnance, and other hardware on the one hand, and solar technology on the other (see Table ES.3).

#### Military readiness is key to deter hostile global rivals and prevent global conflict.

Felzenberg and Gray 11 — Alvin S. Felzenberg, Professorial Lecturer at The Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University, Presidential Historian and Adjunct Faculty Member at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania, former Fellow at the Institute of Politics at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, served as Principal Spokesman for the 9/11 Commission, holds a Ph.D. in Politics from Princeton University, and Alexander B. Gray, Student at the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University and the War Studies Department of King’s College, London, 2011 (“The New Isolationism,” *The National Review*, January 3rd, Available Online at http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/256150, Accessed 01-03-2011)

Anything Reps. Ron Paul (R., Tex.) and Barney Frank (D., Mass.) both support should give the rest of us pause. Their proposal to slash defense spending by $1 trillion over a decade — only the most recent joint effort by the new isolationists on the Left and Right to curtail American military strength around the world — is as foolhardy as it is unrealistic. Were such a policy enacted, the nation and the world would be set on a path not toward peace, but toward instability, conflict, and a lessening of freedom in many corners of the world. As the deteriorating situation on the Korean peninsula reminds us, the security concerns of the United States do not disappear in times of economic distress. America’s interests, whether economic, strategic, diplomatic, or moral, cannot be set aside when Congress tires of them. The United States and the world paid a severe price for the ostrich-like behavior too many democratic nations exhibited during the 1920s and 1930s. Reps. Paul and Frank appear determined to repeat this mistake. The United States continues to face an array of global challenges that require a modern, technologically superior military. It is very much in the interests of the United States to uphold the territorial integrity and economic independence of much of Asia, maintain the security of critical waterways such as the Strait of Hormuz, and protect American trade from pirates and terrorists worldwide. Rather than regard the nation’s defenses as a ready source of money available for diversion to domestic concerns, Congress and the president should identify the challenges America faces and assure that its military is able to meet them. At its core, the Frank-Paul effort appears to be an attempt to prevent repetitions of wars the two congressmen regard as either unnecessary or faultily executed. But the United States has **broader and more important long-run national-security concerns than** Iraq and **Afghanistan**. As the U.S. became bogged down in those two countries, it began **feeling strains elsewhere**, precipitated by **China**, **Russia**, and potentially toxic menaces such as **Iran** and **Venezuela**. Counterinsurgency warfare and Predator-drone strikes against transnational terrorists certainly defined much of **the last decade**. But **the next decade** will witness **increasing competition among nation-states** for control of **valuable resources** and **the exertion of influence worldwide**. Russia, through its control of vital energy pipelines, seeks to draw Western Europe more closely into its orbit, thereby weakening the latter’s historical ties to the United States. By taking a similar approach to Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, the Baltics, and Moldova, Russia is on the verge of re-colonizing economically many of its former satellites. China, while continuing to upgrade its naval capabilities, grows **increasingly assertive**. In pursuit of its own Monroe Doctrine for East Asia, Beijing has proclaimed its sovereignty over the entire South China Sea, menaced neighbors from India to Vietnam, used its economic muscle to intimidate Japan, and increased its threats against Taiwan. China’s leaders have been studying the writings of the 19th-century American naval theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan, who demonstrated the connection between sea power and economic strength. At the turn of the last century, Theodore Roosevelt found in Mahan the blueprint for achieving unprecedented American influence in world affairs. His efforts to build both a strong navy and a sound economy ushered in the “American century,” the period in which the United States became a force for good throughout the world and a beacon of hope for those yearning to breathe free. In pursuing a “blue-water” ocean-going navy capable of supporting their expanding global economic ambitions, the Chinese are acting from a desire to defend their nation’s trade and access to world markets, with a focus on energy supplies. It is critical that the Chinese — who are closely studying both Mahan’s writings and the history of the Monroe Doctrine — and Americans who see Chinese hegemony over Asia as either inevitable or a price they are willing to pay in exchange for slashing defense spending not draw **the wrong lessons from history**. Both sides should understand that it was not American might that gave the Monroe Doctrine force, but the then all-powerful British navy. For much of the 19th century, Great Britain had reasons of its own for keeping other nations out of the Western Hemisphere and for wanting to see the United States develop internally. If appropriately funded, the United States Navy has the capacity to play a similar role in China’s rise — perhaps, in the process, **influencing how China develops**. Should China conclude that the United States intends to remain a visible and active presence in the region, it will respond accordingly. Acting together, the two nations might embark on a series of **cooperative ventures** designed to help assure a steady flow of trade and an unimpeded exchange of people, goods, and ideas. They can also **work together** to combat a rise in piracy and terrorism in Asia and elsewhere and to respond to humanitarian crises, like the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. For its part, China, should it continue to hold North Korea in check, will achieve some of the status it seeks as a rising world power, with commensurate influence on the world stage. Should China conclude, on the other hand, that the United States intends to **turn inward**, it may grow **even more ambitious and assertive in its region and beyond**, potentially **menacing world peace**. Its smaller neighbors nervously wait to see how the United States will respond to China’s growing assertiveness. **Should they come to believe that the U.S. is in retreat, they will make their own accommodations with Beijing**. That result would **wreak irreparable damage both to America’s economy and to its security**. Messrs. Frank and Paul and their supporters have taken it into their minds that a reduced American presence in world affairs, particularly where the military is involved, would be a good thing. They had better think again: World politics, like nature, **is hardly prone to respect vacuums**. Iran and Venezuela remain **as bellicose and destabilizing as ever**, in spite of two years of Obama “engagement.” Iran squats beside the Strait of Hormuz, through which much of the world’s energy supply travels. Iran has also, the original Monroe Doctrine be damned, extended its military cooperation with Hugo Chávez’s authoritarian regime. Evidence is strong that Venezuela is providing sanctuary for Hezbollah terrorists in South America. The alliance of these two anti-American and increasingly menacing states could pose a threat to the United States of a kind that would make us **nostalgic for the Cuban Missile Crisis**. Faced with such challenges, the United States can **ill afford military retrenchment** as advocated by the new isolationists. While waste in the Pentagon’s budget can and should be cut, the new isolationists want to do it with a **chainsaw** when a **scalpel** is needed. In the last decade, the U.S. Navy’s fleet has shrunk to its smallest size since the 19th century, just as potential rivals such as China have not only expanded theirs but have begun to target perceived American maritime vulnerabilities. The U.S. Air Force is fielding an aging and shrinking force, while China is developing an advanced fighter for sale to adversaries of America, including Iran. A world in which the United States willingly ceded power and influence would both be **more dangerous** and prove **less receptive to values** that most Americans share, such as **respect for human rights**, the need to restrain governments through **the rule of law**, and **the sanctity of contracts**. By reducing its military strength to alarmingly low levels, the United States would create **dangerous power vacuums around the world** that other nations, with entirely different values, would be only too happy to fill. **That, as history shows, would make war more, rather than less, likely**. Congress and the president would do well to reflect on those lessons and remember their duty to provide a dominant American military presence on land, at sea, and in the air.

### Advantage 2: Explosions

#### No blackouts—grid’s resilient

Avila 12 (Jim, Senior National Correspondent at ABC News, “A U.S. Blackout as Large as India’s? ‘Very Unlikely’”, http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/headlines/2012/07/a-u-s-blackout-as-large-as-indias-very-unlikely/)

As India recovers from a blackout that left the world’s second-largest country — and more than 600 million residents — in the dark, a ripple of uncertainty moved through the Federal Regulatory Commission’s command center today in the U.S. The Indian crisis had some people asking about the vulnerability of America’s grid.

“What people really want to know today is, can something like India happen here? So if there is an outage or some problem in the Northeast, can it actually spread all the way to California,” John Wellinghoff, the commission’s chairman, told ABC News. “It’s very, very unlikely that ultimately would happen.”

Wellinghoff said that first, the grid was divided in the middle of the nation. Engineers said that it also was monitored more closely than ever. The grid is checked for line surges 30 times a second.

Since the Northeast blackout in 2003 — the largest in the U.S., which affected 55 million — 16,000 miles of new transmission lines have been added to the grid.

And even though some lines in the Northeast are more than 70 years old, Wellinghoff said that the chances of a blackout like India’s were very low.

#### Safeguards check the impact

Leger 12 (Donna, USA Today, “Blackout Like India's Unlikely in U.S., Experts Say”, August 1, http://www.weather.com/news/india-blackout-unlikely-in-us-20120801)

A massive, countrywide power failure like the one in India on Tuesday is "extremely unlikely" in the United States, energy experts say.

In India, three of the country's government-operated power grids failed Tuesday, leaving 620 million people without electricity for several hours. The outage, the second in two days in the country of 1.21 billion people, is the world's biggest blackout on record.

The U.S. electricity system is segmented into three parts with safeguards that prevent an outage in one system from tripping a blackout in another system, "making blackouts across the country extremely unlikely," Energy Department spokeswoman Keri Fulton said.

Early reports from government officials in India say excessive demand knocked the country's power generators offline. Experts say India's industry and economy are growing faster than its electrical systems. Last year, the economy grew 7.8% and pushed energy needs higher, but electricity generation did not keep pace, government records show.

"We are much, much less at risk for something like that happening here, especially from the perspective of demand exceeding supply," said Gregory Reed, a professor of electric power engineering at University of Pittsburgh. "We're much more sophisticated in our operations. Most of our issues have been from natural disasters."

The U.S. generates more than enough electricity to meet demand and always have power in reserve, Reed said.

"Fundamentally, it's a different world here," said Arshad Mansoor, senior vice president of the Electric Power Research Institute in Washington and an expert on power grids. "It's an order of magnitude more reliable here than in a developing country."

Grid operators across the country analyze power usage and generation, factoring outside factors such as weather, in real time and can forecast power supply and demand hour by hour, Mansoor said.

#### No deaths from nuclear meltdowns

Drum 11 Kevin, political blogger for Mother Jones, "Nukes and the Free Market", March 14, www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/03/nukes-and-free-market

We’re currently told that the death toll in Japan will be at least 10,000 people of whom approximately zero seem to have perished in nuclear accidents. What happens when a tsunami hits an offshore drilling platform or a natural gas pipeline? What happens to a coal mine in an earthquake? How much environmental damage is playing out in Japan right now because of gasoline from cars pushed around? The main lesson is “try not to put critical infrastructure near a fault line” but Japan is an earthquakey country, so what are they really supposed to do about this?¶ This is a good point: energy sources of all kind cause problems. Sometimes the problems create screaming headlines (nuke meltdowns, offshore oil explosions, mining disasters) and sometimes they don't (increased particulate pollution, global warming, devastation of salmon runs). But the dangers are there for virtually every type of energy production.¶ Still, it's worth pointing out that the problem with nuclear power isn't so much its immediate capacity to kill people. As Matt points out, no one has died in Japan from the partial meltdowns at its damaged nuclear plants, and it's unlikely anyone ever will. The control rods are in place, and even in the worst case the containment vessels will almost certainly restrict the worst damage.

#### Chernobyl proves meltdowns don’t cause lasting damage

Bosselman 7 (Professor of Law Emeritus, Chicago-Kent College of Law. Fred, “THE NEW POWER GENERATION: ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND ELECTRICITY INNOVATION: COLLOQUIUM ARTICLE: THE ECOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER,” 15 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 1, 2007)

C. "But What About Chernobyl?" In 1986, an explosion at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in the Ukraine caused the release of large amounts of radiation into the atmosphere. [247](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n247) Initially, the Soviet government released little information about the explosion and tried to play down its seriousness, but this secrecy caused great nervousness throughout Europe, and fed the public's fears of nuclear power all over the  [\*46]  world. [248](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n248) Now a **comprehensive analysis** of the event and its aftermath has been made: In 2005, a consortium of United Nations agencies called the Chernobyl Forum released its analysis of the long-term effects of the Chernobyl explosion. [249](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n249) The U.N. agencies' study found that the explosion caused fewer deaths than had been expected. [250](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n250) Although the Chernobyl reactor was poorly designed and badly operated [251](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n251) and lacked the basic safety protections found outside the Soviet Union, [252](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n252) fewer than seventy deaths so far have been attributed to the explosion, mostly plant employees and firefighters who suffered acute radiation sickness. [253](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n253) The Chernobyl reactor, like many Soviet reactors, was in the open rather than in an American type of pressurizable containment structure, which would have prevented the release of radiation to the environment if a similar accident had occurred. [254](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n254)  [\*47]  Perhaps the most surprising finding of the U.N. agencies' study was that "**the ecosystems around the Chernobyl site are now flourishing.** The [Chernobyl exclusion zone] has become a wildlife sanctuary, and it looks like the nature park it has become." [255](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n255) Jeffrey McNeely, the chief scientist of the World Conservation Union, has made similar observations: Chernobyl has now become the world's first radioactive nature reserve... . 200 wolves are now living in the nature reserve, which has also begun to support populations of reindeer, lynx and European bison, species that previously were not found in the region. While the impact on humans was strongly negative, the wildlife is adapting and even thriving on the site of one of the 20th century's worst environmental disasters. [256](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n256) Mary Mycio, the Kiev correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, has written a fascinating book based on her many visits to the exclusion zone and interviews with people in the area. [257](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n257) She notes that the fear that radiation would produce permanent deformities in animal species has not been borne out after twenty years; the population and diversity of animals in even some of the most heavily radiated parts of the exclusion zone is similar to comparable places that are less radioactive.

#### No risk of a cyber-attack on the grid

Douglas Birch 12, former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy, "Forget Revolution," October 1, Foreign Policy, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget\_revolution?page=full

Likewise, some of the bill's advocates suspect that in the aftermath of a truly successful cyber attack, the government would have to bail the utilities out anyway. Joe Weiss, a cyber security professional and an authority on industrial control systems like those used in the electric grid, argued that a well-prepared, sophisticated cyber attack could have far more serious consequences than this summer's blackouts. "The reason we are so concerned is that cyber could take out the grid for nine to 18 months," he said. "This isn't a one to five day outage. We're prepared for that. We can handle that."¶ But pulling off a cyber assault on that scale is no easy feat. Weiss agreed that hackers intent on inflicting this kind of long-term interruption of power would need to use a tool capable of inflicting physical damage. And so far, the world has seen only one such weapon: Stuxnet, which is believed to have been a joint military project of Israel and the United States.¶ Ralph Langner, a German expert on industrial-control system security, was among the first to discover that Stuxnet was specifically designed to attack the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system (SCADA) at a single site: Iran's Natanz uranium-enrichment plant. The computer worm's sophisticated programs, which infected the plant in 2009, caused about 1,000 of Natanz's 5,000 uranium-enrichment centrifuges to self-destruct by accelerating their precision rotors beyond the speeds at which they were designed to operate.¶ Professionals like Weiss and others warned that Stuxnet was opening a Pandora's Box: Once it was unleashed on the world, they feared, it would become available to hostile states, criminals, and terrorists who could adapt the code for their own nefarious purposes. But two years after the discovery of Stuxnet, there are no reports of similar attacks against the United States. What has prevented the emergence of such copycat viruses?¶ A 2009 paper published by the University of California, Berkeley, may offer the answer. The report, which was released a year before Stuxnet surfaced, found that in order to create a cyber weapon capable of crippling a specific control system ­­-- like the ones operating the U.S. electric grid -- six coders might have to work for up to six months to reverse engineer the targeted center's SCADA system.¶ Even then, the report says, hackers likely would need the help of someone with inside knowledge of how the network's machines were wired together to plan an effective attack. "Every SCADA control center is configured differently, with different devices, running different software/protocols," wrote Rose Tsang, the report's author.¶ Professional hackers are in it for the money -- and it's a lot more cost-efficient to search out vulnerabilities in widely-used computer programs like the Windows operating system, used by banks and other affluent targets, than in one-of-a-kind SCADA systems linked to generators and switches.¶ According to Pollard, only the world's industrial nations have the means to use the Internet to attack utilities and major industries. But given the integrated global economy, there is little incentive, short of armed conflict, for them to do so. "If you're a state that has a number of U.S. T-bills in your treasury, you have an economic interest in the United States," he said. "You're not going to have an interest in mucking about with our infrastructure."¶ There is also the threat of retaliation. Last year, the U.S. government reportedly issued a classified report on cyber strategy that said it could respond to a devastating digital assault with traditional military force. The idea was that if a cyber attack caused death and destruction on the scale of a military assault, the United States would reserve the right to respond with what the Pentagon likes to call "kinetic" weapons: missiles, bombs, and bullets.¶ An unnamed Pentagon official, speaking to the Wall Street Journal, summed up the policy in less diplomatic terms: "If you shut down our power grid, maybe we will put a missile down one of your smokestacks."¶ Deterrence is sometimes dismissed as a toothless strategy against cyber attacks because hackers have such an easy time hiding in the anonymity of the Web. But investigators typically come up with key suspects, if not smoking guns, following cyber intrusions and assaults -- the way suspicions quickly focused on the United States and Israel after Stuxnet was discovered. And with the U.S. military's global reach, even terror groups have to factor in potential retaliation when planning their operations.

### Advantage 1: Economy

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Economic collapse inevitable --- now’s better than later

MacKenzie 8 [Debora, Are We Doomed, New Scientist, Vol. 197 Issue 2650, p32-35, 4p, 4 May 2005, EBSCO)

DOOMSDAY. The end of civilisation. Literature and film abound with tales of plague, famine and wars which ravage the planet, leaving a few survivors scratching out a primitive existence amid the ruins. Every civilisation in history has collapsed, after all. Why should ours be any different? Doomsday scenarios typically feature a knockout blow: a massive asteroid, all-out nuclear war or a catastrophic pandemic. Yet there is another chilling possibility: what if the very nature of civilisation means that ours, like all the others, is destined to collapse sooner or later? A few researchers have been making such claims for years. Disturbingly, recent insights from fields such as complexity theory suggest that they are right. It appears that once a society develops beyond a certain level of complexity it becomes increasingly fragile. Eventually, it reaches a point at which even a relatively minor disturbance can bring everything crashing down. Some say we have already reached this point, and that it is time to start thinking about how we might manage collapse. Others insist it is not yet too late, and that we can---we must---act now to keep disaster at bay. History is not on our side. Think of Sumeria, of ancient Egypt and of the Maya. In his 2005 best-seller, Jared Diamond of the University of California, Los Angeles, blamed environmental mismanagement for the fall of the Mayan civilisation and others, and warned that we might be heading the same way unless we choose to stop destroying our environmental support systems. Lester Brown of the Earth Policy Institute in Washington DC agrees. He has that governments must pay more attention to vital environmental resources. "It's not about saving the planet. It's about saving civilisation," he says. Others think our problems run deeper. From the moment our ancestors started to settle down and build cities, we have had to find solutions to the problems that success brings. "For the past 10,000 years, problem solving has produced increasing complexity in human societies," says Joseph Tainter, an archaeologist at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, and author of the 1988 book The Collapse of Complex Societies. If crops fail because rain is patchy, build irrigation canals. When they silt up, organise dredging crews. When the bigger crop yields lead to a bigger population, build more canals. When there are too many for ad hoc repairs, install a management bureaucracy, and tax people to pay for it. When they complain, invent tax inspectors and a system to record the sums paid. That much the Sumerians knew. Diminishing returns There is, however, a price to be paid. Every extra layer of organisation imposes a cost in terms of energy, the common currency of all human efforts, from building canals to educating scribes. And increasing complexity, Tainter realised, produces diminishing returns. The extra food produced by each extra hour of labour---or joule of energy invested per farmed hectare---diminishes as that investment mounts. We see the same thing today in a declining number of patents per dollar invested in research as that research investment mounts. This law of diminishing returns appears everywhere, Tainter says. To keep growing, societies must keep solving problems as they arise. Yet each problem solved means more complexity. Success generates a larger population, more kinds of specialists, more resources to manage, more information to juggle---and, ultimately, less bang for your buck. Eventually, says Tainter, the point is reached when all the energy and resources available to a society are required just to maintain its existing level of complexity. Then when the climate changes or barbarians invade, overstretched institutions break down and civil order collapses. What emerges is a less complex society, which is organised on a smaller scale or has been taken over by another group. Tainter sees diminishing returns as the underlying reason for the collapse of all ancient civilisations, from the early Chinese dynasties to the Greek city state of Mycenae. These civilisations relied on the solar energy that could be harvested from food, fodder and wood, and from wind. When this had been stretched to its limit, things fell apart. Western industrial civilisation has become bigger and more complex than any before it by exploiting new sources of energy, notably coal and oil, but these are limited. There are increasing signs of diminishing returns: the energy required to get is mounting and although global is still increasing, constant innovation is needed to cope with environmental degradation and evolving---the yield boosts per unit of investment in innovation are shrinking. "Since problems are inevitable," Tainter warns, "this process is in part ineluctable." Is Tainter right? An analysis of complex systems has led Yaneer Bar-Yam, head of the New England Complex Systems Institute in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to the same conclusion that Tainter reached from studying history. Social organisations become steadily more complex as they are required to deal both with environmental problems and with challenges from neighbouring societies that are also becoming more complex, Bar-Yam says. This eventually leads to a fundamental shift in the way the society is organised. "To run a hierarchy, managers cannot be less complex than the system they are managing," Bar-Yam says. As complexity increases, societies add ever more layers of management but, ultimately in a hierarchy, one individual has to try and get their head around the whole thing, and this starts to become impossible. At that point, hierarchies give way to networks in which decision-making is distributed. We are at this point. This shift to decentralised networks has led to a widespread belief that modern society is more resilient than the old hierarchical systems. "I don't foresee a collapse in society because of increased complexity," says futurologist and industry consultant Ray Hammond. "Our strength is in our highly distributed decision making." This, he says, makes modern western societies more resilient than those like the old Soviet Union, in which decision making was centralised. Things are not that simple, says Thomas Homer-Dixon, a political scientist at the University of Toronto, Canada, and author of the 2006 book The Upside of Down. "Initially, increasing connectedness and diversity helps: if one village has a crop failure, it can get food from another village that didn't." As connections increase, though, networked systems become increasingly tightly coupled. This means the impacts of failures can propagate: the more closely those two villages come to depend on each other, the more both will suffer if either has a problem. "Complexity leads to higher vulnerability in some ways," says Bar-Yam. "This is not widely understood." The reason is that as networks become ever tighter, they start to transmit shocks rather than absorb them. "The intricate networks that tightly connect us together---and move people, materials, information, money and energy---amplify and transmit any shock," says Homer-Dixon. "A financial crisis, a terrorist attack or a disease outbreak has almost instant destabilising effects, from one side of the world to the other." For instance, in 2003 large areas of North America and Europe suffered when apparently insignificant nodes of their respective electricity grids failed. And this year China suffered a similar blackout after heavy snow hit power lines. Tightly coupled networks like these create the potential for propagating failure across many critical industries, says Charles Perrow of Yale University, a leading authority on industrial accidents and disasters. Credit crunch Perrow says interconnectedness in the global production system has now reached the point where "a breakdown anywhere increasingly means a breakdown everywhere". This is especially true of the world's financial systems, where the coupling is very tight. "Now we have a debt crisis with the biggest player, the US. The consequences could be enormous." "A networked society behaves like a multicellular organism," says Bar-Yam, "random damage is like lopping a chunk off a sheep." Whether or not the sheep survives depends on which chunk is lost. And while we are pretty sure which chunks a sheep needs, it isn't clear---it may not even be predictable---which chunks of our densely networked civilisation are critical, until it's too late. "When we do the analysis, almost any part is critical if you lose enough of it," says Bar-Yam. "Now that we can ask questions of such systems in more sophisticated ways, we are discovering that they can be very vulnerable. That means civilisation is very vulnerable." So what can we do? "The key issue is really whether we respond successfully in the face of the new vulnerabilities we have," Bar-Yam says. That means making sure our "global sheep" does not get injured in the first place---something that may be hard to guarantee as the climate shifts and the world's fuel and mineral resources dwindle. Scientists in other fields are also warning that complex systems are prone to collapse. Similar ideas have emerged from the study of natural cycles in ecosystems, based on the work of ecologist Buzz Holling, now at the University of Florida, Gainesville. Some ecosystems become steadily more complex over time: as a patch of new forest grows and matures, specialist species may replace more generalist species, biomass builds up and the trees, beetles and bacteria form an increasingly rigid and ever more tightly coupled system. "It becomes an extremely efficient system for remaining constant in the face of the normal range of conditions," says Homer-Dixon. But unusual conditions---an insect outbreak, fire or drought---can trigger dramatic changes as the impact cascades through the system. The end result may be the collapse of the old ecosystem and its replacement by a newer, simpler one. Globalisation is resulting in the same tight coupling and fine-tuning of our systems to a narrow range of conditions, he says. Redundancy is being systematically eliminated as companies maximise profits. Some products are produced by only one factory worldwide. Financially, it makes sense, as mass production maximises efficiency. Unfortunately, it also minimises resilience. "We need to be more selective about increasing the connectivity and speed of our critical systems," says Homer-Dixon. "Sometimes the costs outweigh the benefits." Is there an alternative? Could we heed these warnings and start carefully climbing back down the complexity ladder? Tainter knows of only one civilisation that managed to decline but not fall. "After the Byzantine empire lost most of its territory to the Arabs, they simplified their entire society. Cities mostly disappeared, literacy and numeracy declined, their economy became less monetised, and they switched from professional army to peasant militia." Pulling off the same trick will be harder for our more advanced society. Nevertheless, Homer-Dixon thinks we should be taking action now. "First, we need to encourage distributed and decentralised production of vital goods like energy and food," he says. "Second, we need to remember that slack isn't always waste. A manufacturing company with a large inventory may lose some money on warehousing, but it can keep running even if its suppliers are temporarily out of action." The electricity industry in the US has already started identifying hubs in the grid with no redundancy available and is putting some back in, Homer-Dixon points out. Governments could encourage other sectors to follow suit. The trouble is that in a world of fierce competition, private companies will always increase efficiency unless governments subsidise inefficiency in the public interest. Homer-Dixon doubts we can stave off collapse completely. He points to what he calls "tectonic" stresses that will shove our rigid, tightly coupled system outside the range of conditions it is becoming ever more finely tuned to. These include population growth, the growing divide between the world's rich and poor, financial instability, weapons proliferation, disappearing forests and fisheries, and climate change. In imposing new complex solutions we will run into the problem of diminishing returns---just as we are running out of cheap and plentiful energy. "This is the fundamental challenge humankind faces. We need to allow for the healthy breakdown in natural function in our societies in a way that doesn't produce catastrophic collapse, but instead leads to healthy renewal," Homer-Dixon says. This is what happens in forests, which are a patchy mix of old growth and newer areas created by disease or fire. If the ecosystem in one patch collapses, it is recolonised and renewed by younger forest elsewhere. We must allow partial breakdown here and there, followed by renewal, he says, rather than trying so hard to avert breakdown by increasing complexity that any resulting crisis is actually worse. Lester Brown thinks we are fast running out of time. "The world can no longer afford to waste a day. We need a Great Mobilisation, as we had in wartime," he says. "There has been tremendous progress in just the past few years. For the first time, I am starting to see how an alternative economy might emerge. But it's now a race between tipping points---which will come first, a switch to sustainable technology, or collapse?" Tainter is not convinced that even new technology will save civilisation in the long run. "I sometimes think of this as a 'faith-based' approach to the future," he says. Even a society reinvigorated by cheap new energy sources will eventually face the problem of diminishing returns once more. Innovation itself might be subject to diminishing returns, or perhaps absolute limits. Studies of the way by Luis Bettencourt of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico, support this idea. His team's work suggests that an ever-faster rate of innovation is required to keep cities growing and prevent stagnation or collapse, and in the long run this cannot be sustainable.

#### Collapse of the economy now is key to prevent extinction through warming---causes a stable transition to peaceful society

**Barry 8** – President and Founder of Ecological Internet, Ph.D. in Land Resources from U-Wisconsin-Madison

(Glen, “Economic Collapse And Global Ecology”, http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm)

Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life. With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later. Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products. Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration. This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption. We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured. Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil. Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon. A successful revolutionary response to imminent global ecosystem collapse would focus upon bringing down the Earth's industrial economy now. As society continues to fail miserably to implement necessary changes to allow creation to continue, maybe the best strategy to achieve global ecological sustainability is economic sabotage to hasten the day. It is more fragile than it looks.

#### Growth causes war

Trainer 2 Senior Lecturer of School of Social Work @ University of New South Wales (Ted, If You Want Affluence, Prepare for War, Democracy & Nature, Vol. 8, No. 2, EBSCO)

If this limits-to-growth analysis is at all valid, the implications for the problem of global peace and conflict and security are clear and savage. If we all remain determined to increase our living standards, our level of production and consumption, in a world where resources are already scarce, where only a few have affluent living standards but another 8 billion will be wanting them too, and which we, the rich, are determined to get richer without any limit, then nothing is more guaranteed than that there will be increasing levels of conflict and violence. To put it another way, if we insist on remaining affluent we will need to remain heavily armed. Increased conflict in at least the following categories can be expected. First, the present conflict over resources between the rich elites and the poor majority in the Third World must increase, for example, as ‘development’ under globalisation takes more land, water and forests into export markets. Second, there are conflicts between the Third World and the rich world, the major recent examples being the war between the US and Iraq over control of oil. Iraq invaded Kuwait and the US intervened, accompanied by much high-sounding rhetoric (having found nothing unacceptable about Israel’s invasions of Lebanon or the Indonesian invasion of East Timor). As has often been noted, had Kuwait been one of the world’s leading exporters of broccoli, rather than oil, it is doubtful whether the US would have been so eager to come to its defence. At the time of writing, the US is at war in Central Asia over ‘terrorism’. Few would doubt that a ‘collateral’ outcome will be the establishment of regimes that will give the West access to the oil wealth of Central Asia. Following are some references to the connection many have recognised between rich world affluence and conflict. General M.D. Taylor, US Army retired argued ‘... US military priorities just be shifted towards insuring a steady flow of resources from the Third World’. Taylor referred to ‘… fierce competition among industrial powers for the same raw materials markets sought by the United States’ and ‘… growing hostility displayed by have-not nations towards their affluent counterparts’.62 ‘Struggles are taking place, or are in the offing, between rich and poor nations over their share of the world product; within the industrial world over their share of industrial resources and markets’.63 ‘That more than half of the people on this planet are poorly nourished while a small percentage live in historically unparalleled luxury is a sure recipe for continued and even escalating international conflict.’64 The oil embargo placed on the US by OPEC in the early 1970s prompted the US to make it clear that it was prepared to go to war in order to secure supplies. ‘President Carter last week issued a clear warning that any attempt to gain control of the Persian Gulf would lead to war.’ It would ‘… be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States’.65 ‘The US is ready to take military action if Russia threatens vital American interests in the Persian Gulf, the US Secretary of Defence, Mr Brown, said yesterday.’66 Klare’s recent book Resource Wars discusses this theme in detail, stressing the coming significance of water as a source of international conflict. ‘Global demand for many key materials is growing at an unsustainable rate. … the incidence of conflict over vital materials is sure to grow. … The wars of the future will largely be fought over the possession and control of vital economic goods. … resource wars will become, in the years ahead, the most distinctive feature of the global security environment.’67 Much of the rich world’s participation in the conflicts taking place throughout the world is driven by the determination to back a faction that will then look favourably on Western interests. In a report entitled, ‘The rich prize that is Shaba’, Breeze begins, ‘Increasing rivalry over a share-out between France and Belgium of the mineral riches of Shaba Province lies behind the joint Franco– Belgian paratroop airlift to Zaire. … These mineral riches make the province a valuable prize and help explain the West’s extended diplomatic courtship …’68 Then there is potential conflict between the rich nations who are after all the ones most dependent on securing large quantities of resources. ‘The resource and energy intensive modes of production employed in nearly all industries necessitate continuing armed coercion and competition to secure raw materials.’69 ‘Struggles are taking place, or are in the offing, between rich and poor nations over their share of the world product, within the industrial world over their share of industrial resources and markets …’70 Growth, competition, expansion … and war Finally, at the most abstract level, the struggle for greater wealth and power is central in the literature on the causes of war. ‘… warfare appears as a normal and periodic form of competition within the capitalist world economy. … world wars regularly occur during a period of economic expansion. ’71 ‘War is an inevitable result of the struggle between economies for expansion.’72 Choucri and North say their most important finding is that domestic growth is a strong determinant of national expansion and that this results in competition between nations and war.73 The First and Second World Wars can be seen as being largely about imperial grabbing. Germany, Italy and Japan sought to expand their territory and resource access. Britain already held much of the world within its empire … which it had previously fought 72 wars to take! ‘Finite resources in a world of expanding populations and increasing per capita demands create a situation ripe for international violence.’74 Ashley focuses on the significance of the quest for economic growth. ‘War is mainly explicable in terms of differential growth in a world of scarce and unevenly distributed resources … expansion is a prime source of conflict. So long as the dynamics of differential growth remain unmanaged, it is probable that these long term processes will sooner or later carry major powers into war.’75 Security The point being made can be put in terms of security. One way to seek security is to develop greater capacity to repel attack. In the case of nations this means large expenditure of money, resources and effort on military preparedness. However there is a much better strategy; i.e. to live in ways that do not oblige you to take more than your fair share and therefore that do not give anyone any motive to attack you. Tut! This is not possible unless there is global economic justice. If a few insist on levels of affluence, industrialisation and economic growth that are totally impossible for all to achieve, and which could not be possible if they were taking only their fair share of global resources, then they must remain heavily armed and their security will require readiness to use their arms to defend their unjust privileges. In other words, if we want affluence we must prepare for war. If we insist on continuing to take most of the oil and other resources while many suffer intense deprivation because they cannot get access to them then we must be prepared to maintain the aircraft carriers and rapid deployment forces, and the despotic regimes, without which we cannot secure the oil fields and plantations. Global peace is not possible without global justice, and that is not possible unless rich countries move to ‘The Simpler Way’.

**Causes extinction by 2025**

**Chase-Dunn**, Director of the Institute for Research on World-Systems, and Podobnik, Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Lewis and Clark College, **99**

(Christopher and Bruce, *The Future of Global Conflict*, ed. Bornschier and Chase-Dunn, pg 43)

While the onset of a period of hegemonic rivalry is in itself disturbing, the picture becomes even grimmer when the influence of long-term economic cycles is taken into account. As an **extensive body of research** documents (see especially Van Duijn, 1983), the 50 to 60 year business cycle known as the Kondratieff wave (K-wave) has been in synchronous operation on an international scale for at least the last two centuries. Utilizing data gathering by Levy (1983) on war severity, Goldstein (1988) demonstrates that there is a corresponding 50 to 60 year cycle in the number of battle deaths per year for the period 1495-1975. Beyond merely showing that the K-wave and the war cycle are linked in a systematic fashion, Goldstein’s research suggests that severe core wars are **much more likely to occur** late **in the upswing** phase of the K-wave. This finding is interpreted as showing that, while states always desire to go to war, they can afford to do so only when **economic growth** is providing them with sufficient resources. Modelski and Thompson (1996) present a more complex interpretation of the systemic relationship between economic and war cycles, but it closely resembles Goldstein’s hypothesis. In their analysis, a first economic upswing generates the economic resources required by an ascending core state to make a bid for hegemony; a second period of economic growth follows a period of global war and the establishment of a new period of hegemony. Here, again, specific economic upswings are associated with an increased likelihood of the outbreak of core war. It is **widely accepted** that the current K-wave, which entered a downturn around 1967-73, is probably now in the process of beginning a new upturn which will reach its apex around 2025. It is also widely accepted that by this period US hegemony, already unraveling, will have been definitively eroded. This convergence of a plateauing economic cycle with a period of political multicentricity within the core should, if history truly does repeat itself, result in the outbreak of full-scale warfare between the declining hegemon and the ascending core powers. Although both Goldstein (1991) and Modelski and Thompson (1996) assert that such a global war can (somehow) be avoided, other theorists consider that the possibility of such a core war is sufficiently high that **serious steps should be taken to ensure that** such **collective suicide does not occur** .

#### Development makes global pandemics inevitable---causes extinction

**Krepinevich 9** (Andrew, President of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments and Distinguished Visiting Professor @ George Mason's School of Public Policy, Congressional Consultant on Military Affairs, PhD Harvard, "7 Deadly Scenarios," February)

Over the past several decades the world has experience a wave of globalization, far surpassing the great surge that swept over the globe in the years leading up to World War I. The growth of the world economy---facilitated by lower trade barriers, global supply chains, international financial networks, and global communication---has yielded many benefits, including increased wealth and great economic efficiencies. It has also yielded an unprecedented level of mobility---in the movement of capital, goods, and services, in people (including migration) , and last but not least, in disease. For nearly a century the world has been spared the specter of mass deaths induced by a killer disease. The last great global pandemic occurred at the end of World War I, when the misnamed Spanish influenza killed an estimated 20 million people---including nearly 700,000 Americans---before it ran its course. To a significant degree, the spread of influenza was aided and abetted by the world war, which saw the armed forces of many nations on the move from their home countries to other parts of the world. Even then, however, human mobility and trade were far more constrained than they are today, when every year millions of passengers pass through U.S. airports alone. There have been several canaries in humanity's mine shaft, warning of impending disaster. According to the scientific community, the world has been overdue for some form of pandemic. On occasions too numerous to count, members of the medical profession have stated that "it is not a matter of if such an event will occur, but when." As the World Health Organization met in Geneva in the summer of 2009, health officials were citing the "near-misses" the world had recently experienced with the AIDS virus, tuberculosis, and avian flu (commonly referred to as bird flu), and warned that, absent a major effort to improve the globe's public health system, humanity's good fortune could not---and would not---last. But the issue has to struggle to get on the global agenda. Here in America the 2008 presidential campaign (which began in early 2007) was dominated by the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the broader problem of militant Islam, rising energy prices, a falling economy, and growing concerns about global warming. Neither public health concerns over a pandemic nor the country's illegal alien problem appeared prominently on the political radar screen. Call them the "stealth" issues---the ones that we failed to detect.
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#### Nuclear war won't cause extinction

**Martin 82** (Brian, Professor of Social Sciences in the School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication at the University of Wollongong, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 287-300 <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html>)

To summarise the above points, a major global nuclear war in which population centres in the US, Soviet Union, Europe and China ware targeted, with no effective civil defence measures taken, could kill directly perhaps 400 to 450 million people. Induced effects, in particular starvation or epidemics following agricultural failure or economic breakdown, might add up to several hundred million deaths to the total, though this is most uncertain. Such an eventuality would be a catastrophe of enormous proportions, but it is far from extinction. Even in the most extreme case there would remain alive some 4000 million people, about nine-tenths of the world's population, most of them unaffected physically by the nuclear war. The following areas would be relatively unscathed, unless nuclear attacks were made in these regions: South and Central America, Africa, the Middle East, the Indian subcontinent, Southeast Asia, Australasia, Oceania and large parts of China. Even in the mid-latitudes of the northern hemisphere where most of the nuclear weapons would be exploded, areas upwind of nuclear attacks would remain free of heavy radioactive contamination, such as Portugal, Ireland and British Columbia. Many people, perhaps especially in the peace movement, believe that global nuclear war will lead to the death of most or all of the world's population.[12] Yet the available scientific evidence provides no basis for this belief. Furthermore, there seem to be no convincing scientific arguments that nuclear war could cause human extinction.[13] In particular, the idea of 'overkill', if taken to imply the capacity to kill everyone on earth, is highly misleading.[14] In the absence of any positive evidence, statements that nuclear war will lead to the death of all or most people on earth should be considered exaggerations. In most cases the exaggeration is unintended, since people holding or stating a belief in nuclear extinction are quite sincere.[15]

#### We'll preempt their 1AR author---Robock and Sagan are incorrect---nuclear warfare does NOT cause extinction---their authors are biased

**Seitz 6**---former associate of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University’s Center for International Affairs (Russell, “The' Nuclear Winter ' Meltdown Photoshopping the Apocalypse”, http://adamant.typepad.com/seitz/2006/12/preherein\_honor.html)

All that remains of Sagan's Big Chill are curves such as this , but history is full of prophets of doom who fail to deliver, not all are without honor in their own land. The 1983 'Nuclear Winter " papers in Science were so politicized that even the eminently liberal President of The Council for a Liveable World called "The worst example of the misrepesentation of science to the public in my memory." Among the authors was Stanford President Donald Kennedy. Today he edits Science , the nation's major arbiter of climate science--and policy. Below, a case illustrating the mid-range of the ~.7 to ~1.6 degree C maximum cooling the 2006 studies suggest is superimposed in color on the Blackly Apocalyptic predictions published in Science Vol. 222, 1983 . They're worth comparing, because the range of soot concentrations in the new models overlaps with cases assumed to have dire climatic consequences in the widely publicized 1983 scenarios -- "Apocalyptic predictions require, to be taken seriously, higher standards of evidence than do **assertions** on other matters where the stakes are not as great." wrote Sagan in Foreign Affairs , Winter 1983 -84. But that "evidence" was never forthcoming. 'Nuclear Winter' never existed outside of a computer except as air-brushed animation commissioned by the a PR firm---Porter Novelli Inc. Yet Sagan predicted "the extinction of the human species " as temperatures plummeted 35 degrees C and the world froze in the aftermath of a nuclear holocaust. Last year, Sagan's cohort tried to reanimate the ghost in a machine anti-nuclear activists invoked in the depths of the Cold War, by re-running equally arbitrary scenarios on a modern interactive Global Circulation Model. But the Cold War is history in more ways than one. It is a credit to post-modern computer climate simulations that they do not reproduce the apocalyptic results of what Sagan oxymoronically termed "a sophisticated one dimensional model." The subzero 'baseline case' has melted down into a tepid 1.3 degrees of average cooling- grey skies do not a Ragnarok make . What remains is just not the stuff that End of the World myths are made of. It is hard to exaggerate how seriously " nuclear winter "was once taken by policy analysts who ought to have known better. Many were taken aback by the sheer force of Sagan's rhetoric Remarkably, Science's news coverage of the new results fails to graphically compare them with the old ones Editor Kennedy and other recent executives of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, once proudly co-authored and helped to publicize. You can't say they didn't try to reproduce this Cold War icon. Once again, soot from imaginary software materializes in midair by the megaton , flying higher than Mount Everest . This is not physics, but a crude exercise in ' garbage in, gospel out' parameter forcing designed to maximize and extend the cooling an aeosol can generate, by sparing it from realistic attrition by rainout in the lower atmosphere. Despite decades of progress in modeling atmospheric chemistry , there is none in this computer simulation, and ignoring photochemistry further extends its impact. Fortunately , the history of science is as hard to erase as it is easy to ignore. Their past mastery of semantic agression cannot spare the authors of "Nuclear Winter Lite " direct comparison of their new results and their old. Dark smoke clouds in the lower atmosphere don't last long enough to spread across the globe. Cloud droplets and rainfall remove them. rapidly washing them out of the sky in a matter of days to weeks- not long enough to sustain a global pall. Real world weather brings down particles much as soot is scrubbed out of power plant smoke by the water sprays in smoke stack scrubbers, Robock acknowledges this- not even a single degree of cooling results when soot is released at lower elevations in the models . The workaround is to inject the imaginary aerosol at truly Himalayan elevations---pressure altitudes of 300 millibar and higher , where the computer model's vertical transport function modules pass it off to their even higher neighbors in the stratosphere , where it does not rain and particles linger.. The new studies like the old suffer from the disconnect between a desire to paint the sky black and the vicissitudes of natural history. As with many exercise in worst case models both at invoke rare phenomena as commonplace, claiming it prudent to assume the worst. But the real world is subject to Murphy's lesser known second law- if everything must go wrong, don't bet on it. In 2006 as in 1983 firestorms and forest fires that send smoke into the stratosphere rise to alien prominence in the modelers re-imagined world , but in the real one remains a very different place, where though every month sees forest fires burning areas the size of cities---2,500 hectares or larger , stratospheric smoke injections arise but once in a blue moon. So how come these neo-nuclear winter models feature so much smoke so far aloft for so long?

#### Every legitimate scientist concludes negative---nuclear winter theory is crap science

J.R. Nyquist, WorldNetDaily contributing editor and author of ‘Origins of the Fourth World War,’ May 20, 1999, Antipas, “Is Nuclear War Survivable?” http://www.antipas.org/news/world/nuclear\_war.html

I patiently reply to these correspondents that **nuclear war would not be the end of the world**. I then point to studies showing that “nuclear winter” has no scientific basis, that fallout from a nuclear war would not kill all life on earth. Surprisingly, few of my correspondents are convinced. They prefer apocalyptic myths created by pop scientists, movie producers and journalists. If Dr. Carl Sagan once said “nuclear winter” would follow a nuclear war, then it must be true. If radiation wipes out mankind in a movie, then that’s what we can expect in real life. But Carl Sagan was wrong about nuclear winter. And the movie “On the Beach” misled American filmgoers about the effects of fallout. It is time, once and for all, to lay these myths to rest. Nuclear war would not bring about the end of the world, though it would be horribly destructive. The truth is, many prominent physicists have condemned the nuclear winter hypothesis. Nobel laureate Freeman Dyson once said of nuclear winter research, “It’s an absolutely atrocious piece of science, but I quite despair of setting the public record straight.” Professor Michael McElroy, a Harvard physics professor, also criticized the nuclear winter hypothesis. McElroy said that nuclear winter researchers “stacked the deck” in their study, which was titled “Nuclear Winter: Global Consequences of Multiple Nuclear Explosions” (Science, December 1983). Nuclear winter is the theory that the mass use of nuclear weapons would create enough smoke and dust to blot out the sun, causing a catastrophic drop in global temperatures. According to Carl Sagan, in this situation the earth would freeze. No crops could be grown. Humanity would die of cold and starvation. In truth, natural disasters have frequently produced smoke and dust far greater than those expected from a nuclear war. In 1883 **Krakatoa exploded** with a blast equivalent to 10,000 one-megaton bombs, a detonation **greater than the combined nuclear arsenals** **of** planet **earth**. The Krakatoa explosion had negligible weather effects. Even more disastrous, going back many thousands of years, a meteor struck Quebec with the force of 17.5 million one-megaton bombs, creating a crater 63 kilometers in diameter. But the world did not freeze. Life on earth was not extinguished. Consider the views of Professor George Rathjens of MIT, a known antinuclear activist, who said, “Nuclear winter is the worst example of misrepresentation of science to the public in my memory.” Also consider Professor Russell Seitz, at Harvard University’s Center for International Affairs, who says that the nuclear winter hypothesis has been discredited. Two researchers, Starley Thompson and Stephen Schneider, debunked the nuclear winter hypothesis in the summer 1986 issue of Foreign Affairs. Thompson and Schneider stated: “the global apocalyptic conclusions of the initial nuclear winter hypothesis can now be relegated to a vanishingly **low level of probability**.”

 OK, so nuclear winter isn’t going to happen. What about nuclear fallout? Wouldn’t the radiation from a nuclear war contaminate the whole earth, killing everyone? The short answer is: absolutely not. Nuclear fallout is a problem, but we should not exaggerate its effects. As it happens, there are two types of fallout produced by nuclear detonations. These are: 1) delayed fallout; and 2) short-term fallout. According to researcher Peter V. Pry, “Delayed fallout will not, contrary to popular belief, gradually kill billions of people everywhere in the world.” Of course, delayed fallout would increase the number of people dying of lymphatic cancer, leukemia, and cancer of the thyroid. “However,” says Pry, “these deaths would probably be far fewer than deaths now resulting from ... smoking, or from automobile accidents.” The real hazard in a nuclear war is the short-term fallout. This is a type of fallout created when a nuclear weapon is detonated at ground level. This type of fallout could kill millions of people, depending on the targeting strategy of the attacking country. But short-term fallout rapidly subsides to safe levels in 13 to 18 days. It is not permanent. People who live outside of the affected areas will be fine. Those in affected areas can survive if they have access to underground shelters. In some areas, staying indoors may even suffice. Contrary to popular misconception, there were no documented deaths from short-term or delayed fallout at either Hiroshima or Nagasaki. These blasts were low airbursts, which produced minimal fallout effects. Today’s thermonuclear weapons are even “cleaner.” If used in airburst mode, these weapons would produce few (if any) fallout casualties. On their side, Russian military experts believe that the next world war will be a nuclear missile war. They know that nuclear weapons cannot cause the end of the world. According to the Russian military writer, A. S. Milovidov, “There is profound error and harm in the disoriented claims of bourgeois ideologues that there will be no victor in a thermonuclear world war.” Milovidov explains that Western objections to the mass use of nuclear weapons are based on “a subjective judgment. It expresses mere protest against nuclear war.” Another Russian theorist, Captain First Rank V. Kulakov, believes that a mass nuclear strike may not be enough to defeat “a strong enemy, with extensive territory enabling him to use space and time for the organizations of active and passive defense. ...” Russian military theory regards nuclear war as highly destructive, but nonetheless winnable. Russian generals do not exaggerate the effects of mass destruction weapons. Although nuclear war would be unprecedented in its death-dealing potential, Russian strategists believe that a well-prepared system of tunnels and underground bunkers could save many millions of lives. That is why Russia has built a comprehensive shelter system for its urban populace. On the American side as well, there have been studies which suggest that **nuclear war is survivable**. The famous 1960 Rand Corporation study, “On Thermonuclear War,” says, “Even if 100 metropolitan areas [in the USA] are destroyed, there would be more wealth in this country than there is in all of Russia today and more skills than were available to that country in the forties. The United States is a very wealthy and well-educated country.” The Rand study states that even if half the U.S. population were killed, “**the survivors would not just lie down and die**. Nor would they necessarily suffer a disastrous social disorganization.”

### 2NC No War

#### No conflicts resulted from the recession – disproves the impact

Barnett 9**—**senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC (Thomas, The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis, 25 August 2009, 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.

#### History proves

Ferguson 6— Laurence A. Tisch prof of History at Harvard. William Ziegler of Business Administration at Harvard. MA and D.Phil from Glasgow and Oxford (Niall, “The Next War of the World,” September/October 2006, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\_next\_war\_of\_the\_world.html)

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.

#### Robust studies prove

Miller 2k – Professor of Management, Ottawa (Morris, Poverty As A Cause Of Wars?, http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac/pac256/WG4draft1.htm)

Thus, these armed conflicts can hardly be said to be caused by poverty as a principal factor when the greed and envy of leaders and their hegemonic ambitions provide sufficient cause. The poor would appear to be more the victims than the perpetrators of armed conflict. It might be alleged that some dramatic event or rapid sequence of those types of events that lead to the exacerbation of poverty might be the catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who might be tempted to seek a diversion by finding/fabricating an enemy and going to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since World War II they concluded that Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong... The severity of economic crisis---as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth---bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes. A more direct role was played by political variables such as ideological polarization, labor radicalism, guerilla insurgencies and an anti-Communist military... (In democratic states) such changes seldom lead to an outbreak of violence (while) in the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another.

#### Econ collapse saps resources from military aggression

Bennett 2k– PolSci Prof, Penn State (Scott and Timothy Nordstrom, Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Ebsco)

Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a “guns versus butter” world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended becausethe Unionof Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States.

### AT Diversionary Conflicts

#### Diversionary theory is crap---180 empirics disprove it

**Gelpi 97** (Christopher, Center for International Affairs @ Harvard, "Democratic Diversions," Sage)

Students of international politics have often argued that state leaders initiate the use of force internationally to divert attention away from domestic problems. The author contends that these arguments concerning relationship between domestic unrest and international conflict are **not supported empirically** because they focus too narrowly on the incentives state leaders have to use external force as a diversionary tactic without considering alternative solutions to quieting domestic unrest. It is hypothesized that democratic leaders will respond to domestic unrest by diverting attention by using force internationally. On the other hand, authoritarian leaders are expected to repress the unrest directly, and these acts of repression will make them less likely to use force internationally. An analysis of the initiation of force by the challenging states **in 180 international crises** between 1948 and 1982 **strongly supports these hypotheses**. The results of the analyses and their implications for the literature on diversionary conflicts and the rapidly growing literature on democratic peace are discussed.

### AT: Lots Die

#### Transition now is sustainable --- this is offense for us ---future collapse won’t be

**Heinberg 10—**journalist, teaches at the Core Faculty of New College of California, on the Board of Advisors of the Solar Living Institute and the Post Carbon Institute (Richard Life After Growth, 04 March 2010, http://www.countercurrents.org/heinberg040310.htm)

By saying this, I am not suggesting that we should all simply give up and accept an inevitable, awful fate. Even though the collapse of the world's financial and industrial systems has started, effort now at minimizing further dire consequences is essential. Collapse does not mean extinction. A new way of life will almost certainly emerge from the wreckage of the fossil-fueled growth era. It is up to those of us who have some understanding of what is happening, and why, to help design that new way of life so that it will be sustainable, equitable, and fulfilling for all concerned. We all need practical strategies and tools to weather the collapse and to build the foundation of whatever is to come after. Journey to a New Economy The propositions described above, and my personal journey, are the starting points for a search that can be summarized in a single question: What are the guideposts toward a livable, inviting post-growth society? This search has in many instances entailed a literal, geographic journey. During the past few years, as I traveled the lecture circuit, I met thousands of people who had already concluded on their own that the global stage was being set for an economic crash of epic proportions. They had passed through the psychological stages of grief—denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance. They were thinking creatively, building new lives, and experimenting with a wide range of strategies for meeting basic human needs while using much less of just about everything. Some of these folks, like me, had been thinking along these lines for a long time—since the 1970s. Many were much younger, though, had learned about Peak Oil or climate change just within the past few years, and had recently decided to devote their lives to building a post-hydrocarbon world. Some were clearly members of what was known in the 1970s as the "counterculture." Others were mainstream citizens—investment bankers, real estate sellers, high school teachers, small business owners, corporate middle managers—who had chanced upon information that awakened them forcibly from their routines. Many of these folks lived in large cities, but others in small towns or on farms; some were rich, some poor (a few by choice); some were devout, others agnostic or atheist; some were working alone on survivalist projects, while others were building community organizations; some saw the transition as a business opportunity while others were working through non-profit organizations. Here are just three examples that stand out. In 2005, while on a lecture tour in Ireland, I met a young college teacher named Rob Hopkins who believed that life could be better without fossil fuels. He had led his students in developing an "Energy Descent Action Plan" for their town, and believed he had the seed for something larger and more significant. He soon moved back to his native England to earn his Ph.D., and designed his thesis project around helping the village of Totnes begin a cooperative, phased process of transitioning away from its dependence on fossil fuels. This project in turn led to the start of a series of Transition Initiatives in villages, towns, and neighborhoods throughout the U.K. In 2007, a version of Rob's written Ph.D. thesis was published as a book (The Transition Handbook) that quickly began inspiring others to take up this strategy. Today there are hundreds of Transition Initiatives at various stages of development in a dozen countries (including over 50 in the U.S.). While in Montana for a speaking engagement at the University of Montana in Helena in spring 2009, some local Peak Oil activists drove me to the town of Ronan and introduced me to Billie Lee, who had helped start Mission Mountain Food Enterprise Center. The Center is housed in a fairly small, non-descript building and features medium-scale food processing equipment that local small food producers can rent at reasonable rates. This enables small farmers to produce value-added products (everything from canned soups to herbal tea bags) that are profitable and are price-competitive with those made by industrial food companies located hundreds or thousands of miles from Ronan. Local food has become an obsession for the sustainability-minded during the past few years, and local food systems will be a necessary pillar of post-growth economies. Yet aspiring small-scale farmers often have a hard time getting started because they cannot afford the equipment to enable them to produce profitable value-added products. Here in the tiny hamlet of Ronan was an ingenious solution to the problem, and one that deserves to be replicated in every agricultural county in the nation. On a trip to New England in 2007, I met Lynn Benander, a community energy activist and entrepreneur who had started a project called Co-op Power to bring renewable energy to low-income and multi-ethnic communities throughout the Northeast. Typically, renewable energy projects cost more to get going than conventional coal or gas power projects, and so they tend to be found in wealthier communities and regions. Conversely, the most polluting energy projects tend to be sited in or near poor neighborhoods or regions. Co-op Power aims to change that imbalance of power—in a way that any community can copy. A typical project: You help four people put up a solar hot water system and everyone comes to help you put up yours; you save 40 to 50 percent off your total system price, get to know your neighbors, and learn how your system works. Co-op Power had also pioneered a cooperative financing method that cuts through the usual roadblocks to renewable energy projects in poorer neighborhoods by leveraging member equity. Individually, these initiatives and projects may seem to be on too small a scale to make much of a difference. But multiplied by thousands, with examples in nearly every community, they represent a quiet yet powerful movement. Few of these efforts have gained national media attention. Most media commentators who address economic issues are focused on the prospects—positive or negative—of the existing growth-based economy. These projects don't seem all that important within that framework of thinking. But in the new context of the no-growth economy, they may mean the difference between ruinous poverty and happy sufficiency. The trends are already in evidence: as the financial crisis worsens, more people are planting gardens, and seed companies are working hard to keep up with the demand. More young people are taking up farming now than in any recent decade. In 2008, more bicycles were sold in the U.S. than automobiles (not good news for the struggling car companies, but great news for the climate). And since the crisis started, Americans have been spending much less on non-essentials—repairing and re-using rather than replacing and adding. Many economists assume these trends are short-term and that Americans will return to consumerism as economic crisis shifts into recovery. But if there is no "recovery" in the usual sense, then these trends will only grow. This is what the early adopters are assuming. They believe that the nation and the world have turned a corner. They understand something the media either ignore or deny. They're betting on a future of local food systems, not global agribusiness; of community credit co-ops rather than too-big-to-fail Wall Street megabanks; of small-scale renewable energy projects, not a world-spanning system of fossil-fuel extraction, trade, and consumption. A future in which we do for ourselves, share, and cooperate. They're embarking on a life after growth.

### K-Waves Overview

#### We outweigh on probability and magnitude---wars during growth are more likely and worse

Mager 86 [Nathan, economist, *The Kondratieif* *Waves*, p 197-8]

The overall trend of the economy shapes perceptions as to its strength and direction. In a hull market, "experts" are almost uniformly optimistic; in a bear market the owlish analysts almost universally suggest caution. It is during the upward swings, soon after a trough and just before a peak, thatwars become more likely. It should be noted that peak wars are the result of a different kind of socioeconomic psychological pressure and have quite different economic results than trough wars. Nations become socially and politically unsettled after a long period of boom and expansion, perhaps because in their final stages, peoples' expectations begin to outrun actual growth in the general level of prosperity. War then becomes the ultimate destination. Inasmuch as all nations arc attempting to expand simultaneously, the intense competition for resources and markets leads eventually to military confrontations, which become contagious. One explanation suggested is that during trough wars the public is still largely concerned with private considerations and their own wellbeing. They tend to be less interested in international disputes, world crusades, or campaigns involving large investment of cash, effort, and the nervous energy needed to pursue projects to a conclusion. Trough wars tend to be short. They are more a matter of choice and sudden decision by the stronger power. Inasmuch as peak wars are the result of frustration of expectations {usually with economic elements), peak wars tend to be more desperate, more widespread, and more destructive.

### Warming Impact Calculus

#### It’s linear---the longer we wait, the worse the collapse will be---independently causes extinction from other sources of environmental destruction

**Barry 10**—President and Founder of Ecological Internet. Ph.D. in "Land Resources" from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a Masters of Science in "Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development" also from Madison, and a Bachelor of Arts in "Political Science" from Marquette University (Glen, Resisting Global Ecological Change, 5 January 2010)

The human family faces imminent and (Copenhagen would suggest) inevitable collapse of the biosphere – the thin layer of life upon an otherwise lifeless planet – that makes Earth habitable. Marshes and rivers and forests and fish are far more than resources – they and all natural ecosystems are a necessity for humanity’s existence upon Earth. A few centuries of historically unprecedented explosion in human numbers and surging, albeit inequitable, consumption and resultant resource use, ecosystem destruction and pollution; is needlessly destroying being for all living things. Revolutionary action such as ending coal use, reforming industrial agriculture and protecting and restoring old forests and other natural ecosystems, is a requirement for the continuation of shared human being. Earth is threatened by far more than a changing atmosphere causing climate change. Cumulative ecosystem destruction – not only in climate, but also water, forests, oceans, farmland, soils and toxics -- in the name of “progress” and “development” -- threatens each of us, our families and communities, as well as the Earth System in total and all her creatures. Any chance of achieving global ecological sustainability depends urgently upon shifting concerns regarding climate change to more sufficiently transform ourselves and society to more broadly resist global ecological change. Global ecological, social and economic collapse may be inevitable, but its severity, duration and likelihood of recovery are being determined by us now. It does not look good as the environmental movement has been lacking in its overall vision, ambition and implementation. The growing numbers of ecologically literate global citizens must come forward to together start considering ecologically sufficient emergency measures to protect and restore global ecosystems. We need a plan that allows humans and as many other species as possible to survive the coming great ecological collapse, even as we work to soften the collapse, and to restore to the extent practicable the Earth’s ecosystems. This mandates full protection for all remaining large natural ecosystems and working to reconnect and enlarge biologically rich smaller remnants that still exist. It is time for a hard radical turn back to a fully functioning and restored natural Earth which will require again regaining our bond with land (and air, water and oceans), powering down our energy profligacy, and taking whatever measures are necessary to once again bring society into balance with ecosystems. This may mean taking all measures necessary to stop those known to be destroying ecosystems for profit. As governments dither and the elite profit, it has become dreadfully apparent that the political, economic and social structures necessary to stop human ecocide of our and all life’s habitats does not yet exist. The three hundred year old hyper-capitalistic and nationalistic growth machine eating ecosystems is not going to willingly stop growing. But unless it does, human and most or all other life will suffer a slow and excruciating apocalyptic death. Actions can be taken now to soften ecological collapse while maximizing the likelihood that a humane and ecologically whole Earth remains to be renewed.

#### Turns the case:

#### Warming causes global nuclear warfare and breaks down international cooperation

Dyer 9 – PhD in ME History

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C%3A%5Cwiki%5CSenior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C%3A%5Cwiki%5CRoyal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

THIS BOOK IS AN ATTEMPT, peering through a glass darkly, to understand the politics and the strategies of the potentially apocalyptic crisis that looks set to occupy most of the twenty­first century. There are now many books available that deal with the science of climate change and some that suggest pos­sible approaches to getting the problem under control, but there are few that venture very far into the grim detail of how real countries experiencing very different and, in some cases, overwhelming pressures as global warming proceeds, are likely to respond to the changes. Yet we all know that it's mostly politics, national and international, that will decide the outcomes. Two things in particular persuaded me that it was time to write this book. One was the realization that the first and most important impact of climate change on human civiliza­tion will be an acute and permanent crisis of food supply. Eating regularly is a non-negotiable activity, and countries that cannot feed their people are unlikely to be "reasonable" about it. Not all of them will be in what we used to call the "Third World" -the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The other thing that finally got the donkey's attention was a dawning awareness that, in a number of the great pow­ers, climate change scenarios are already playing a large and increasing role in the military planning process. Rationally, you would expect this to be the case, because each country pays its professional military establishment to identify and counter "threats" to its security, but the implications of their scenarios are still alarming. There is a probability of wars, including even nuclear wars, if temperatures rise two to three degrees Celsius. Once that happens, all hope of international cooperation to curb emissions and stop the warming goes out the window.

### AT: Cap Resilient

#### The current economic decline is different---multiple structural differences mean decline will cause capitalism to completely collapse---causes a smooth transition---key to solving extinction

Dr. Minqi Li 10, Assistant Professor Department of Economics, University of Utah, “The 21st Century Crisis: Climate Catastrophe or Socialism” Paper prepared for the David Gordon Memorial Lecture at URPE Summer Conference 2010

The Structural Crisis of Capitalism

The impending climate catastrophe is but one of several aspects of the structural crisis of capitalism in the 21st century. We are currently in the beginning of a prolonged period of global instability and chaos. Similar periods of systemic chaos had happened before (for example, during the first half of the 20th century). Capitalism had managed to survive earlier crises, through institutional adjustments without changing the system’s essential features (production for profit and endless accumulation of capital).

Because of this historical observation, some have developed the belief that capitalism is such a remarkably “flexible” and “creative” system that it can always reform itself, adapt to change, survive crises, and meet challenges. But this belief is short-sighted and fundamentally ahistorical.

Like every other social system, for capitalism to exist and function, it requires certain necessary historical conditions. Capitalism would remain viable (and therefore “reformable”) only to the extent the necessary historical conditions required for its normal operations are present. But the development of capitalism inevitably leads to fundamental changes in the underlying historical conditions. Sooner or later, a point will be reached where the necessary historical conditions are no longer present, and capitalism as a historical system will cease to exist.

If one compares the current systemic crisis with earlier instances of systemic crisis, what are some of the major differences?

First, in previous periods of crisis, the world’s natural resources remained relatively abundant and the global environment remained largely intact. Today, the global ecological system is literally on the verge of complete collapse. The impending climate catastrophe is only one among many aspects of global environmental crisis. Global capitalism has already exhausted the environmental space for further capital accumulation.

Secondly, the successful operations of the capitalist world system require it be regulated by an effective hegemonic power at the systemic level. However, with the decline of the US hegemony, no other big power was in a position to replace the US to become the new hegemonic power. Without an effective hegemonic power, the system would be unable to pursue its own long-term interest and solve system-wide problems.

Thirdly, in the past the capitalist system had managed to survive crisis through social reforms. In essence, social reform is for the system to buy off certain opposition groups by making limited concessions. The concessions have to be limited so that they do not undermine the essential interest of the ruling class. Today, the system has run out of its historical space for social compromise.

In virtually all the advanced capitalist countries, now a restoration of favorable conditions for capitalist accumulation would require nothing short of large and sustained declines of working class living standards. Will the western working classes simply surrender and give up their entire historical gains since the 19th century? If not, Western Europe and North America will again become major battlegrounds of class struggle in the coming decades.

Fourthly, the world has reached the advanced stage of proletarianization. Marx famously predicted that the proletariat would become the grave diggers of capitalism. For the entire 19th and much of 20th century, the process of proletarianization was largely limited to the “West” (the advanced capitalist countries). In the neoliberal era, as capital is relocated from advanced capitalist countries to the rest of the world to exploit the reserve army of cheap labor force, there have been large formations of industrial working classes in the non-western world.

Over time, the non-western working classes will have developed the organizational capacity and demand a growing range of economic, social, and political rights. For the capitalist world system, if its economic and ecological resources are already so limited that it is no longer possible to accommodate the historical demands of the western working classes, what is the chance for the system to accommodate the demands of the much larger non-western working classes?

If the system can no longer survive by buying off its potential oppositions, can it simply survive by repression, and for how long?

How will the combination of these trends play out in the coming decades? Will the current structural crisis turn out to be the terminal crisis of capitalism? One thing is clear. If capitalism does survive the current crisis, there is probably not much hope for the humanity to survive the coming global climate catastrophe. For the humanity’s sake, end capitalism before we are ended by capitalism.

### Movements Now

#### Movements against growth now

Speth 2008Served as President Jimmy Carter’s White House environmental adviser and as head of the United Nations’ largest agency for international development Prof at Vermont law school. Former dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University . Former Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, teaching environmental and constitutional law. .Former Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President. Co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council. Was law clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black JD, Yale. (James Gustave, The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability, Gigapedia, 83)

The seriousness of looming environmental threats is slowly sinking in, driven largely by the climate issue but also informed by the outpouring of serious books and articles pointing out that various breakdowns and collapses are actually possible. In the right hands, crises and calamities related to environment can generate positive change, as Hurricane Katrina could have. We can also see the beginnings of social change in the efforts of some consumers to downshift and go green, in the anti-corporate-abuse stirrings of some communities, and in the proliferation of initiatives involving new forms of business ownership and management. Polls suggest that the public is distressed by runaway materialism, and there are signs that student activism is reawakening and that faith communities are taking up environmental causes. Religion can help us see that the challenges we face are moral and spiritual and that sin is not strictly individual but is also social and institutional, and it can call us to refl ection, repentance, and resistance. And there is growing strength in the worldwide social movement 235 described by Paul Hawken in Blessed Unrest. From huge nonprofi ts to home-based causes, the groups in this movement are emerging as a creative and infl uential global force. And, of course, there is the hope that springs from today’s young people. We see their commitment in the demand for the greening of our colleges and universities and in the growing student activism and political mobilization. Concerns have been expressed that they are the “quiet generation,” too on-line, but climate threats and social justice issues are now spurring a new, activist youth-led movement for change.

### Mindset Shift

#### Collapse now causes shift to small, sustainable societies

**Lewis 2k** Ph.D. University of Colorado at Boulder Chris H, “The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Global Industrial Civilization”

With the collapse of global industrial civilization, smaller, autonomous, local and regional civilizations, cultures, and polities will emerge. We can reduce the threat of mass death and genocide that will surely accompany this collapse by encouraging the creation and growth of sustainable, self-sufficient regional polities. John Cobb has already made a case for how this may work in the United States and how it is working in Kerala, India. After the collapse of global industrial civilization, First and Third World peoples won't have the material resources, biological capital, and energy and human resources to re-establish global industrial civilization. Forced by economic necessity to become dependent on local resources and ecosystems for their survival, peoples throughout the world will work to conserve and restore their environments. Those societies that destroy their local environments and economies, as modern people so often do, will themselves face collapse and ruin**.**

#### Desire irrelevant --- collapses forces transition

**Lewis 2k** Ph.D. University of Colorado at Boulder Chris H, “The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Global Industrial Civilization”

A more hopeful cause of the collapse of global industrial civilization is a global economic collapse “financial crises have become increasingly common with the speed and growth of global capital flows.” The financial crises caused by the 1994 collapse of the Mexican peso, the 1997 Asian financial panic, the 1998 Russian financial panic, and the 1998 bailout of Long Term Capital Management by the United States Federal Reserve and Global Banks are all examples of recent financial crises that greatly stressed the global financial system. During the 1997 Asian financial crisis, U.S. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin said, “There was a moment when I thought it could have come undone.” He was, of course, referring to the global financial system. A global depression caused by a financial panic could finally undermine the entire structure of globalization. With the loss of trillions of dollars of paper money, First World elites would find that they don’t have the funds to bail out Third World countries and banks, and even bail their own banks and corporations out. With the loss of trillions of dollars, the global economy would come to a grinding halt and there wouldn’t be the collective resources or the will to restart it. Of course, these are the precise sorts of crises that lead to World Wars and military conflict. No matter how it collapses, through economic collapse and the development of local and regional economies and/or through **a** global military struggle by the First World to maintain its access to Third World resources, global industrial civilization will collapse because its demands for wealth, natural resources, energy, and ecosystem services aren't sustainable**.**

### 2NC Unsustainability (Generic)

#### Collapse is inevitable – increasing complexity makes a growth society unsustainable and all recent models agree.

Hengeveld 4/14 – (2012, Rob, PhD, Professor of Earth and Life Sciences, University of Amsterdam, “Our apocalyptic odds,” <http://www.salon.com/2012/04/14/our_apocalyptic_odds/>)

 Because they are much of a jumble as well, societies can crash or collapse. Such crashes not only develop rapidly, but their cause, course, and timing are unpredictable. Mathematicians call this field of study deterministic chaos: unpredictability reigns, even when nothing happens by chance; chance within the process only gives additional unpredictability. Imagine, therefore, what happens when such systems contain an element of chance as well.¶ So, how does chance work, and does chance depend on the number of people making up society and its complexity? If so, does the chance of societal collapse increase over time as our numbers and their resulting societal complexity grow? Have our living conditions changed (gradual soil salination, or a sudden rise in the price of food due to drought in Australia or Russia, for example)?¶ Think for a moment of a die: what is the chance of throwing, say, a five? A die has six sides, each with the same chance of turning up. The chance of throwing a five is one in six, or 17 percent. Conversely, the combined chance of throwing any number other than five is five in six, or 83 percent. But how great is the chance of getting a five within two consecutive throws? That chance is obviously twice as large, or 33 percent, and the chance of getting any other number is 67 percent. Therefore, the more throws, the greater the chance of getting your preferred five at least once. And the chance of missing it reduces accordingly. The same reasoning applies to, say, the chance of some explosion happening in an oil pipe, though in this case you are interested in the chance of the event not happening. Now the chance that some disaster will not happen is made as small as possible, say, one in 10,000, and the chance of an explosion occurring is only one in 9,999. Obviously, these chances also depend on the length of the pipe, on the number of pipes, on the number of welds, or the number of pumping and control stations, that is, on the complexity of the pipe system, and also on the length of the period the system is operating: the longer the pipes and the more there are, the greater the complexity of the system they form and the longer the period of operation, the greater the chance of something going wrong, resulting in an explosion.¶ Moreover, all these mistakes and disasters have different chances of happening, and all these chances are superimposed. You can try out for yourself what happens by throwing different kinds of dice, the normal one with six sides, then one with four, eight, ten, twelve, twenty, and one with thirty sides. The result is a very wiggly line when you add the outcomes of these sets of dice for a number of throws together for each point on this line. Each new point is different from any of the previous ones and therefore is impossible to predict; it was already impossible to predict the outcome of one single die. Still, this curve resembles the real world in many respects where also many chance events occur, the one adding to another and each with a different chance of happening.¶ In reality, the chances have different and varying weights relative to the total process as well, and they interact both linearly and nonlinearly, which we all kept constant and independent when we threw our seven sets of dice. How can we predict the future of society but in general terms of depletion and pollution rates? These are our certainties, but we really can’t predict in detail what will happen and when as a social or economic result. For these societal effects we can only say that the chance of collapse increases with an increasing complexity of society, as well as with increasing stress from resource depletion, pollution, and social inequality.¶ Think of the decline of ancient Rome, which took centuries; nobody knows why it declined; we have more explanations than authors. Because of the great influence of chance in all aspects of society, whose behavior is unknowable and, hence, unpredictable—manageable only up to some point, after which further developments grow out of hand. Why the reason for a crash such as the decline of Rome is also unknowable, and why its crash was unmanageable, is that people usually look at only one process in isolation, such as the invasion of the Gothic tribes or the general poisoning of people by lead in the water pipes. In many cases, however, a disaster is triggered by the coinciding of a number of different events or processes, not by a single event or process. Therefore, as our numbers continue to grow exponentially, the size and complexity of society increases exponentially relative to those numbers. Consequently, the predictability of a particular crash developing from the occurrence of a certain combination of chance events or processes decreases.¶ Moreover, because many factors can be interdependent, a crash in one sector pulls others in its wake,making it a general crash in no time and also making it more difficult to manipulate or manage.**Crashes of our socioeconomic system will** **therefore** **become more frequent and less easy to control**.¶

 I think that the collapse of the present human population, its numbers and quality of life, is likely, and also that the most humane way to weather this period is to design a strategy and follow it ourselves rather than sit back and wait complacently. Unfortunately, the time for old customs and cultural traditions or of long-held beliefs and trusts is over. As the latest calculations from 1992 by Meadows and colleagues in “Beyond the Limits“ showed, our world can collapse, and this can happen even before any resource has definitively been depleted; collapse may come at any time and out of nowhere. **It’s an inevitable, unavoidable result of** **the behavior of** **an oversized, complex, nonlinear system** in which interdependent chance processes dominate.¶ The wave of large-scale deregulations because of the globalization of the last thirty years have only made this worse by allowing **more positive feedback loops** into the system. Nobody knows exactly how likely it is that our societal system will collapse or when. We know that this is theoretically inescapable, because all the local and national infrastructures and the global superstructure are based on abstractions. Moreover, **system collapse follows from almost any simulation experiment based on relatively recent data**—data that are now already twenty years old and are therefore too optimistic. In those twenty years, it has become even more likely that the conditions theoretically leading to system collapse will occur.

#### Prefer our evidence—it’s based on physical capacities of the earth while theirs is theory

Heinberg 10**—**journalist, teaches at the Core Faculty of New College of California, on the Board of Advisors of the Solar Living Institute and the Post Carbon Institute (Richard Life After Growth, 04 March 2010, http://www.countercurrents.org/heinberg040310.htm)

In nature, growth always slams up against non-negotiable constraints sooner or later. If a species finds that its food source has expanded, its numbers will increase to take advantage of those surplus calories—but then its food source will become depleted as more mouths consume it, and its predators will likewise become more numerous (more tasty meals for them!). Population "blooms" (that is, periods of rapid growth) are always followed by crashes and die-offs. Always. Here's another real-world example. In recent years China's economy has been growing at eight percent or more per year; that means it is more than doubling in size every ten years. Indeed, China consumes more than twice as much coal as it did a decade ago—the same with iron ore and oil. The nation now has four times as many highways as it did, and almost five times as many cars. How long can this go on? How many more doublings can occur before China has used up its key resources—or has simply decided that enough is enough and has stopped growing? It makes sense that economies should follow rules analogous to those that govern biological systems. Plants and animals tend to grow quickly when they are young, but then they reach a more or less stable mature size. In organisms, growth rates are largely controlled by genes. In economies, growth seems tied to factors such as the availability of resources—chiefly energy resources ("food" for the industrial system). During the 20th century, cheap and abundant fossil fuels enabled rapid economic expansion; at some point, therefore, fossil fuel depletion could put a brake on growth. It is also possible that industrial wastes could accumulate to the point that the biological systems that underpin economic activity (such as forests, crops, and human bodies) begin to fail. But economists generally don't see things this way. That's probably because most current economic theories were formulated during an anomalous historical period of sustained growth. Economists are merely generalizing from their experience: they can point to decades of steady growth in the recent past, and so they simply project that experience into the future. Moreover, they have ways to explain why modern market economies are immune to the kinds of limits that constrain natural systems; the two main ones concern substitution and efficiency. If a useful resource becomes scarce, its price will rise, and this creates an incentive for users of the resource to find a substitute. For example, if oil gets expensive enough, energy companies might start making liquid fuels from coal. Or they might develop other energy sources undreamed of today. Economists theorize that this process of substitution can go on forever. It's part of the magic of the free market. Increasing efficiency means doing more with less. In the U.S., the number of inflation-adjusted dollars generated in the economy for every unit of energy consumed has increased steadily over recent decades (the amount of energy, in British Thermal Units, required to produce a dollar of GDP has been dropping steadily, from close to 20,000 BTU per dollar in 1949 to 8,500 BTU in 2008). That's one kind of economic efficiency. Another has to do with locating the cheapest sources of materials, and the places where workers will be most productive and work for the lowest wages. As we increase efficiency, we use less—of either resources or money—to do more. That enables more growth. Finding substitutes for depleting resources and upping efficiency are undeniably effective adaptive strategies of market economies. Nevertheless, the question remains open as to how long these strategies can continue to work in the real world—which is governed less by economic theories than by the laws of physics. In the real world, some things don't have substitutes, or the substitutes are too expensive, or don't work as well, or can't be produced fast enough. And efficiency follows a law of diminishing returns: the first gains in efficiency are usually cheap, but every further incremental gain tends to cost more, until further gains become prohibitively expensive. Unlike economists, most physical scientists recognize that growth within any functioning, bounded system has to stop sometime.

### AT: XYZ Solves (Must Read)

#### Draw a line here—all their arguments assume that growth is linear, not exponential—the rate of economic growth is constantly increasing, so adaptation and building tech and regulation are doomed since we can’t stabilize the population fast enough

Bartlett, Prof @ Colorado, 4 [Dr. Albert Bartlett is a Physics Professor Emeritus at the. University of Colorado at Boulder, “Dr. Albert Bartlett on Compounding,” http://www.chrismartenson.com/dr\_albert\_bartlett]

\*gender modified

Now there's something else that’s very important: the growth in any doubling time is greater than the total of all the preceding growth. For example, when I put eight grains on the 4th square, the eight is larger than the total of seven that were already there. I put 32 grains on the 6th square. The 32 is larger than the total of 31 that were already there. Every time the growing quantity doubles, it takes more than all you’d used in all the proceeding growth. Well, let’s translate that into the energy crisis. Here’s an ad from the year 1975. It asks the question “Could America run out of electricity?” America depends on electricity. Our need for electricity actually doubles every 10 or 12 years. That's an accurate reflection of a very long history of steady growth of the electric industry in this country, growth at a rate of around 7% per year, which gives you doubling every 10 years. Now, with all that history of growth, they just expected the growth would go on, forever. Fortunately it stopped, not because anyone understood arithmetic, it stopped for other reasons. Well, let's ask “What if?” Suppose the growth had continued? Then we would see here the thing we just saw with the chess board. In the ten years following the appearance of this ad, in that decade, the amount of electrical energy we would have consumed in this country would have been greater than the total of all of the electrical energy we had ever consumed in the entire proceeding history of the steady growth of that industry in this country. Now, did you realize that anything as completely acceptable as 7% growth per year could give such an incredible consequence? That in just ten years you'd use more than the total of all that had been used in all the proceeding growth? Well, that's exactly what President Carter was referring to in his speech on energy. One of his statements was this: he said, “In each of those decades (1950s and 1960s) more oil was consumed than in all of (hu)mankind's previous history.” By itself that's a stunning statement. Now you can understand it. The president was telling us the simple consequence of the arithmetic of 7% growth each year in world oil consumption, and that was the historic figure up until the 1970s. There's another beautiful consequence of this arithmetic. If you take 70 years as a period of time—and note that that's roughly one human lifetime—then any percent growth continued steadily for 70 years gives you an overall increase by a factor that's very easy to calculate. For example, 4% per year for 70 years, you find the factor by multiplying four twos together, it's a factor of 16. A few years ago, one of the newspapers of my hometown of Boulder, Colorado, quizzed the nine members of the Boulder City Council and asked them, “What rate of growth of Boulder's population do you think it would be good to have in the coming years?” Well, the nine members of the Boulder City council gave answers ranging from a low of 1% per year. Now, that happens to match the present rate of growth of the population of the United States. We are not at zero population growth. Right now, the number of Americans increases every year by over three million people. No member of the council said Boulder should grow less rapidly than the United States is growing. Now, the highest answer any council member gave was 5% per year. You know, I felt compelled, I had to write him a letter and say, “Did you know that 5% per year for just 70 … ” I can remember when 70 years used to seem like an awful long time, it just doesn't seem so long now. (audience laughter). Well, that means Boulder's population would increase by a factor of 32. That is, where today we have one overloaded sewer treatment plant, in 70 years, we'd need 32 overloaded sewer treatment plants. Now did you realize that anything as completely all-American as 5% growth per year could give such an incredible consequence in such a modest period of time? Our city council people have zero understanding of this very simple arithmetic. Well, a few years ago, I had a class of non-science students. We were interested in problems of science and society. We spent a lot of time learning to use semi-logarithmic graph paper. It's printed in such a way that these equal intervals on the vertical scale each represent an increase by a factor of 10. So you go from one thousand to ten thousand to a hundred thousand, and the reason you use this special paper is that on this paper, a straight line represents steady growth. Now, we worked a lot of examples. I said to the students, “Let’s talk about inflation, let’s talk about 7% per year.” It wasn't this high when we did this, it's been higher since then, fortunately it's lower now. And I said to the students, as I can say to you, you have roughly sixty years life expectancy ahead of you. Let’s see what some common things will cost if we have 60 years of 7% annual inflation. The students found that a 55-cent gallon of gasoline will cost $35.20; $2.50 for a movie will be $160; the $15 sack of groceries my mother used to buy for a dollar and a quarter, that will be $960; a $100 suit of clothes, $6,400; a $4000 automobile will cost a quarter of a million dollars; and a $45,000 home will cost nearly 3 million dollars. Well, I gave the students these data (shows overhead). These came from a Blue Cross, Blue Shield ad. The ad appeared in Newsweek magazine and the ad gave these figures to show the cost escalation of gall bladder surgery in the years since 1950, when that surgery cost $361. I said, “Make a semi logarithmic plot, let’s see what's happening.” The students found that the first four points lined up on a straight line whose slope indicated inflation of about 6% per year, but the fourth, fifth, and sixth were on a steeper line, almost 10% inflation per year. Well, then I said to the students, “Run that steeper line on out to the year 2000, let’s get an idea of what gall bladder surgery might cost,” and this was, 2000 was four years ago—the answer is $25,000. The lesson there is awfully clear: if you're thinking about gall bladder surgery, do it now. (audience laughter) In the summer of 1986, the news reports indicated that the world population had reached the number of five billion people growing at the rate of 1.7% per year. Well, your reaction to 1.7% might be to say “Well, that's so small, nothing bad could ever happen at 1.7% per year.” So you calculate the doubling time, you find it’s only 41 years. Now, that was back in 1986; more recently in 1999, we read that the world population had grown from five billion to six billion . The good news is that the growth rate had dropped from 1.7% to 1.3% per year. The bad news is that in spite of the drop in the growth rate, the world population today is increasing by about 75 million additional people every year. Now, if this current modest 1.3% per year could continue, the world population would grow to a density of one person per square meter on the dry land surface of the earth in just 780 years, and the mass of people would equal the mass of the earth in just 2400 years. Well, we can smile at those, we know they couldn't happen. This one make for a cute cartoon; the caption says, “Excuse me sir, but I am prepared to make you a rather attractive offer for your square.” There's a very profound lesson in that cartoon. The lesson is that zero population growth is going to happen. Now, we can debate whether we like zero population growth or don't like it, it’s going to happen. Whether we debate it or not, whether we like it or not, it’s

absolutely certain. People could never live at that density on the dry land surface of the earth. Therefore, today’s high birth rates will drop; today’s low death rates will rise till they have exactly the same numerical value. That will certainly be in a time short compared to 780 years. So maybe you're wondering then, what options are available if we wanted to address the problem. In the left hand column, I’ve listed some of those things that we should encourage if we want to raise the rate of growth of population and in so doing, make the problem worse. Just look at the list. Everything in the list is as sacred as motherhood. There's immigration, medicine, public health, sanitation. These are all devoted to the humane goals of lowering the death rate and that’s very important to me, if it’s my death they’re lowering. But then I’ve got to realise that anything that just lowers the death rate makes the population problem worse. There’s peace, law and order; scientific agriculture has lowered the death rate due to famine—that just makes the population problem worse. It’s widely reported that the 55 mph speed limit saved thousands of lives—that just makes the population problem worse. Clean air makes it worse.

### Growth Causes Warming

#### Best scientific models prove growth makes extinction-level warming inevitable---only dedev solves

Dr. Minqi **Li 10,** Assistant Professor Department of Economics, University of Utah, “The 21st Century Crisis: Climate Catastrophe or Socialism” Paper prepared for the David Gordon Memorial Lecture at URPE Summer Conference 2010 The global average surface temperature social ownership of the means of production and society-wide planning (Section 6).

The global average surface temperature is now about 0.8°C (0.8 degrees Celsius) higher than in pre-industrial times. Under the current trend, the world is on track towards a long-term warming between [4 and 8 degrees Celsius] 4°C and 8°C. At this level of global warming, the world would be in an extreme greenhouse state not seen for almost 100 million years, devastating human civilization and destroying nearly all forms of life on Earth (Conner and McCarthy 2009). The scientific community has reached consensus that the current global warming results from the excessive accumulation in the atmosphere of carbon dioxide (CO2 ) and other greenhouse gases (such as methane and nitrous oxide) emitted by human economic activities. 1 The capitalist historical epoch has been characterized by the explosive growth of material production and consumption. The massive expansion of the world economy has been powered by fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas). Since 1820, the world economy has expanded by about seventy times and the world emissions of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels burning have increased by about sixty times (see Figure 1). At the United Nations Conference on Climate Change concluded in Copenhagen in December 2009, the world’s governments officially committed to the objective of limiting global warming to no more than 2°C. However, according to the “Climate Action Tracker,” despite the official statement, the national governments’ current pledges regarding emission reduction in fact imply a warming of at least [3 degrees] 3°C by the end of the 21st century with more warming to come in the following centuries (Climate Action Tracker 2010). In reality, all the major national governments are committed to infinite economic growth and none of them is willing to consider any emission reduction policy that could undermine economic growth. This is not simply because of intellectual ignorance or lack of political will. The pursuit of endless accumulation of capital (and infinite economic growth) is derived from the basic laws of motion of the capitalist economic system. Without fundamental social transformation, human civilization is now on the path to self-destruction. The next section (section 2) reviews the basic scientific facts concerning the climate change crisis. Without an end to economic growth, it is virtually impossible for meaningful climate stabilization to be achieved (section 3). However, both capitalist enterprises and states are constantly driven to expand production and consumption. The system of nation states effectively rules out a meaningful global political solution to the climate change crisis (section 4). The climate change crisis is but one of several long-term historical trends that are now leading to the structural crisis of capitalism (section 5). The resolution of the crisis and the survival of humanity require the building of a fundamentally different social system that is based on social ownership of the means of production and society-wide planning (section 6).

### Growth Causes Diseases

#### Growth causes diseases mutations --- escalates to spread rampantly

Hamburg 8**—**FDA Commissioner.Senior Scientist Nuclear Threat Initiative. MD (Margaret, Germs Go Global: Why Emerging Infectious Diseases Are a Threat to America, http://healthyamericans.org/assets/files/GermsGoGlobal.pdf)

Globalization, the worldwide movement toward economic, financial, trade, and communications integration, has impacted public health significantly. Technology and economic interdependence allow diseases to spread globally at rapid speeds. Experts believe that the increase in international travel and commerce, including the increasingly global nature of food handling, processing, and sales contribute to the spread of emerging infectious diseases.47 Increased global trade has also brought more and more people into contact with zoonosis -- diseases that originated in animals before jumping to humans. For example, in 2003, the monkeypox virus entered the U.S. through imported Gambian giant rats sold in the nation’s under-regulated exotic pet trade. The rats infected pet prairie dogs, which passed the virus along to humans.48 International smuggling of birds, brought into the U.S. without undergoing inspection and/or quarantine, is of particular concern to public health experts who worry that it may be a pathway for the H5N1 “bird flu” virus to enter the country. Lower cost and efficient means of international transportation allow people to travel to more remote places and potential exposure to more infectious diseases. And the close proximity of passengers on passenger planes, trains, and cruise ships over the course of many hours puts people at risk for higher levels of exposure. If a person contracts a disease abroad, their symptoms may not emerge until they return home, having exposed others to the infection during their travels. In addition, planes and ships can themselves become breeding grounds for infectious diseases. The 2002-2003 SARS outbreak spread quickly around the globe due to international travel. SARS is caused by a new strain of coronavirus, the same family of viruses that frequently cause the common cold. This contagious and sometimes fatal respiratory illness first appeared in China in November 2002. Within 6 weeks, SARS had spread worldwide, transmitted around the globe by unsuspecting travelers. According to CDC, 8,098 people were infected and 774 died of the disease.49 SARS represented the first severe, newly emergent infectious disease of the 21st century. 50 It illustrated just how quickly infection can spread in a highly mobile and interconnected world. SARS was contained and controlled because public health authorities in the communities most affected mounted a rapid and effective response. SARS also demonstrated the economic consequences of an emerging infectious disease in closely interdependent and highly mobile world. Apart from the direct costs of intensive medical care and disease control interventions, SARS caused widespread social disruption and economic losses. Schools, hospitals, and some borders were closed and thousands of people were placed in quarantine. International travel to affected areas fell sharply by 50---70 percent. Hotel occupancy dropped by more than 60 percent. Businesses, particularly in tourism-related areas, failed. According to a study by Morgan Stanley, the Asia-Pacific region’s economy lost nearly $40 billion due to SARS.51 The World Bank found that the East Asian region’s GDP fell by 2 percent in the second quarter of 2003.52 Toronto experienced a 13.4 percent drop in tourism in 2003.53

### AT: Irreversible

Only limited warming is inevitable---now is key to preventing irreversible increases

Patrick Moriarty 10 Ph.D.1, Department of Design, Monash University and Damon Honnery Ph.D.2, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Monash University "Why Technical Fixes Won’t Mitigate Climate Change" Journal of Cosmology, 2010, Vol 8, 1921-1927. journalofcosmology.com/ClimateChange107.html

Since the Industrial Revolution, the planet has warmed about 0.76 ºC, and because of thermal inertia of the oceans, a further 0.6 ºC is unavoidable. Yet avoiding dangerous anthropogenic climate change could require us to limit the total temperature rise to 2 ºC above pre-industrial, as adopted by the European Union (Meinshausen et al. 2009). Clearly, if this value is accepted, drastic action is needed either to reduce our emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to the atmosphere, or to somehow counterbalance the positive ‘forcing function’ from GHG increases.

[It's](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2009/10/08/204710/it-is-not-too-damn-late-part-1-the-science/?mobile=nc) **not too late to solve the worst of warming**

**Romm 9 | Fellow @ American Progress** (Joe, Fellow @ American Progress, " Is it just too damn late? Part 1, the Science," Oct 8, http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2009/10/08/204710/it-is-not-too-damn-late-part-1-the-science/?mobile=nc)

 It’s not too late to avert the worst impacts of human-caused global warming. In fact, it’s not too late to stabilize total warming from preindustrial levels at 1.5°C — or possibly less. But the U.S. must pass a comprehensive climate and clean energy bill, leading to a major global deal, to give us a plausible chance of getting on the necessary emissions pathway. From a scientific perspective, a major new study (subs. req’d, discussed below) is cause for some genuine non-pessimism, concluding “Near-zero CH4 growth in the Arctic during 2008 suggests we have not yet activated strong climate feedbacks from permafrost and CH4 hydrates.” The media and others want to move quickly from denial to despair, because both perspectives justify inaction, justify maintaining our grotesquely unsustainable behavior, justify sticking with the global Ponzi scheme in the immoral delusion we can maintain our own personal wealth and well-being for a few more decades before the day of reckoning. I have, however, received a number of queries from progressives about the meaning of this somewhat misleading Washington Post article, “New Analysis Brings Dire Forecast Of 6.3-Degree Temperature Increase,” which begins: Climate researchers now predict the planet will warm by 6.3 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century even if the world’s leaders fulfill their most ambitious climate pledges, a much faster and broader scale of change than forecast just two years ago, according to a report released Thursday by the United Nations Environment Program…. Robert Corell, who chairs the Climate Action Initiative and reviewed the UNEP report’s scientific findings, said the significant global temperature rise is likely to occur even if industrialized and developed countries enact every climate policy they have proposed at this point. The increase is nearly double what scientists and world policymakers have identified as the upper limit of warming the world can afford in order to avert catastrophic climate change. I don’t think the basic story should be a surprise to regular readers of this blog. We’re in big, big trouble, and we’re not yet politically prepared to do what is necessary to avert catastrophe — as I’ve said many times. But that is quite different from concluding it’s too late and we’re doomed. The WashPost story is about the Climate Rapid Overview and Decision-support Simulator — the C-ROADS model. It “translates complex climate modeling into readily digestible predictions” and “is being adopted by negotiators to assess their national greenhouse-gas commitments ahead of December’s climate summit in Copenhagen,” as explained in a recent Nature article (subs. req’d, excerpted here). As one of the leading C-ROADS modelers — my friend Drew Jones — explained in his blog, the Post headline could have easily been: “New Analysis Shows Growing Commitment to a Global Deal Will Help Stabilize Climate.” The first thing to remember is that the major developed countries, including China or India, haven’t agreed to cap their emissions, let alone to ultimately reduce them. Until that happens, no model of global commitments is going to keep us anywhere near 2°C (3.6F). Second, people forget that the 1987 Montr©al protocol would not have stopped the atmospheric concentration of ozone-destroying chemicals from rising forever. And yet we appear to have acted in time to save the ozone layer. Third, people also seem to forget that the United States government led by President Bush’s father, and including the entire Senate, agreed that we would tackle global warming the same way — with the rich countries going first. I have no doubt that China will ultimately agree to a cap (see “Peaking Duck: Beijing’s Growing Appetite for Climate Action“). Indeed, if a shrinking economy-wide cap on GHGs similar to the House bill or draft Senate bill ends up on Obama’s desk in the next few months, then the international community will almost certainly agree on a global deal, which will include China sharply reducing its business-as-usual growth path. Then in the next deal in a few years, China will, I expect, agree to a cap no later than 2025. But I’m getting ahead of myself. This is an important issue that I will treat in a multipart series. People seem to view this question of “Is it too late?” as if it were primarily a scientific issue, but that is because they have internalized their preconceptions about what is politically possible in terms of clean energy deployment in this country and around the world. There is no evidence scientifically that it is too late to stabilize at 350 ppm atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, at 1.5°C total planetary warming from preindustrial levels. Nor is there any scientific evidence that we can’t afford to overshoot 350 ppm — as we already have — for a period of many decades.

### Endocrine

#### Growth causes endocrine disruption and extinction

Douthwaite 99 council member of Comhar, the Irish government's national sustainability council and a Fellow of the Post Carbon Institute. Visiting lecturer at the University of Plymouth ED By Ronaldo Munck andDenis O'Hearn (Richard, Critical development theory: contributions to a new paradigm, GoogleBooks, 158)

A third reason that the world economy is unsustainable is that some of the chemicals it employs mimic human hormones and disrupt the body's endocrine system. As a result, the sperm counts of European men have been falling at 3 per cent per year since these chemicals came into use after the Second World War (Swan et al 1997). The same chemicals are also causing increases in testicular and breast cancer (European Workshop 1996) and are causing fewer boys to be born relative to girls. Moreover, a higher proportion of these boys than ever before have defective genitals. In short, the world economic system is undermining humanity's ability to reproduce itself. If the human race is not sustainable then neither is its economic system.

### AT: Explosions

#### No deaths from nuclear meltdowns

Drum 11 Kevin, political blogger for Mother Jones, "Nukes and the Free Market", March 14, www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/03/nukes-and-free-market

We’re currently told that the death toll in Japan will be at least 10,000 people of whom approximately zero seem to have perished in nuclear accidents. What happens when a tsunami hits an offshore drilling platform or a natural gas pipeline? What happens to a coal mine in an earthquake? How much environmental damage is playing out in Japan right now because of gasoline from cars pushed around? The main lesson is “try not to put critical infrastructure near a fault line” but Japan is an earthquakey country, so what are they really supposed to do about this?¶ This is a good point: energy sources of all kind cause problems. Sometimes the problems create screaming headlines (nuke meltdowns, offshore oil explosions, mining disasters) and sometimes they don't (increased particulate pollution, global warming, devastation of salmon runs). But the dangers are there for virtually every type of energy production.¶ Still, it's worth pointing out that the problem with nuclear power isn't so much its immediate capacity to kill people. As Matt points out, no one has died in Japan from the partial meltdowns at its damaged nuclear plants, and it's unlikely anyone ever will. The control rods are in place, and even in the worst case the containment vessels will almost certainly restrict the worst damage.

#### Chernobyl proves meltdowns don’t cause lasting damage

Bosselman 7 (Professor of Law Emeritus, Chicago-Kent College of Law. Fred, “THE NEW POWER GENERATION: ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND ELECTRICITY INNOVATION: COLLOQUIUM ARTICLE: THE ECOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER,” 15 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 1, 2007)

C. "But What About Chernobyl?" In 1986, an explosion at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in the Ukraine caused the release of large amounts of radiation into the atmosphere. [247](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n247) Initially, the Soviet government released little information about the explosion and tried to play down its seriousness, but this secrecy caused great nervousness throughout Europe, and fed the public's fears of nuclear power all over the  [\*46]  world. [248](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n248) Now a **comprehensive analysis** of the event and its aftermath has been made: In 2005, a consortium of United Nations agencies called the Chernobyl Forum released its analysis of the long-term effects of the Chernobyl explosion. [249](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n249) The U.N. agencies' study found that the explosion caused fewer deaths than had been expected. [250](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n250) Although the Chernobyl reactor was poorly designed and badly operated [251](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n251) and lacked the basic safety protections found outside the Soviet Union, [252](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n252) fewer than seventy deaths so far have been attributed to the explosion, mostly plant employees and firefighters who suffered acute radiation sickness. [253](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n253) The Chernobyl reactor, like many Soviet reactors, was in the open rather than in an American type of pressurizable containment structure, which would have prevented the release of radiation to the environment if a similar accident had occurred. [254](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n254)  [\*47]  Perhaps the most surprising finding of the U.N. agencies' study was that "**the ecosystems around the Chernobyl site are now flourishing.** The [Chernobyl exclusion zone] has become a wildlife sanctuary, and it looks like the nature park it has become." [255](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n255) Jeffrey McNeely, the chief scientist of the World Conservation Union, has made similar observations: Chernobyl has now become the world's first radioactive nature reserve... . 200 wolves are now living in the nature reserve, which has also begun to support populations of reindeer, lynx and European bison, species that previously were not found in the region. While the impact on humans was strongly negative, the wildlife is adapting and even thriving

on the site of one of the 20th century's worst environmental disasters. [256](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n256) Mary Mycio, the Kiev correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, has written a fascinating book based on her many visits to the exclusion zone and interviews with people in the area. [257](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n257) She notes that the fear that radiation would produce permanent deformities in animal species has not been borne out after twenty years; the population and diversity of animals in even some of the most heavily radiated parts of the exclusion zone is similar to comparable places that are less radioactive.

#### Net effects of meltdowns are ecologically positive

Lynas 11—Visiting Research Associate at Oxford University’s School of Geography and the Environment. (Mark, How a nuclear disaster can be good for ecology, [www.marklynas.org/2011/06/how-a-nuclear-disaster-can-be-good-for-ecology/](http://www.marklynas.org/2011/06/how-a-nuclear-disaster-can-be-good-for-ecology/))

It is an article of faith for most greens that nuclear power is an ‘environmental’ issue. Ergo, nuclear power is bad for ‘the environment’ and should be replaced with ‘clean, renewable power’ like windmills and solar panels. This is in effect what the German government has agreed to do, under pressure from its resurgent Green Party, in phasing out nuclear by 2022. (Ignore for the moment the fact that in reality this will almost certainly lead to a vast increase in fossil fuelled carbon emissions.)¶ The truth, insofar as ecological science can establish it, is rather different. Here is what Robert Baker and Ronald Chesser, two ecologists studying biodiversity around Chernobyl, wrote more than ten years ago in the journal Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry:¶ Mention of the Chornobyl nuclear disaster usually brings thoughts of death, destruction, cancer, massive economic loss, and other negative images. Clearly, the economic impacts have been devastating for the Ukrainian economy, and the harmful effects such as elevated cancer rates in humans and the killing of pine trees in the Red Forest are real. However, the sum effect for the flora and fauna in the highly radioactive, restricted zone has been overwhelmingly positive in favor of biodiversity and abundance of individuals. Our 12 expeditions to the most radioactive areas of these zones reveal that animal life is abundant. Parts of the 10-km exclusion zone around Reactor 4 are strikingly, yet deceptively, beautiful. Only the clicks and whistles of our electronic equipment indicated that the habitat was contaminated with radioactivity.¶ Of course, this is not to say that radiation in and of itself somehow benefits wildlife. What brings the big boon to biodiversity is the removal of humans from the equation. Baker and Chesser reported frequent sightings of moose, deer, foxes, wild boar and river otters inside the 30-kilometre Chernobyl exclusion zone – whereas in the still-cultivated area outside the zone, the only wildlife they saw was a single rabbit. The researchers concluded:¶ … the benefit of excluding humans from this highly contaminated ecosystem appears to outweigh significantly any negative cost associated with Chornobyl radiation¶ and that¶ … typical human activity (industrialization, farming, cattle raising, collection of firewood, hunting, etc.) is more devastating to biodiversity

 and abundance of local flora and fauna than is the worst nuclear power plant disaster¶ Why this ecological knowledge has failed to penetrate amongst self-professed ‘environmentalists’ is a mystery. In the popular imagination the area around Chernobyl is a blighted wasteland, a mental picture kept alive by the apocalyptic (and superlatively unscientific) myths put about by the likes of Greenpeace. Take the recent piece by the Observer’s Robin McKie, who – as far as I can tell – visited Chernobyl on a stage-managed Greenpeace press tour and penned an obedient piece titled ‘Chernobyl 25 years on: A poisoned landscape‘. Employing the traditional scary imagery, he writes:¶ The Ukrainian steppe is still frost-burned and the trees leafless at this time of year. There are no buds on branches and little hint of greenery, a combination that only enhances the eerie desolation inside the 30km exclusion zone around the reactor…¶ But the clue to why McKie saw a ‘poisoned landscape’ lies in the first sentence: he went in winter. When I visited last summer, I saw a very different scene – the vibrant profusion of vegetation was extraordinary, as was the noise of bird calls and buzzing insects. It seemed like life was exploding everywhere.¶ So on, inevitably, to Fukushima. Once again, this is not an ‘environmental’ disaster in any sense in which the word is commonly understood. There will be no discernible ecological impacts, despite the substantial amounts of radiation that have been released through the triple meltdown and containment failures seen immediately after the tsunami. Unlike with Chernobyl the contamination of surrounding areas is not serious enough to require the permanent evacuation of its human population, so the benefits to wild plants and animals will be minimal. At sea – where most of the radiation went – the impact could well be positive if it reduces the fishing pressure for which Japan is notorious in terms of its impact on marine ecology.

## 1NR

### Iran

#### Extinction

Hirsch 5 - Professor @ UC San Diego (Jorge, “Can a nuclear strike on Iran be averted,” November 21st)

The Bush administration has put together all the elements it needs to justify the impending military action against Iran. [Unlike in the case of Iraq](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html), it will happen without warning, and most of the justifications will be issued after the fact. We will wake up one day to learn that facilities in Iran have been bombed in a joint U.S.-Israeli attack. It may even take another couple of days for the revelation that some of the U.S. bombs were nuclear. Why a Nuclear Attack on Iran Is a Bad Idea Now that we have outlined what is very close to happening, let us discuss briefly why everything possible should be done to prevent it. In a worst-case scenario, the attack will cause a violent reaction from Iran. Millions of "[human wave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_wave_attack)" Iranian militias will storm into Iraq, and just as Saddam [stopped them with chemical weapons](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2003/n01232003_200301234.html), the U.S. will stop them with nuclear weapons, resulting potentially in hundreds of thousands of casualties. The Middle East will explode, and popular uprisings in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and other countries with pro-Western governments could be overtaken by radical regimes. Pakistan already has nuclear weapons, and a nuclear conflict could even lead to Russia's and Israel's involvement using nuclear weapons. In a best-case scenario, the U.S. will destroy all nuclear, chemical, and missile facilities in Iran with conventional and low-yield nuclear weapons in a lightning surprise attack, and Iran will be paralyzed and decide not to retaliate for fear of a vastly more devastating nuclear attack. In the short term, the U.S. will succeed, leaving no Iranian nuclear program, civilian or otherwise. Iran will no longer threaten Israel, a regime change will ensue, and a pro-Western government will emerge. However, even in the best-case scenario, the long-term consequences are dire. The nuclear threshold will have been crossed by a nuclear superpower against a non-nuclear country. Many more countries will rush to get their own nuclear weapons as a deterrent. With no taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, they will certainly be used again. Nuclear conflicts will occur within the next 10 to 20 years, and will escalate until much of the world is destroyed. Let us remember that the destructive power of existing nuclear arsenals is approximately [one million times that of the Hiroshima bomb](http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/1997/00/00_babst_consequences.htm), enough to erase Earth's population many times over.

### Russia

#### GOP victory would undo the reset and destroy Russia relations---triggers prolif, European instability, and global conflict

Deyermond 10/1 Ruth Deyermond is Lecturer in War Studies in the Department of War Studies, King’s College London. “The Republican Challenge to Obama’s Russia Policy,” Survival, Volume 54, Issue 5, 2012, Taylor and Francis

Implications of the divide In his 2008 analysis of the claims regarding a new Cold War, Russia specialist Richard Sakwa observed that the phenomenon would be ‘a very peculiar Cold War, since there are no fundamental ideological contradictions’ between Russia and the United States.61 The Obama administration’s reset was predicated on precisely this assumption. Along with other factors, this made possible a substantial improvement in the quality of US–Russia relations which, in turn, contributed to progress on issues of central importance to US and **global security such as arms control** and Afghanistan. One of the difficulties with regard to future US–Russia relations, however, is that this is not an assumption shared by the US political elite as a whole. For an increasingly large and dominant section of the Republican Party, it is precisely ideology which divides the United States and its foreign policy from that of Russia.¶ A striking feature of this development is the disappearance of the nuanced, broadly Realist view of Russia evident in sections of the Republican political elite in previous periods. With the gradual turnover of congressional seats and the change in the political composition of the Republican Party, the spectrum of Republican views has narrowed. This was already evident at the start of the Obama presidency, and has become more pronounced since then. Thus, of the 13 Republican senators who voted to ratify New START in December 2010, five have left, declared their intention to stand down (one citing the rigid, partisan character of contemporary congressional politics as the reason for doing so), or, in the case of Richard Lugar, lost a 2012 nomination contest to a Tea Party-backed competitor.62 Of the remaining eight, half have not faced re-election since the ratification vote. Thus more than half the Republican senators who voted for New START and who have faced re-election either failed to secure re-nomination or chose not to seek it. This turnover has taken place in the context of a strengthening of the conservative wing as the increasingly dominant force in the Republican Party.¶ What makes the Republican picture of Russia problematic is the tone of criticisms, which often combine inaccuracy with heightened rhetoric, and the fact that these criticisms are rarely, if ever, tempered with less negative observations about contemporary Russia, or mitigating context. This is not to suggest that political and analytical elites should claim to see positive features where none exist, but that the conduct of **effective, cooperative bilateral relations becomes** impossible **when the majority party in one state regards the other state as its political and moral opposite.** A Republican-majority Senate would make the exercise of US–Russia relations very difficult; evidence to date suggests that the election of a Republican president would make this problem even **more acute.** ¶ This is of particular concern because opposition to the current administration’s policies to improve relations with Russia does not always appear to be grounded in concern about the technical detail of the policies, but rather in partisan opposition to an overall reset policy which the Obama administration has identified as a significant foreign-policy success, and in a **fundamental opposition to the Russian state**. Both factors present intractable problems for the future of the US–Russia relationship. Research into both congressional behaviour and party support in the US indicates that partisanship is hardening, and that it is unlikely to be reversed.63 If the Republican picture of Russia is also grounded in political ideology and world view, then the steady transformation of the Republican Party into a politically narrower, more cohesively conservative organisation is likely to continue to strengthen that picture. The consequences are not confined to the next Republican presidency.¶ As the 2012 US presidential election approaches, the reset relationship has come under strain in a number of areas. The Obama administration, which had previously tended to avoid the strident language on democracy used by the Bush administration, was unusually forthright on the subject of the Russian parliamentary elections in November 2011, which Secretary of State Hillary Clinton described as ‘neither free nor fair’, a response attacked by both Putin and Medvedev.64 In the same month, Obama refused to provide Russia with legal guarantees that the European missile-defence system could not be used against Russian missiles. In response, Medvedev announced that if missile-defence plans continued in ways contrary to Russian security interests, Russia would take assertive measures including the deployment of missiles along its southern and western borders; arming new ballistic missiles with missile-defence penetration systems; and withdrawing from the New START treaty.65¶ As Dmitri Trenin, director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, has suggested, Obama’s refusal to make concessions on this aspect of missile defence needs to be understood in the context of Republican opposition to such agreements.66 Given the attacks made by Republicans on the administration’s policy on missile defence and New START, and on the subject of democracy in Russia, this public hardening in approach on these issues appears to have been driven, to some extent, by the desire to neutralise criticism in an election year (this appeared to be the implication of Obama’s overheard comments to Medvedev in March). The Republican response to this incident appeared to confirm Obama’s view that compromise on the subject would be politically impossible before the election; in addition to the condemnation of Obama’s comments, some sections of the party subsequently sought to portray Obama and the Russian government as close political allies. One March 2012 Republican National Committee press release, for example, was titled ‘President Medvedev (D-Russia)’, adapting the designation for Democratic members of Congress.67¶ The complexity of negotiating the relationship with Russia in the context of partisan, domestic hostility has been increased by the serious dispute with Russia over Syria. The Russian government’s refusal to agree to a Security Council resolution on Syria has produced the administration’s most outspoken criticism of Russia, with Hillary Clinton describing Russian blocking of a resolution in February 2012 as ‘despicable’ and urging states in July 2012 to ‘directly and urgently mak[e] it clear that Russia and China will pay a price’ for their conduct on Syria.68 This increasingly forthright position has, to be sure, not prevented senior Republicans from claiming that inaction on Syria is a product of the reset, and of the administration’s inability to assert US interests and values in its dealings with an authoritarian regime in Moscow. This domestic criticism, despite the strong public stance of the administration, limits the scope for possible negotiation with Russia, particularly in an election period. Given the entrenching of the Russian position in response to public criticism on this and other issues, the constraining influence of domestic pressure from the Republican Party risks a further deterioration in bilateral relations, with the potential to undo much of the progress achieved under the reset. The strong response by Russia on these issues indicates the dangers that this domestic pressure poses to the gains of the reset.¶ **The most significant, near-term threat lies in the possibility of a change in policy towards Russia if a new US president is elected** in November 2012.69 This would not only damage the bilateral relationship itself, but also disrupt progress on a range of critical global security issues, including future arms-control and **non-prolifer**ation efforts; and further reduce the already restricted possibility of coordinated action on **international security challenges** in the UN and other institutions; and on the long-term prospects for European security, all of which rely on cooperative engagement between Washington and Moscow. The mainstream Republican hostility towards a ‘Potemkin reset’ and to the contemporary Russian state needs to be reconsidered for the sake of American and **international security.**

#### US-Russia relations key to solve extinction

Allison 11 (Graham, 10/30, Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar [CTR] Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions.

#### Russia war outweighs – largest arsenals and most probable because of hair-trigger alert

Helfand and Pastore 9 | Presidents of Physicians for Social Responsibility (Ira and John, MD's and Past Presidents of the Physicians for Social Responsbility, "US-Russia nuclear war still a threat," 3/31)

Since the end of the Cold War, many have acted as though the danger of nuclear war has ended. It has not. There remain in the world more than 20,000 nuclear weapons. Alarmingly, more than 2,000 of these weapons in the U.S. and Russian arsenals remain on ready-alert status, commonly known as hair-trigger alert. They can be fired within five minutes and reach targets in the other country 30 minutes later. Just one of these weapons can destroy a city. A war involving a substantial number would cause devastation on a scale unprecedented in human history.

**//**

A study conducted by Physicians for Social Responsibility in 2002 showed that if only 500 of the Russian weapons on high alert exploded over our cities, 100 million Americans would die in the first 30 minutes. An attack of this magnitude also would destroy the entire economic, communications and transportation infrastructure on which we all depend. Those who survived the initial attack would inhabit a nightmare landscape with huge swaths of the country blanketed with radioactive fallout and epidemic diseases rampant. They would have no food, no fuel, no electricity, no medicine, and certainly no organized health care. In the following months it is likely the vast majority of the U.S. population would die. Recent studies by the eminent climatologists Toon and Robock have shown that such a war would have a huge and immediate impact on climate world wide. If all of the warheads in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals were drawn into the conflict, the firestorms they caused would loft 180 million tons of soot and debris into the upper atmosphere — blotting out the sun. Temperatures across the globe would fall an average of 18 degrees Fahrenheit to levels not seen on earth since the depth of the last ice age, 18,000 years ago. Agriculture would stop, eco-systems would collapse, and many species, including perhaps our own, would become extinct. It is common to discuss nuclear war as a low-probabillity event. But is this true? We know of five occcasions during the last 30 years when either the U.S. or Russia believed it was under attack and prepared a counter-attack. The most recent of these near misses occurred after the end of the Cold War on Jan. 25, 1995, when the Russians mistook a U.S. weather rocket launched from Norway for a possible attack. Jan. 25, 1995, was an ordinary day with no major crisis involving the U.S. and Russia. But, unknown to almost every inhabitant on the planet, a misunderstanding led to the potential for a nuclear war. The ready alert status of nuclear weapons that existed in 1995 remains in place today. The nuclear danger will not pass until the U.S. and Russia lead the other nuclear states to a Nuclear Weapons Convention that seeks to abolish these weapons forever. As a critical first step the U.S. and Russia must take their weapons off ready-alert status. Presidents Obama and Medvedev can do this on their own by executive order.

#### Relations key to solve cyber terror

Weitz 5 (Richard, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Political-Military Analysis at Hudson Institute and non-resident Senior Fellow at the Project on National Security Reform (PNSR) and non-resident Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), 2005, Revitalising US-Russian security cooperation : practical measures, book)

Enhancing ties between the Russia and American defence research, development and acquisition communities could produce mutually beneficial military technologies and weapons systems. The two countries share outstanding and often unique expertise in many defence fields, including ballistic missiles, combat aircraft, nuclear submarines and – especially –WMD. Although financial problems limited Russian military research and development during much of the 1990s, funding and programmes have increased markedly since then. Russian and US military designers have increased markedly since then. Russian and US military designers often adhere to different methodologies and schools, allowing them to apply complementary perspectives to problems. The successful cooperation between Russian and US non-proliferation experts has demonstrated the value of pursuing joint proposals and technologies for common security problems. For example, the bi-national Warhead Safety and Security Exchange Agreement (WSSX) has helped to improve the safety and security of nuclear warheads by developing better radiation detectors and explosive-resistant storage units. Russian and US analysts have been evaluating threats from cyber-terrorism, especially computer networks attempting to seize control of nuclear weapons or mislead early-warning and command, control and communications systems into launching unauthorized missile strikes. The time appears ripe to fund demonstration projects of the most promising of these concepts.

### Uniqueness

#### Obama’s ahead in the newest polling and has arrested Romney’s momentum

Silver 10/26 Nate is an elections expert for the NYT. “Oct. 25: The State of the States,” 2012, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/26/oct-25-the-state-of-the-states/?gwh=9157D2A2D5EC17B9DE2F9DF51818F651>

Thursday was a busy day for the polls, with some bright spots for each candidate. But it made clear that Barack Obama maintains a narrow lead in the polling averages in states that would get him to 270 electoral votes. Mr. Obama also remains roughly tied in the polls in two other states, Colorado and Virginia, that could serve as second lines of defense for him if he were to lose a state like Ohio.¶ The day featured the release of 10 national polls, but there was little in the way of a consistent pattern in them. On average, the polls showed a tied race. Furthermore, among the nine polls that provided for a comparison to another poll conducted after the first presidential debate in Denver, the net result was unchanged, on average, with Mr. Obama gaining one percentage point or more in three polls, but Mr. Romney doing so in three others.¶ Mr. Obama held the lead in nine polls of battleground states on Thursday, as compared to three leads for Mr. Romney and two polls showing a tied race.¶ This tally exaggerates the lopsidedness of the polling a bit, since the state polls released on Thursday were something of a Democratic-leaning bunch, some of which had shown strong numbers for Mr. Obama previously.¶ Mr. Romney’s strongest number came in a Fox News poll of Virginia, which had him 2 points ahead there – a sharp reversal from a 7-point advantage there for Mr. Obama before the Denver debate. However, Mr. Romney’s worst poll of the day was probably also in Virginia, where Public Policy Polling showed Mr. Obama’s lead expanding to 5 points from 2.¶ Among the 10 polls that provided for a comparison to another poll conducted after the Denver debate, Mr. Obama gained 1 percentage point, on average. The past week of polling suggests that Mr. Romney is no longer improving his position in the race.¶ Whether Mr. Obama has any momentum of his own, such as because of this week’s debate in New York, is less clear. To me, it looks more like a gradual reversion to the mean than anything all that assertive.¶ At the same time, Mr. Obama has led in the polling averages all year in states that would allow him to win the Electoral College, and that remains the case now.

#### Obama will win---swing states, models, ground game, enthusiasm, early voting

Klein 10/25 Ezra is a politics writer for the Washington Post. “Where the 2012 presidential election is right now,” 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/10/25/where-the-2012-presidential-election-is-right-now/?wprss=rss\_ezra-klein

State polls: Barack Obama holds a slight but persistent lead in the battleground states. Real Clear Politics puts him up in Ohio, New Hampshire, Iowa, Nevada, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan — which is **more than enough to win the election**. Romney is up in Florida, Colorado and North Carolina. Virginia is tied. The Pollster.com list is exactly the same, save for Obama holding slight leads in Colorado and Virginia. Note that in all the polling averages, Obama’s lead in Ohio is larger than Romney’s lead in Florida.¶ Models: At this point, I don’t know of any continuously updated model that shows Romney ahead. Nate Silver’s model gives Obama a 71 percent chance of winning. Sam Wang’s meta-analysis predicts 293 electoral votes for Obama. Drew Linzer’s Votamatic predicts 332 electoral votes for Obama.¶ Ground game: No one pretends that Romney’s ground game is anything close to what the Obama campaign has put together. Conventional wisdom is that a good ground game can get you about 2 percentage points in the polls. If that proves true here, **it will be decisive**. (For more on this, read Molly Ball’s excellent survey of the two ground games.) ¶ Enthusiasm: The conventional wisdom through much of this election is that Democrats face an enthusiasm gap. But that’s become hard to spot in the polls. The latest Washington Post/ABC News tracker, for instance, puts Romney up by 1 point among likely voters, and reports that 95 percent of Obama’s supporters say they’re enthusiastic about voting and 93 percent of Romney voters say the same.¶ Early voting: Absolutely everything I’ve heard suggests the Obama campaign is meeting and exceeding its early voting targets. You can see some on-the-ground evidence of this from Jon Ralston’s look at early voting in Nevada, which is showing huge numbers for the Democrats, and the Time poll of Ohio, which showed a huge lead for Democrats among early voters. Democrats also appear to lead in early voting in North Carolina. Note that Obama is casting a highly publicized early vote in Chicago today. Aaron Blake’s survey of the early voting — which includes some evidence that Republicans are beginning to tighten the margin — is worth reading.

#### Err neg---polls underestimate true turnout for Obama and he’s ahead where it matters

Wright 10/25 Robert is a senior editor at The Atlantic. “It's Official: Romney Has Zero Momentum,” 2012, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/10/its-official-romney-has-zero-momentum/264141/

[1] Obama's numbers in swing states are running ahead of his numbers nationally. When the national polls were moving in Romney's direction, this gap may have been partly due to the fact that, because swing states polls were being done less often than national polls, swing state polls were lagging indicators. But when, as now, national polls are flat, and swing state polls are being conducted more and more often, that ceases to be a plausible explanation for the difference.¶ [2] **The polls, especially in swing states, may underpredict Obama's election day** numbers. These polls count only the responses of "likely voters"--a subset of the "registered voters" the pollsters interview. Obama tends to do better with the latter than the former. And some people think that, because Obama's "ground game" is better than Romney's, more Obama voters whom pollsters put in the "registered but not likely" category will wind up voting.¶ These two factors explain why, though Romney is slightly ahead in national "likely voter" polls, **Obama is a clear favorite** in the betting markets. As I write this, Intrade gives him a 62 percent chance of winning.

### Link Debate

#### Solar is framed as fiscally irresponsible---get’s Romney votes

Silverstein 8/22 Ken is a contributor to Forbes. “Wind Energy Generating A Lot of Mud,” 2012, http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2012/08/22/wind-energy-generating-a-lot-of-mud/

The presidential candidates are sure slinging a lot of mud. But that dirt is getting picked up and carried by the wind — wind energy, that is. The arguments, generally, center on whether the U.S. government ought to provide support for nascent energy forms or if so, at what level or in what form.¶ It may seem counter-intuitive to knock wind energy, or the production tax credits that help make it viable in today’s markets. After all, if asked, most people would say that they favor the cleaner production of electricity. But GOP-hopeful Mitt Romney is hitting on a different angle, also one that the American people support: Giving away billions in taxpayer dollars to industries that would not otherwise be competitive, all at a time when the federal debt is the highest it has ever been.¶ “In place of real energy, Obama has focused on an imaginary world where government-subsidized windmills and solar panels could power the economy,” writes Mitt Romney, the presumptive Republican nominee, in his blog. “This vision has failed.”¶ At issue is the production tax credit provided to wind and solar energies, although the one for wind is set to expire in December. It’s a 2.2 cent per kilowatt hour credit given to wind developers for 10 years. Producers are now racing to get projects completed before year-end so that they qualify.¶ No doubt, the credit has always been a political bargaining chip, allowing more encompassing energy proposals to pass. But now the tone is different. Budget hawks are saying that billions in taxpayer money is being wasted. And skeptics are also saying that wind energy is an intermittent fuel that must always be backed up by a power source that can begin generating when the wind dies down, making it expensive to operate.

#### Spotlighting Obama’s support for renewables swings the election---highly unpopular in key swing states that depend on coal

Coral Davenport 9-2, National Journal writer, “Energy: A Proxy Fight Over Government’s Role,” 9/2/12, http://mobile.nationaljournal.com/daily/energy-a-proxy-fight-over-government-s-role-20120902

Solyndra, Keystone, the “war on coal”—energy issues have taken a starring role on the 2012 campaign trail. Here’s why: Both President Obama and Mitt Romney are using the debate over coal, drilling, and renewable energy as a proxy for their bigger fight about the economy, the budget, and the very role of government.¶ Romney, who as governor of Massachusetts endorsed programs to address climate change and boost renewable energy—and once even accused a coal plant of killing people—now embraces a fossil-fuel-friendly platform that includes expanding offshore drilling, rolling back clean-air regulations, and waffling on whether humans cause global warming.¶ Obama is also navigating tricky terrain. Despite the bankruptcy of Solyndra, the solar company that received a $535 million guaranteed loan from his economic stimulus, Obama continues to push the idea of renewable energy as a jobs creator. But he has also come under fire from the coal and oil industries for delaying the Keystone XL pipeline and unleashing new Environmental Protection Agency regulations on coal-fired power plants.¶ In response, the president has appropriated the GOP’s “all of the above” energy slogan, touts the nation’s boom in new natural-gas production, and is moving toward approving offshore drilling in Alaska. Those moves, however, have infuriated his environmental base while failing to quiet attacks from the fossil-fuel-funded Right.¶ Coal, one of the nation’s cheapest, most abundant, and dirtiest energy sources, has become a campaign issue as well.¶ As EPA rolls out new clean-air regulations, Republicans and the coal industry have fired back with ads accusing Obama of waging a “war on coal” that will shutter power plants, put miners out of jobs, and send electricity rates soaring. EPA’s new rules came out just in time to clash with the tea party’s fight against government overreach, making the agency a ready-made symbol for what the GOP calls “job-killing regulations.”¶ All that ramps up the fight for battleground states where coal is a key part of the economy—particularly in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. Renewable energy is also flaring: For Republicans, Solyndra is the gift that keeps on giving. The Romney campaign has seized on the company as a symbol of the failure of the economic stimulus and Obama’s green-jobs agenda.

### AT: Plan After Election

#### The plan happens before the election---Congress is holding pro forma sessions now

Cox 9/24 Ramsey is a writer for The Hill. “Congress to hold pro forma sessions until November,” 2012, http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/251313-congress-to-hold-pro-forma-sessions-until-november

Rather than being in recess for more than five weeks, both the Senate and the House decided to hold pro forma sessions until after the November elections.

#### Legislation can be passed then

Cover 12 Matt is a writer at CNS news. “Democrats Passed Payroll Tax Extension During ‘Pro Forma’ Session on Dec. 23,” 1/6, http://cnsnews.com/news/

(CNSNews.com) – Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) took to the Senate floor during a “pro forma” session on Dec. 23 to pass a two-month extension to the payroll tax. President Barack Obama, however, this week claimed that a pro forma session means the Senate is practically in recess, opening the door for him to make appointments whenever he deems the Senate is out of session.¶ In justifying the appointments made on Wednesday, Jan. 4, while the Senate was in pro forma session, Obama spokesman Dan Pfeiffer said that the Senate was “effectively” in recess because “no Senate business is conducted.”¶ “The Senate has effectively been in recess for weeks, and is expected to remain in recess for weeks,” Pfeiffer wrote on the White House Web site on Jan. 4. “In an overt attempt to prevent the President from exercising his authority during this period, Republican Senators insisted on using a gimmick called ‘pro forma’ sessions, which are sessions during which no Senate business is conducted.”¶ However, **the Senate did conduct business during a pro forma session**, with Majority Leader Reid leading the unanimous consent proceeding to pass the two-month payroll tax extension.

#### Delay kills neg ground---all uniqueness is temporally sensitive. It’s infinitely regressive---no reason they couldn’t delay it years---makes it impossible to get any offense.

#### Even if they win this argument, Obama still would announce his intentions to push the plan now---perception would trigger the link.

#### Independents are key---this answers all their warrants and is more qualified

Killian 12 Linda is a senior scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. She is the director of the Boston University Washington Center and a Boston University professor of journalism. “5 myths about independents,” 5/27, http://www.usatoday.com/USCP/PNI/Editorial/2012-05-27-PNI0527vip-killianPNIBrd\_ST\_U.htm

5 myths about independents¶ Independent voters aren't really independent.¶ Perhaps the biggest myth about independents is that they are closet partisans or "leaners" who are independent in name only but regularly vote with one party. True, about half of independents do fit into this category, but the rest are truly independent; their allegiance swings from election to election. **They are persuadable,** not polarized partisans. A recent Pew Research Center poll puts the number of swing voters this year at 23 percent -- **almost a quarter of the electorate**.¶ In 2006, independents chose Democratic House candidates over Republicans, 57 to 39 percent. But, in 2008, Democrats won independent voters by only 8 points and lost them by 19 points in 2010. With that kind of track record, it is impossible to say that independent voters are reliably partisan.¶ Independent voters are less engaged.¶ In hundreds of interviews with independent voters, I found that they tend to be well-informed and care about the political process -- even though the two parties have done their best to alienate them through attacks, gridlock and dysfunction. About two-thirds of them say they are independent because "both parties care more about special interests than about average Americans," according to a Pew survey.¶ Independent turnout is typically lower than it is among partisan voters. But in more than half of the country, independents are not permitted to vote in primaries, so they have no say in the candidates selected in the general election. (Independent voters can vote in non-presidential Arizona primaries.) It's no surprise then that they are usually less satisfied with their candidate choices than partisan voters are.¶ Independents are more turned off than partisan voters by negative campaign ads and are more likely to say they want more substantive discussions from the candidates and the media. Independents take voting seriously but are less moved by partisan appeals. They care more about the deficit than Democratic voters do, more about the environment than Republicans do, and less about social issues, such as same-sex marriage and abortion, than do voters from either party.¶ ¶ Independent voters want a third party.¶ I found no unanimity: Some of them think we do need a third- or multiparty system and consistently vote for outsider and third-party candidates, while others accept that this is a two-party nation.¶ The most successful third-party presidential candidacy in the past 100 years was when Teddy Roosevelt ran for a third term as a candidate with the Bull Moose Party in 1912 and won 27 percent of the vote. Roosevelt came in second to Woodrow Wilson and carried half a dozen states, including California, Michigan and Pennsylvania. Ross Perot, running as a Reform Party candidate in 1992, won 19 percent of the vote.¶ The third-party organization Americans Elect gathered enough signatures to qualify for the ballot in more than half of the states but did not attract a candidate who could generate much interest and officially suspended its effort May 17. Many independent voters think it is more realistic to push for open primaries and campaign finance and congressional redistricting reform that would open up the process to all voters and candidates than it would be to try to create a competitive third party.¶ Independents are centrists.¶ Independent voters are more diverse in age, race, gender and income than their Republican and Democratic counterparts. Most independents are socially liberal, fiscally responsible centrists, but some libertarians and far-left progressives also call themselves independents.¶ Sixty percent of independents say they are not aligned with a party because they agree with the Republicans on some things, such as the economy and national security, and with the Democrats on social issues.¶ I think of independent voters as falling into four key constituencies: NPR Republicans who are socially moderate and fiscally conservative; America First Democrats, who tend to be male and more socially conservative (formerly known as Reagan Democrats); the Facebook generation of voters younger than 35 who lean libertarian on social and economic issues; and Starbucks Moms and Dads, suburban voters who make up a huge chunk of the electorate and are reliably unpredictable.¶ Washington and the nation at large may seem polarized, but a majority of voters consider themselves somewhere in between the two parties. These are not just independents but centrists and moderates who still may be registered with one party but at times vote for the other. Independents and their views are diverse -- they don't fit into either political party or neatly in the center.¶ Independent voters are disillusioned with President Barack Obama.¶ In 2008, Barack Obama won 52 percent of independent voters to John McCain's 44 percent, the largest margin a Democratic presidential candidate has received from independents since 1996.¶ Almost half of the independents who voted for Obama in 2008 did not vote Democratic in 2004; and independents made up 23 percent of Obama voters, according to a study by Third Way, a centrist think tank.¶ **Because their numbers are growing and the Democratic and Republican parties are shrinking, independent voters, especially those in swing states,** hold the key **to the 2012 election**.¶ Gallup polling has shown Obama and presumptive GOP nominee Mitt Romney in a virtual tie among independent voters. The most recent poll had Obama up 2 points with this group nationwide but also revealed that he has a 9-point lead among independents in 12 battleground states.¶ According to a recent Washington Post poll, independents favor Obama's support for same-sex marriage 49 to 43percent, but independents still think the economy is the most important issue and will probably make their decision based on how it is doing in the fall.¶ Ninety percent of Democrats and Republicans say they plan to vote for their party's candidate, while a third of independent voters say they are not sure how they will vote. That means you will see a lot more visits by Obama and Romney to battleground states, trying to capture independent swing voters.

#### The deficit is the key election issue - Obama needs to appear fiscally responsible - new spending causes him to lose

USA Today 5/26 "Obama campaign goes on the defensive on spending, debt," 2012, http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/story/2012-05-26/obama-romney-debt-spending/55221120/1

#### WASHINGTON (AP)---Government spending and debt are emerging as a campaign tug-of-war, with Mitt Romney blaming President Obama for a "prairie fire of debt" and Obama calling the charge a "cowpie of distortion." House Speaker John Boehner is talking about a debt ceiling that is still more than eight months away.¶ What gives? In a word, polling.¶ The American public is growing increasingly distressed about government spending and high budgets. The issue now ranks as high on the worry scale as lack of jobs. And it worked well for Republicans in 2010, who galvanized voters with ads and flyers that drew attention to government red ink and took back control of the U.S. House after four years of Democratic rule.¶ Republicans are looking for that magic again.¶

#### Tiny shifts can sway the election

Silver 12 Nate is the Chief Pollster for the New York Times' 538 Election Polling Center. He is regarded as a top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models. "A 30,000-Foot View on the Presidential Race," May 15, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/

The last thing to remember is that when an election is quite close, it does not take very much to shift the race from one candidate being a 60/40 favorite to it being about even. ¶ At the betting market Intrade, Mr. Obama’s odds of re-election have consistently been around 60 percent. While, on the one hand, it is good not to overreact to new data at this early stage of the race, it is also worth remembering that even a one-point shift in a president’s approval ratings, or a modest change in the economic forecasts, can move a president’s re-election odds at the margin.

#### It will be down to the wire - small voting shifts matter

Abramowitz 6/7 Alan is the Alben W. Barkley Professor of Political Science at Emory University. He holds a PhD from Stanford. "Persuasion Versus Mobilization: Obama & Romney’s Swing State Strategy," 2012, http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/persuasion-versus-mobilization-what-strategy-should-the-obama-and-romney-campaigns-emphasize-in-the-battleground-states/

With five months to go until Election Day 2012, all indications are that the presidential race between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney is going to go down to the wire and that the outcome will ultimately be decided by voters in 10-15 battleground states in which neither candidate has a decisive advantage.¶ These findings raise an important question for the Obama and Romney campaigns. In deciding how to allocate money and other resources, how much emphasis should they give to mobilizing potential supporters versus persuading undecided voters? The answer to this question depends on the characteristics and political attitudes of two key groups of voters in the battleground states: unregistered supporters and undecided registered voters.¶ In order to compare the potential payoffs of a strategy emphasizing mobilization compared with a strategy emphasizing persuasion, I analyzed data from a March 20-26 Gallup Poll in 12 key battleground states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. This was the most recent battleground state polling data available for analysis. A total of 1,046 adults were interviewed on landline and cellular telephones, including 871 registered voters.¶ Swing voters: Unhappy with Obama but unenthusiastic about voting¶ One important finding from Gallup’s March swing state poll is that there were relatively few swing voters in these swing states. Among registered voters, 49% supported Barack Obama and another 1% indicated that they leaned toward Obama, while 41% supported Mitt Romney and another 2% leaned toward Romney.¶ The March 20-26 survey was conducted at a time when Mitt Romney was still battling with Rick Santorum for the Republican nomination. Now that Romney has locked up the GOP nomination, Obama’s lead in these battleground states may very well be smaller. What is striking, however, is that as early as March, relatively few registered voters were unwilling to state a preference in a Romney-Obama contest. Even combining leaners with the undecided, swing voters made up less than 10% of the electorate in these 12 states.¶ Still, with the race between Obama and Romney expected to be very close, even a small group of swing voters could decide the outcome. So who are these swing voters? To answer this question, I compared the characteristics and political attitudes of swing voters (those who were undecided or only leaning toward a candidate) with the characteristics and attitudes of voters who were supporting either Obama or Romney. The results are displayed in Table 1.
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#### A --- Interpretation --- restrictions are direct governmental limitations on production

Annamaria Viterbo 12 , Assistant Professor in International Law at the University of Torino, PhD in International Economic Law from Bocconi University and Jean Monnet Fellow at the European University Institute, 2012, International Economic Law and Monetary Measures: Limitations to States' Sovereignty and Dispute, p. 166

In order to distinguish an exchange restriction from a trade measure, the Fund chose not to give relevance to the purposes or the effects of the measure and to adopt, instead, a technical criterion that focuses on the method followed to design said measure.

An interpretation that considered the economic effects and purposes of the measures (taking into account the fact that the measure was introduced for balance of payments reasons or to preserve foreign currency reserves) would have inevitably extended the Fund's jurisdiction to trade restrictions, blurring the boundaries between the IMF and the GATT. The result of such a choice would have been that a quantitative restriction on imports imposed for balance of payments reasons would have fallen within the competence of the Fund.

After lengthy discussions, in 1960 the IMF Executive Board adopted Decision No. 1034-(60/27).46 This Decision clarified that the distinctive feature of a restriction on payments and transfers for current international transactions is "whether it involves a direct governmental limitation on the availability or use of exchange as such\*.47 This is a limitation imposed directly on the use of currency in itself, for all purposes.

#### Energy production refers to the extraction, conversion, and distribution of energy

Koplow 4 Doug Koplow is the founder of Earth Track in Cambridge, MA. He has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for 20 years, primarily in the energy sector "Subsidies to Energy Industries" Encyclopedia of Energy Vol 5 2004www.earthtrack.net/files/Energy%20Encyclopedia,%20wv.pdf

3.2 Production

Energy production includes all stages from the point of resource location through distribution to the final consumers. Specific items examined here include resource extraction, resource conversion (including electricity), the various distribution links to bring the energy resource to the point of final use, and accident risks.

#### B --- Violation --- CFIUS doesn’t restrict --- it regulates which companies can produce energy

Douglas William Nigh 98, associate professor of international business at the University of South Carolina, and Douglas P. Woodward, associate professor of economics at the University of South Carolina, Foreign Ownership and the Consequences of Direct Investment in the United States: Beyond Us and Them, 1998, p. 144

How did the U.S. government respond to the influx of FDI that dates from the 1970s? The answer is “favorably,” with only nominal institutional constraints on investment flows. At the federal level, the institution directly responsible for addressing issues relating to FDIUS is the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS). Created by President Gerald Ford as an oversight body in 1975, CFIUS monitors and regulates FDIUS from the standpoint of protecting national security. It is an interagency body composed of officials from the Departments of State, Commerce, Defense, and Justice, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers; it is usually chaired by a Treasury official.

#### C --- Vote neg ---

#### 1 --- Ground --- they avoid links to core disads which are based on increases in energy production --- the US companies are already producing energy --- they just allow foreign firms to acquire those US companies

#### 2 --- Unlimits—allows for affs that repeal a environmental or corporate regulations that have no effect on the amount of energy produced, kills neg ground

#### 3 --- Precision --- restriction is narrower than regulation

US District Court 9—Judge Thomas E. Johnson, US District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/west-virginia/wvsdce/5:2009cv00152/61171/33

9 The fourth prong of the Central Hudson test refers to "regulation" of speech. 447 U.S. at 567. "Regulation" could be construed broadly as applying [\*\*29] a system of laws, including penalties, affecting a particular manner of commercial speech. However, in subsequent cases, the Supreme Court has employed the narrower word, "restriction," in place of "regulation." See, e.g., Bd. of Trs. v. Fox, 492 U.S. 469, 476, 109 S. Ct. 3028, 106 L. Ed. 2d 388 (1989) ("[G]overnment restrictions upon commercial speech may be no more broad or no more expansive than 'necessary' to serve its substantial interests").

### 1NC

#### Obama’s ahead but the race is close---voters are paying attention which means the plan could cause a shift

Cooper 10/25 Michael is a writer at the New York Times’ Caucus blog. “Has Romney’s Rise in Polls Stopped?” 2012, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/25/has-romneys-rise-in-polls-stopped/?gwh=20374120E0C2B79985262EFF8E8CD19D

A debate has been raging among polling analysts and commentators about whether Mitt Romney is still gaining ground, as he did after the first debate, or if his bounce has slowed or stalled. But while some Republicans say that they still have the wind at their backs, several polling analysts weighed in recently to argue that the data suggests there is no longer a Romney surge.¶ Mark Blumenthal, the senior polling editor of the Huffington Post and the founding editor of Pollster.com, wrote a piece this morning with the headline: “Presidential Polls Counter Romney Surge Myth.”¶ “While Romney gained significantly in the wake of the first presidential debate in early October,’’ he wrote, “the lack of a continuing trend over the past two weeks helps counter a theme in some campaign coverage that Romney’s support continues to ‘surge’ nationwide.”¶ Sam Wang, who analyzes state polls at the Princeton Election Consortium, wrote this week that the Mr. Obama’s plunge after the first debate had **stopped with him still ahead**, and delivered the following verdict: “Indeed **the race is close,** but it seems stable. For the last week, there is no evidence that conditions have been moving toward Romney. There is always the chance that I may have to eat my words — but that will require movement that is not yet apparent in polls.”¶ Nate Silver, who writes the FiveThirtyEight blog in The New York Times, wrote Thursday: “Mr. Romney clearly gained ground in the polls in the week or two after the Denver debate, putting himself in a much stronger overall position in the race. However, it seems that he is no longer doing so.”¶ With the race so close in so many places, it can be difficult to assess the true state of play. ¶ Most major national polls, with the exception of a few tracking polls, have shown the race to be essentially tied for months. Some polls in crucial swing states where Mr. Obama has been leading have tightened between the two candidates since the first debate, including Ohio, which is closer than it was a month ago. And **now is the point where many voters pay more attention** to the election, **which can move the polls**. But even with the proliferation of polls and the increased reliance on aggregated polls — lumping or averaging many polls together — it can be difficult to get a realistic picture on any given day in the closing weeks, given that some polls do not reach voters who use only cellphones, and many polls have struggled in an environment where fewer people want to respond to questions.

#### The plan makes China a pivotal election issue – bashing empirically benefits the GOP

Yingzi, 10 (Tan, “US likely to give nod to CNOOC deal, despite opposition” 10/14, China Daily,

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2010-10/14/content\_11409139.htm

In 2005, CNOOC gave up plans to acquire Unocal Oil Co after the bid met unexpected US political opposition. Some had viewed the proposed merger as a threat to US security.

Several proposed Chinese investment projects in the US have encountered political obstacles this year. Some Congress members blamed China for the high US unemployment rate and regard the emerging economy's global expansion as a national security threat.

China has appeared as a "scapegoat" for the wobbly US economy in the fierce campaign for November's midterm elections. At least 29 candidates have aired advertisements blaming their opponents for being too sympathetic to China, the New York Times reported on Saturday.

Strong political opposition to the CNOOC deal is likely, given the recent congressional objections to Anshan Iron and Steel Group's investment in a small US steel company, said Scissors from the Heritage Foundation.

#### Tiny shifts can sway the election

Silver 12 Nate is the Chief Pollster for the New York Times' 538 Election Polling Center. He is regarded as a top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models. "A 30,000-Foot View on the Presidential Race," May 15, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/

The last thing to remember is that when an election is quite close, it does not take very much to shift the race from one candidate being a 60/40 favorite to it being about even. ¶ At the betting market Intrade, Mr. Obama’s odds of re-election have consistently been around 60 percent. While, on the one hand, it is good not to overreact to new data at this early stage of the race, it is also worth remembering that even a one-point shift in a president’s approval ratings, or a modest change in the economic forecasts, can move a president’s re-election odds at the margin.

#### Romney causes massive foreign backlash and nuclear wars globally

Bandow 12 Doug is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. “Mitt Romney: The Foreign Policy of Know-Nothingism,” 5/15, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/mitt-romney-foreign-policy-knownothingism>

Republican politicians continue to **beat the war drums**. All of this cycle’s GOP presidential contenders, save Rep. Ron Paul, charged President Barack Obama with weakness, indeed, almost treason. But the public isn’t convinced. The president who increased military spending, twice upped troop levels in Afghanistan, started his own war with Libya, talked tough to North Korea, loudly threatened Iran and Syria, and oversaw the hit on Osama bin Laden just doesn’t look like a wimp.¶ In fact, a recent Washington Post-ABC poll found that Americans prefer Barack Obama to Mitt Romney on international issues by 53 percent to 36 percent. Republican apparatchiks Karl Rove and Ed Gillespie nevertheless claim, “the president is strikingly vulnerable in this area,” but so far Romney is convincing only as a blowhard with a know-nothing foreign policy. Noted Jacob Heilbrunn of the National Interest, the GOP is “returning to a prescription that led to trillion-dollar wars in the Middle East that the public loathes.”¶ Romney’s overall theme is American exceptionalism and greatness, slogans that win public applause but offer no guidance for a bankrupt superpower that has squandered its international credibility. “This century must be an American century,” Romney proclaimed. “In an American century, America leads the free world and the free world leads the entire world.” He has chosen a mix of advisers, including the usual neocons and uber-hawks — Robert Kagan, Eliot Cohen, Jim Talent, Walid Phares, Kim Holmes, and Daniel Senor, for instance — that gives little reason for comfort. Their involvement suggests Romney’s general commitment to an imperial foreign policy and force structure. ¶ Romney is no fool, but he has never demonstrated much interest in international affairs. He brings to mind George W. Bush, who appeared to be largely ignorant of the nations he was invading. Romney may be temperamentally less likely to combine recklessness with hubris, but he would have just as strong an incentive to use **foreign aggression** to win conservative acquiescence to domestic compromise. This tactic worked well for Bush, whose spendthrift policies received surprisingly little criticism on the right from activists busy defending his war-happy foreign policy. ¶ The former Massachusetts governor has criticized President Obama for “a naked political calculation or simply sheer ineptitude” in following George W. Bush’s withdrawal timetable in Iraq and for not overriding the decision of a government whose independence Washington claims to respect. But why would any American policymaker want to keep troops in a nation that is becoming ever more authoritarian, corrupt, and sectarian? It is precisely the sort of place U.S. forces should not be tied down. ¶ In contrast, Romney has effectively taken no position on Afghanistan. At times he appears to support the Obama timetable for reducing troop levels, but he has also proclaimed that “Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan under a Romney administration will be based on conditions on the ground as assessed by our military commanders.” Indeed, he insisted: “To defeat the insurgency in Afghanistan, the United States will need the cooperation of both the Afghan and Pakistani governments — we will only persuade Afghanistan and Pakistan to be resolute if they are convinced that the United States will itself be resolute,” and added, “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban.” ¶ Yet it’s the job of the president, not the military, to decide the basic policy question: why is the U.S. spending blood and treasure trying to create a Western-style nation state in Central Asia a decade after 9/11? And how long is he prepared to stay — forever? On my two trips to Afghanistan I found little support among Afghans for their own government, which is characterized by gross incompetence and corruption. Even if the Western allies succeed in creating a large local security force, will it fight for the thieves in Kabul? ¶ Pakistan is already resolute — in opposing U.S. policy on the ground. Afghans forthrightly view Islamabad as an enemy. Unfortunately, continuing the war probably is the most effective way to destabilize nuclear-armed Pakistan. What will Romney do if the U.S. military tells him that American combat forces must remain in Afghanistan for another decade or two in order to “win”? ¶ The ongoing AfPak conflict is not enough; Romney appears to desire war with Iran as well. No one wants a nuclear Iran, but Persian nuclear ambitiions began under America’s ally the Shah, and there is no reason to believe that the U.S. (and Israel) cannot deter Tehran. True, Richard Grenell, who briefly served as Romney’s foreign-policy spokesman, once made the astonishing claim that the Iranians “will surely use” nuclear weapons. Alas, he never shared his apparently secret intelligence about the leadership in Tehran’s suicidal tendencies. The Iranian government’s behavior has been rational even if brutal, and officials busy maneuvering for power and wealth do not seem eager to enter the great beyond. Washington uneasily but effectively deterred Joseph Stalin and Mao Zedong, the two most prolific mass murderers in history. Iran is no substitute for them. ¶ Romney has engaged in almost infantile ridicule of the Obama administration’s attempt to engage Tehran. Yet the U.S. had diplomatic relations with Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia. Washington came to regret not having similar contact with Mao’s China. Even the Bush administration eventually decided that ignoring Kim Jong-Il’s North Korea only encouraged it to build more nuclear weapons faster. ¶ Regarding Iran, Romney asserted, “a military option to deal with their nuclear program remains on the table.” Building up U.S. military forces “will send an unequivocal signal to Iran that the United States, acting in concert with allies, will never permit Iran to obtain nuclear weapons... Only when the ayatollahs no longer have doubts about America’s resolve will they abandon their nuclear ambitions.” Indeed, “if all else fails... then of course you take military action,” even though, American and Iranian military analysts warn, such strikes might **only delay** development of nuclear weapons. “Elect me as the next president,” he declared, and Iran “will not have a nuclear weapon.” ¶ Actually, **if Tehran becomes convinced** that **an attack** and attempted regime change **are likely**, **it will have** no choice **but to develop nuclear weapons**. How else to defend itself? The misguided war in Libya, which Romney supported, sent a clear signal to both North Korea and Iran never to trust the West. ¶ Iran’s fears likely are exacerbated by Romney’s promise to subcontract Middle East policy to Israel. The ties between the U.S. and Israel are many, but their interests often diverge. The current Israeli government wants Washington to attack Iran irrespective of the cost to America. Moreover, successive Israeli governments have decided to effectively colonize the West Bank, turning injustice into state policy and making a separate Palestinian state practically impossible. Perceived American support for this creates enormous hostility toward the U.S. across the Arab and Muslim worlds. ¶ Yet Romney promises that his first foreign trip would be to Israel “to show the world that we care about that country and that region” — as if anyone anywhere, least of all Israel’s neighbors, doesn’t realize that. He asserted that “you don’t allow an inch of space to exist between you and your friends and allies,” notably Israel. The U.S. should “let the entire world know that we will stay with them and that we will support them and defend them.” Indeed, Romney has known Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for nearly four decades and has said that he would request Netanyahu’s approval for U.S. policies: “I’d get on the phone to my friend Bibi Netanyahu and say, ‘Would it help if I say this? What would you like me to do?’” Americans would be better served by a president committed to making policy in the interests of the U.S. instead. ¶ Romney’s myopic vision is just as evident when he looks elsewhere. For instance, he offered the singular judgment that Russia is “**our number one geopolitical foe**.” Romney complained that “across the board, it has been a thorn in our side on questions vital to America’s national security.” ¶ The Cold War ended more than two decades ago. Apparently Romney is locked in a time warp. Moscow manifestly does not threaten vital U.S. interests. Romney claimed that Vladimir “Putin dreams of ‘rebuilding the Russian empire’.” Even if Putin has such dreams, they don’t animate Russian foreign policy. No longer an ideologically aggressive power active around the world, Moscow has retreated to the status of a pre-1914 great power, concerned about border security and international respect. Russia has no interest in conflict with America and is not even much involved in most regions where the U.S. is active: Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. ¶ Moscow has been helpful in Afghanistan, refused to provide advanced air defense weapons to Iran, supported some sanctions against Tehran, used its limited influence in North Korea to encourage nuclear disarmament, and opposes jihadist terrorism. This is curious behavior for America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” ¶ Romney’s website explains that he will “implement a strategy that will seek to discourage aggressive or expansionist behavior on the part of Russia,” but other than Georgia where is it so acting? And even if Georgia fell into a Russian trap, Tbilisi started the shooting in 2008. In any event, absent an American security guarantee, which would be madness, the U.S. cannot stop Moscow from acting to protect what it sees as vital interests in a region of historic influence. ¶ Where else is Russia threatening America? Moscow does oppose NATO expansion, which actually is foolish from a U.S. standpoint as well, adding strategic liabilities rather than military strengths. Russia strongly opposes missile defense bases in Central and Eastern Europe, but why should Washington subsidize the security of others? Moscow opposes an attack on Iran, and so should Americans. Russia backs the Assad regime in Syria, but the U.S. government once declared the same government to be “reformist.” Violent misadventures in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya demonstrate that America has little to gain and much to lose from another attempt at social engineering through war. If anything, the Putin government has done Washington a favor keeping the U.S. out of Syria. ¶ This doesn’t mean America should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But **treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to** act like one.Doing so especially will make Moscow more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union. Naturally, Romney wants to “encourage democratic political and economic reform” in Russia — a fine idea in theory, but meddling in another country’s politics rarely works in practice. Just look at the Arab Spring. ¶ Not content with attempting to start a **mini-Cold War**, Mitt Romney dropped his nominal free-market stance to demonize Chinese currency practices. He complained about currency manipulation and forced technology transfers: “China seeks advantage through systematic exploitation of other economies.” ¶ On day one as president he promises to designate “China as the currency manipulator it is.” Moreover, he added, he would “take a holistic approach to addressing all of China’s abuses. That includes unilateral actions such as increased enforcement of U.S. trade laws, punitive measures targeting products and industries that rely on misappropriations of our intellectual property, reciprocity in government procurement, and countervailing duties against currency manipulation. It also includes multilateral actions to block technology transfers into China and to create a trading bloc open only for nations genuinely committed to free trade.” ¶ Romney’s apparent belief that Washington is “genuinely committed to free trade” is charming nonsense. The U.S. has practiced a weak dollar policy to increase exports. Washington long has subsidized American exports: the Export-Import Bank is known as “Boeing’s Bank” and U.S. agricultural export subsidies helped torpedo the Doha round of trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization. ¶ Of course, Beijing still does much to offend Washington. However, the U.S. must accommodate the rising power across the Pacific. Trying to keep China out of a new Asia-Pacific trade pact isn’t likely to work. America’s Asian allies want us to protect them — no surprise! — but are not interested in offending their nearby neighbor with a long memory. The best hope for moderating Chinese behavior is to tie it into a web of international institutions that provide substantial economic, political, and security benefits. ¶ Beijing already has good reason to be paranoid of the superpower which patrols bordering waters, engages in a policy that looks like containment, and talks of the possibility of war. Trying to isolate China economically would be taken as a direct challenge. Romney would prove Henry Kissinger’s dictum that even paranoids have enemies. ¶ Naturally, Romney also wants to “maintain appropriate military capabilities to discourage any aggressive or coercive behavior by China against its neighbors.” However, 67 years after the end of World War II, it is time for Beijing’s neighbors to arm themselves and cooperate with each other. Japan long had the second largest economy on earth. India is another rising power with reason to constrain China. South Korea has become a major power. Australia has initiated a significant military build-up. Many Southeast Asian nations are constructing submarines to help deter Chinese adventurism. Even Russia has much to fear from China, given the paucity of population in its vast eastern territory. But America’s foreign-defense dole discourages independence and self-help. The U.S. should step back as an off-shore balancer, encouraging its friends to do more and work together. It is not America’s job to risk Los Angeles for Tokyo, Seoul, or Taipei. ¶ Romney similarly insists on keeping the U.S. on the front lines against North Korea, even though all of its neighbors have far more at stake in a peaceful peninsula and are able to contain that impoverished wreck of a country. The Romney campaign proclaims: “Mitt Romney will commit to eliminating North Korea’s nuclear weapons and its nuclear-weapons infrastructure.” Alas, everything he proposes has been tried before, from tougher sanctions to tighter interdiction and pressure on China to isolate the North. What does he plan on doing when Pyongyang continues to develop nuclear weapons as it has done for the last 20 years? ¶ The American military should come home from Korea. Romney complained that the North’s nuclear capability “poses a direct threat to U.S. forces on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere in East Asia.” Then withdraw them. Manpower-rich South Korea doesn’t need U.S. conventional support, and ground units do nothing to contain North Korea’s nuclear ambitions. Pull out American troops and eliminate North Korea’s primary threat to the U.S. Then support continuing non-proliferation efforts led by those nations with the most to fear from the North. That strategy, more than lobbying by Washington, is likely to bring China around. ¶ Romney confuses dreams with reality when criticizing President Obama over the administration’s response to the Arab Spring. “We’re facing an Arab Spring which is out of control in some respects,” he said, “because the president was not as strong as he needed to be in encouraging our friends to move toward representative forms of government.” Romney asked: “How can we try and improve the odds so what happens in Libya and what happens in Egypt and what happens in other places where the Arab Spring is in full bloom so that the developments are toward democracy, modernity and more representative forms of government? This we simply don’t know.” ¶ True, the president doesn’t know. But neither does Mitt Romney. The latter suffers from the delusion that bright Washington policymakers can remake the world. Invade another country, turn it into a Western-style democracy allied with America, and everyone will live happily every after. But George W. Bush, a member of Mitt Romney’s own party, failed miserably trying to do that in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The Arab Spring did not happen because of Washington policy but in spite of Washington policy. And Arabs demanding political freedom — which, unfortunately, is not the same as a liberal society — have not the slightest interest in what Barack Obama or Mitt Romney thinks. ¶ Yet the latter wants “convene a summit that brings together world leaders, donor organizations, and young leaders of groups that espouse” all the wonderful things that Americans do. Alas, does he really believe that such a gathering will stop, say, jihadist radicals from slaughtering Coptic Christians? Iraq’s large Christian community was destroyed even as the U.S. military occupied that country. His summit isn’t likely to be any more effective. Not everything in the world is about Washington. ¶ Which is why Romney’s demand to do something in Syria is so foolish. Until recently he wanted to work with the UN, call on the Syrian military to be nice, impose more sanctions, and “increase the possibility that the ruling minority Alawites will be able to reconcile with the majority Sunni population in a post-Assad Syria.” Snapping his fingers would be no less effective. ¶ Most recently he advocated arming the rebels. But he should be more cautious before advocating American intervention in another conflict in another land. Such efforts rarely have desirable results. Iraq was a catastrophe. Afghanistan looks to be a disaster once American troops come home. After more than a decade Bosnia and Kosovo are failures, still under allied supervision. Libya is looking bad. ¶ Even without U.S. “help,” a full-blown civil war already threatens in Syria. We only look through the glass darkly, observed the Apostle Paul. It might be best for Washington not to intervene in another Muslim land with so many others aflame. ¶ Despite his support for restoring America’s economic health, Romney wants to increase dramatically Washington’s already outsize military spending. Rather than make a case on what the U.S. needs, he has taken the typical liberal approach of setting an arbitrary number: 4 percent of GDP. It’s a dumb idea, since America already accounts for roughly half the globe’s military spending — far more if you include Washington’s wealthy allies — and spends more in real terms than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War, and real outlays have nearly doubled since 2000. By any normal measure, the U.S. possesses far more military resources than it needs to confront genuine threats. ¶ What Romney clearly wants is a military to fight multiple wars and garrison endless occupations, irrespective of cost. My Cato colleague Chris Preble figured that ¶ Romney's 4 percent gimmick would result in taxpayers spending more than twice as much on the Pentagon as in 2000 (111 percent higher, to be precise) and 45 percent more than in 1985, the height of the Reagan buildup. Over the next ten years, Romney's annual spending (in constant dollars) for the Pentagon would average 64 percent higher than annual post-Cold War budgets (1990-2012), and 42 percent more than the average during the Reagan era (1981-1989). ¶ If Mitt Romney really believes that the world today is so much more dangerous than during the Cold War, he should spell out the threat. He calls Islamic fundamentalism, the Arab Spring, the impact of failed states, the anti-American regimes of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela, rising China, and resurgent Russia “powerful forces.” It’s actually a pitiful list — Islamic terrorists have been weakened and don’t pose an existential threat, the Arab Spring threatens instability with little impact on America, it is easier to strike terrorists in failed states than in nominal allies like Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, one nuclear-armed submarine could vaporize all four hostile states, and Russia’s modest “resurgence” may threaten Georgia but not Europe or America. Only China deserves to be called “powerful,” but it remains a developing country surrounded by potential enemies with a military far behind that of the U.S. ¶ In fact, the greatest danger to America is the blowback that results from **promiscuous intervention** in conflicts not our own. Romney imagines a massive bootstrap operation: he wants a big military to engage in social engineering abroad which would require an even larger military to handle the violence and chaos that would result from his failed attempts at social engineering. Better not to start this vicious cycle. ¶ America faces international challenges but nevertheless enjoys unparalleled dominance. U.S. power is buttressed by the fact that Washington is allied with every industrialized nation except China and Russia. America shares significant interests with India, the second major emerging power; is seen as a counterweight by a gaggle of Asian states worried about Chinese expansion; remains the dominant player in Latin America; and is closely linked to most of the Middle East’s most important countries, such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq. If Mitt Romney really believes that America is at greater risk today than during the Cold War, he **is not qualified to be president**. ¶ In this world the U.S. need not confront every threat, subsidize every ally, rebuild every failed state, and resolve every problem. Being a superpower means having many interests but few vital ones warranting war. Being a bankrupt superpower means exhibiting judgment and exercising discretion. ¶ President Barack Obama has been a disappointment, amounting in foreign policy to George W. Bush-lite. But Mitt Romney sounds even worse. His rhetoric suggests a return to the worst of the Bush administration. The 2012 election likely will be decided on economics, but foreign policy will prove to be equally important in the long-term. America can ill afford another know-nothing president.

### 1NC

#### Energy production is the peak of our manipulation of the environment – rather than revealing the ontological beauty of nature, it exploits it for human utilization – this standing reserve logic obviates our relation to Earth and causes extinction – our alternative is to refuse action in this instance in favor of contemplating being – this is key to more effective environmental policies

Grego 7 – Dr. Richard Grego 7, Associate Professor, Department of Humanities/ Culture, Daytona Beach College, 2007, “Global Warming, Environmental Philosophy and Public Policy: John Dewey vs Martin Heidegger,” online: http://www.philosophos.com/philosophy\_article\_153.html

This essay compares and contrasts the views of Martin Heidegger and John Dewey with respect to environmental philosophy and the global warming issue. It examines how their respective concepts of nature, human nature, and philosophy of science, might apply to current environmental thought and policy. It argues that Heidegger's latter thought (with its rejection of modern culture's science, technology, and commercialism, as well as its quasi-mystical concepts like 'Being' and 'freedom') is generally less-suited to constructive application in environmental policy than Dewey's philosophy (which celebrates these modern institutions as a triumph of both natural and human potentials). However it is also argued in conclusion that, while the spirit of Dewey's philosophy might be better-suited to policies which entail short-term strategies regarding environmental regulations, laws, and improved technologies, the essential message of Heidegger's philosophy may be needed for **ensuring** a long-term commitment to **sustainable environmental protection**. ¶ Heidegger, Dewey, and Environmental Philosophy¶ Concern over global warming and other environmental problems has garnered a great deal of public attention recently. The February 2007 report issued by the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is controversial (and the technical scientific details of its various possible interpretations are beyond the purview of this essay), but it appears to confirm what many environmentalists have been asserting for some time now: The planet is heating up, and this phenomenon is man-made. This heating process is part of a century-long trend — likely caused in large-part by greenhouse gas emissions (CO2, methane, nitrous oxide, etc) — that is already having adverse environmental effects on many levels. Much of the scientific community agrees that its long-term consequences (which, again, cannot be detailed here but include such possibilities as heat waves, droughts, new wind patterns, melting polar ice, and species extinction) could be catastrophic for both the natural environment and human civilization. ¶ At this time therefore, environmental policy makers are attempting to answer two main questions:¶ 1) What is causing the problem? And 2) What can/should we do about it?¶ Scientists have provided some obvious technical answers here. Global warming is caused by greenhouse gas emissions and the solution to the problem of global warming is to reduce emissions via improved technologies, policies, and regulations where necessary (one of the most recent ideas in the U.S. along these lines is a change in the federal tax code to encourage the use and development of alternate energy sources by corporations). ¶ Of course philosophers , as always, tend to view both the causes and possible solutions to such problems in more complex and problematic ways than do scientists. Environmental philosophy thus encompasses things like ethics, metaphysics, and the philosophy of science, rather than just simple empirical analysis, in seeking to address issues related to environmental protection. These issues are currently being debated by any number of thinkers across academic disciplines and professions. ¶ While contemporary environmental philosophy is a rich and prolific field of scholarship, it is still sometimes instructive to take a glance at some of its intellectual origins. Though John Dewey and Martin Heidegger (as philosophers at the beginning of the 20th century) lived and thought prior to the most recent environmental concerns of our time, they nonetheless had much to say about science, nature, and humanity's relationship with the natural world. Their respective ideas on these themes have provided a firm foundation upon which much contemporary environmental thought is based. Current philosophers like Michael Zimmerman and Bruce Foltz have synthesized Heidegger's thought with environmental philosophy, while philosophers such as Andrew Light, Larry Hickman, and Anthony Weston have applied Dewey's pragmatism to environmentalism. Thus, examining some of Dewey's and Heidegger's basic concepts in comparative perspective can highlight and clarify assumptions and themes discussed/ debated by contemporary scholars — and can provide critical insight into some of the philosophical issues at stake in current environmental policy debates. ¶ In fact, although Heidegger and Dewey share certain environmentally relevant ideas, their differences are more pronounced and exemplify two distinctly different attitudes toward issues like global warming. Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) has been associated with the 20th century philosophical movements known as phenomenology and (though he disowned the label) existentialism. A student of phenomenologist Edmund Husserl, Heidegger was one of this century's most influential thinkers. His thought, as we shall discuss further, tended to assume a decidedly anti-modernist bias — leading him, especially in latter writings, to critique unfavorably such cultural institutions as technology, commercialism, and instrumental science. Since these institutions are so integral to the modern world, there is a quasi-reactionary sensibility about Heidegger's latter thought (Although in all fairness to him, he considered his critique of western civilization to be forward-looking and visionary.) ¶ American philosopher John Dewey (1859-1952) in contrast, was an unequivocally forward-looking thinker who embraced the spirit of modernism enthusiastically. Closely identified with 'pragmatism', his philosophy has also been referred to as 'instrumentalism' and 'experimentalism'. Unlike Heidegger, he saw science, technology, and commerce as creative expressions of human potentiality. He therefore tended to be more supportive of these institutions and their cultural influence than Heidegger was. ¶ The Nature of Science and the Science of Nature¶ Were they actually here to comment themselves, both thinkers would undoubtedly see deep connections between concrete problems like global warming and more abstract issues like the philosophy of science, the metaphysics of nature, and human nature. However they would also surely disagree on the character of these connections. Their philosophies agree that science and technology have shaped humankind's relationship with the natural world, but they disagree about what this relationship is, how it has come about, and what it means.¶ Heidegger's vision of science and technology is, for all practical purposes, a negative one. In his latter work especially, he portrayed the scientific legacy in western history as a manifestation of humanity's disregard for, and estrangement from, the natural world and from the very ground of existence. This legacy, beginning with the philosophy and culture of ancient Greece and culminating in the science and philosophy of modernity, is a tragic story of cultural and spiritual decline. Pre-Socratic Greeks first apprehended the awesome wonder and mystery of existence (or 'Being', as Heidegger calls it) and began to develop philosophy and science to describe this experience. However, the ultimate meaning of this experience was simply too sublime and profound for any descriptions to do justice to, so subsequent thinkers like Plato and Aristotle began to articulate philosophy and science simply as logical explanations for the natural world, rather than as poetic exclamations about the mysterious experience of Being. Such explanations **made the** natural **world** rationally **intelligible** but did so **by neglecting** a deeper **appreciation for Being**'s original revelation. This made any deep appreciation for the Being of nature impossible and led to the progressive alienation of humanity from nature in western thought and culture.¶ Thus, the development of science and technology in the modern (post-enlightenment-era) world are cultural expressions of this alienation. Science and technology have now 'enframed' (in Heidegger's terms) the natural world by turning it into a mere object of empirical study for the purpose of commercial exploitation. The natural world has become a resource 'standing reserve' for technical manipulation. Science: ¶ ...Sets upon Nature... Agriculture is now the mechanized food industry. Air is now set upon to yield oxygen, the earth to yield uranium... Even the Rhine [River] itself appears to be something at our command... the revealing that rules throughout modern technology has the character of setting upon. (QT, 320-321)¶ Hence, enlightenment philosopher Rene Descartes' belief that the scientific revolution's purpose is to accomplish '..the mastery and possession of nature' has come to full fruition in modern life. Science has transformed nature from a living revelation of Being into an intellectual/ commercial resource.¶ Dewey agrees with Heidegger that modern science has its origins in the intellectual life of ancient Greece and has since changed humanity's relationship with the natural world. However unlike Heidegger, Dewey views the legacy of science as one of liberation and enlightenment, rather than one of domination and estrangement. Though the classical founders of western philosophy and science were engaged in a futile 'quest for certainty' and search for an eternal or sacred meaning in nature , modern science since the enlightenment-era has become a more practical tool for framing open-ended questions and generating temporary hypothesis. Unlike the science, philosophy, and theology of ancient times, modern science does not see reality or nature as having any fixed or determined metaphysical or supernatural structure. Nature, as the subject-matter of current science, is a malleable and dynamic construct of the human intellect. Science, according to Dewey, has created, 'A natural world that does not subsist for the sake of realizing a fixed set of ends' and 'is relatively malleable and plastic; it can be used for this or that'. (RP, 70)¶ Heidegger agrees with Dewey that this is indeed what has happened, but thinks it is a bad thing. Dewey however, sees the advent of modern science as the great liberating event in the history of ideas and extols its possibilities for empowering human potentials------advocating: 'the transfer of the experimental method from the field of physical science to the wider field of human life'. Dewey concludes that in the contemporary world:¶ Nature as it already exists ceases to be something which must be accepted and submitted to, endured and enjoyed just as it is. It is now something to be modified, to be intentionally controlled. It is material to act upon so as to transform it into new objects which better answer our needs. (QC, 80-81)¶ — And indeed this is just as it must and should be: For nature is the source of human abilities, and the ultimate evolutionary product of nature is the human ability to transform nature itself. Our ability to bend nature to our will is an aspect of nature. The improvement of human conditions by manipulating and transforming the natural world via science, technology, commerce and the arts, is nature's own supreme achievement.¶ Heidegger, in contrast, tends to view nature more as 'something which must be accepted and submitted to...', as the unfolding of something sacred and supernatural ('Being') with which humanity loses touch when it is treated as an object of scientific knowledge or commercial exploitation. Our destruction of the natural world is symptomatic of our spiritual alienation from the ultimate source of meaning in our lives. Having reduced 'Being' to a scientific-technocratic-commercial world of objectified 'beings', humanity now finds itself alone in a trivialized world of 'resources' and 'commodities'. Having separated nature from its sacred animating ground, humanity has robbed nature (and itself, for that matter) of intrinsic value. Nature now seems lifeless and meaningless in any deep sense.¶ Thus a kind of 'Homelessness', as Heidegger calls it, 'has come to be the destiny of the world' (LH, 243), and **the only remedy** for this dilemma (which Heidegger seems dubious about, even while advocating it) **is** for humanity to reject the 'frenzy of rationalization', technology, and commercialism (QT, 449) **in favor of** 'freedom'. Heidegger describes this 'freedom' as **the** 'letting-be of beings' (ET, 125). It involves an attitude of quietism, reverence, and profound appreciation for nature as a sacred incarnation of 'Being'. In this state of mind, nature would be celebrated once again as a source of wonder, and would no longer be used merely as an object of exploitation.¶ Science, Nature, and Environmental Policy¶ Having examined Dewey's and Heidegger's contrasting views on these issues then, their possible respective answers to our original questions regarding global warming might seem obvious. Given his rather strong endorsement of an 'activist' scientific spirit, Dewey would probably see the cause of global warming as a possible miscalculation of our collective goals and methods with respect to what we currently know about our technologies and the environment. His probable solution would involve evaluating how our development (on many levels) is effected by this phenomenon and then re-evaluating how best to utilize the technologies that are responsible for it.¶ However, his radically dynamic and open-ended conception of both nature and human nature would make these evaluations quite problematic. If nature and human development are in perpetual flux, have no inherent structure, and are continually re-configured by the ever-evolving matrix of inter-relationships that they are a part of, then even defining what the natural environment 'is' — let alone what may or may not be harmful to it — becomes extremely difficult at best. There is nothing intrinsic or essential to nature in Dewey's view. It is an ever unfinished project whose limits cannot be defined and whose 'purpose' is a matter of interpretation. Whether current policies are benefiting or harming nature is therefore a matter of interpretation as well — and our interpretations are largely tentative and change with every temporary change in values, needs, and worldviews. Indeed, the spirit of Dewey's instrumentalism suggests the possibility that there may be ways still unimagined in which global warming may actually enhance human potentials and improve the environment!¶ On the other hand, Heidegger's response might not be quite as predictable — if he would choose to respond at all. Commentators have speculated widely on the reasons for an attitude of philosophical disregard and personal aloofness concerning real-world affairs that Heidegger seemed to hold throughout his life and career. Some have suggested that it had obvious origins in his rejection of science, commerce, and all such institutions of modern culture. Others have claimed that abstract quasi-mystical themes like 'freedom', 'Being',and 'nothingness' that dominated his latter writing, led to an Ivory-Tower lack of interest in worldly concerns. Still others have suggested more cynical and opportunistic motives behind his his unwillingness to risk taking personal stands on controversial issues. Whatever his reason(s) may have been, Heidegger claimed that humanity and nature have now reached the end of their potentialities, and that humanity cannot hope to 'engineer' its way out of the spiritual malaise wrought by its alienation from Being via science and technology. 'Being' has now exhausted its possibilities in 'Nothingness', which manifests itself in contemporary culture as **nihilism and meaninglessness.** World civilization is dominated by an instrumentalist mentality in which nothing is intrinsically valuable or sacred. The devaluation of nature to the status of a mere resource for technology and industry is an example of this nihilism.¶ Unfortunately, Heidegger also says that any attempt to engineer yet another scientifically calculated solution to this dilemma would be, paradoxically, a perpetuation of the very nihilistic mentality that has caused it. **Scientifically generated public policies**, ecological initiatives, and environmental regulations, are part of the mentality that 'enframes' or objectifies nature by controlling and manipulating it via science and technology. Neither humanity nor nature can be redeemed in this way. In fact, since the only hope for an authentic encounter with nature involves appreciating it in 'freedom' — which means 'letting-be', rather than trying to change or improve it — Heidegger seems to be claiming that inaction (simply doing nothing) is our best course of action. We must, he states, wait patiently for the 'soundless voice of Being' to reveal itself once again. But it must come to us during an experience of the kind of quietism in which the 'frenzy of rationalization' is finally stilled.¶ How any of this might translate into an actual environmental policy is anyone's guess (and contemporary interpreters of Heidegger are certainly doing a lot of guessing!) but some general possibilities come to mind. Environmentally, Heidegger is heir to the legacy of Medieval Christian mysticism, German idealism, and romanticism, and he is the inspiration for much contemporary thinking associated with 'deep ecology'. He encourages a heartfelt awareness of and appreciation for the natural world as a dwelling-place of the sacred. With this awareness and appreciation may perhaps come a **general shift in the public consciousness** (a renewed revelation of 'Being') that can lead, in turn, to a new way of 'dwelling authentically' or living harmoniously with the natural world. Such dwelling or living will then lead effortlessly to policies that sustain this harmony. However we cannot make these policies unless the shift in consciousness occurs first.¶ Dewey's views, in contra-distinction, are quite compatible with the spirit of instrumental science, technology and commerce and are applicable to environmentally sound policies like low-carbon technologies in industry, international regulations on greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental standards in the Kyoto Protocol. These are temporary flexible innovations made by interested political and commercial parties that are based on tentative research-findings which may be revised as circumstances change. Dewey does not share Heidegger's antipathy toward modernity and sees things like environmental problems as incentives to further research and improvement, rather than as an end to human possibilities. While Dewey endorses a kind of Heideggerian-sounding awareness and appreciation of the natural world (lauding the value of 'aesthetic experiences' in the appreciation of nature, for instance), he sees this as only one capacity among many that may be employed to protect or improve the natural environment, which humanity is an integral part of. The Global Roundtable On Climate Change based at Columbia Universities' Earth Institute in New York, in which various scientists, corporations, civic organizations, and political action groups from around the world are researching and adopting a comprehensive statement on environmental science and policy, seems like precisely the sort of initiative that Dewey would support.¶ Yet, while Heidegger's views may seem too extreme for the practical necessities of our current situation, Dewey's more practical approach is vulnerable to the Heideggerian criticism that it may be too accommodating to this situation. Heidegger would probably say that any attempt to preserve, protect, or improve nature by tinkering with it through science, defeats its own purpose — and it does appear as though every new 'solution' to ecological dangers over the past half-century has only yielded new problems — the latest of which is global warming (and some of the proposed scientific solutions to this problem are ominous themselves: From giant space shields, to spreading aerosol particles in the upper atmosphere, to spraying water-clouds into the air from the oceans). Thus perhaps the very impractically of Heidegger's ideas make them particularly worthy of consideration. It is fairly obvious that environmental degradation is largely — if not primarily — a result of the impact of science, technology and commerce on the natural world, and that the kind of reverent appreciation for nature's sanctity that Heidegger advocates would engender a deeper concern and respect for nature. What may therefore be needed for environmental protection over the long-term (as opposed to short-term fixes for temporarily 'fashionable' issues like global warming) is a Heideggerian-type transformation in the public consciousness, rather than more Deweyan technocratic innovations. A renewed experience of authentic 'freedom' and the revelation of that 'Being' which is the groundless ground that sustains both nature and humanity, might be just what is needed for the earth's sustainable future.

### 1NC

#### TEXT:

#### The United States Federal Government should:

#### -mandate that the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States’ annual report to Congress quantify the number of deals that were approved during the previous year; and

#### -should amend Exon-Florio to define “national security” so as to consider the following factors in reviewing foreign acquisitions as per Carroll

#### Amending Exon-Florio to narrowly define national security solves the case --- it removes “economic security” as a consideration in the CFIUS process --- this accurate reading of their Carroll solvency evidence provides further support:

Carroll 9 23 Emory Int'l L. Rev. 167 COMMENT: BACK TO THE FUTURE: REDEFINING THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY ACT'S CONCEPTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY, 2009, lexis

Exon-Florio should be amended to more narrowly define national security. The open-ended nature of the current definition has allowed the process to become politicized. Instead, national security should be specifically defined so as to prevent acquisition of industries that are critical to the military aspects of our national defense and that have capacities that are not duplicable by other market entities. The definition should also serve to ensure that export control laws are not circumvented by foreign acquisition of American companies. The following proposed definition would once again focus on preventing foreign governments from gaining unique military capabilities through private transactions that could threaten American national security:¶ National Security shall be defined so as to consider the following factors in reviewing foreign acquisitions:¶ A. Potential effect upon assets essential to the military aspects of national defense, specifically those firms whose contributions to the national defense cannot be easily replaced by another domestic corporation;¶ B. Whether the acquisition poses a substantial risk of espionage or terrorism that can be certified by the relevant United States intelligence agencies;¶ C. Whether the acquisition would pose a unique risk of weapons proliferation of critical military assets that cannot be otherwise dealt with by United States laws, particularly to countries that are not allies of the United States;¶ [\*198] D. Economic security, or any other factor not mentioned in this section, shall not be considered by the CFIUS process. [n222](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n222)¶ Such an interpretation of national security would heavily scrutinize acquisition of, or joint ventures with, Lockheed Martin or any other company that makes a large contribution to the defense industrial base. Certain high-tech companies that produce computer chips that give the U.S. armed forces technological advantages over other countries might also fall under this definition. China should not be allowed to acquire a controlling interest in the present-day equivalent of Fairchild Semiconductor.¶ This proposed definition of national security would be even more limited than the original Exon-Florio signed by President Reagan, as Exon-Florio was designed to apply mainly to defense-based technological acquisitions. [n223](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n223) The main difference between this definition of national security and the original Exon-Florio legislation is that this definition would codify national security to explicitly prevent protectionist use of the CFIUS for political ends. Any consideration of economic security or protection of energy assets from foreign acquisition would be excluded from this definition, as inclusion of such economic factors can only encourage protectionism and politicization of the CFIUS process. [n224](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n224)¶ The narrower definition of national security would eliminate the mandatory reviews of every foreign-government-controlled transaction as required by FINSA. [n225](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n225) Instead, the CFIUS would be given flexibility to decide which transactions truly threaten national security, without being bound to review every governmental acquisition. Narrowing the definition of national security in this manner would allow the CFIUS to focus its resources on real national security threats, rather than waste resources analyzing nearly every transaction involving a foreign governmental takeover. [n226](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n226)¶ The CFIUS should certainly consider the prospect of terrorism and take every step possible to safeguard against such a risk. In many cases, safeguards such as extra scans on containers should be put in place to minimize the risk of [\*199] terrorism. These safeguards should be applied regardless of whether the ownership is foreign or domestic. [n227](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n227) Protectionism cannot replace the Department of Homeland Security when it comes to defending critical infrastructure. [n228](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n228) Besides, the terrorists who struck on 9/11 did not own substantial property within the United States. Nor would the CFIUS regulations have stopped the subsequent terrorist incidents, such as Richard Reid's attempted shoe bomb or the anthrax shipments. In fact, there is no evidence that any company has been used as a front for a terrorist plot. [n229](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n229)¶ However, transactions should be blocked by the CFIUS on the basis of homeland security only when there is evidence of a clear and present threat of terrorism, or perhaps of espionage or sabotage. If the term "critical infrastructure" must be kept in FINSA, then members of Congress and the CFIUS must do a better job articulating what exactly constitutes critical infrastructure and what they consider the link between foreign ownership of critical infrastructure and threats to national security. [n230](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n230) Explicitly laying out such guidelines will illustrate the boundaries to foreign investors and will make CFIUS decisions seem less arbitrary and political. [n231](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n231) Additionally, screening employees of foreign corporations that purchase critical infrastructure can often identify potential security vulnerabilities without taking the drastic step of vetoing a transaction. [n232](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n232)¶ Limiting the Exon-Florio definition of national security only to military threats may seem odd and reactionary in the post-9/11 world, where unconventional threats abound. However, counter-terrorism requires appropriate tools, and regulating foreign direct investment simply falls short of being a cost-effective method of ensuring homeland security. [n233](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n233) Focusing on the nationality of a company's ownership in a globalized world only distracts us from real security threats posed by non-state actors. [n234](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n234) Many terrorist threats do not exist as a result of primary support from any nation, but rather as tactics in service of an ideology. [n235](http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348369211723&returnToKey=20_T15589579183&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.217127.34243487497" \l "n235) As Jose Padilla, John Walker Lindh, and [\*200] many others have illustrated, no one ethnic group has a monopoly on Al-Qaeda membership or support. Instead of penalizing investments from various Arab states simply because terrorists draw support from that region, homeland security policy should focus on thwarting the terrorists themselves. The CFIUS must return to a focus on state military capabilities because the terrorist threats are from non-state actors, and restricting economic investment from certain nations does not, per se, deal with the threat of terrorism. Just because terrorism is a serious threat does not mean that the CFIUS is the best tool to protect critical infrastructure.¶ In conclusion, 9/11 did radically change the world, and Exon-Florio should change to fit the new realities of homeland security. However, the most effective reform of Exon-Florio is not expansion of the definition of national security to include economic protectionism, but rather a narrowing of the definition to guard against real threats to American security while encouraging beneficial foreign investment. The security challenges of the twenty-first century cannot be met by protectionism. Only by embracing globalization and cooperation can the United States truly achieve national security.

#### The aff goes too far by excluding any oil and gas deals from CFIUS reviews --- this is precisely the situation Carroll wants to avoid: a Chinese state-owned company could try to buy companies that supply energy to the U.S. military and the US would have no capacity to even review such a deal – much less block it

#### This obviously harms national security since Chinese companies can freely buy-up US oil companies --- fuels their aggressive expansionism --- and it’s politically unpopular

Alex Newman 12, “Communist China Lobbying to Take Over U.S. Oil, Lawmakers Still Concerned,” NewAmerican, 8-7-12, http://www.thenewamerican.com/economy/sectors/item/12364-communist-china-lobbying-to-take-over-us-oil-lawmakers-still-concerned

Top American lawmakers on both sides of the aisle are expressing serious concerns about a bid by the communist dictatorship ruling mainland China to purchase Canadian energy firm Nexen and its vast U.S. oil and natural gas holdings. The deal by the Chinese regime, acting through its state-owned front company China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC), also represents a potential national security risk, warned Republican and Democrat members of Congress.¶ Canadian lawmakers have also questioned the plan, asking for a public review before the controversial deal is allowed to go through. Critics point out that CNOOC is not a “company” in the traditional sense — it is an organ of one of the most brutal and repressive regimes in the world. The communist regime and its front company, however, are fighting back hard against the opposition, dropping big money on lobbying and propaganda efforts — they call it “public relations” — in both countries. ¶ In 2005, CNOOC’s bid to purchase California-based Unocal for almost $20 billion was withdrawn after a bipartisan wave of outrage. But that was then. Analysts suspect the Chinese dictatorship may have learned from its past experience, taking slow steps and making the potential success of its latest takeover attempt far more likely.¶ "It's partly the valuation, partly an evolution of the Chinese mindset. You couldn't do this deal a year after Unocal," a source familiar with the deal told Reuters. "They had to have made the smaller steps in the meantime that made everyone comfortable that they knew how to behave responsibly, operate effectively, treat employees well."¶ If approved by authorities in the United States and Canada, the $15-billion Nexen takeover would mark the first time that the communist Chinese dictatorship would be operating U.S. leases in the Gulf of Mexico. However, it would be in line with the brutal regime’s recent pattern of expansion in various American markets.¶ Consider that just in recent months, for example, China purchased its first U.S. bank and the second-largest cinema chain in the country. That trend is expected to continue picking up steam as the dictatorship, flush with dollars and U.S. debt, becomes more aggressive in gobbling up international assets.¶ But despite CNOOC stepping up its efforts to buy influence on Capitol Hill by enlisting major lobbying and “public relations” firms for the proposed Nexen purchase, a few American lawmakers are putting up at least some tepid resistance. A coalition including members of the House and Senate from both parties have already asked for a review by U.S. regulators. ¶ “I have serious national security concerns with the Chinese government, acting through one of its corporations, purchasing a company that will give it control over significant U.S. oil and gas resources,” Senator James Inhofe (R-Okla.) told MarketWatch on August 6, becoming the latest lawmaker to express misgivings about the plan. “This combined with China’s closed economy, its prohibition on direct, full investment in Chinese business operations by U.S. firms, and its blatant disregard to U.S. intellectual property rights make this transaction even more concerning.”¶ Lawmakers are asking for a proper review of the deal by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S. (CFIUS), an official inter-agency body charged with investigating the national-security implications of major deals before signing off on them. And the committee chair, Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, has already started receiving requests from Capitol Hill about the Nexen scheme. ¶ In a letter sent last month, Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) actually asked Geithner to “withhold approval of this transaction until China's government has made tangible, enforceable commitments to ensure U.S. companies reciprocal treatment.” Apparently he wants the Chinese dictatorship to be more open to foreign investment, which currently faces severe restrictions imposed by the regime.¶ “I believe approval of the CNOOC-Nexen transaction should be a test of these reciprocal commitments, and that concrete progress must be made by both sides simultaneously,” Senator Schumer said in the letter. He also told reporters that it was time for America to play “hard ball” with the Chinese dictatorship.¶ In the House, Congressman Edward Markey (D-Mass.), the top Democrat on the House Natural Resources Committee, also expressed serious concerns about the proposed deal. “I believe this merger could lead to a massive transfer of wealth from the American people to the Chinese government, and I strongly urge you to block this proposed transaction until, at a minimum, parties to the merger agree to pay royalties to the U.S. taxpayer on all oil produced off American shores or relinquish any ownership interests in these leases,” he wrote in a recent letter to Geithner.¶ Markey also slammed the U.S. government policy of allowing some oil extraction on certain leases in the Gulf of Mexico without the firms having to pay royalties. Nexen apparently controls at least two such sites, allowing it to extract unlimited amounts oil and natural gas without offering the U.S. government any fees. If the Chinese dictatorship took over the firm, the benefits of those resources would then go straight to China without offering American taxpayers any compensation.¶ “Giving valuable American resources away to wealthy multi-national corporations is wasteful,” Rep. Markey noted in the letter. “But giving valuable American resources away to a foreign government is far worse: it has the potential to directly undermine American economic and national security.”¶ From the GOP, Inhofe said he still supports the idea of putting the Defense Department — as opposed to the Treasury — in charge of CFIUS. Because the inter-agency committee deals mostly with national-security risks, the Oklahoma lawmaker said DOD was the “appropriate agency” to handle most security-related issues on deals.¶ Meanwhile, Senator John Hoeven (R-N.D.) is also raising alarm bells about the controversial Chinese takeover. He said he “very definitely” has concerns and that the deal should be looked at “carefully” before moving forward.¶ “Do we really want to be buying our oil, or Canadian oil, back from the Chinese?” he wondered during a press conference unveiling a bill to approve the Keystone pipeline and expand access to U.S. oil. “If we don’t take action to develop our resources and work with our closest friend and ally, Canada, that is exactly what is going to happen.” Nexen is also involved in developing the Canadian oil sands.¶ A spokesman for the Chinese regime’s oil behemoth was quoted as saying that CNOOC is “respectful of the regulatory requirements across all the respective jurisdictions.” The brutal dictatorship’s front company also seeks to “comply with all of the regulatory and governmental processes and procedures and to cooperate with all relevant regulatory authorities,” he added.¶ Canadian regulators will also review the potential deal, which would be the Chinese regime’s largest-ever takeover of a foreign energy company. Analysts cited in news reports from Canada predicted that the scheme would be approved and that the communist dictatorship would be pursuing even bigger deals in the not-too-distant future. But some Canadian lawmakers urged caution.¶ “The size and scope of this transaction raises important questions and Canadians deserve the opportunity to seek clarity on the commitments that CNOOC is making on protecting jobs, contributing to the community and consulting affected First Nations,” the opposition New Democrats party said in a public statement seeking hearings. “We ask that you convene meetings of each Standing Committee at the earliest possible convenience to engage in a full and comprehensive study of the proposed acquisition of Nexen Inc by CNOOC, and of the broader policy issues raised by this case.”¶ Experts say that the barbaric communist dictatorship — Beijing persecutes Christians, enforces its “one child” policy with forced abortions, operates slave-labor camps, harvests organs from political prisoners, considers the U.S. Constitution's Second Amendment to be a "violation" of "human rights," and more — is only just getting started on its global shopping spree. Africa and Latin America have long been the targets. Increasingly, however, it appears that assets in Canada and the United States are now solidly in the regime’s cross hairs — and will remain there as long as policymakers refuse to resist.

### China Relations Advantage

### CFIUS Politicization Inevitable

#### Alternate causalities swamp the case --- a handful of other industries will still politicize the CFIUS national security standard

Susan W. Liebeler 93, a former chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission, is a partner in the law firm of Irell & Manella. William H. Lash III is an assistant professor at St. Louis University School of Law, Exon-Florio: Harbinger of Economic Nationalism? Regulation, Vol. 16, No. 1, Winter 1993, www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv16n1/reg16n1d.html

Many members of Congress have pressured CFIUS to use Exon-Florio more widely for reasons having nothing to do with national security. Sen. Exon suggested that CFIUS could block an acquisition by Tokuyama Soda because of Tokuyama's role in a soda ash cartel. House majority leader Richard A. Gephardt has suggested that Exon-Florio can be used to protect ``American competitiveness,'' whatever that means. Investment in South Africa was raised as a reason for stopping BTR's bid for Norton. Citing a disturbing pattern of labor policies in South Africa, Rep. Ronald V. Dellums warned President Bush that allowing BTR to expand its U.S. operations would risk ``a potential backlash from African countries with whom the United States has vital political and economic interests.''¶ The problem is that Exon-Florio is a potential tool for a future administration to use in implementing a policy of economic nationalism. The statute and implemention regulations neither define national security nor provide a list of industries exempt from Exon-Florio scrutiny. National security can be stretched fairly thin. In the past clothespin, peanut, pottery, shoe, pen, paper, and pencil manufacturers have tried to justify government protection by invoking national security. Under another administration national security could be interpreted to encompass economic security. Changes in the political philosophy of future administrations could certainly result in a change in the makeup of CFIUS and the way Exon-Florio is administered.

#### They only affect oil and natural gas investments --- acquisitions in any other sector would still prompt Congressional calls for protectionism

### 1NC --- Ralls/Wind AC + Status Quo Solves Transparency

#### Obama just blocked a Chinese energy investment on CFIUS’ national security grounds --- freaks out Chinese investors in the short-term – but will ultimately cause greater CFIUS transparency, which solves the case

WSJ 10-2, Chinese-Owned Firm Sues Obama Over Wind-Farm Project, October 2, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444004704578032083846454200.html

WASHINGTON—The Chinese executives that President Barack Obama blocked from acquiring a wind-farm project in Oregon challenged the rare rejection with a lawsuit Monday alleging that the president acted unconstitutionally.¶ The suit faces an uphill path, but raises the question of whether presidential decisions should be subject to review by courts.¶ On Friday, the president effectively nullified the Chinese-owned Ralls Corp.'s purchase of four wind-farm projects next to a naval test facility in Oregon. He followed the recommendation in September of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S., a panel comprising representatives of 16 government agencies and offices that scrutinizes the national-security implications of foreign investments.¶ The decision, coming in the midst of a presidential election which has seen both candidates jockey to appear tough on China, was the first time in more than 20 years that a president scuppered a proposed deal by a foreign buyer on national-security grounds. Nearly all proposed deals that raise security concerns at CFIUS are fixed or withdrawn before they reach the president's desk.¶ Ralls had challenged CFIUS in court before the president made his ruling. In a lawsuit filed last month, Ralls argued that CFIUS acted in an arbitrary manner by ordering the company to cease construction at the wind farms without revealing what the national-security concerns were or how they could be addressed.¶ In blocking the deal himself, Mr. Obama appeared to fend off that legal challenge, and made further legal action against the ruling seemingly hopeless.¶ But Ralls amended its complaint late Monday, arguing that the president exceeded his statutory authority by ordering Ralls to unwind its operation in Oregon. The company also alleged it was deprived of due process.¶ "CFIUS and the president acted in an unlawful and unauthorized manner," reads the amended complaint. "At no point has CFIUS ever provided or discussed with Ralls any evidence" related to the transaction's "supposed national-security risks," it said.¶ The Treasury Department plays a central role in the CFIUS determination process, and spokeswoman Natalie Wyeth Earnest said Tuesday that "We believe the lawsuit has no merit, and we intend to defend the case vigorously."¶ CFIUS approves most of the roughly 100 applications it reviews each year. It has never been seriously challenged in court. However, legal experts said some of Ralls's arguments do raise legitimate questions about how CFIUS operates, legal experts said.¶ For instance, companies that are "adversely affected" by the actions of a government agency have the right, under the Administrative Procedures Act, to judicial review. Ralls argues that companies injured by CFIUS rulings should have that same right.¶ However, the president is traditionally given wide latitude to decide matters relating to national security.¶ The suit is "a little bit of a Hail Mary. It's going to be interesting to see if there's a court that would take the view that the president's decision on something related to national security is something that ought to be second-guessed," said Farhad Jalinous, a trade lawyer at Kaye Scholer LLP in Washington.¶ But the filing of the lawsuit could embolden companies. Mr. Jalinous said that companies involved in negotiations with CFIUS might feel they have more leverage if legal action is an option. Conversely, at a time when the U.S. is seeking to attract more foreign investment, some experts think the lawsuit could prompt CFIUS to be more transparent about how it evaluates potential deals.¶ "CFIUS may take this to heart, to some extent, in terms of what they start coming back to companies with when they are really concerned about a transaction, in terms of being more transparent about the basis for the concerns," said Thad McBride, an international trade lawyer at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP in Washington.

### 1NC --- No Impact to CFIUS --- General

#### No impact --- CFIUS approves 99.9% of all transactions

Marchick 7 (David, partner at Covington & Burling, where he advises companies on the CFIUS process, “Swinging the Pendulum too Far: An Analysis of the CFIUS Process Post-Dubai Ports World,” Jan, http://www.nfap.net/researchactivities/studies/NFAPPolicyBriefCFIUS0107.pdf)

In the 18 years that Exon-Florio has been in force, there have been slightly more than 1700 CFIUS filings. Only one transaction has formally been blocked by the President — a 1990 aerospace investment by a Chinese company. From the data, one would think that CFIUS has merely been a rubber stamp, approving 99.9 percent of the acquisitions. The data belie actual practice, since tough restrictions are imposed by CFIUS as a condition for approval — typically through “mitigation” or “national security” agreements. In addition, parties typically will abandon a transaction in the face of a possible rejection rather than force the President to formally block a proposed acquisition. The public relations damage to a company if a President were to block an acquisition would be substantial.

### 1NC --- No Impact to CFIUS --- China-Specific

#### Oil and gas investments are high – despite CFIUS --- their evidence is outdated

James D. Rosener 11, partner in the Commercial Department of Pepper Hamilton LLP, Ostensibly Kosher: CFIUS Review of Foreign Investment in U.S. Industries, A Publication of Pepper Hamilton LLP, 9-22-11, <http://www.pepperlaw.com/publications_update.aspx?ArticleKey=2198>

In recent years, the CFIUS has been rather swift in blocking Chinese deals. In 2009, CFIUS blocked the purchase of Firstgold Corp., a development stage mining company, by Northwest Non Ferrous International Investment Company Ltd., a Chinese corporation. It is reported that this sale was blocked because the mining company was located near sensitive military assets. Similarly, in 2005, the China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC), through its Hong Kong subsidiary (CNOOC Ltd.), announced an unsolicited bid to acquire the U.S. energy company Unocal. Pursuant to filing with the CFIUS, CNOOC subsequently withdrew its bid among concerns of foreign ownership of U.S. energy companies.

So would it be appropriate to generalize that U.S. is suspicious about investments from China and as such may not be open to Chinese investors? Probably not, especially in light of certain recent Chinese transactions that have passed CFIUS muster including the acquisition of American oil and natural gas projects by the Chinese state-owned oil company CNOOC Ltd., the purchase of a stake in a U.S. power generating company by the China Investment Corporation and the sale of Ford’s Volvo unit to a Chinese automobile manufacturer. So can we then say that the United States is more concerned about Chinese investments in critical technology? Again, that may not be true, as the China-based Lenovo Group’s acquisition of IBM’s personal computer business was cleared without much of a hiccup. One reason possibly could be that Lenovo is a publicly listed entity and does not have suspicious ties with the PLA and has a relatively cleaner history than Huawei, which was once linked to selling communication technology to Saddam Husain’s regime in Iraq.

#### Their evidence reflects a media bias --- most deals move through CFIUS without problems

Ting Xu 12, Bertelsmann Foundation, Dr. Thieß Petersen, Bertelsmann Stiftung, and Tianlong Wang, China Center for International Economic Exchanges (CCIEE), Cash in Hand, Bertelsmann Foundation, 2012, <http://www.bfna.org/sites/default/files/publications/Cash%20in%20Hand%20Second%20Edition%20final.pdf>

The lack of transparency surrounding the CFIUS process–particularly the lack of a clearly defined¶ industry blacklist or a set of credibility criteria guiding review of investments—has created¶ uncertainty among investors. This in turn may deter otherwise benign and mutually beneficial¶ FDI from China. However, **the emphasis on CFIUS and on the deterred deals by media is largely**¶ **overblown** and it taints the image that in general the U.S. wants to attract Chinese FDI. CFIUS has¶ covered 313 transactions from 2008–2010, only 16 of which involved Chinese acquirers compared¶ to 91 transactions of UK origin. That said, it is understandable that Chinese companies are under¶ heavier scrutiny, given that Japan over the same period had roughly the same number of covered¶ transactions, while the Netherlands and Finland combined had fewer than China (CFIUS 2011,¶ 18). These countries take a far more significant share in FDI in the U.S. than China (See Figure 9).¶ Even so, **most of the Chinese transactions covered by CFIUS moved forward without any problem.**¶Although CNOOC hit a wall in 2005 trying to acquire Unocal, its acquisition of offshore fields in¶ the Gulf of Mexico in 2009 was unopposed and the company successfully closed on a multi-billion¶ dollar investment in Chesapeake Energy Corp in 2010. While Huawei was not able to acquire¶ network gear maker 3Com, Lenovo’s acquisition of IBM’s personal computer division was cleared¶ by CFIUS. In 2011, the Chinese Aviation Industry General Aircraft Co. also successfully acquired¶ U.S. aircraft maker Cirrus after CFIUS review.

### 1NC --- Chinese FDI High

#### Chinese FDI is high – across a range of industries – including oil and natural gas

Daniel H. Rosen 12, partner at the Rhodium Group, and Thilo Hanemann research director at the Rhodium Group, “The Rise in Chinese Overseas Investment and What It Means for American Businesses,” China Business Review, July-September 2012, https://www.chinabusinessreview.com/public/1207/rosen.html

China accounts for only a tiny share of total foreign direct investment in the United States, but the upward trend is clearly underway. A new assessment of FDI flows calculated by the Rhodium Group shows that Chinese firms are now operating in at least 37 of 50 states and have investments across a wide range of US industries. Chinese investment in the United States grew from less than $1 billion annually before 2008 to $2 billion in 2009 and $5 billion in 2010 (see Fig. 2). While fewer deals were made in the second half of 2011, dragging down the full year figure to $4.5 billion, investment picked up again in the first months of 2012. Several large scale acquisitions have already closed, for example Sinopec Shanghai Petrochemical Co.'s (Sinopec) $2.5 billion investment in five shale oil and gas fields owned by Oklahoma-based Devon Energy Corp. and the $2.6 billion acquisition of movie theater operator AMC Entertainment Holdings by China's Dalian Wanda Group Co. Several big manufacturing deals are also in the pipeline for 2012, such as Golden Dragon Precise Copper Tube Group, Inc.'s $100 million copper tubing plant in Alabama, and a massive $5 billion solar project by ENN Mojave Energy Corp. in Nevada. If the ENN deal goes through, it would be equivalent to all Chinese investment in the United States in 2011.

### 1NC --- Political Backlash Turn

#### CFIUS reviews encourage Chinese oil companies to prudently negotiate the American political climate to avoid backlash

WSJ 12 --- China Foothold in U.S. Energy, 3-6-12, http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:qnxJVCUg4KgJ:online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204883304577223083067806776.html+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a

**China's new approach to investing in U.S. energy companies suggests it has learned lessons about how to make the industry and American politicians more comfortable with Chinese money**. "Buy a portion of that company, work together with that company, and that company is your strongest ally in the U.S.," says S. Ming Sung, a former executive at Royal Dutch Shell PLC who has advised Sinopec and is now an adviser to several organizations that promote clean energy.¶ Sinopec's Mr. Fu, who declined to comment for this article, has been China's most visible proponent of the new approach. Born in China's remote northern Heilongjiang province, the 60-year-old executive earned a master's degree in petroleum engineering in 1986 from the University of Southern California, where he now serves on the board of trustees. Like other leaders of major state-run companies, he is a senior member of the Communist Party.¶ Those who know him say his technical and operational knowledge of the oil industry is considerable. "He built his foundation in engineering," said Iraj Ershaghi, a professor of petroleum engineering at USC who taught Mr. Fu in the 1980s.¶ Mr. Fu joined Cnooc when the state-owned company was set up in 1982, and held senior positions in its joint ventures with foreign companies such as Shell and the former Phillips Petroleum, now part of ConocoPhillips .¶ By 2005, China's oil consumption was surging, and Chinese companies of all sorts were beginning to explore major acquisitions abroad.¶ Mr. Fu, by then Cnooc's chairman, began negotiating directly with Unocal's then Chief Executive Charles Williamson to buy the El Segundo, Calif.-based company for $18.5 billion. News of the offer brought criticism from U.S. lawmakers, who argued the deal would put crucial U.S. energy resources in Chinese hands. U.S. lawmakers passed a resolution asking the Bush administration to review any Unocal-Cnooc deal. ¶ Mr. Fu spoke out publicly in defense of the deal—an unusual move for the leader of a state-controlled company. In an opinion piece in The Wall Street Journal titled "Why is America Worried?", he argued that most of Unocal's reserves were outside the U.S. anyway, and that Cnooc would preserve American jobs and "will be an open and responsible participant in the process."¶ Nevertheless, members of the Committee for Foreign Investment in the U.S., an interagency body chaired by the Treasury Department, indicated they would recommend that President George W. Bush block the deal, say people briefed by members. The Treasury Department declined to comment, saying it doesn't talk publicly about specific cases reviewed by the committee.¶ After lawmakers passed language in a bill that would delay a deal, Mr. Fu pulled the offer. Cnooc blamed "unprecedented political opposition." Unocal subsequently was bought by Chevron for $17.3 billion.¶ In a 2006 interview with the Journal, Mr. Fu said that Cnooc "learned we need to be more prudent in terms of public relations and political lobbying when dealing with such a big deal.We now understand American politics better."¶ In the wake of the busted deal, Chinese energy firms shied away from North America. State-owned oil companies began striking energy deals elsewhere in the world, such as in Nigeria and Yemen, which gave it access to significant reserves.¶ Meanwhile, back in North America, new techniques were being developed to extract oil and natural gas from shale formations deep underground, from tar sands in Canada, and from deep water in the Gulf of Mexico. Chesapeake and its competitors were rushing to buy drilling rights to U.S. shale fields.¶ Such projects require vastly more capital to drill than conventional reservoirs. A single shale well can cost more than $9 million, U.S. companies say. But the global financial crisis was constricting capital for these expensive projects, so energy companies began looking for new sources of funding.¶ In 2009, China National Petroleum Corp., or PetroChina, bought 60% stakes in two oil-sands projects from a Canadian operator for about $1.9 billion. The following year, Sinopec committed $4.65 billion for a 9% stake in Alberta's Syncrude oil-sands project, one of Canada's biggest energy projects. Last summer, Cnooc agreed to pay $2.1 billion for OPTI Canada Inc., a producer that held a minority stake in a large oil-sands project. There was little political opposition in Canada.¶ Cnooc tiptoed back into the U.S. in 2009 with a small deal to provide development funding and receive a minority stake in some of Statoil ASA's Gulf of Mexico leases.¶ Oklahoma City-based Chesapeake began looking to Asia as a source of capital, says Mr. McClendon, the CEO. In 2010 it sold preferred shares to a unit of Singapore's Temasek Holdings Ltd. and Hopu Investment Management Co., a China-focused private-equity firm. Other investors with ties to the governments of South Korea and China followed with similar investments in Chesapeake.¶ The deals gave Chesapeake "the Good Housekeeping stamp of approval in Asia," says Mr. McClendon. Encouraged, Chesapeake approached Chinese oil companies, and Mr. McClendon developed a rapport with Mr. Fu, who he describes as "comfortable with Americans." Mr. McClendon says Cnooc executives were openly saying: "Since 2005, we haven't had a strategy to invest in the U.S., and we think now is the time to do it."¶ In 2010, Cnooc agreed to pay Chesapeake $1.08 billion for a one-third stake in 600,000 acres in the oil-rich Eagle Ford Shale formation in south Texas, and to spend another $1.08 billion on drilling there. The two executives struck a similar deal, worth nearly $1.3 billion, for stakes in Wyoming and Colorado fields.¶ Messrs. McClendon and Fu were intent on avoiding the kind of political opposition Cnooc faced five years earlier in its ill-fated bid for Unocal. The deals were structured so that Cnooc didn't get an ownership stake in Chesapeake itself and didn't control production.¶ "They didn't come over here and try to buy Chesapeake," Mr. McClendon says. "They came over here to buy a minority, nonoperating interest in an asset and not take the oil and gas home."

#### Failure to effectively negotiate the political climate means Congress and the public will backlash regardless of CFIUS --- scuttles deals --- empirically proven

MATTHEW R. BYRNE 6, J.D., The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, expected 2007, Protecting National Security and Promoting Foreign Investment: Maintaining the Exon-Florio Balance, OHIO STATE LAW JOURNAL, 2006, http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/67.4.byrne\_.pdf

CNOOC’s attempt to acquire Unocal occurred in the summer of 2005. After a much-publicized bidding and public relations war for control of Unocal between CNOOC and another major U.S. oil company, Chevron, Inc., CNOOC’s bid was ultimately defeated by political pressure applied by the United States Congress.8 Many members of Congress had publicly and forcefully expressed grave reservations about the possible national security repercussions if China’s state-owned company gained control of Unocal’s oil reserves.9 This debate led to discussion of not only national security, but also economic security.10 Even though CFIUS never initiated a review of the CNOOC transaction, let alone gave the transaction its approval, numerous members of Congress who feared that the Committee would not block the transaction began to suggest that changes to the Exon-Florio statute were in order as a means to address these concerns.11¶ This debate over changes to Exon-Florio resumed in early 2006, when DPW attempted to purchase Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. (“P&O”), a British firm, in a $6.8 billion deal.12 With the acquisition of P&O, the Dubai-based company would have acquired operational control of certain terminals at six U.S. ports.13 The revelation that CFIUS had approved the deal set off a firestorm of criticism on Capitol Hill as members and leaders of both political parties in Congress denounced the merger.14 Though DPW and the Bush Administration agreed to conduct an additional fortyfive- day investigation under the CFIUS statute, the House Appropriations Committee voted 62–2 to effectively block the transaction, and under intense political pressure DPW agreed to transfer its U.S. ports interests to an American buyer.15 In the midst of the ports controversy, legislation was proposed in Congress not only to block the deal, but also to make substantial changes to the Exon-Florio statute in an attempt to strengthen the CFIUS review process.16 As of the time this Note goes to publication, committees in both the House and Senate have approved legislation that would modify the Exon-Florio statute.17 The full bodies have not yet approved these bills, their significant differences have not been reconciled in a conference committee, and the President has not signed a bill. Therefore, these bills’ proposed changes to the statute are still mere possibilities, not certainties.

### 1NC---China Relations Defense

#### Relations resilient

Wan 10 (China: U.S. relations 'sound', 7 September 2010, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/09/06/AR2010090603660.html)

At a time of tension in U.S.-China relations, a three-day visit by senior U.S. officials to Beijing began Monday with signs that Chinese leaders want to smooth over some key frictions. "Sound" and "stable" was how a top Communist Party official described the two countries' relationship while receiving the U.S. delegation, which included National Economic Council Director Lawrence H. Summers and deputy national security adviser Thomas Donilon. The meeting comes after the U.S.-China relationship has been battered on several fronts. The United States has fought with China during the past few months over China's trade surplus and currency valuation, with little to show for it. U.S.-South Korea military exercises near the Chinese coast have incensed Chinese officials, as did President Obama's meeting with the exiled Tibetan spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, and a U.S. arms sale to Taiwan, both of which happened earlier this year. Rhetoric on both sides has ratcheted up in recent weeks on national security issues - with China's state-owned party papers denouncing U.S. interference in South China Sea issues, and Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton responding in July at an Association of Southeast Asian Nations meeting that the area is part of her country's "national interest," which set off more fuming in party papers. On Monday, both sides expressed hope that meetings between U.S. and Chinese officials scheduled in coming weeks may help thaw some of the recent difficulties. "Although there were some disturbances in China-U.S. relations, in April and May after President Obama and President Hu Jintao had two meetings, our relations have gotten back on a sound track," Li Yuanchao, head of the section in the Chinese government that oversees senior party appointments, said before the closed-door talks began. Later Monday, according to the Associated Press, Summers told Vice Premier Wang Qishan that Obama "has emphasized for us the importance he attaches to a very strong relationship between the United Sates and China." Among this visit's top issues, Summers added, is setting up a trip for Hu to Washington. Still to come in the next few months are Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao's visit in a few weeks to the U.N. General Assembly in New York, a meeting of the U.S.-China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade and the Group of 20 summit, where additional China-U.S. talks may occur. Hu is likely to visit the United States in January. Some of the most pressing issues in this week's meetings involve the Korean Peninsula, said Shi Yinhong, an international studies professor at Beijing's Renmin University. There have been icy feelings all around, he said, since the Cheonan, a warship belonging to U.S. ally South Korea, was sunk near the border of China's ally, North Korea. "Neither China nor the U.S. wants to make a concession on this," Shi said, "but the two countries also don't seem to want the relationship to deteriorate again."

#### No risk of military or nuclear confrontation between US-China—economic interdependence

Perry & Scowcroft, 9 – \*Professor at Stanford University, \*\*Resident Trustee of the Forum for International Policy (William & Brent, 2009, “US Nuclear Weapons Policy,” Council on Foreign Relations)

Economic interdependence provides an incentive to avoid military conflict and nuclear confrontation. Although the United States has expressed concern about the growing trade deficit with China, the economies of the two countries have become increasingly intertwined and interdependent. U.S. consumers have bought massive quantities of cheap Chinese goods, and Beijing has lent huge amounts of money to the United States. Similarly, Taiwan and the mainland are increasingly bound in a reciprocal economic relationship. These economic relation- ships should reduce the probability of a confrontation between China and Taiwan, and keep the United States and China from approach- ing the nuclear brink, were such a confrontation to occur. On other nuclear issues, China and the United States have generally supported each other, as they did in the six-party talks to dismantle North Korea’s nuclear weapons programs. Here, the supportive Beijing-Washington relationship points toward potentially promising dialogues on larger strategic issues.

### Iran Advantage

### 1NC Iran Defense

#### No impact to nuclear Iran – doesn’t snowball or cause aggression

**Layne 9** – Int’l Affairs Prof, Texas A&M, Visiting Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies, Cato Institute (Christopher, America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq, Review of International Studies 35, Cambridge Journals)

Of course, hard-line US neoconservatives reject this approach and argue that a nuclear-armed Iran would have three bad consequences: there could be a nuclear arms race in the Middle East; Iran might supply nuclear weapons to terrorists; and Tehran could use its nuclear weapons to blackmail other states in the region, or to engage in aggression. Each of these scenarios, however, is improbable.24 A nuclear Iran will not touch off a proliferation snowball in the Middle East. Israel, of course, already is a nuclear power. The other three states that might be tempted to go for a nuclear weapons capability are Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey. However, each of these states would be under strong pressure not to do so, and Saudi Arabia lacks the industrial and engineering capabilities to develop nuclear weapons indigenously. Notwithstanding the Bush administration’s hyperbolic rhetoric, Iran is not going to give nuclear weapons to terrorists. This is not to deny Tehran’s close links to groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. However, there are good reasons that states – even those that have ties to terrorists – draw the line at giving them nuclear weapons (or other WMD): if the terrorists were to use these weapons against the US or its allies, the weapons could be traced back to the donor state, which would be at risk of annihilation by an American retaliatory strike.25 Iran’s leaders have too much at stake to run this risk. Even if one believes the administration’s claims that rogue state leaders are indifferent to the fate of their populations, they do **care very much** about the survival of their regimes, which means that they can be deterred. For the same reason, Iran’s possession of nuclear weapons will not invest Tehran with options to attack, or intimidate its neighbours. Israel’s security with respect to Iran is guaranteed by its own formidable nuclear deterrent capabilities. By the same token, just as it did in Europe during the Cold War, the US can extend its own deterrence umbrella to protect its clients in the region – Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states, and Turkey. American security guarantees not only will dissuade Iran from acting recklessly, but also restrain proliferation by negating the incentives for states like Saudi Arabia and Turkey to acquire their own nuclear weapons. Given the overwhelming US advantage in both nuclear and conventional military capabilities, Iran is not going to risk national suicide by challenging America’s security commitments in the region. In short, while a nuclear-armed Iran hardly is desirable, neither is it ‘intolerable’, because it could be contained and deterred successfully by the US.

#### No middle east war

Cook 7**—**CFR senior fellow for Mid East Studies. BA in international studies from Vassar College, an MA in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and both an MA and PhD in political science from the University of Pennsylvania(Steven, Ray Takeyh, CFR fellow, and Suzanne Maloney, Brookings fellow, 6 /28, Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast, http://www.iht.com/bin/print.php?id=6383265, AG)

Underlying this anxiety was a scenario in which Iraq's sectarian and ethnic violence spills over into neighboring countries, producing conflicts between the major Arab states and Iran as well as Turkey and the Kurdistan Regional Government. These wars then destabilize the entire region well beyond the current conflict zone, involving heavyweights like Egypt. This is scary stuff indeed, but with the exception of the conflict between Turkey and the Kurds, the scenario is far from an accurate reflection of the way Middle Eastern leaders view the situation in Iraq and calculate their interests there. It is abundantly clear that major outside powers like Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey are heavily involved in Iraq. These countries have so much at stake in the future of Iraq that it is natural they would seek to influence political developments in the country. Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, **the region has** also **developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.**

#### No impact---Iranian prolif will be stabilizing

Robert D. Kaplan 11 is a national correspondent for The Atlantic and a senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security, AND Stephen S. Kaplan is a research associate in the Brookings Institution, “America Primed” Feb 23 http://nationalinterest.org/article/america-primed-4892

Moreover, a nuclear-armed Iran is not a worst-case scenario. Tehran would have a few uncertain weapons, though perhaps with a confident missile arsenal of various ranges, and an early-warning system the United States and Israel could penetrate at will, even as they would bear down on Iran with all the might of their own, far-vaster nuclear arsenals. In addition, a nuclear Islamic Republic would further weaken the influence of Egypt and Saudi Arabia, and force them to rely on Israel and the United States for deterrence, even as they might develop their own nuclear arsenals as a response.

An Egypt and a Saudi Arabia forced to rely implicitly more on Israel for deterrence against Iran are more likely to put pressure on the West Bank Palestinians to conclude a peace deal with the Jewish state (though, it must be said, prospects for Middle East peace are slim under almost any circumstance). As much as liberal internationalists and neoconservatives rightly trumpet the broad benefits of democracy during this unprecedented time of democratic upheaval, it has been only Arab autocrats who have thus far come to an accord with Israel. Autocrats can act boldly, even as they can efficiently purge dissenting members of their own circles who disagree with new policies, exactly as Egypt’s President Anwar el-Sadat and Jordan’s King Hussein did in making peace with Israel. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas’s ability to act likewise is questionable.

Indeed, the ascent of Iranian influence is not an altogether bad development. It was lethargic Sunni Arab dictatorships, nominally pro-American, whose societies supplied the social and political conditions for the emergence of the 9/11 terrorists. The toppling of Saddam Hussein, and the consequent rise of Shia Iran as a regional power, has finally shocked sclerotic Arab leaders into actions that benefit U.S. interests: moving a bit nearer to Israel and working more closely with America. An Iranian Shia power that balances against a Sunni Arab world, democratic or not, would be an ideal outcome were Iran to go through a whole or even partial political transformation. Shia power in the future will not necessarily speak with one voice, given the prospect of ongoing tensions between Tehran and Baghdad. For even a weak Shia state in Iraq will offer a political and theological alternative to the Islamic Republic. (This is not to justify the costs of invading Iraq, only to mention the few benefits that have emerged from the effort.) And Turkey, whose Islamic democracy makes the United States uncomfortable, still has an appeal to the Arab masses on the basis of religion rather than ethnicity which serves a useful purpose: it implicitly checks Iran.

A divided Middle East, coupled with an Arab world weakened by domestic strife, has much to recommend itself for the future of American power. And demographic, cultural and other indicators point to a positive ideological and philosophical shift in Iranian politics in the future. This prognosis, coupled with the difficulties inherent in a wholly successful U.S. strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities, leads to the containment of a nuclear Iran—should sanctions and industrial sabotage not work in the long run—as the least-bad option, and the one least likely to embroil the United States even deeper in the Middle East.

#### No chance of a terrorist attack

Mueller 8/2—IR prof at Ohio State. PhD in pol sci from UCLA (2 August 2011, John, The Truth about Al Qaeda, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68012/john-mueller/the-truth-about-al-qaeda?page=show)

As a misguided Turkish proverb holds, "If your enemy be an ant, imagine him to be an elephant." The new information unearthed in Osama bin Laden's hideout in Abbottabad, Pakistan, suggests that the United States has been doing so for a full decade. Whatever al Qaeda's threatening rhetoric and occasional nuclear fantasies, its potential as a menace, particularly as an atomic one, has been much inflated.

The public has now endured a decade of dire warnings about the imminence of a terrorist atomic attack. In 2004, the former CIA spook Michael Scheuer proclaimed on television's 60 Minutes that it was "probably a near thing," and in 2007, the physicist Richard Garwin assessed the likelihood of a nuclear explosion in an American or a European city by terrorism or other means in the next ten years to be 87 percent. By 2008, Defense Secretary Robert Gates mused that what keeps every senior government leader awake at night is "the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear." Few, it seems, found much solace in the fact that an al Qaeda computer seized in Afghanistan in 2001 indicated that the group's budget for research on weapons of mass destruction (almost all of it focused on primitive chemical weapons work) was some $2,000 to $4,000.

In the wake of the killing of Osama bin Laden, officials now have more al Qaeda computers, which reportedly contain a wealth of information about the workings of the organization in the intervening decade. A multi-agency task force has completed its assessment, and according to first reports, it has found that al Qaeda members have primarily been engaged in dodging drone strikes and complaining about how cash-strapped they are. Some reports suggest they've also been looking at quite a bit of pornography.

### China Shale Advantage

### 1NC --- Regulatory Experience Turn

#### China no longer fears protectionism as a result of US policy --- CFIUS is good because it forces Chinese corporations to build-up their regulatory experience and capability --- ultimately incentivizes reforms that liberalize the Chinese economy

Daniel H. Rosen 12, partner at the Rhodium Group, and Thilo Hanemann research director at the Rhodium Group, “The Rise in Chinese Overseas Investment and What It Means for American Businesses,” China Business Review, July-September 2012, https://www.chinabusinessreview.com/public/1207/rosen.html

Initially, politicians in Washington and elsewhere were caught off guard by rising Chinese investment interest in the United States. Hostile reactions to China National Offshore Oil Corp.'s (CNOOC) 2005 takeover offer for Union Oil Company of California (Unocal), a California-based oil company that later merged with Chevron Corp., left Chinese companies and officials with negative impressions of the US investment environment. US lawmakers were concerned that the deal could affect the availability of oil or endanger US national security. The shadow of the Unocal debacle still looms over the China-US investment relationship, but progress has been made over the past two years on both the federal and local levels. These efforts have helped to reassure Chinese investors that the United States is open for business.¶ Despite the downturn caused by the financial crisis, the Obama administration has stood firmly against calls to use national security reviews for foreign investment as a protectionist tool, and officials have repeatedly emphasized that the United States **welcomes investment from China**. The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (**CFIUS),** which screens investments for national security risks, **has cleared the vast majority of Chinese proposals**, among them acquisitions in sensitive sectors, such as power generation, **shale gas** development, and aviation. At the same time, policymakers in Washington are struggling with legitimate questions related to Chinese investment, such as how to treat investment in telecom networks and other critical infrastructure, and the potential impact of investment by China's state-owned enterprises on competition and markets given the distorted nature of their cost structures back home.¶ Over the past two years, the Obama administration has also stepped up the federal government's efforts to attract foreign investors to the United States. In 2011, the US government beefed up its federal investment promotion effort with a new initiative called "Select USA" to aid foreign investors. Many states have also started to ramp up their efforts to target Chinese investors specifically, opening offices and hosting road shows in China. This increased on-the-ground assistance will help Chinese investors overcome some of the difficulties they have experienced making the move to the United States. ¶ HOME-GROWN PROBLEMS REMAIN KEY IMPEDIMENTS¶ The most significant hurdles for Chinese firms looking to expand their footprint in the United States **are not US policy or politics,** **but a lack of capability and experience with overseas investment in sophisticated markets**. In the past, most Chinese firms were focused on establishing themselves in the competitive domestic market or serving overseas markets through exports. This inward orientation **has left firms ill-prepared for the challenge of going abroad**. And the challenges are only exacerbated for the new generation of overseas investors—mostly firms in the manufacturing and service sectors—who are near the beginning of the learning curve, well behind early frontrunners like China's large oil firms that have been operating in overseas markets for more than a decade.¶ The track record of Chinese investments in North America and Europe illustrates these weaknesses. Many firms have rushed into opportunistic takeover attempts **without careful planning or a clear strategy**. One particular problem is that Chinese firms have to actively manage political risks on two fronts, but often lack the capacity to do so. In addition to navigating through national security screenings and politicization in host countries, Chinese corporations also have to deal with domestic politics in China. Despite gradual liberalization of China's capital controls in past years, firms still need to go through a burdensome and time-consuming approval process for overseas investments. This often involves numerous regulators and bureaucrats with different preferences and attitudes, delaying deals and diminishing the Chinese firm's chances in competitive bids. Sometimes Chinese regulators and industrial policy planners also strong-arm firms into abandoning deals, as when China's Sichuan Tengzhong Heavy Industrial Machinery Co. was forced to relinquish an attempted takeover of US auto brand Hummer in 2010. The purchase of Hummer was not seen as in line with important industrial policy goals, such as consolidation of the fragmented auto sector and the promotion of higher fuel efficiency cars.¶ Other home-grown factors add to the difficulties. The bias of the domestic financial system towards state-owned firms and investments in tangible assets is even more pronounced when it comes to overseas financing, especially smaller firms from China's private sector that struggle to raise financing for overseas projects. More importantly, the weak domestic regulatory environment **leaves China's firms unprepared to do business in highly regulated markets**. This can simply be a drag for operating in the United States, but in some cases it also makes Chinese investors **more vulnerable** to outside attacks by competitors or interest groups. Domestic reforms addressing these weaknesses, such as strengthening corporate governance rules, are urgently needed to accelerate the learning curve of Chinese businesses.¶ IMPLICATIONS FOR AMERICAN BUSINESSES¶ The era of rising Chinese investment will be both sweet and sour for American businesses. In many industries, the emergence of these new Asian multinationals will transform the competitive landscape. Rising overseas Chinese presence will mean new competitors for US firms. The acquisition of foreign brands and technology will make Chinese firms stronger in their home markets, which is in some cases currently dominated by foreign firms, such as autos or luxury goods. OFDI will also help Chinese manufacturers enter markets they have yet to breach. In addition to moving them up the technology ladder, OFDI will help China's pioneers establish local after-sales operations, which was the key for frontrunners including Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., Sany Heavy Industry Co., Ltd., and Haier Group Co. to sell high-tech products in foreign markets.¶ Finally, the emergence of Chinese multinationals will enhance competition for scarce global assets, most importantly human talent. Unlike the multiethnic and diverse workforces typical of Western multinationals, Chinese companies mostly employ young Han Chinese with very little experience in running global operations. China's new multinationals will have to adjust their structures and workforce to be successful in markets abroad, which means a massive demand for talented staff. Several industries are already experiencing a burgeoning hiring spree by new entrants, for example Huawei's local recruiting efforts in the United States and Europe. This is good news for local job markets, but may not be such good news for other multinationals keen on retaining their most valuable staff.¶ On the other hand, a Chinese investment boom will offer plenty of opportunities for well-positioned US firms. In a post-crisis, slow-growth world with significantly lower levels of global FDI, Chinese buyers are a bright spot for divesting assets. Chinese firms are interested in acquiring assets that US firms want to discard when moving up the value chain themselves, such as when International Business Machines Corp. (IBM) sold its PC division to China-based Lenovo Group Ltd. in 2004. The move of Chinese firms into new markets will also offer plenty of opportunities for co-investments and partnerships. China's firms are in a weak position when it comes to running overseas operations for all the reasons discussed above, and just like American multinationals entering China in years past, they will need allies to establish a presence in advanced market economies in the period ahead.¶ One dividend from China's move abroad will be **the benefit of their having to learn to play our game**. For decades, Chinese businesses have operated on a purely domestic field and have therefore remained more or less shielded from foreign regulations and courts. Dumping duties were one of the few legal instruments Chinese firms had to fear. **Going abroad changes this situation fundamentally**. Chinese firms operating in the United States and Europe will have to comply with local laws and regulations, and they are subject to US courts and litigation, giving their competitors a greater arsenal of legal options in the case of improper behavior. **Exposure to foreign regulators should also create a positive feedback loop back into China**, pushing the government to realize that its own legal system is diminishing the chances for these firms to successfully compete overseas. Over the long term, China's new multinationals might even ramp up lobbying efforts with their own government **for a level playing field at home**, once they are able to compete in a rules-based and sophisticated market economy and see this as competitive advantage vis-à-vis less globalized domestic competitors.¶ Finally, growing Chinese investment in developed economies will open up new opportunities in the Chinese market. China still maintains significant controls on capital inflows, and many sectors of the economy remain closed to foreign investment, especially in services. The Chinese government emphasizes that it will continue to open these sectors to private and foreign investment, but in a gradual manner. The growing interest in outward investment in developed economies provides Beijing with an excellent reason to **accelerate the pace of opening** at home, to forestall the unfavorable comparisons of reciprocal treatment which will inevitably arise. **This could well lead to new liberalization in China**, offering wider opportunities for foreign multinationals in industries currently off-limits to them.

#### Market reforms are key to continued Chinese economic growth

Wayne M. Morrison 12, Specialist in Asian Trade and Finance – CRS, “China’s Economic Conditions,” June 26, 2012, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33534.pdf

China’s economy has shown remarkable growth over the past several years, and many economists project that it will enjoy fairly healthy growth in the near future. However, economists caution that these projections are likely to occur **only if China continues to make major reforms to its economy**. Failure to implement such reforms could endanger future growth. They note that China’s current economic model has resulted in a number of negative economic (and social) outcomes, such as over-reliance on fixed investment and exporting for its economic growth, extensive inefficiencies that exist in many sectors (due largely to government industrial policies), wide-spread pollution, and growing income inequality, to name a few. Many of China’s economic problems and challenges stem from its **incomplete transition to a free market economy** and from imbalances that have resulted from the government’s goal of economic growth at all costs.

### --- Shift Away From Coal Now

#### --- China’s moving away from coal now

Ailun Yang 10-15, Senior Associate – World Resources Institute, “What Is The Future Of King Coal In China?” 10-15-12, http://insights.wri.org/news/2012/10/what-future-king-coal-china

China’s great thirst for coal is undeniably troubling from a sustainable development standpoint. However, the situation may be changing. I recently joined three other experts to speak at a Congressional briefing entitled, “Why China Is Acting on Clean Energy: Successes, Challenges, and Implications for U.S. Policy.” While my fellow speakers spoke about the progress of clean energy development in China, I sought to explain how the growing constraints on coal development are acting as one factor **pushing China to move more aggressively towards clean energy.**

What’s Pushing China Toward Clean Energy?

Traditional wisdom has been that China is building massive numbers of new coal-fired plants, and that such development would continue forever. However, two new indicators seem to be telling a different story.

The first and arguably most important indicator is the **weak economic performance of China’s coal power sector**, which accounts for more than half of China’s coal consumption. China’s State Electricity Regulatory Commission (SERC) reported that almost all coal-fired plants have been losing money since last year. Investment in coal-fired plants in 2011 was not even half of what was invested in 2005. About one-third of the proposed new coal–fired plants that have been approved are delaying the start of their construction, resulting in a big slowdown in newly added coal power capacity. In fact, based on the number of coal-fired plants completed this year so far, newly installed capacity is likely to be only half of what was installed last year.

### --- CFIUS Not Key

#### --- Chinese companies are pursuing “hands off” oil deals because of the political conditions --- not CFIUS

Mandel – 1AC author – 12 (Jenny, Reporter for EnergyWire, a daily publication covering the unconventional oil and gas sectors, Previous positions with E%26E include editing Land Letter and writing news and feature stories for Greenwire, ClimateWire, and other news outlets, "Will U.S. shale technology make the leap across the Pacific?," EnergyWire: Tuesday, July 17, 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/07/17/1)

Despite the challenges, the allure of a massive new domestic energy source has the Chinese government and private and state-owned companies moving cautiously toward development. Today, virtually all of the key intellectual property behind shale gas extraction lies with North American companies, and one of the first steps the Chinese have taken is to pour money into U.S. and Canadian ventures where those technologies are in use.

In 2010 and 2011, China National Offshore Oil Corp. (CNOOC) paid $2.3 billion for partial stakes in plays by Chesapeake Energy Corp. in Texas, Wyoming and Colorado. Earlier this year, Sinopec bought into Oklahoma City-based Devon Energy Corp.'s holdings across Louisiana, Mississippi, Colorado, Ohio and Michigan in a $2.5 billion deal. Chinese companies have also aggressively pursued investment deals in Canadian shale projects.

But Johns Hopkins' Kong said attempts by Chinese companies to negotiate North American on-the-job training have been blocked.

The deal with Chesapeake, for example, limited the interaction of CNOOC personnel with sensitive technologies by restricting the company's right to send workers into gas fields, Kong said. "The Chinese companies have agreed deliberately not to send their oil workers to American gas fields and not to participate in boardroom decisions," Kong said. **"The Chinese companies have agreed to this long-term, slow, gradual approach** to gaining know-how in the North American energy sector."

**The caution stems mostly from a political firestorm that broke out when, in 2005, CNOOC tried to buy Unocal** Corp. in an $18.5 billion deal that was eventually withdrawn in the face of opposition from Congress. Since then, **there has been a general awareness among Chinese players of the need to move slowly and avoid raising red flags** (E&ENews PM, Aug. 2, 2005).

So what do Chinese investors gain from these North American investments, then, if not direct access to fracking technologies? "By investing in the U.S. ... they benefit from the spill-over effect," Kong said. They have some personnel involved with the projects, even if they're not learning the nitty-gritty of how to develop a fracking plan, and may be able to pick up some very high-level management expertise that is relevant at home.

### --- No Solvency --- Domestic Impediments

#### --- No solvency --- numerous domestic impediments to Chinese shale development

Kevin Tu 10-24, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, where he directs Carnegie's work on China's energy and climate policies, “Beijing's Problem With Shale,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444734804578062402954326178.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

But China is hardly on track to replicate America's success. Several factors still threaten to trip up Beijing's efforts to bring the shale revolution to the Middle Kingdom.

"Technologically recoverable" is not the same as "economically recoverable." Shale gas deposits in China are generally located in mountainous areas and remote deserts, and are buried deep underground. While the technology exists to extract gas in those conditions, it's not cheap. Drilling costs in China have run as high as $16 million per well, compared to only several million dollars in the United States.

This need for capital is related to the weakest link of China's shale gas industry: the country's inability to attract the right types of developers and incentivize private enterprises to spur much-needed innovations. Major international players, while interested in investing, are well positioned to resist transferring critical technological know-how to their Chinese counterparts—which effectively leads to a prolonged learning curve.

Despite some signs of openness, China has struggled to attract investment from smaller foreign players. Beijing already faced an uphill slog since many smaller American drillers face financial troubles due to low gas prices in their home market. Making matters worse, the legal vacuum for shale gas development (including licensing, exploration and production); a lack of intellectual property rights protection for technology; low gas prices in China; and a dearth of easily recoverable fields for new entrants all are deterring investment.

Beijing also has a hard time attracting the right kind of domestic developers. China lacks strong protections for private property rights, especially in the energy industry. Shale gas investors will have noticed the most recent consolidation of the Shanxi coal industry starting from 2009, in which the government forced mergers among ostensibly private mines and mostly benefited state-owned companies. Not surprisingly, private investors in China are more likely to be interested in short-term speculation instead of long-term investment in research and development that is key to a Chinese shale gas revolution.

Nor will China necessarily reap environmental rewards from shale gas. Hydraulic fracturing—which uses pressurized fluid to break up the shale deposits that contain the gas—is water-intensive and many shale gas fields in China face serious water shortages, making it difficult to scale up output. Even in regions where water availability is less of a concern, inexperienced or irresponsible drilling practices risk fresh water contamination.

Though China currently has only 62 shale gas wells in trial development zones, Beijing has recognized the importance of water management in China's Shale Gas Development Plan for 2011-2015. Even so, China's problematic environmental enforcement records and the country's highly fragmented water governance mechanism certainly do not necessarily hold the promise of moving the water management agenda toward the right direction.

Shale gas can improve China's environment and energy security. But there are too many barriers that will prevent China from duplicating America's success. The shale revolution can certainly spread across the Pacific one day. But for that to happen, Beijing will need a major revamp of basic policies such as protection of property rights.

#### No solvency --- technical difficulties, complex geology, lack of a pipeline, and artificial pricing

Leslie Hook 12, “Country focus: China faces difficulties in shale gas production,” Financial Times, 3-28-12, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/3fcc49a4-71de-11e1-90b5-00144feab49a.html#axzz2AFOYdPa5

Shale gas is **technically difficult** to extract and China’s national oil companies are relatively new to unconventional extraction techniques.

To acquire the necessary expertise, they have invested billions of dollars in shale oil and gas projects in the US, such as Sinopec’s recent $2.5bn deal with Devon Energy of Oklahoma to invest in shale oil and gas projects in the US.

At home, China’s oil majors are partnering with foreign companies, including Shell and Chevron, to explore shale resources.

Scientists say the country’s **complex geology** will be a challenge, particularly in the Sichuan basin, which contains huge gas resources but is highly fractured, making it difficult to drill the horizontal wells needed to extract shale gas.

Even after the gas is out of the ground, further obstacles remain: China lacks a widespread pipeline infrastructure that would allow it to be transported efficiently across the country. And natural gas prices, which are controlled by the state, are kept at low levels that discourage investment in explorationbecause oil projects are much more lucrative at current prices.

### --- No Solvency --- Long Timeframe

#### --- Timeframe for solving is at least a decade

Mandel – 1AC author – 12 (Jenny, Reporter for EnergyWire, a daily publication covering the unconventional oil and gas sectors, Previous positions with E%26E include editing Land Letter and writing news and feature stories for Greenwire, ClimateWire, and other news outlets, "Will U.S. shale technology make the leap across the Pacific?," EnergyWire: Tuesday, July 17, 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/07/17/1)

The University of Alberta's Jiang said Chinese shale interests, including both government and industry players, are undecided on how to move forward and how much to focus on domestic development versus lower-cost production overseas. "I don't think they have reached a conclusion one way or the other," he said. As a result, the country pursues "a two legs walking approach -- on the one side they want to explore domestic possibilities, on the other they want to explore possibilities with lower ... prices" elsewhere.

**That likely means a timeline of a decade, at a minimum, before Chinese shale gas resources are well-understood and a clear path to their development emerges, and potentially as long as two decades**, observers say.

### CCP Collapse Defense

#### CCP is resilient

Kurlantzick 11— Fellow at the USC School of Public Diplomacy and the Pacific Council on International Policy. Frmr visiting scholar in the China program at Carnegie. (Joshua, Beijing has bought itself a respite from middle class revolt, 7 March 2011, http://www.thenational.ae/thenationalconversation/comment/beijing-has-bought-itself-a-respite-from-middle-class-revolt?pageCount=0)

As governments across North Africa have been overthrown or are seemingly near the verge of collapse, some Chinese writers and activists are hopeful that this democratic wave might sweep over the world's largest and most powerful authoritarian state. Unknown Chinese activists have anonymously posted an online manifesto calling for their own "Jasmine Revolution". Groups of protesters - even joined by the American ambassador to China - have gathered in Beijing to heed the call for revolt. The Chinese authorities, taking no chances, **quickly shut down protests** and apparently jailed some of the demonstrators. They have also been blocking any internet discussion of activists' "Jasmine Manifesto".

But despite Beijing's quick response, in reality China's leadership has far less to fear than Hosni Mubarak or Muammar Qaddafi. For one thing, unlike in many parts of the Middle East, **China's urbanised centres haven't turned against the regime.** Instead, most city residents essentially support, or at least tolerate, the regime. And why not? The government has been very, very good to them, as Minxin Pei, a professor at Claremont McKenna College, documented in his book China's Trapped Transition.

After the 1989 Tiananmen protests, the Chinese Communist Party, recognising the power of educated urban protesters, delivered a raft of new incentives to co-opt the urban middle class. The government directed growth to urban areas, and launched other pro-middle class programmes. These included higher salaries for academics and other professionals; restrictions on rural people's housing and schools so that peasants cannot attend many of the best urban institutions; and opening the Party to membership for entrepreneurs, many of whom eagerly joined as a business networking opportunity. The Party reinforces the middle class content with the status quo by using speeches and state media to suggest that, in a democracy, total freedom of movement would allow rural peasants to swamp the cities, ruining the standard of living in wealthier urban areas.

All these incentives are reasons why Chinese city residents in polls show high appreciation of the current state of affairs. In one recent survey, nearly 90 per cent of Chinese expressed satisfaction with the current station of their nation; since these polls, conducted by telephone, are focused on urban areas, they represent more closely the views of the urban middle class.

China's leaders also are not as out of touch, isolated or brittle as some of those in the Middle East. The Communist Party may be an authoritarian regime and there is certainly plenty of corruption - one Chinese scholar estimates that corruption costs China more than $80 billion (Dh294 billion) in growth each year. Still, the leadership now is a collective one, and no single official amasses the type of enormous wealth of leaders like Tunisia's Zine El Abidine Ben Ali. China's collective leadership, unlike in Mao's time, also has some ability to listen to and respond to public opinion. In 2008, for example, protests in Tibet initially were met by a relatively moderate response from the central government. But angry online sentiment - the Chinese blogosphere is highly nationalist and often conservative - partly prompted a tougher crackdown, according to Chinese officials and scholars.

Perhaps most importantly, unlike much of the Middle East, China's economy is booming, and not simply because of resource extraction. In Tunisia, and then in Egypt, protests erupted after immolations by young men and women who, although they had undergraduate degrees, were unable to find work in economies that could not keep pace with growing populations. Although Chinese university graduates certainly have a tougher time finding jobs than they did several years ago, the Chinese economy continues to boom: China grew by more than 9 per cent last year, during a global economic crisis, and will likely grow at least as much this year, a rate it has kept up for roughly three decades (the Chinese premier, Wen Jiabao, downgraded that to 7 per cent this week). Educated young men and women still can find high-paying jobs, particularly if they are willing to move to interior cities that have been prioritised by the central government.

And, unlike in places like Egypt, foreign powers such as the United States - which has sold roughly $2 trillion in government debt to China - do not have much leverage over the People's Republic. In the early 1990s, when China remained a global pariah because of the 1989 Tiananmen crackdown, America had more leverage to push Beijing on human rights and democracy, and President Bill Clinton, during a visit to the country, publicly and harshly criticised China's record on rights.

Today, the story is much different. Dependent on China not only to keep the American economy propped up but also for cooperation on global issues like trade and climate change, the Obama administration has taken a much softer approach to Beijing. When Barack Obama headed to China for the first time as president in the fall of 2009, he agreed to a "press conference" with the Chinese president Hu Jintao at which the two actually took no questions, and when the American president held a town forum with Chinese students, he delivered none of the broadsides against China's rights record that his predecessor had.

Any change that happens in China in the future is going to come from domestic events, not from external pressure. **But don't expect that change to happen anytime soon.**

### China/Russia War Defense

#### No Sino/Russia war

Weitz 11---Director, Center for Political-Military Analysis Senior Fellow Hudson Institute. PhD in pol sci from Harvard (Richard, China-Russia relations and the United States: At a turning point?, <http://en.rian.ru/valdai_op/20110414/163523421.html>)

Since the end of the Cold War, the improved political and economic relationship between Beijing and Moscow has affected a range of international security issues. China and Russia have expanded their bilateral economic and security cooperation. In addition, they have pursued distinct, yet parallel, policies regarding many global and regional issues.

Yet, Chinese and Russian approaches to a range of significant subjects are still largely uncoordinated and at times in conflict. Economic exchanges between China and Russia remain minimal compared to those found between most friendly countries, let alone allies.

Although stronger Chinese-Russian ties could present greater challenges to other countries (e.g., the establishment of a Moscow-Beijing condominium over Central Asia), several factors make it unlikely that the two countries will form such a bloc.

The relationship between the Chinese and Russian governments is perhaps the best it has ever been. The leaders of both countries engage in numerous high-level exchanges, make many mutually supportive statements, and manifest other displays of Russian-Chinese cooperation in what both governments refer to as their developing strategic partnership.

The current benign situation is due less to common values and shared interests than to the fact that Chinese and Russian security concerns are predominately directed elsewhere.

Although both countries have experienced a geopolitical resurgence during the past two decades, Chinese and Russian security concerns are not directed at each other but rather focus on different areas and issues, with the notable exceptions of maintaining stability in Central Asia and constraining North Korea’s nuclear activities.

Most Chinese policy makers worry about the rise of separatist movements and Islamist terrorism in western China and about a potential military clash with the United States in the Asia-Pacific region, especially regarding Taiwan and the contested maritime regions of the South China and East China Seas.

In contrast, most Russian analysts see terrorism in the North Caucasus, maintaining influence in Europe, and managing security relations with Washington as the main security challenges to their country.

Neither Chinese nor Russian military experts perceive a near-term military threat from the other’s country. The Russian government has even provided sophisticated navy, air, and air defense platforms to the Chinese military, confident that the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) would only employ these systems, if at all, against other countries. In addition, China and Russia have resolved their longstanding border disputes as well as contained their rivalries in Central Asia, the Korean Peninsula, and other regions.

Since the Soviet Union’s disintegration in the early 1990s, China and Russia have resolved important sources of their Cold War-era tensions. Through protracted negotiations, the two governments have largely solved their boundary disputes, which had erupted in armed border clashes in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The stoking of anti-Chinese sentiment by politicians in the Russian Far East impeded the ability of Russia’s first President, Boris Yeltsin, to make substantial progress during the 1990s in demarcating the Russia-China border. These politicians sought to rally local support by accusing Moscow of planning to surrender territory to Beijing. By the mid-2000s, Yeltsin’s successor, Vladimir Putin, managed to centralize sufficient political power in the Kremlin to ignore these local sentiments. Furthermore, Russia and China have demilitarized their lengthy shared frontier through a series of arms control and disarmament measures.

Chinese and Russian leaders share a commitment to a philosophy of state sovereignty (non-interference) and territorial integrity (against separatism). Although Russian and Chinese leaders defend national sovereignty by appealing to international law, their opposition also reflects more pragmatic considerations---a shared desire to shield their human rights and civil liberties practices, and those of their allies, from Western criticism.

Chinese and Russian officials refuse to criticize each other’s foreign and domestic policies in public. They also have issued many joint statements calling for a multi-polar world in which no one country (e.g., the United States) dominates. During the past few years, their leaders have commonly blamed American economic mismanagement for precipitating the global recession.

They regularly advocate traditional interpretations of national sovereignty that exempt a government’s internal policies from foreign criticism. Beijing and Moscow oppose American democracy promotion efforts, U.S. missile defense programs, and Washington’s alleged plans to militarize outer space.

The two countries strive to uphold the authority of the United Nations, where the Chinese and Russian delegations frequently collaborate to dilute resolutions seeking to impose sanctions on Burma, Iran, Zimbabwe, and other governments they consider friendly. In July 2008, they finally demarcated the last pieces of their 4,300-km (2,700 mile) frontier, one of the world’s longest land borders, ending a decades-long dispute.

Chinese and Russian officials have expressed concern about the efforts by the United States and its allies to strengthen their ballistic missile defense (BMD) capabilities. Their professed fear is that these strategic defense systems, in combination with the strong American offensive nuclear capabilities, might enable the United States to obtain nuclear superiority over China and Russia.

Both governments have also expressed unease regarding U.S. military programs in the realm of outer space. Russian and Chinese experts claim that the United States is seeking to acquire the means to orchestrate attacks in space against Russian and Chinese reconnaissance satellites and long-range ballistic missiles, whose trajectories passes through the upper atmosphere. In response, the Russian and Chinese governments have proposed various arms control initiatives purportedly aimed at preventing the militarization of space.

For example, the Russian and Chinese representatives have unsuccessfully sought for years at the UN Conference on Disarmament to negotiate a treaty on the “Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space,” which would seek to prohibit the militarization of outer space. More recently, China and Russia have submitted a joint Space Treaty to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, which would impose legal constraints on how the United States could use outer space. They have sought to link progress on other international arms control initiatives to the adoption of these space limitations.

The bilateral defense relationship has evolved in recent years to become more institutionalized and better integrated. As befits two large and powerful neighbors, the senior military leaders of Russia and China now meet frequently in various formats. Their direct encounters include annual meetings of their defense ministers and their armed forces chiefs of staff. Since 1997, they have also organized yearly “strategic consultations” between their deputy chiefs of the general staff. In March 2008, the Chinese defense minister established a direct telephone line with his Russian counterpart, the first such ministerial hotline ever created by China and another country. In December 2008, the chiefs of the Chinese and Russian general staffs created their own direct link.

Senior Russian and Chinese defense officials also typically participate in the regular heads of government meetings between Russia and China, which occur about once a year as bilateral summits. They also confer frequently at sessions of multinational gatherings, such as at meetings of the SCO, which host regular sessions for defense ministers. Contacts are even more common among mid-level military officers, especially those in charge of border security units and military units in neighboring Chinese and Russian territories.

Russian and Chinese military experts also engage in regular direct discussions related to their functional expertise such as communications, engineering, and mapping. Substantial academic exchanges also regularly occur. More than 1,000 Chinese students have studied at over 20 Russian military academies since 1996. The two defense communities conduct a number of larger exchanges and engagements. The best known are the major biennial military exercises that they have been holding since 2005, but smaller-scale engagements also frequently occur.

Chinese and Russian leaders also have developed shared perspectives and independent offensive capabilities regarding governmental activities in the cyber domain. The two governments have been developing their information warfare capabilities and now possess an extensive variety of offensive and defensive tools in this domain.

Furthermore, recent revelations regarding Chinese cyber-espionage activities suggest the extent to which Chinese operatives have penetrated Western information networks. In Russia’s case, cyber attacks against Estonia, Georgia, and other countries illustrate the extensive offensive capabilities available to that country’s forces. Russia’s hybrid August 2008 campaign against Georgia was particularly effective in disabling Georgia’s infrastructure as well as demonstrating a potential capacity to inflict widespread physical damage.

Both countries appear to have already conducted extensive surveying of U.S. digital vulnerabilities and to have prepared targeted campaign plans to exploit U.S. network vulnerabilities if necessary. Although these offensive and defensive preparations are being conducted independently, the Chinese and Russian governments are collaborating, along with other Eurasian allies in the SCO, to deny Internet resources to civil liberties groups and other opponents of their regimes.

Central Asia perhaps represents the geographic region where the security interests of China and Russia most overlap. Although China and Russia often compete for Central Asian energy supplies and commercial opportunities, the two governments share a desire to limit potential instability in the region. They especially fear ethnic separatism in their border territories supported by Islamic fundamentalist movements in Central Asia. Russian authorities dread the prospect of continued instability in the northern Caucasus, especially Chechnya and neighboring Dagestan. China’s leaders worry about separatist agitation in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region.

The shared regional security interests between Beijing and Moscow have meant that the newly independent states of Central Asia---Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan---have become a generally unifying element in Chinese-Russian relations. Their overlapping security interests in Central Asia have manifested themselves most visibly in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO).\

### Sino/India War Defense

#### China and India will cooperate – they’re on the same side of all major issues

Jing 10 (Huang Jing - Professor, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, served as interlocutor the Dalai Lama and Chinese authorities. “India, China need each other to change the world,” July 23, 2010, http://news.rediff.com/column/2010/jul/23/india-china-need-each-other-to-change-the-world.htm)

Fundamental changes have taken place since the 1990s, and these changes have made cooperation the only option for China and India to sustain their ascendancy. First and foremost, unlike previous powers whose rise was preconditioned by the global reach of their military capability, China and India cannot rise through expansion backed by military might in today's world. Rather, China and India are rising through integration into the existing world system amidst globalisation; and, this world system is based on capitalism and is dominated by developed countries. Thus, reform, not military power, has been the precondition for the rise of China and India. Only by changing themselves first, in order to join the world, can a rising China and India help change the world. The pursuit of a similar path in their ascendancy has resulted in common interests and demands. Rising as status quo powers, India and China have a shared demand to reform the existing world system, so that it can continuously facilitate, rather than hinder, their development. This explains why on major global issues -- from environmental concerns to food security and from restructuring the world financial system to trade policies -- India and China are naturally on the same side. Beneath these common interests lies the fact that India and China are facing the same fundamental challenge in their endeavours for modernisation. Yet the established model to achieve this goal -- modernisation through industrialisation -- is unsustainable because the experience of the developed countries shows that industrialisation means massive consumption of natural resources and rampant urbanisation. Given the combined population of 2.5 billion people, western-style industrialisation in India and China would bring doomsday. Thus, it is a joint mission for India and China to find an alternative path and, moreover, to persuade the developed countries to support this mission and help pay up the environmental deficit that had been accumulated in their modernisation process. Bilateral cooperation also serves the interests of India and China on other more pressing issues. "Water shortage looms for China, India" -- this eye-catching Bloomberg headline on May 31, 2010 indicates a looming crisis of water in India, China and all the Asian-continental countries, where the flowing water comes from the same place. As water has become a vital economic resource and an important strategic asset, bilateral cooperation between the two big powers in Asia is the key to solve this problem. Confrontation will only make everyone the loser. Nowadays, India and China also find convergent concern rather than divergent interest on the Pakistan issue. Lingering instability, rapid expansion of fundamentalist influences, and persistent military dominance since the start of the Afghan war have dramatically increased Pakistan's profile in China's security concerns, especially after the violent, explosive riot in Xinjiang on July 5, 2009. China and India will have to work together to promote stability and development in Pakistan, with a military under solid civilian control and an economy integrated regionally. Even on the thorny border issue, bilateral cooperation brings more benefits. Beijing [ Images ] and New Delhi [ Images ] have keenly realised that the border dispute involves strong nationalistic resentment because it roots deep in the injustice both nations had endured during the colonial period. Any compromise on this issue -- even if necessary -- can provoke damaging backlashes in domestic politics. Thus, the bilateral approach towards the border dispute, as indicated by the dialogue between National Security Advisor M K Narayanan and State Councilor Dai Bingguo in August 2009, is to seek effective management, rather than a premature solution. Obviously, it takes constant consultations to manage the dispute and prevent explosive escalation. Indeed, bilateral cooperation demands a forward-looking vision. The explosive increase in Sino-India trade -- from merely $2 billion in 2000 to over $60 billion in 2009 -- is but a footnote of the unfolding momentum in bilateral relations. It is true that Sino-India trade was less than 3 per cent of China's total trade volume -- $2007.2 billion -- in 2009. But bilateral trade -- if its annual increase keeps just half of the 50 per cent annual rate in the past decade -- will be over $400 billion in 2020, which is larger than the present trade between China and America. No doubt that there are conflicts of interest between the two rising powers. But this only highlights the importance and necessity of bilateral cooperation, not just because common interests far outweigh conflictual ones, but because confrontation would surely make both losers. It is high time for China and India to make a joint effort to promote bilateral exchanges and, specifically, to institutionalise bilateral summits and high-level dialogues. An Asian Group of Two -- the institutionalised management of bilateral cooperation -- is necessary to promote and sustain a peaceful and constructive relationship between the two rising Asian powers, whose success is essential for peace and prosperity in the entire region.

### Naval War Defense

#### No Chinese naval threat – can’t project through Africa or South America.

Polmar 9 (Norman Polmar, 4/27/09, “China’s ‘Increasing Naval Threat’ Overstated” http://defensetech.org/2009/04/27/chinas-increasing-naval-threat-overstated/)

China’s Navy — officially the Peoples Liberation Army’s Navy — held an impressive naval review in the historic port city of Qingdao on 23 April, the 60th anniversary of the founding of the PLA Navy. By any criteria, the event was a great success. Beyond a Chinese contingent of 2 nuclear and 2 diesel-electric submarines, 5 missile destroyers, and 6 frigates, there were 21 ships representing 14 other nations at the review. The U.S. Navy’s contribution to the anniversary celebration was the Aegis missile destroyer Fitzgerald (DDG 62). By the criteria of many American newspapers and, of course, bloggers, the event revealed the increasing “threat” to Western interests from China’s Navy. Indeed, a Time magazine blog showed an Associated Press (AP) photo of a Chinese warship with the caption, “A Chinese navy soldier guards on a battleship at Quingdao port…” The photo, however, shows what is probably a frigate. China does not have any battleships; nor does any other nation. Other articles — some citing official Chinese statements indicating that aircraft carriers will be constructed “in the future” — tell how the Chinese Navy is about to overtake the U.S. Navy, although by which measures is usually ignored. Indeed, one AP article declares that Chinese nuclear-propelled submarines “are considered just a notch below cutting-edge U.S. and Russian craft.” Reality is quite different. First, simplistic numerical comparisons are too often misleading. But quantity does provide a quality. For example: \* Nuclear aircraft carriers (CVN) U.S. = 11 China = 0 \* VSTOL/helicopter carriers (LHA/LHD) U.S. = 11 China = 0 \* Guided missile cruisers (CG) U.S. = 22 China = 0 \* Destroyers (DDG/DD) U.S. = 60 China = 27 \* Frigates (FF/FFG) U.S. = 30 China = 48 \* Ballistic missile submarines (nuclear)(SSBN) U.S. = 14 China = 3 \* Attack/cruiser missile submarines (nuclear) (SSN/SSGN) U.S. = 57 China = 6 \* Attack submarine (non-nuclear) (SS/SSK) U.S. = 0 China = 55 Second, numbers alone to not convey an adequate comparison. For example, each U.S. CVN-type carrier can operate 60 or more high-performance aircraft. All U.S. cruisers and destroyers have the Aegis advanced radar/fire control system; only a few Chinese ships have the equivalent. Similarly, all U.S. cruisers and destroyers have vertical-launch systems for firing long-range Tomahawk strike (land-attack) missiles as well as surface-to-air missiles. The Chinese have no ship-launched strike weapons and their surface-to-air missiles are inferior. Further, there is no public evidence that the Chinese SSBNs have an operational missile, and none is known to have undertaken a long-range patrol. No long-range patrols have been reported of nuclear torpedo-attack submarines (SSN), and relatively few are made by diesel-electric undersea craft. The one category in which the Chinese Navy does pose a potential threat to the U.S. Navy — in this writer’s opinion — is in non-nuclear submarines. The Chinese Navy has modern, Russian-built Kilo (Project 877EKM) submarines as well indigenous-built diesel-electric submarines. An Air-Independent Propulsion (AIP) submarine program is underway. The U.S. Navy’s ability to detect these craft, especially in littoral areas is limited. This was demonstrated for two years when the U.S. Navy operated against a Swedish AIP submarine, the Gotland, “loaned” for anti-submarine exercises. According to the Swedish officers, the U.S. carrier battle groups operating against the Gotland off the southern California coast invariably failed to locate the craft. Less is publicly known about the results/lessons of several South American diesel-electric submarines that periodically exercise with the U.S. Navy. The Chinese Navy, supported by a large, land-based air arm and land-based anti-ship missiles, could most likely deny U.S. surface and air operations off of the lengthy Chinese coast, and in the Taiwan Strait. At this time U.S. (nuclear) submarine operations in those areas appear to be feasible. Those submarines, armed with torpedoes, mobile mines, and Tomahawk missiles provide a considerable war-fighting capability. But the most likely scenarios for a U.S.-Chinese conflict appear to be in Third World, resource-rich areas, such as Africa and South America. And today, and for the foreseeable future, the Chinese Navy cannot project meaningful political or military power to those distances. To develop such a capability would take at least a decade, and most likely longer.

### SCS Defense

#### No south china sea conflict

Andrew H. Ring 12, Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Navy and former Federal Executive Fellow at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University, "A U.S. South China Sea Perspective: Just Over the Horizon," July 4, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, projects.iq.harvard.edu/sites/projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/fellows/files/ring.pdf

China has maintained peaceful relations with the fourteen countries it shares land borders with for over thirty years. This peaceful environment helped China’s rise. It allowed a majority of China’s resources to be poured into economic development versus defense infrastructure, and encouraged foreign investment and trade. China’s continued ascendancy will depend in part on Chinese leaders’ ability to maintain this peaceful environment and effectively address the emerging domestic issues (e.g., the demands of the rising middle class, entitlements, and its aging population). With its growing sphere of influence comes a need, and some may say, a responsibility, to maintain a peaceful environment within the South China Sea as well. China realizes that needless aggressive military action against its Southeast Asian neighbors will likely draw world powers into the South China Sea dispute.

## 2NC

### CP

### 2NC CP Overview

#### The CP solves the case --- the only investment deals subject to CFIUS review on national security grounds are those that affect assets essential to the military aspects of national defense; pose substantial risk of espionage or terrorism; and whether there is a proliferation risk

should amend Exon-Florio to define “national security” so as to consider the following factors in reviewing foreign acquisitions as per Carroll

#### Err neg since this is the accurate reading of their Caroll evidence and they have no solvency advocate – which is a voting issue since it’s unpredictable and not realistic

#### The plan alone goes too far since it inoculates oil and gas companies from any CFIUS reviews --- means that China, Saudi Arabia, or any other state could enter into oil deals with US companies and the US would have no authority to even review – nonetheless block – such a deal

#### Undermines US security since it risks Chinese manipulation of oil companies and caters to their aggressive plans for geopolitical expansion --- that’s Newman

### Do Both

Links to al the net-benefits or is severance

### 2NC CP --- AT: Politicization

#### The CP solves their politicization arguments:

#### A --- Deals with oil companies that do not affect the military and are not listed as espionage or terrorism risks by US intel agencies would not subject to CFIUS reviews

#### B --- It clarifies and defines what “national security” means in the context of CFIUS – which provides business predictability

#### Narrowing the ‘national security’ standard allows CFIUS to effectively promote security and investment

Mark E. Plotkin 6, partner in Covington & Burling's Washington office, chairs the firm's Electronic Commerce and Information Technology practice, David M. Marchick, leading authority on the Exon-Florio amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950, and David N. Fagan, associate - Covington & Burling, Foreign Investment Laws and National Security: Lessons from Exon-Florio, May, 2006, <http://www.cov.com/files/Publication/8fdb961b-d279-4e73-802e-e6de0555af86/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/2696e4d4-1d5f-4c9d-8589-f1b433c93009/oid14563.pdf>

Second, many transactions that potentially touch on U.S. national security interests have proceeded because the CFIUS process has enabled the government to negotiate (often creative) commitments from the transaction parties to mitigate any potential national security threat. In particular, the flexibility of the statute enables the negotiation of agreements - and, when appropriate, subsequent modifications to such negotiated agreements - that reflect an evolving threat environment. For example, in the immediate aftermath of September 11, 2001, security agreements governing foreign investment in the telecommunications sector as a general rule became significantly tougher.¶ Third, potential foreign bids that truly would impair the national security have been deterred. While it is impossible to know the exact number of such bids, the prospect of a CFIUS review undoubtedly has prevented potentially controversial offers from ever being made. Moreover, parties to many other agreements over the years have, once confronted with CFIUS resistance, elected to withdraw the transaction rather than have it be formally disapproved.8 This deterrence factor and the number of withdrawals help explain the low number of transactions that have proceeded to an investigation and the fact that only one transaction has been rejected by the President.¶ While, in our view, CFIUS in the wake of September 11 at times has been overly cautions and imposed unnecessary and overbroad security requirements,9 these three results demonstrate that, over the course of its 17-year history, CFIUS generally has administered the Exon-Florio statute, as its drafters intended, to be a mechanism to review the national security implications of certain inward investments but not to interfere with the United States' broader policy support for free investment flows.¶ Lessons from the Exon-Florio Experience to Date¶ CFIUS' ability to administer Exon-Florio in a manner that still permits open investment flows is potentially instructive for lawmakers abroad considering similar national security-based investment review laws, as well as those in the United States who would propose changes to Exon-Florio. The system, however, is not perfect, and there are important lessons to be gleaned not only from its successes, but also from its vulnerability to politicization, the pressures that Congress can seek to impose over the Exon-Florio review process, and the historical debate in the United States over the appropriate grounds to review foreign investment. In light of these lessons, and based on our experience advising companies on successfully navigating the Exon-Florio process, we offer seven principles that should be kept in mind as Exon-Florio is debated here and that may be helpful for debates in other countries over how to create a process that allows for a reasonable review of investments on national security grounds while still promoting overall inward direct investment.¶ 1. A Broad National Security-Based Investment Review Process Should Be Voluntary, Not Mandatory.¶ To attract foreign investment, it is vital that a market avoid imposing unnecessary regulatory hurdles and provide as much flexibility to the investing parties as reasonably possible. In the context of a national security- based investment review regime, the experience under Exon-Florio has demonstrated that a process that provides the parties with discretion to file for review - and the reviewing agencies discretion to initiate a review in the absence of a voluntary filing - is more than sufficient to protect national security. In fact, as noted, companies will prefer to file first with CFIUS and receive approval if there is any reasonable argument that the transaction could touch on national security interests, rather than consummate a transaction and risk CFIUS initiating a later review that could unwind the transaction. Thus, in practice, a voluntary filing system sufficiently enables the government to review those transactions that could potentially cause concern, without being distracted by transactions that have no bearing on national security.

### Elections

### Impact Calculus

#### Afghan instability causes nuclear war

Carafano 10 – James Jay is a senior research fellow for national security at The Heritage Foundation and directs its Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, “Con: Obama must win fast in Afghanistan or risk new wars across the globe,” Jan 2 http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/jan/02/con-obama-must-win-fast-afghanistan-or-risk-new-wa/

We can expect similar results if Obama’s Afghan strategy fails and he opts to cut and run. Most forget that throwing South Vietnam to the wolves made the world a far more dangerous place. The Soviets saw it as an unmistakable sign that America was in decline. They abetted military incursions in Africa, the Middle East, southern Asia and Latin America. They went on a conventional- and **nuclear-arms spending spree**. They stockpiled enough smallpox and anthrax to **kill the world several times over**. State-sponsorship of terrorism came into fashion. Osama bin Laden called America a “paper tiger.” If we live down to that moniker in Afghanistan, odds are the world will get a lot less safe. Al-Qaida would be back in the game. Regional terrorists would go after both Pakistan and India—potentially **triggering a nuclear war** between the two countries. Sensing a Washington in retreat, Iran and North Korea could shift their nuclear programs into overdrive, hoping to save their failing economies by selling their nuclear weapons and technologies to all comers. Their nervous neighbors would want nuclear arms of their own. The resulting nuclear arms race could be **far more dangerous than the Cold War’s** two-bloc standoff. With multiple, independent, nuclear powers cautiously eyeing one another, the world would look a lot more like Europe in 1914, when precarious shifting alliances **snowballed into a very big, tragic war**. The list goes on. There is no question that countries such as Russia, China and Venezuela would rethink their strategic calculus as well. That could produce all kinds of serious regional challenges for the United States. Our allies might rethink things as well. Australia has already hiked its defense spending because it can’t be sure the United States will remain a responsible security partner. NATO might well fall apart. Europe could be left with only a puny EU military force incapable of defending the interests of its nations.

#### US-Russia relations key to solve extinction

Allison 11 (Graham, 10/30, Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar [CTR] Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions.

#### Romney destroys China relations, the global economy, East Asian stability, and causes Middle East war

Lieven 9/16 Anatol Lieven is Professor at the War Studies Department, King’s College, Cambridge, and Senior Fellow of the New America Foundation in Washington, DC. “The US elections and Asia,” East Asia Forum, 2012, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2012/09/16/the-us-elections-and-asia/

If Mitt Romney wins the US elections this November and actually implements some of the ideas he has set out during the election campaign, **then Asia, the United States and the world could be in serious trouble.** This applies above all to relations with China. Romney has vowed that ‘unless China changes its ways, on day one of my presidency I will designate it a currency manipulator and take appropriate counteraction’. On Taiwan he declared that ‘the Department of Defense should reconsider recent decisions not to sell top-of-the line equipment to our closest Asian allies. We should be coordinating with Taiwan to determine its military needs and supplying them with adequate aircraft and other military platforms’. Put together, these actions would bring about a crisis in US–Chinese relations, **with very grave potential consequences for the** global economy **and for** military tension **between the United States and China**. And though Romney’s rhetoric about China’s human rights record echoes that of the Obama administration, it is a good deal shriller. If continued when in office, it would also **significantly worsen relations.** But would a Romney administration pursue this line? There is, after all, a well-established pattern whereby US parties in opposition condemn US administrations for pursuing realist policies towards China — only to pursue those very same policies when in government. On past occasions the Democrats have used this tactic against the Republicans, and vice versa. This was pre-eminently true of the contrast between anti-Chinese rhetoric by the Republicans in the 2000 election campaign, and the restrained and realistic policies generally pursued by the Bush administration toward Beijing and over issues of key Chinese concern, like North Korea. It is possible that the staggering economic rise of China over the past decade, and the new centrality of China to US strategy, will alter this. But by the same token, the pivot toward the Asia Pacific has been initiated by the Obama administration, and despite obligatory Republican campaign rhetoric about how this pivot is under-resourced and how Romney would greatly increase spending on the US navy, it is not at all clear how a Republican administration could actually do more, given iron US budget constraints. More sensible military analysts in Washington certainly do not take these promises seriously — and in this they are reflecting widespread opinion within the Pentagon. A second concern about a Romney administration’s strategy in East Asia is that it might make, or continue, US commitments elsewhere that would further reduce available US resources. These commitments could lead to repeating the situation under Bush, when for a number of years the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq (and to a much lesser extent the pursuit of NATO expansion against Russia) distracted attention from the Far East. This could potentially lead to a situation in which Romney had contributed to a **drastically worsened security situation in East Asia**, only to find himself without the resources to back up his strategy. That would be the worst position of all for the United States and its allies. A worrying sign in this regard — at least as an indication of a basic inability to make realistic calculations about US strategy and interests — is what seems to be a continued obsession in the Republican Party and the Romney camp with Russia as an enemy. Obama’s ‘reset’ with Russia corresponds with the most basic dictates of any sensible foreign policy: to reduce commitments in an area of lesser concern and lesser threat in order to concentrate on a greater and increasing threat. The idea that Russia today compares with China as a threat to US interests is simply misguided. An interesting force for moderation comes into play here: the US uniformed military. Far from being the warmongers of left-wing mythology, military high command has emerged as a brake on the wilder ambitions of some politicians. For instance, in the last year of the Bush administration, Admiral Michael Mullen and Defence Secretary Robert Gates were instrumental in preventing both stronger US support for Georgia during the war with Russia in August 2008 (when Vice President Cheney wished to send US troops to the region) and a US attack on Iran. An Israeli attack on Iran with the backing of a Romney administration would not only **create a monstrous new crisis in the Middle East**, but would nail the US still further to that region, making it even more difficult to redeploy resources to the Pacific. The Romney camp has launched attacks on Obama for ‘abandoning’ Israel, but in fact commitment to Israel is an entirely bipartisan affair — also privately checked to some degree not by political forces, but by the Pentagon.

#### Extinction

Hirsch 5 - Professor @ UC San Diego (Jorge, “Can a nuclear strike on Iran be averted,” November 21st)

The Bush administration has put together all the elements it needs to justify the impending military action against Iran. [Unlike in the case of Iraq](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html), it will happen without warning, and most of the justifications will be issued after the fact. We will wake up one day to learn that facilities in Iran have been bombed in a joint U.S.-Israeli attack. It may even take another couple of days for the revelation that some of the U.S. bombs were nuclear. Why a Nuclear Attack on Iran Is a Bad Idea Now that we have outlined what is very close to happening, let us discuss briefly why everything possible should be done to prevent it. In a worst-case scenario, the attack will cause a violent reaction from Iran. Millions of "[human wave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_wave_attack)" Iranian militias will storm into Iraq, and just as Saddam [stopped them with chemical weapons](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2003/n01232003_200301234.html), the U.S. will stop them with nuclear weapons, resulting potentially in hundreds of thousands of casualties. The Middle East will explode, and popular uprisings in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and other countries with pro-Western governments could be overtaken by radical regimes. Pakistan already has nuclear weapons, and a nuclear conflict could even lead to Russia's and Israel's involvement using nuclear weapons. In a best-case scenario, the U.S. will destroy all nuclear, chemical, and missile facilities in Iran with conventional and low-yield nuclear weapons in a lightning surprise attack, and Iran will be paralyzed and decide not to retaliate for fear of a vastly more devastating nuclear attack. In the short term, the U.S. will succeed, leaving no Iranian nuclear program, civilian or otherwise. Iran will no longer threaten Israel, a regime change will ensue, and a pro-Western government will emerge. However, even in the best-case scenario, the long-term consequences are dire. The nuclear threshold will have been crossed by a nuclear superpower against a non-nuclear country. Many more countries will rush to get their own nuclear weapons as a deterrent. With no taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, they will certainly be used again. Nuclear conflicts will occur within the next 10 to 20 years, and will escalate until much of the world is destroyed. Let us remember that the destructive power of existing nuclear arsenals is approximately [one million times that of the Hiroshima bomb](http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/1997/00/00_babst_consequences.htm), enough to erase Earth's population many times over.

### Politics --- Link Turns Case --- 1nc/2nc

#### Link turns the case --- public backlash disrupts FDI

**Merrill, 11** - \* B.A. Tufts University; J.D. Columbia Law School (Margaret, “Overcoming CFIUS Jitters: A Practical Guide for Understanding the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States”, 30 Quinnipiac L. Rev. 1, lexis)

The second measure relates to the public's perception of the proposed covered transaction. Considering the highly politicized nature of the CFIUS process, creating a positive public image is crucial for any deal. As discussed above, the negative publicity surrounding past FDI misfires has often played a key role in a transaction's collapse. Time and time again, generating negative media coverage in regards to potential FDI transactions has been a potent tool for private interests looking to gain from the transaction's undoing. This type of maneuvering, however, can also be employed by those who would like to see the transaction consummated. Given the prominent and widespread trepidation over the future strength of economic stability in this country, FDI transactions are likely to be viewed more favorably than they have been in a long time. n232 Proactively reaching out to suitable media outlets with information regarding the benefits of any proposed FDI transaction allows the foreign investor to shape the conversation rather than being on the defensive. The resulting public support for the transaction will make it that much more resistant to political attack.

### AT: Plan After Election

#### The plan happens before the election---Congress is holding pro forma sessions now

Cox 9/24 Ramsey is a writer for The Hill. “Congress to hold pro forma sessions until November,” 2012, http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/251313-congress-to-hold-pro-forma-sessions-until-november

Rather than being in recess for more than five weeks, both the Senate and the House decided to hold pro forma sessions until after the November elections.

#### Legislation can be passed then

Cover 12 Matt is a writer at CNS news. “Democrats Passed Payroll Tax Extension During ‘Pro Forma’ Session on Dec. 23,” 1/6, http://cnsnews.com/news/

(CNSNews.com) – Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) took to the Senate floor during a “pro forma” session on Dec. 23 to pass a two-month extension to the payroll tax. President Barack Obama, however, this week claimed that a pro forma session means the Senate is practically in recess, opening the door for him to make appointments whenever he deems the Senate is out of session.¶ In justifying the appointments made on Wednesday, Jan. 4, while the Senate was in pro forma session, Obama spokesman Dan Pfeiffer said that the Senate was “effectively” in recess because “no Senate business is conducted.”¶ “The Senate has effectively been in recess for weeks, and is expected to remain in recess for weeks,” Pfeiffer wrote on the White House Web site on Jan. 4. “In an overt attempt to prevent the President from exercising his authority during this period, Republican Senators insisted on using a gimmick called ‘pro forma’ sessions, which are sessions during which no Senate business is conducted.”¶ However, **the Senate did conduct business during a pro forma session**, with Majority Leader Reid leading the unanimous consent proceeding to pass the two-month payroll tax extension.

### AT: UQ O/W Link

#### The race could still shift---every swing state is close

Cohn 10/24 Nate is an elections expert at The New Republic. “Expect the Unexpected: Diverse Battleground States Mean the Race Can Shift in Any Number of Ways,” 2012, http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/109067/diverse-and-competitive-electoral-map-introduces-more-possibilities-surprisi

With a deadlocked popular vote all eyes turn toward the electoral college, where the conventional wisdom holds that the state of the race is pretty straightforward: Romney leads in North Carolina and Florida, but Obama leads in Ohio, Nevada, and Wisconsin, states worth 271 electoral votes. As an advocate of the polling average as the principal means to understand the state of the race, I don’t fundamentally disagree with this view. But this year’s battleground states **are so close** and so diverse that it would be wise to remain open to unexpected outcomes.¶ That's because the battleground states are all so different demographically. States once deemed microcosmic of the country like Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Missouri have been swept off the map for being a few points too Republican or Democratic, and they’ve been replaced with a diverse set of states that add up to a tight race. “New coalition” states like Virginia and Colorado hold exceptionally well-educated and affluent populations. More than 20 percent of the Virginia and North Carolina electorates might be black in 2012—far more than any battleground state of 2004. Nevada and the once dispositive Orlando area have been dramatically reshaped by an exploding Latino population. Northeast Ohio is full of manufacturing workers, something absent from many other battleground states.¶ Today, the national polls show a truly deadlocked race, and the nine battleground states each appear to rest within about three points on either side of a tie. With diverse battlegrounds, **there are plenty of moving pieces that could potentially nudge a state one or two** percentage **points in either side’s direction** without influencing the other battlegrounds. For instance, if Romney sweeps undecided and disaffected white working class voters, it won’t do him much additional good in Virginia but could make the difference in Ohio. If Obama’s GOTV efforts rejuvenate Latino turnout, it barely matters in Iowa but probably ends Romney’s chances in Nevada. If Mourdock comments cause a new round of abortion coverage, it might make a difference in Colorado without any consequence for Ohio or Florida. A strong black turnout wouldn't swing New Hampshire but could be decisive in Virginia.¶ Making matters worse, several of the most important questions of the election are issues that pollsters struggle with the most. While the average of polls is the best available indicator of the state of the race, the polls are neither perfect nor infallible. The RealClearPolitics average, for instance, usually misses its mark by an average of 2 or 3 points, even without systemic bias toward either party and even in years when it gets all the states right. And unlike unscientific criticisms of polls (ie: the party-ID wars), there are many substantive and defensible criticisms of the continuing accuracy of polling in an era of low response rates, including their ability to reach out to Latino voters and people with cell phones. For good measure, likely voter screens are imprecise, to say the least. While all of these issues were potentially problematic a decade ago, many were not as serious. Cell phones weren't yet ubiquitous, and an enclave of Cubans in Miami were the most important Latinos to the election. Young voters were not as critical to the Democratic coalition, since the age gap was far smaller than it is today. These issues give more reason to avoid placing too much faith in a 2-point lead in a polling average, but they could also manifest unevenly across the electoral map. If the polls miss Latino turnout in 2012, that potentially changes the outcome of Colorado, Nevada, and Florida without much of a consequence for Iowa or Ohio. And it’s worth remembering that something like this may have been responsible for Reid and Bennet’s upset victories in 2010. ¶ None of these scenarios are particularly probable, especially individually. But one way or another, **we could easily be surprised between now and the** time the **election** is called in 13 days. The polls are pretty good, but they are not perfect, and with observers paying so much attention to the slight distinctions between Obama's 1.9 point lead in Ohio and .6 point lead in Virginia, unrealistic levels of precision may be necessary to avoid surprises. And that's before accounting for the possibility that the race could shift over the final two weeks in subtle ways that move particular demographic groups and states without similar changes in others. The nine battleground states are so close and so diverse that late movement among specific demographic groups or slight errors in the polling could easily reshape the electoral map before November 6.

#### The election will be down to the wire

Hamby 10/23 Peter is a CNN Political Reporter. “Down to the wire: Campaign enters stretch run,” 2012, http://www.cnn.com/2012/10/23/politics/campaign-stretch-run/index.html

Boca Raton, Florida (CNN) -- A dramatic new consensus has taken hold inside the campaigns of President Obama and Mitt Romney, one that was unthinkable just a few weeks ago: **Americans will wake up on Election Day not knowing who their next president will be.**¶ Polls have tightened, with trend lines in several key states favoring Romney, and Monday's foreign policy debate in Florida doing little to radically alter the shape of the race.¶ Romney spent much of the year working to shore up his conservative flank. But now, buoyed by his vigorous first debate performance, he plans to spend the remainder of the campaign visiting swing precincts where both campaigns are competing for a diminishing slice of undecided or persuadable suburban women.¶ Obama campaign officials now privately acknowledge that North Carolina, a state they can afford to lose, is moving perilously out of reach. Polling shows Florida also moving slightly toward Romney, but few in either camp believe the Republican nominee has more than a 1- or 2-percentage-point edge here.¶ Both campaigns consider Virginia and Colorado tight.¶ New Hampshire is now a jump ball, and the Romney campaign is making a last-minute investment on expensive Boston area television ads in an attempt to turn the state red.¶ The president's re-election chances increasingly hinge on a "Big Ten" firewall of Iowa, Wisconsin and, most importantly, Ohio -- a state where Romney has been stymied by his opposition to the federal auto bailout and a concentrated effort by Obama forces to portray the former private equity whiz as out of touch with the middle class.¶ The Obama campaign is highlighting polls showing robust leads in early voting and absentee balloting in Iowa and Ohio, but Republicans have worked to close the wide early voting gap that helped drive Obama's victory in 2008.¶ Still, both campaigns are seeing the race narrow in those Midwestern states, which just weeks ago were thought to be firmly in Obama's grasp.

#### Obama’s ahead but this is one of the closest elections in history---small movements will make a difference

Cohn 10/23 Nate is an elections expert at The New Republic. “Daily Breakdown: Extraordinarily Tight Race With Fourteen Days To Go,” 2012, http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/109011/daily-breakdown-extraordinarily-tight-race-fourteen-days-go

After the final presidential debate in Boca Raton, the two campaigns head into the final stretch of what could be **one of the closest presidential elections in American history.** The instapolls and pundits appear to have resolved that the president was a modest victor in last night's debate on foreign policy, a peripheral issue in a campaign dominated by domestic affairs. But although there’s still plenty of reason to be skeptical that the polls will lurch decidedly toward either candidate, **any movement would be significant in such a close race.** In the 13 national polls released yesterday, Obama led by a miniscule 47.38 to 47.31 margin—it’s hard to imagine the national polls have ever been tighter with two weeks to go.¶ The state polls, however, suggest that Obama retains a modest lead in Ohio, Wisconsin, and Nevada—three states sufficient to provide Obama with a second term. Yesterday’s polls hinted at the possibility that Ohio was closer than prior polls had suggested, with Suffolk showing a tied race, POS showing Romney ahead by one point, and CBS/NYT/Quinnipiac showing Obama up by 5 points, down from an unsustainable 11 point lead in September. Nonetheless, the balance of evidence continues to show Obama with a discernible edge in the Buckeye State, and Obama will remain a slight favorite to win the election so long as that remains, at least if the election were held today. ¶ If the polls are right and Obama holds the advantage in the critical battleground states into the final stretch, then a modest victory for the president was helpful to his chances, even if it doesn’t move the polls in his direction. Romney only has two weeks left to move the needle two points in Ohio, Nevada and Iowa, or Wisconsin and any other tilt-Obama state, and relitigating the facts and memes from last night’s debate are assured to take up at least a couple of critical days. If Romney's deficit in Ohio is larger than one or two points, then that's a real lost opportunity. Of course, if the Romney campaign believes they have already brought the race back to a dead-heat in Ohio, losing three days worth of lost comeback isn’t terrible—so long as the president doesn’t outright make gains as a result of the debate.

### Politics --- Link --- 1nc

#### The plan makes China a pivotal election issue – bashing empirically benefits the GOP

Yingzi, 10 (Tan, “US likely to give nod to CNOOC deal, despite opposition” 10/14, China Daily,

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2010-10/14/content\_11409139.htm

In 2005, CNOOC gave up plans to acquire Unocal Oil Co after the bid met unexpected US political opposition. Some had viewed the proposed merger as a threat to US security.

Several proposed Chinese investment projects in the US have encountered political obstacles this year. Some Congress members blamed China for the high US unemployment rate and regard the emerging economy's global expansion as a national security threat.

China has appeared as a "scapegoat" for the wobbly US economy in the fierce campaign for November's midterm elections. At least 29 candidates have aired advertisements blaming their opponents for being too sympathetic to China, the New York Times reported on Saturday.

Strong political opposition to the CNOOC deal is likely, given the recent congressional objections to Anshan Iron and Steel Group's investment in a small US steel company, said Scissors from the Heritage Foundation.

### Politics --- Link --- 2nc

#### Bipartisan support for being tough on China through CFIUS

Barron, 12 -Mint Press's New York Correspondent. She has worked for leading news organizations, including Time, Inc., CNN, CNBC and CBS News, in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America and the Middle East as well as in the United States (Lisa, “Republicans, Democrats Come Together To Oppose Chinese Oil Deal” Mint Press News, 7/30, http://www.mintpress.net/chinese-oil-deal-becoming-political-football-in-u-s/)

(NEW YORK) MintPress — It seems that Congressional Democrats and Republicans have finally found something on which they can agree. Both parties are coming out against a bid by Chinese energy giant CNOOC for Canadian oil company Nexen.¶ CNOOC, owned by the Chinese government and based in Beijing, agreed on July 23 to pay $15.1 billion for Calgary-based Nexen, which operates in the U.S. portion of the Gulf of Mexico. It is CNOOC’s biggest North American deal since it walked away from Unocal under pressure from Congress in 2005.¶ This time around, Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), who is a frequent critic of China’s trade and currency policy, has sent a letter to Treasury Secretary asking the U.S. government to block the Nexen deal.¶ “I respectfully urge you, in your capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), to withhold approval of this transaction to ensure U.S. companies reciprocal treatment,” Schumer wrote.¶ Schumer pointed to the 2012 Strategic and Economic Dialogue in which the U.S. committed to a fair review process by the CFIUS and, in return, China committed to “fair treatment to foreign investors in China.”¶ “I urge you not to miss this opportunity – the largest foreign acquisition ever by a Chinese company – to hold China to the commitments it has made to provide a level playing field for U.S. companies seeking to access Chinese markets,” Schumer said.¶ His sentiments were shared by the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi. “This deal prompts great concern about the Chinese government’s continued attempts to use its state-owned enterprises to acquire global energy resources,” spokesman Drew Hamill said in a statement.¶ Republican reaction¶ A similar response came from Sen. David Vitter (R-La.). “I’m concerned because it’s really a trend, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico,” he said. “I do think the far better alternative is for us to play offense, and for us to be developing, taking advantage of these energy resources.”¶ And Sen. John Hoeven (R-N.D.), whose home state is the country’s second-largest oil producer, told a news conference, “Do we really want to be buying our oil or Canadian oil back from the Chinese? If we don’t take action to develop our resources and work with our closest friends and ally Canada, that’s exactly what’s going to happen.”¶ Hoeven and other Republicans have unveiled a package of proposals that would allow for more drilling on government-owned land, reduce regulations, streamline drilling permits and approve TransCanada’s Keystone project.¶ In January, Obama refused to approve the proposed Canada-to-Texas pipeline because he said Congress cut short the environmental review process.¶ Republicans branded his decision as a job-killer that undermines energy independence. “It is time for President Obama to stop putting politics ahead of struggling families and small businesses and approve the Keystone XL pipeline,” House Speaker John Boehner, the top congressional Republican, said in a statement in February.¶ 2012 elections¶ CFIUS lawyers have said they believe the deal will not face regulatory obstacles, but it’s not clear whether the transaction could become a political issue in a tight election year.¶ One of the main driving forces behind the company’s problem with Unocal in 2005 was the fact that it was competing against Chevron, a U.S. oil major with strong allegiances on Capitol Hill.¶ CNOOC does not have a U.S. rival in the Nexen deal. And in May, it hired Hill & Knowlton Strategies to lobby Congress on issues relating to the environment and natural gas.¶ It is clearly going to remain a divisive issue. Both sides may want to seize the opportunity to look tough on China, but foreign investment overall helps the economy and investment in the oil and gas sector in particular helps the U.S. become less dependent on oil from overseas.

### Politics --- Link --- AT: Main Wire

#### 2 --- The NEXEN deal controversy proves the backlash DA --- Congress doesn’t want to approve Chinese oil companies taking-over US companies --- empirically causes deal collapse --- their ev:

The Main Wire 7/24/12

HEADLINE: Two Key Canadian Regulators To Review CNOOC /Nexen

CNOOC's proposed takeover was unanimously approved by the Nexen board but is still to be approved by shareholders, who would get a 61% premium from Nexen's closing price Friday. At 12.45 P.m. ET Monday, on the New York Stock Exchange, Nexen shares were going at US$25.99, an increase of $8.93 or 52.36% from the Friday closing price. Apart from Canadian approval, CNOOC said the transaction must be approved in the United States and China and perhaps in the European Union. Approval in the United States, in this election year especially, could prove difficult. There was huge political opposition in the U.S. to CNOOC's proposed US$18.5 billion takeover of Unocal Corp. in 2005. CNOOC eventually withdrew the bid, citing political tensions.

### China Relations Adv

### CFIUS Politicization Inevitable

#### Alternate causalities swamp the case --- a handful of other industries will still politicize the CFIUS national security standard

Susan W. Liebeler 93, a former chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission, is a partner in the law firm of Irell & Manella. William H. Lash III is an assistant professor at St. Louis University School of Law, Exon-Florio: Harbinger of Economic Nationalism? Regulation, Vol. 16, No. 1, Winter 1993, www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv16n1/reg16n1d.html

Many members of Congress have pressured CFIUS to use Exon-Florio more widely for reasons having nothing to do with national security. Sen. Exon suggested that CFIUS could block an acquisition by Tokuyama Soda because of Tokuyama's role in a soda ash cartel. House majority leader Richard A. Gephardt has suggested that Exon-Florio can be used to protect ``American competitiveness,'' whatever that means. Investment in South Africa was raised as a reason for stopping BTR's bid for Norton. Citing a disturbing pattern of labor policies in South Africa, Rep. Ronald V. Dellums warned President Bush that allowing BTR to expand its U.S. operations would risk ``a potential backlash from African countries with whom the United States has vital political and economic interests.''¶ The problem is that Exon-Florio is a potential tool for a future administration to use in implementing a policy of economic nationalism. The statute and implemention regulations neither define national security nor provide a list of industries exempt from Exon-Florio scrutiny. National security can be stretched fairly thin. In the past clothespin, peanut, pottery, shoe, pen, paper, and pencil manufacturers have tried to justify government protection by invoking national security. Under another administration national security could be interpreted to encompass economic security. Changes in the political philosophy of future administrations could certainly result in a change in the makeup of CFIUS and the way Exon-Florio is administered.

### 1NC --- Ralls/Wind AC + Status Quo Solves Transparency

#### Obama just blocked a Chinese energy investment on CFIUS’ national security grounds --- freaks out Chinese investors in the short-term – but will ultimately cause greater CFIUS transparency, which solves the case

WSJ 10-2, Chinese-Owned Firm Sues Obama Over Wind-Farm Project, October 2, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444004704578032083846454200.html

WASHINGTON—The Chinese executives that President Barack Obama blocked from acquiring a wind-farm project in Oregon challenged the rare rejection with a lawsuit Monday alleging that the president acted unconstitutionally.¶ The suit faces an uphill path, but raises the question of whether presidential decisions should be subject to review by courts.¶ On Friday, the president effectively nullified the Chinese-owned Ralls Corp.'s purchase of four wind-farm projects next to a naval test facility in Oregon. He followed the recommendation in September of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S., a panel comprising representatives of 16 government agencies and offices that scrutinizes the national-security implications of foreign investments.¶ The decision, coming in the midst of a presidential election which has seen both candidates jockey to appear tough on China, was the first time in more than 20 years that a president scuppered a proposed deal by a foreign buyer on national-security grounds. Nearly all proposed deals that raise security concerns at CFIUS are fixed or withdrawn before they reach the president's desk.¶ Ralls had challenged CFIUS in court before the president made his ruling. In a lawsuit filed last month, Ralls argued that CFIUS acted in an arbitrary manner by ordering the company to cease construction at the wind farms without revealing what the national-security concerns were or how they could be addressed.¶ In blocking the deal himself, Mr. Obama appeared to fend off that legal challenge, and made further legal action against the ruling seemingly hopeless.¶ But Ralls amended its complaint late Monday, arguing that the president exceeded his statutory authority by ordering Ralls to unwind its operation in Oregon. The company also alleged it was deprived of due process.¶ "CFIUS and the president acted in an unlawful and unauthorized manner," reads the amended complaint. "At no point has CFIUS ever provided or discussed with Ralls any evidence" related to the transaction's "supposed national-security risks," it said.¶ The Treasury Department plays a central role in the CFIUS determination process, and spokeswoman Natalie Wyeth Earnest said Tuesday that "We believe the lawsuit has no merit, and we intend to defend the case vigorously."¶ CFIUS approves most of the roughly 100 applications it reviews each year. It has never been seriously challenged in court. However, legal experts said some of Ralls's arguments do raise legitimate questions about how CFIUS operates, legal experts said.¶ For instance, companies that are "adversely affected" by the actions of a government agency have the right, under the Administrative Procedures Act, to judicial review. Ralls argues that companies injured by CFIUS rulings should have that same right.¶ However, the president is traditionally given wide latitude to decide matters relating to national security.¶ The suit is "a little bit of a Hail Mary. It's going to be interesting to see if there's a court that would take the view that the president's decision on something related to national security is something that ought to be second-guessed," said Farhad Jalinous, a trade lawyer at Kaye Scholer LLP in Washington.¶ But the filing of the lawsuit could embolden companies. Mr. Jalinous said that companies involved in negotiations with CFIUS might feel they have more leverage if legal action is an option. Conversely, at a time when the U.S. is seeking to attract more foreign investment, some experts think the lawsuit could prompt CFIUS to be more transparent about how it evaluates potential deals.¶ "CFIUS may take this to heart, to some extent, in terms of what they start coming back to companies with when they are really concerned about a transaction, in terms of being more transparent about the basis for the concerns," said Thad McBride, an international trade lawyer at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP in Washington.

* **China doesn’t perceive the difference and it’s not UQ for the aff it TAKES OUT the aff**

AP, 10-23 --- “Chinese firm says U.S. rejection deters investment,” <http://ajw.asahi.com/article/asia/china/AJ201210230021>

BEIJING--The Chinese company has sued President Barack Obama for blocking its planned wind farm projects in Oregon accused the U.S. leader and his government of discrimination and **warned that the case would deter Chinese investment in the United States.**

Last month, Obama blocked Ralls Corp.'s plan to build four wind farms near a U.S. Navy base, after the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States concluded it posed security risks. It was the first time a U.S. president stepped in to halt such a foreign business deal for national security reasons since 1990, when President George H.W. Bush scuttled the sale of a manufacturer to a Chinese agency.

Company bosses denied that the project posed security risks, said U.S. officials were discriminating against the firm because it was Chinese and filed a lawsuit against the U.S. government last month, adding Obama's name as a defendant earlier this month. U.S. officials have said the case has no merit and that they will "vigorously" defend against it.

Ralls Corp. CEO Wu Jialiang said at a Beijing news conference on Oct. 18 that his company "would never do anything that threatens U.S. national security."

Ralls is an associated enterprise of Sany Group, the largest construction machinery manufacturer in China. Sany said that Ralls purchased the Butter Creek wind farm project from a Greek electricity grid company with the development already approved and permits in hand.

Xiang Wenbo, a Sany director, said the company had agreed to transfer, relocate or remove the wind turbines after objections were raised, but they hadn't been allowed to. He said U.S. authorities had reached unfair conclusions, seized their property and assets and aren't to be reasoned with, likening their behavior to that of "thugs."

The case has handed Obama the opportunity to appear tough on Chinese interests during an U.S. election campaign in which both the president and his Republican challenger Mitt Romney have invoked China as a villain in their arguments about revitalizing the U.S. economy. Both have accused the other of policies that send jobs to China.

To consternation in China, a U.S. governmental report last week said Chinese telecom equipment makers Huawei Technologies Inc. and ZTE Corp. are potential security threats and recommended regulators block them from buying U.S. companies.

"I don't know really what signal President Obama and his administration wish to give to investors around the world," said Mei Xinyu, of the Ministry of Commerce's Institute of International Trade and Cooperation, who also spoke at the news conference. **"Maybe the signal is 'Come and invest in the U.S. and then you will end up penniless.'**"

### 2NC Cards

#### --- Recent national-security related rejections overwhelm the case

WSJ 10-18 --- Failed U.S. Deals Stir Tensions With China, Wall Street Journal, 10-18-12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444592704578064990253875004.html>

A series of scuttled deals is rankling Chinese firms trying to invest in U.S. businesses and throwing fuel on an increasingly tense trade relationship between the world's two largest economies.

In the latest failed deal, Hawker Beechcraft Inc.'s plan to sell itself to a Chinese firm fell apart amid concerns about potential U.S. government national-security objections and difficulties separating its defense aerospace operations from other businesses, according to people familiar with the matter.

U.S. government hurdles also stymied other recent deals, including a Chinese firm's wind-power project in Oregon and the attempted sale of battery maker A123 Systems Inc. AONE -30.25% to a Chinese auto-parts manufacturer. Officials from Chinese telecommunications firms Huawei Technologies Co. and ZTE Corp. 000063.SZ +0.33% also are fuming over a congressional report that warned U.S. businesses against working with the two companies.

The troubled deals stand apart from a trend of steadily rising Chinese investment in the U.S. But they're occurring as the two major candidates for president are competing over who would be tougher on China and China's leadership is about to change, raising the perceived significance of each failure. The debate risks exacerbating trade tensions between the two countries and creating a backlash against U.S. corporations trying to invest in China.

Mei Xinyu, a researcher under the Ministry of Commerce's Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation, said the wind-farm decision undermines efforts by U.S. officials to court Chinese investors. "I don't know what signal [President] Obama is trying to give to foreign investors around the world. Maybe it is 'come to invest in the U.S. and you will end up pant-less and penniless,' " said Mr. Mei.

#### Ralls sends a protectionist signal to Chinese investors

John Zhang 9-17, Caixin columnist and a partner of U.S.-based law firm Reed Smith, “A Chinese Investment Left Twisting in the Wind,” Caixin, 9-17-12, http://english.caixin.com/2012-09-17/100438828.html

(Beijing) – A U.S.-based company owned by senior executives of Chinese heavy equipment maker Sany Group Co. has sued a U.S. national security panel led by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner for, it says, unreasonably barring the company's investment in wind farms.¶ Ralls Corp., a Delaware-registered company controlled by Sany vice presidents Duan Dawei and Wu Jiadong, sought to develop wind power projects in the United States. In March, the company acquired four wind farms in the U.S. state of Oregon with a combined power generation capacity of 40 million watts.¶ The purchase was aimed at developing projects with wind turbines produced by Sany Electric Co., a subsidiary of Sany Group.¶ Ralls didn't report the acquisition to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), an interagency committee headed by Geithner that reviews foreign investment transactions for possible implications on national security.¶ The company said that shortly after it acquired land for a wind farm, the U.S. Navy expressed concern that the location of the wind turbines could disturb military aircraft training and asked the company to move the planned facility.¶ Ralls agreed, then submitted a voluntary notice about the deals to CFIUS on June 28.¶ On July 25, CFIUS issued an order to stop the construction and operation of all of Ralls' four wind farms on the grounds of national security and requested the company remove all its equipment within five days.¶ The next day, Ralls told CFIUS that it planned to sell the site. On August 2, CFIUS said Ralls would not be permitted to sell any assets without the committee's approval and ordered the use of Sany products to be restricted on these sites.¶ The directives from CFIUS diminished Ralls' hopes of finishing work on the sites by the end of the year, which would have allowed the company to secure US $25 million in U.S. investment tax credit for renewable energy projects.¶ Ralls then filed a lawsuit against CFIUS, claiming the committee exceeded its authority and violated the legal process. According to the complaint, CFIUS offered no "evidence or explanation for its determination" over what aspects of the transaction raised national security concerns.¶ Ralls is the first Chinese company to take legal action against CFIUS since the committee was created. Previously, a number of Chinese firms, including China National Offshore Oil Corp. (CNOOC) and telecom equipment maker Huawei Technologies Co., have faced objections from the committee on their acquisitions in the United States.¶ According to U.S. law, CFIUS can recommend the president block a foreign investment deal, rather than announce a termination itself. So far, a U.S. president has only issued an order to block one Chinese investment; that was in the aviation parts manufacturing sector in 1990. In most cases, CFIUS suggests companies withdraw their deals.¶ But in the Ralls case, it appears CFUIS bypassed a recommendation to the president and expanded its authority in ordering restrictions on the sales of Sany's products. Meanwhile, it also failed to give an explanation for how the acquisitions by Ralls presented a national security concern.¶ Chinese companies eyeing the U.S. market should draw lessons from the Ralls case and be prepared for the possibility of national security reviews on any acquisition. In addition, the final outcome of the case may be viewed as a precedent for the upcoming CFUIS assessment on CNOOC's US$ 15 billion purchase of Canadian oil firm Nexen.

### 1NC --- No Impact to CFIUS --- General

#### No impact --- CFIUS approves 99.9% of all transactions

Marchick 7 (David, partner at Covington & Burling, where he advises companies on the CFIUS process, “Swinging the Pendulum too Far: An Analysis of the CFIUS Process Post-Dubai Ports World,” Jan, http://www.nfap.net/researchactivities/studies/NFAPPolicyBriefCFIUS0107.pdf)

In the 18 years that Exon-Florio has been in force, there have been slightly more than 1700 CFIUS filings. Only one transaction has formally been blocked by the President — a 1990 aerospace investment by a Chinese company. From the data, one would think that CFIUS has merely been a rubber stamp, approving 99.9 percent of the acquisitions. The data belie actual practice, since tough restrictions are imposed by CFIUS as a condition for approval — typically through “mitigation” or “national security” agreements. In addition, parties typically will abandon a transaction in the face of a possible rejection rather than force the President to formally block a proposed acquisition. The public relations damage to a company if a President were to block an acquisition would be substantial.

### 1NC --- No Impact to CFIUS --- China-Specific

#### Oil and gas investments are high – despite CFIUS --- their evidence is outdated

James D. Rosener 11, partner in the Commercial Department of Pepper Hamilton LLP, Ostensibly Kosher: CFIUS Review of Foreign Investment in U.S. Industries, A Publication of Pepper Hamilton LLP, 9-22-11, <http://www.pepperlaw.com/publications_update.aspx?ArticleKey=2198>

In recent years, the CFIUS has been rather swift in blocking Chinese deals. In 2009, CFIUS blocked the purchase of Firstgold Corp., a development stage mining company, by Northwest Non Ferrous International Investment Company Ltd., a Chinese corporation. It is reported that this sale was blocked because the mining company was located near sensitive military assets. Similarly, in 2005, the China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC), through its Hong Kong subsidiary (CNOOC Ltd.), announced an unsolicited bid to acquire the U.S. energy company Unocal. Pursuant to filing with the CFIUS, CNOOC subsequently withdrew its bid among concerns of foreign ownership of U.S. energy companies.

So would it be appropriate to generalize that U.S. is suspicious about investments from China and as such may not be open to Chinese investors? Probably not, especially in light of certain recent Chinese transactions that have passed CFIUS muster including the acquisition of American oil and natural gas projects by the Chinese state-owned oil company CNOOC Ltd., the purchase of a stake in a U.S. power generating company by the China Investment Corporation and the sale of Ford’s Volvo unit to a Chinese automobile manufacturer. So can we then say that the United States is more concerned about Chinese investments in critical technology? Again, that may not be true, as the China-based Lenovo Group’s acquisition of IBM’s personal computer business was cleared without much of a hiccup. One reason possibly could be that Lenovo is a publicly listed entity and does not have suspicious ties with the PLA and has a relatively cleaner history than Huawei, which was once linked to selling communication technology to Saddam Husain’s regime in Iraq.

#### Their evidence reflects a media bias --- most deals move through CFIUS without problems

Ting Xu 12, Bertelsmann Foundation, Dr. Thieß Petersen, Bertelsmann Stiftung, and Tianlong Wang, China Center for International Economic Exchanges (CCIEE), Cash in Hand, Bertelsmann Foundation, 2012, <http://www.bfna.org/sites/default/files/publications/Cash%20in%20Hand%20Second%20Edition%20final.pdf>

The lack of transparency surrounding the CFIUS process–particularly the lack of a clearly defined¶ industry blacklist or a set of credibility criteria guiding review of investments—has created¶ uncertainty among investors. This in turn may deter otherwise benign and mutually beneficial¶ FDI from China. However, **the emphasis on CFIUS and on the deterred deals by media is largely**¶ **overblown** and it taints the image that in general the U.S. wants to attract Chinese FDI. CFIUS has¶ covered 313 transactions from 2008–2010, only 16 of which involved Chinese acquirers compared¶ to 91 transactions of UK origin. That said, it is understandable that Chinese companies are under¶ heavier scrutiny, given that Japan over the same period had roughly the same number of covered¶ transactions, while the Netherlands and Finland combined had fewer than China (CFIUS 2011,¶ 18). These countries take a far more significant share in FDI in the U.S. than China (See Figure 9).¶ Even so, **most of the Chinese transactions covered by CFIUS moved forward without any problem.**¶Although CNOOC hit a wall in 2005 trying to acquire Unocal, its acquisition of offshore fields in¶ the Gulf of Mexico in 2009 was unopposed and the company successfully closed on a multi-billion¶ dollar investment in Chesapeake Energy Corp in 2010. While Huawei was not able to acquire¶ network gear maker 3Com, Lenovo’s acquisition of IBM’s personal computer division was cleared¶ by CFIUS. In 2011, the Chinese Aviation Industry General Aircraft Co. also successfully acquired¶ U.S. aircraft maker Cirrus after CFIUS review.

#### CFIUS doesn’t impede Chinese foreign investment

David N. Fagan 12, Partner in the law firm Covington & Burling LLP in Washington, D.C., Hearing on “The Evolving U.S.-China Trade and Investment Relationship” Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, June 14, 2012, <http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2012hearings/written_testimonies/12_6_14/Fagan.pdf>

Beyond the generic landscape of greenfield investments, there may be particular federal laws and regulations that apply to investments depending on the industry (e.g., telecommunications, energy, and banking), the size and scope of the transaction (e.g., Hart-Scott-Rodino), and the nature of the business (e.g., securities filings for acquisitions involving publicly traded companies), as well as other rules and regulations at the federal, state and local levels that, while not triggered by a transaction, are relevant to it. But these rules and regulations do not turn on the country of origin of the investment, and they accordingly are not geared to discriminate against investment from China or any other country; rather, they apply equally, if at all, to all foreign investors. The fact that the United States is the world’s largest recipient of FDI also underscores the openness of the regulatory landscape to foreign investment.

The national security review process undertaken by CFIUS is a narrow — but important — overlay to this regulatory landscape. CFIUS operates pursuant to clear statutory authorities (i) to determine the national security effects of certain controlling foreign investments, and (ii) to take action, as necessary, to address national security risks when no other laws apart from certain Presidential emergency powers are sufficient to address the risk. Unlike many other countries, the U.S. does not apply an economic interest test when reviewing foreign investment. Rather, CFIUS is an appropriately tailored process focused strictly on national security, such that the vast majority of foreign investments —around 90 percent — are not subject to CFIUS review.

Thus, for many Chinese investments in the U.S., **CFIUS will not be relevant, let alone an obstacle**.

 For those investments that are subject to CFIUS review, the CFIUS process is not one to be feared. CFIUS acts within precise timeframes and under a defined regulatory process that, consistent with U.S. law and policy, appropriately balances the benefits of FDI with the protection of national security interests. The Committee conducts a thorough review of each case presented before it, operating from a premise — supported by the statute — that it should seek, if at all possible, to find solutions that enable transactions to proceed while protecting national security. CFIUS’s record in this regard is strong; while not hesitating to take tough action to protect national security, **CFIUS has an overwhelming record of approving transactions, including Chinese transactions, in a timely fashion.**

### 1NC --- Chinese FDI High

#### Chinese FDI is high – across a range of industries – including oil and natural gas

Daniel H. Rosen 12, partner at the Rhodium Group, and Thilo Hanemann research director at the Rhodium Group, “The Rise in Chinese Overseas Investment and What It Means for American Businesses,” China Business Review, July-September 2012, https://www.chinabusinessreview.com/public/1207/rosen.html

China accounts for only a tiny share of total foreign direct investment in the United States, but the upward trend is clearly underway. A new assessment of FDI flows calculated by the Rhodium Group shows that Chinese firms are now operating in at least 37 of 50 states and have investments across a wide range of US industries. Chinese investment in the United States grew from less than $1 billion annually before 2008 to $2 billion in 2009 and $5 billion in 2010 (see Fig. 2). While fewer deals were made in the second half of 2011, dragging down the full year figure to $4.5 billion, investment picked up again in the first months of 2012. Several large scale acquisitions have already closed, for example Sinopec Shanghai Petrochemical Co.'s (Sinopec) $2.5 billion investment in five shale oil and gas fields owned by Oklahoma-based Devon Energy Corp. and the $2.6 billion acquisition of movie theater operator AMC Entertainment Holdings by China's Dalian Wanda Group Co. Several big manufacturing deals are also in the pipeline for 2012, such as Golden Dragon Precise Copper Tube Group, Inc.'s $100 million copper tubing plant in Alabama, and a massive $5 billion solar project by ENN Mojave Energy Corp. in Nevada. If the ENN deal goes through, it would be equivalent to all Chinese investment in the United States in 2011.

### 2NC --- Chinese FDI High

#### Chinese oil and gas investments are high – despite CFIUS – they’ve adapted --- proves the backlash turn

WSJ 12 --- China Foothold in U.S. Energy, 3-6-12, http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:qnxJVCUg4KgJ:online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204883304577223083067806776.html+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a

Fu Chengyu's first attempt to buy a piece of the U.S. oil industry kicked up a storm of protest and ended in failure.Seven years later, the Chinese executive is pouring billions of dollars into the oil patch without even a whisper of trouble.¶ His new recipe for success: Seek minority stakes, play a passive role and, in a nod to U.S. regulators, keep Chinese personnel at arm's length from advanced U.S. technology.¶ Since 2010, Chinese companies have invested more than $17 billion into oil and gas deals in the U.S. and Canada, according to data provider Dealogic, giving their energy-thirsty nation a long-coveted foothold in a region known for innovative new drilling techniques. North America has become China's top region for oil and gas deals. Mr. Fu has been leading the push, first as chairman of China National Offshore Oil Corp., known as Cnooc, then as chairman of China Petrochemical Corp., called Sinopec, one of the largest oil companies in the world.¶ [COIL-p1]¶ The recent deals are nothing like Mr. Fu's audacious, unsuccessful bid for Unocal Corp. in 2005. They typically involve a Chinese firm paying upfront for a stake in an oil or gas field and agreeing to cover some drilling costs. Cnooc executives figured such joint ventures "might be a nonthreatening way to get back into America," says Aubrey McClendon, chief executive of Chesapeake Energy Corp., who struck a 2010 deal with Mr. Fu that marked the beginning of the Chinese investment surge. ¶ The deals address pressing needs for both sides. U.S. companies have developed revolutionary new ways to extract oil and gas, but they need lots of capital to make that happen. China's state-owned energy companies, for their part, have been scouring the globe for supplies of oil and gas to help power the nation's surging economy, and the knowledge to extract their own hard-to-tap reserves back home.

### --- No Impact to CFIUS

#### --- No impact to CFIUS --- deals are still going through

WSJ 10-18 --- Failed U.S. Deals Stir Tensions With China, Wall Street Journal, 10-18-12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444592704578064990253875004.html>

Still, the latest cases appear to be exceptions. Wanxiang Group signaled on Thursday that it planned a new offer for electric-car battery maker A123 Systems. Its original $465 million deal for 80% of the company fell apart amid congressional opposition. Few foreign-investment deals fail outright due to U.S. national-security objections raised through the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, a government panel that reviews sensitive acquisitions. Just 5% of the 313 CFIUS-reviewed transactions between 2008 and 2010 forced changes to the deal. U.S. officials say the process doesn't discriminate based on the country of a company trying to invest in the U.S.

"The perception in China is that the U.S. market is difficult to invest in, that CFIUS is knocking down all these deals," said Timothy J. Keeler, a partner at Mayer Brown LLPin Washington and former U.S. trade official. Thanks to overall increased China investment in the U.S., it isn't surprising to see "an increase in the number of deals that run into problems even though the number is relatively small,'' the lawyer added.

### 1NC --- Political Backlash Turn

#### CFIUS reviews encourage Chinese oil companies to prudently negotiate the American political climate to avoid backlash

WSJ 12 --- China Foothold in U.S. Energy, 3-6-12, http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:qnxJVCUg4KgJ:online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204883304577223083067806776.html+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a

**China's new approach to investing in U.S. energy companies suggests it has learned lessons about how to make the industry and American politicians more comfortable with Chinese money**. "Buy a portion of that company, work together with that company, and that company is your strongest ally in the U.S.," says S. Ming Sung, a former executive at Royal Dutch Shell PLC who has advised Sinopec and is now an adviser to several organizations that promote clean energy.¶ Sinopec's Mr. Fu, who declined to comment for this article, has been China's most visible proponent of the new approach. Born in China's remote northern Heilongjiang province, the 60-year-old executive earned a master's degree in petroleum engineering in 1986 from the University of Southern California, where he now serves on the board of trustees. Like other leaders of major state-run companies, he is a senior member of the Communist Party.¶ Those who know him say his technical and operational knowledge of the oil industry is considerable. "He built his foundation in engineering," said Iraj Ershaghi, a professor of petroleum engineering at USC who taught Mr. Fu in the 1980s.¶ Mr. Fu joined Cnooc when the state-owned company was set up in 1982, and held senior positions in its joint ventures with foreign companies such as Shell and the former Phillips Petroleum, now part of ConocoPhillips .¶ By 2005, China's oil consumption was surging, and Chinese companies of all sorts were beginning to explore major acquisitions abroad.¶ Mr. Fu, by then Cnooc's chairman, began negotiating directly with Unocal's then Chief Executive Charles Williamson to buy the El Segundo, Calif.-based company for $18.5 billion. News of the offer brought criticism from U.S. lawmakers, who argued the deal would put crucial U.S. energy resources in Chinese hands. U.S. lawmakers passed a resolution asking the Bush administration to review any Unocal-Cnooc deal. ¶ Mr. Fu spoke out publicly in defense of the deal—an unusual move for the leader of a state-controlled company. In an opinion piece in The Wall Street Journal titled "Why is America Worried?", he argued that most of Unocal's reserves were outside the U.S. anyway, and that Cnooc would preserve American jobs and "will be an open and responsible participant in the process."¶ Nevertheless, members of the Committee for Foreign Investment in the U.S., an interagency body chaired by the Treasury Department, indicated they would recommend that President George W. Bush block the deal, say people briefed by members. The Treasury Department declined to comment, saying it doesn't talk publicly about specific cases reviewed by the committee.¶ After lawmakers passed language in a bill that would delay a deal, Mr. Fu pulled the offer. Cnooc blamed "unprecedented political opposition." Unocal subsequently was bought by Chevron for $17.3 billion.¶ In a 2006 interview with the Journal, Mr. Fu said that Cnooc "learned we need to be more prudent in terms of public relations and political lobbying when dealing with such a big deal.We now understand American politics better."¶ In the wake of the busted deal, Chinese energy firms shied away from North America. State-owned oil companies began striking energy deals elsewhere in the world, such as in Nigeria and Yemen, which gave it access to significant reserves.¶ Meanwhile, back in North America, new techniques were being developed to extract oil and natural gas from shale formations deep underground, from tar sands in Canada, and from deep water in the Gulf of Mexico. Chesapeake and its competitors were rushing to buy drilling rights to U.S. shale fields.¶ Such projects require vastly more capital to drill than conventional reservoirs. A single shale well can cost more than $9 million, U.S. companies say. But the global financial crisis was constricting capital for these expensive projects, so energy companies began looking for new sources of funding.¶ In 2009, China National Petroleum Corp., or PetroChina, bought 60% stakes in two oil-sands projects from a Canadian operator for about $1.9 billion. The following year, Sinopec committed $4.65 billion for a 9% stake in Alberta's Syncrude oil-sands project, one of Canada's biggest energy projects. Last summer, Cnooc agreed to pay $2.1 billion for OPTI Canada Inc., a producer that held a minority stake in a large oil-sands project. There was little political opposition in Canada.¶ Cnooc tiptoed back into the U.S. in 2009 with a small deal to provide development funding and receive a minority stake in some of Statoil ASA's Gulf of Mexico leases.¶ Oklahoma City-based Chesapeake began looking to Asia as a source of capital, says Mr. McClendon, the CEO. In 2010 it sold preferred shares to a unit of Singapore's Temasek Holdings Ltd. and Hopu Investment Management Co., a China-focused private-equity firm. Other investors with ties to the governments of South Korea and China followed with similar investments in Chesapeake.¶ The deals gave Chesapeake "the Good Housekeeping stamp of approval in Asia," says Mr. McClendon. Encouraged, Chesapeake approached Chinese oil companies, and Mr. McClendon developed a rapport with Mr. Fu, who he describes as "comfortable with Americans." Mr. McClendon says Cnooc executives were openly saying: "Since 2005, we haven't had a strategy to invest in the U.S., and we think now is the time to do it."¶ In 2010, Cnooc agreed to pay Chesapeake $1.08 billion for a one-third stake in 600,000 acres in the oil-rich Eagle Ford Shale formation in south Texas, and to spend another $1.08 billion on drilling there. The two executives struck a similar deal, worth nearly $1.3 billion, for stakes in Wyoming and Colorado fields.¶ Messrs. McClendon and Fu were intent on avoiding the kind of political opposition Cnooc faced five years earlier in its ill-fated bid for Unocal. The deals were structured so that Cnooc didn't get an ownership stake in Chesapeake itself and didn't control production.¶ "They didn't come over here and try to buy Chesapeake," Mr. McClendon says. "They came over here to buy a minority, nonoperating interest in an asset and not take the oil and gas home."

#### Failure to effectively negotiate the political climate means Congress and the public will backlash regardless of CFIUS --- scuttles deals --- empirically proven

MATTHEW R. BYRNE 6, J.D., The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, expected 2007, Protecting National Security and Promoting Foreign Investment: Maintaining the Exon-Florio Balance, OHIO STATE LAW JOURNAL, 2006, http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/67.4.byrne\_.pdf

CNOOC’s attempt to acquire Unocal occurred in the summer of 2005. After a much-publicized bidding and public relations war for control of Unocal between CNOOC and another major U.S. oil company, Chevron, Inc., CNOOC’s bid was ultimately defeated by political pressure applied by the United States Congress.8 Many members of Congress had publicly and forcefully expressed grave reservations about the possible national security repercussions if China’s state-owned company gained control of Unocal’s oil reserves.9 This debate led to discussion of not only national security, but also economic security.10 Even though CFIUS never initiated a review of the CNOOC transaction, let alone gave the transaction its approval, numerous members of Congress who feared that the Committee would not block the transaction began to suggest that changes to the Exon-Florio statute were in order as a means to address these concerns.11¶ This debate over changes to Exon-Florio resumed in early 2006, when DPW attempted to purchase Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. (“P&O”), a British firm, in a $6.8 billion deal.12 With the acquisition of P&O, the Dubai-based company would have acquired operational control of certain terminals at six U.S. ports.13 The revelation that CFIUS had approved the deal set off a firestorm of criticism on Capitol Hill as members and leaders of both political parties in Congress denounced the merger.14 Though DPW and the Bush Administration agreed to conduct an additional fortyfive- day investigation under the CFIUS statute, the House Appropriations Committee voted 62–2 to effectively block the transaction, and under intense political pressure DPW agreed to transfer its U.S. ports interests to an American buyer.15 In the midst of the ports controversy, legislation was proposed in Congress not only to block the deal, but also to make substantial changes to the Exon-Florio statute in an attempt to strengthen the CFIUS review process.16 As of the time this Note goes to publication, committees in both the House and Senate have approved legislation that would modify the Exon-Florio statute.17 The full bodies have not yet approved these bills, their significant differences have not been reconciled in a conference committee, and the President has not signed a bill. Therefore, these bills’ proposed changes to the statute are still mere possibilities, not certainties.

### 2NC --- Political Backlash Turn

#### Chinese investment prompts Congressional backlash

AP 8-23, 2012, China investment in US rises despite tough talk, <http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-08-23/news/33342341_1_chinese-investment-china-investment-chinese-companies/2>

As a strategic and emerging military rival of the US, however, China brings with it more baggage. China still restricts foreign investment in much of its own economy. Many of its biggest companies looking to invest abroad are state-controlled.

Cybersecurity is also a major concern because of repeated reports of cyber-attacks on Western companies and government departments originating from China. That has dented the prospects for its telecommunications and technology giants.

Attempts by Huawei, a private Chinese company founded by a former army officer, to acquire 3Com in 2008 and failing US computer company, 3Leaf Systems, in 2011 were floored by security concerns.

US lawmakers have often weighed into the debate. The House Intelligence Committee is investigating Huawei, one of the world's biggest suppliers of telecoms gear, and its rival, ZTE, examining their ties to the Chinese government. It is also probing reports that ZTE is supplying surveillance equipment to Iran.

### 2NC --- Political Backlash Turn

#### CFIUS reviews teach Chinese companies to approach the American political climate cautiously and save face to avoid political backlash

Financial Times 9-21-12 --- Chinese windmill CFIUS suit signals ‘the courtroom is open’ for challenges, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/440b3bda-03f4-11e2-9322-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz27LugY2IS

But for Chinese companies, the case also serves an important lesson.¶ Yeland Group (000616.SH), a Chinese real estate developer, had planned to buy the Oregon wind projects from Ralls after the development was completed but backed out of the purchase agreement in late August because of US regulatory uncertainty.¶ “The [CFIUS] approval problems with the US government that happened to Sany has really taught us a big lesson, not only for us, but for all Chinese companies, that we should be more careful and consider more thoroughly in planning and investigating mergers and acquisitions in the US, especially regarding regulatory approvals,” an investor relations representative for Yeland told PaRR.¶ Mark Plotkin, a partner and co-chair of the CFIUS practice at Covington & Burling in Washington, DC, said Chinese companies often fail to consult with specialized and experienced CFIUS counsel at the very earliest stages of their consideration of a potential target.¶ “While there are excellent corporate and transactional counsels working on Chinese transactions, they generally lack CFIUS experience. Experienced CFIUS counsel can identify areas of likely US government national security concern and assist the company in saving face before it makes a public announcement

 of an intention to make an acquisition that will raise national security concerns,” he said.

#### Taking account of political conditions is key to deal success

John B. Bellinger 11 III, Adjunct Senior Fellow for International and National Security Law --- Council on Foreign Relations, “Year of the Rabbit May Bring More U.S. Opportunities for Chinese Investors,” January 28, 2011, http://english.caijing.com.cn/2011-01-28/110630632.html

Third, understand the political dimension. Historically, the Executive Branch’s management of CFIUS reviews has been neutral and free from political influence. President Obama has not taken a noticeably harder or softer line than President Bush on investment by Chinese companies in areas that affect national security. In both administrations, career officials have conducted thorough and independent reviews that have generally not been strongly influenced by political appointees. After his meeting with President Obama last week, President Hu said he believed that the Obama Administration “will provide a level playing field for Chinese companies to make investments” in the United States.

Although the Executive Branch may welcome Chinese investment, the same may not true be for **Congress and the media, who can kill a foreign investment** as they did in the 2006 Dubai Ports World deal. During the 2010 election year, Republican members of Congress asked the CFIUS to block potential investments by Huawei and the Anshan Iron & Steel Group.

Fortunately for Chinese investors, 2011 is not an election year and thus the political wildcard is less likely to come into play. That said, Republicans, who recently took control of the House of Representatives, may be more skeptical about Chinese investment, and protectionism driven by the recession may lead other members to oppose deals that threaten U.S. jobs.

The Chinese Year of the Rabbit has the potential to be an auspicious year for Chinese investment in the United States. If Chinese companies choose their investments cautiously and **take account of political considerations when planning transactions** that may affect the U.S. national security, they can dispel the myth that such deals aren’t achievable.

## 1NR

### China Shale Advantage

#### I marked the card in the 1NC – I’ll finish it here – it’s key to China’s economic liberalization

Rosen 12

importantly, the weak domestic regulatory environment **leaves China's firms unprepared to do business in highly regulated markets**. This can simply be a drag for operating in the United States, but in some cases it also makes Chinese investors **more vulnerable** to outside attacks by competitors or interest groups. Domestic reforms addressing these weaknesses, such as strengthening corporate governance rules, are urgently needed to accelerate the learning curve of Chinese businesses.¶ IMPLICATIONS FOR AMERICAN BUSINESSES¶ The era of rising Chinese investment will be both sweet and sour for American businesses. In many industries, the emergence of these new Asian multinationals will transform the competitive landscape. Rising overseas Chinese presence will mean new competitors for US firms. The acquisition of foreign brands and technology will make Chinese firms stronger in their home markets, which is in some cases currently dominated by foreign firms, such as autos or luxury goods. OFDI will also help Chinese manufacturers enter markets they have yet to breach. In addition to moving them up the technology ladder, OFDI will help China's pioneers establish local after-sales operations, which was the key for frontrunners including Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., Sany Heavy Industry Co., Ltd., and Haier Group Co. to sell high-tech products in foreign markets.¶ Finally, the emergence of Chinese multinationals will enhance competition for scarce global assets, most importantly human talent. Unlike the multiethnic and diverse workforces typical of Western multinationals, Chinese companies mostly employ young Han Chinese with very little experience in running global operations. China's new multinationals will have to adjust their structures and workforce to be successful in markets abroad, which means a massive demand for talented staff. Several industries are already experiencing a burgeoning hiring spree by new entrants, for example Huawei's local recruiting efforts in the United States and Europe. This is good news for local job markets, but may not be such good news for other multinationals keen on retaining their most valuable staff.¶ On the other hand, a Chinese investment boom will offer plenty of opportunities for well-positioned US firms. In a post-crisis, slow-growth world with significantly lower levels of global FDI, Chinese buyers are a bright spot for divesting assets. Chinese firms are interested in acquiring assets that US firms want to discard when moving up the value chain themselves, such as when International Business Machines Corp. (IBM) sold its PC division to China-based Lenovo Group Ltd. in 2004. The move of Chinese firms into new markets will also offer plenty of opportunities for co-investments and partnerships. China's firms are in a weak position when it comes to running overseas operations for all the reasons discussed above, and just like American multinationals entering China in years past, they will need allies to establish a presence in advanced market economies in the period ahead.¶ One dividend from China's move abroad will be **the benefit of their having to learn to play our game**. For decades, Chinese businesses have operated on a purely domestic field and have therefore remained more or less shielded from foreign regulations and courts. Dumping duties were one of the few legal instruments Chinese firms had to fear. **Going abroad changes this situation fundamentally**. Chinese firms operating in the United States and Europe will have to comply with local laws and regulations, and they are subject to US courts and litigation, giving their competitors a greater arsenal of legal options in the case of improper behavior. **Exposure to foreign regulators should also create a positive feedback loop back into China**, pushing the government to realize that its own legal system is diminishing the chances for these firms to successfully compete overseas. Over the long term, China's new multinationals might even ramp up lobbying efforts with their own government **for a level playing field at home**, once they are able to compete in a rules-based and sophisticated market economy and see this as competitive advantage vis-à-vis less globalized domestic competitors.¶ Finally, growing Chinese investment in developed economies will open up new opportunities in the Chinese market. China still maintains significant controls on capital inflows, and many sectors of the economy remain closed to foreign investment, especially in services. The Chinese government emphasizes that it will continue to open these sectors to private and foreign investment, but in a gradual manner. The growing interest in outward investment in developed economies provides Beijing with an excellent reason to **accelerate the pace of opening** at home, to forestall the unfavorable comparisons of reciprocal treatment which will inevitably arise. **This could well lead to new liberalization in China**, offering wider opportunities for foreign multinationals in industries currently off-limits to them.

#### *Market reforms are key to continued Chinese economic growth*

*Wayne M. Morrison 12, Specialist in Asian Trade and Finance – CRS, “China’s Economic Conditions,” June 26, 2012, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33534.pdf*

*China’s economy has shown remarkable growth over the past several years, and many economists project that it will enjoy fairly healthy growth in the near future. However, economists caution that these projections are likely to occur* ***only if China continues to make major reforms to its economy****. Failure to implement such reforms could endanger future growth. They note that China’s current economic model has resulted in a number of negative economic (and social) outcomes, such as over-reliance on fixed investment and exporting for its economic growth, extensive inefficiencies that exist in many sectors (due largely to government industrial policies), wide-spread pollution, and growing income inequality, to name a few. Many of China’s economic problems and challenges stem from its* ***incomplete transition to a free market economy*** *and from imbalances that have resulted from the government’s goal of economic growth at all costs.*

#### More evidence

Wayne M. Morrison 12, Specialist in Asian Trade and Finance – CRS, “China’s Economic Conditions,” June 26, 2012, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33534.pdf

Some economic forecasters project that China will overtake the United States as the world’s largest economy within a few years, although U.S. per capita GDP levels are expected to remain much larger than that of China for many years to come. However, the ability of China to maintain a rapidly growing economy in the long run will depend largely on the ability of the Chinese government to implement comprehensive economic reforms that more quickly hasten China’s transition to a free market economy; rebalance the Chinese economy by making consumer demand, rather than exporting and fixed investment, the main engine of economic growth; and boosting productivity and innovation. China faces numerous other challenges as well that could affect its future economic growth, such as widespread pollution, growing income disparities, an undeveloped social safety net, and extensive involvement of the state in the economy. The Chinese government has acknowledged that its current economic growth model needs to be altered. In October 2006, the Chinese government formally outlined a goal of building a “harmonious socialist society” by taking steps (by 2020) to lessen income inequality, improve the rule of law, enhance environmental protection, reduce corruption, and improve the country’s social safety net (such as expanding health care and pension coverage to rural areas). In addition, the government announced plans to rebalance the economy and boost innovation.

#### A --- Continued Chinese trade liberalization is necessary to avert growing Chinese protectionism

Joshua Meltzer 12, Fellow - Global Economy and Development at Brookings, Continue Progress on a Key Trade Relationship, Brookings, May 11, 2012, http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/05/11-china-trade-meltzer

The international economic implications of the growing role of the state in the Chinese economy require attention as well. While China has benefited enormously from a system of open nondiscriminatory trade, the growing influence of the Chinese state in the Chinese economy presents many difficult challenges for U.S.-China economic relations and for the global economic system more broadly. **Increasing state control in the Chinese economy has bred its own forms of protectionism** as China’s state-owned enterprises—supported by immense subsidies in the form of cheap credit, low energy prices, and access to land—are typically **less productive and competitive** than their foreign rivals. This has led Chinese state-owned firms to **advocate for protectionist trade and investment policies**. These subsidies not only tilt the playing field in favor of state-owned enterprises but they also act as barriers to U.S. exports and investment.

Over the past several years, the United States has sought to give China a larger stake and leadership role in the global economic order by supporting changes to the voting structure of the International Monetary Fund and making China central to the WTO Doha Round negotiations. However, efforts to maintain the viability of state-owned enterprises will hinder China’s ability to provide the type of global economic leadership the United States envisions. **To play such a role, China would have to further liberalize trade and investment and level the playing field for trade and investment both at home and overseas**. China’s capital account would also have to be liberalized, which would mean moving to a floating exchange rate for the renminbi.

#### B --- Abandoned Chinese trade liberalization triggers US protectionism

Daniel Ikenson 12, director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, Trade Policy Priority One: Averting a U.S.-China "Trade War,” Free Trade Bulletin no. 47, March 5, 2012, http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/trade-policy-priority-one-averting-uschina-trade-war

Second, and more substantively, the U.S. business community in China, which had long counseled against U.S. policies that might frustrate its access to the Chinese market, began to air grievances about proliferating Chinese protectionism and issued warnings that China's market liberalization — evident through the early part of the last decade — had stopped and was beginning to reverse. An annual white paper published by the American Chamber of Commerce in China identified rising protectionism, lack of regulatory transparency and consistency, and favoritism toward local firms as big and growing problems in 2009.3 Meanwhile, another report published by AmCham-China exposed "a web of industrial policies" in China, such as indigenous innovation policies and elaborate plans to build national champions by borrowing Western technology.4

Publication of those reports and reaction to them inspired a change in sentiment within the U.S. multinational community, which shifted the balance of interests that shape U.S.Ã¢ï¿½ï¿½China policy in the direction of those traditionally more inclined toward trade restrictions and tougher enforcement, giving greater cover to U.S. policymakers to take a more strident tack with Beijing.

#### The turn outweighs their solvency --- regulatory inexperience is the biggest impediment to successful Chinese investment

Daniel H. Rosen 12, partner at the Rhodium Group, and Thilo Hanemann research director at the Rhodium Group, “The Rise in Chinese Overseas Investment and What It Means for American Businesses,” China Business Review, July-September 2012, https://www.chinabusinessreview.com/public/1207/rosen.html

China's outward foreign direct investment (OFDI) expanded significantly in the past decade, but the majority of the investment has gone to countries in the developing world. However, in recent years the focus of Chinese investors has started to shift to North America and Europe. Since 2009, Chinese direct investment in America and Europe has increased sharply, and developed economy-bound flows are poised to grow heavily through 2020, according to Rhodium Group estimates. Policymakers are still grappling with the proper policy response, but significant progress has been made in the United States over the past two years. The key impediments Chinese firms face when setting up US shops are inexperience and lack of capabilities rather than political shenanigans. For American businesses, the growth of Chinese investment does pose certain risks, most importantly new competition at home and abroad, but it also brings invaluable new opportunities, such as divestment of assets, co-investment, and new business opportunities in China.

#### AND --- Chinese trade liberalization boosts trade and solidifies US-China relations

James Dorn 5, vice president for academic affairs at the Cato Institute, U.S.-China Relations after CNOOC, The Freeman, December 2005 • Volume: 55 • Issue: 10, http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/us-china-relations-after-cnooc/

Congress is right to criticize China for its adherence to a “socialist market economy,” but the PRC has moved steadily toward a real market system by removing barriers to trade and investment, and freeing most prices. We should recognize those gains while criticizing China’s human-rights violations and the lack of a just rule of law. Even with China’s shortcomings, however, Congress was not justified in interfering with the CNOOC-Unocal deal. As the Chinese Foreign Ministry said before CNOOC’s pullout, “We demand that the U.S. Congress correct its mistaken ways of politicizing economic and trade issues, and stop interfering in the normal commercial exchanges.”

Alarm over China’s economic and military rise is often justified by reference to China’s poor human rights record. The record is indeed poor, but it will not be improved by denying the Chinese people the right to trade, which itself is an important human right. Countries that are left outside the global trading system, such as Cuba and North Korea, have shown no interest in advancing human rights and have perpetuated poverty.

What China needs is less government and more markets. The surest way to achieve that result is to strengthen the policy of engagement, not to threaten China with protectionist measures under the guise of national security. Beijing will view Congress’s interference as yet another attempt by the U.S. government to widen its power at the expense of China’s development.

China’s thirst for oil and natural gas has driven world demand upward and increased prices, and that trend is likely to continue.Over time, production and consumption will respond to higher prices as producers search for new supplies and consumers conserve and switch to cheaper alternatives. If the U.S. government interferes with the market process, future production will suffer and American energy companies will find it more difficult to operate in foreign countries.

Of course, if CNOOC were a truly private firm, Congress would not have been so concerned. China’s challenge is to move more rapidly toward **privatization and the rule of law**. **Future cross-border transactions will then be less costly and more successful, and U.S.-China relations will improve.**

#### CFIUS reviews teach Chinese companies to approach the American political climate cautiously and save face to avoid political backlash

Financial Times 9-21-12 --- Chinese windmill CFIUS suit signals ‘the courtroom is open’ for challenges, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/440b3bda-03f4-11e2-9322-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz27LugY2IS

But for Chinese companies, the case also serves an important lesson.¶ Yeland Group (000616.SH), a Chinese real estate developer, had planned to buy the Oregon wind projects from Ralls after the development was completed but backed out of the purchase agreement in late August because of US regulatory uncertainty.¶ “The [CFIUS] approval problems with the US government that happened to Sany has really taught us a big lesson, not only for us, but for all Chinese companies, that we should be more careful and consider more thoroughly in planning and investigating mergers and acquisitions in the US, especially regarding regulatory approvals,” an investor relations representative for Yeland told PaRR.¶ Mark Plotkin, a partner and co-chair of the CFIUS practice at Covington & Burling in Washington, DC, said Chinese companies often fail to consult with specialized and experienced CFIUS counsel at the very earliest stages of their consideration of a potential target.¶ “While there are excellent corporate and transactional counsels working on Chinese transactions, they generally lack CFIUS experience. Experienced CFIUS counsel can identify areas of likely US government national security concern and assist the company in saving face before it makes a public announcement of an intention to make an acquisition that will raise national security concerns,” he said.

#### *--- China’s moving away from coal now*

*Ailun Yang 10-15, Senior Associate – World Resources Institute, “What Is The Future Of King Coal In China?” 10-15-12, http://insights.wri.org/news/2012/10/what-future-king-coal-china*

*China’s great thirst for coal is undeniably troubling from a sustainable development standpoint. However, the situation may be changing. I recently joined three other experts to speak at a Congressional briefing entitled, “Why China Is Acting on Clean Energy: Successes, Challenges, and Implications for U.S. Policy.” While my fellow speakers spoke about the progress of clean energy development in China, I sought to explain how the growing constraints on coal development are acting as one factor* ***pushing China to move more aggressively towards clean energy.***

*What’s Pushing China Toward Clean Energy?*

*Traditional wisdom has been that China is building massive numbers of new coal-fired plants, and that such development would continue forever. However, two new indicators seem to be telling a different story.*

*The first and arguably most important indicator is the* ***weak economic performance of China’s coal power sector****, which accounts for more than half of China’s coal consumption. China’s State Electricity Regulatory Commission (SERC) reported that almost all coal-fired plants have been losing money since last year. Investment in coal-fired plants in 2011 was not even half of what was invested in 2005. About one-third of the proposed new coal–fired plants that have been approved are delaying the start of their construction, resulting in a big slowdown in newly added coal power capacity. In fact, based on the number of coal-fired plants completed this year so far, newly installed capacity is likely to be only half of what was installed last year.*

#### *--- Chinese companies are pursuing “hands off” oil deals because of the political conditions --- not CFIUS*

*Mandel – 1AC author – 12 (Jenny, Reporter for EnergyWire, a daily publication covering the unconventional oil and gas sectors, Previous positions with E%26E include editing Land Letter and writing news and feature stories for Greenwire, ClimateWire, and other news outlets, "Will U.S. shale technology make the leap across the Pacific?," EnergyWire: Tuesday, July 17, 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/07/17/1)*

*Despite the challenges, the allure of a massive new domestic energy source has the Chinese government and private and state-owned companies moving cautiously toward development. Today, virtually all of the key intellectual property behind shale gas extraction lies with North American companies, and one of the first steps the Chinese have taken is to pour money into U.S. and Canadian ventures where those technologies are in use.*

*In 2010 and 2011, China National Offshore Oil Corp. (CNOOC) paid $2.3 billion for partial stakes in plays by Chesapeake Energy Corp. in Texas, Wyoming and Colorado. Earlier this year, Sinopec bought into Oklahoma City-based Devon Energy Corp.'s holdings across Louisiana, Mississippi, Colorado, Ohio and Michigan in a $2.5 billion deal. Chinese companies have also aggressively pursued investment deals in Canadian shale projects.*

*But Johns Hopkins' Kong said attempts by Chinese companies to negotiate North American on-the-job training have been blocked.*

*The deal with Chesapeake, for example, limited the interaction of CNOOC personnel with sensitive technologies by restricting the company's right to send workers into gas fields, Kong said. "The Chinese companies have agreed deliberately not to send their oil workers to American gas fields and not to participate in boardroom decisions," Kong said.* ***"The Chinese companies have agreed to this long-term, slow, gradual approach*** *to gaining know-how in the North American energy sector."*

***The caution stems mostly from a political firestorm that broke out when, in 2005, CNOOC tried to buy Unocal*** *Corp. in an $18.5 billion deal that was eventually withdrawn in the face of opposition from Congress. Since then,* ***there has been a general awareness among Chinese players of the need to move slowly and avoid raising red flags*** *(E&ENews PM, Aug. 2, 2005).*

*So what do Chinese investors gain from these North American investments, then, if not direct access to fracking technologies? "By investing in the U.S. ... they benefit from the spill-over effect," Kong said. They have some personnel involved with the projects, even if they're not learning the nitty-gritty of how to develop a fracking plan, and may be able to pick up some very high-level management expertise that is relevant at home.*

#### Cross-examination proves – their Downs evidence

Downs 00 (Erica, China Fellow @ Brookings, CHINA’S ENERGY SECURITY ACTIVITIES, http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1244/MR1244.ch3.pdf)

The Chinese government can also improve China’s energy security through development of the country’s natural gas industry. Greater use of natural gas in China has been hindered by the absence of a bureaucratic champion for gas, the remote location of China’s gas reserves, an inadequate pipeline infrastructure, lack of a well developed market, and insufficient funding. However, over the past few years, the Chinese government has expanded the role of natural gas in China’s energy structure, primarily as a result of concern over China’s growing dependency on oil imports and widespread environmental degradation caused by coal. Other reasons for the high priority placed on natural gas development include chronic energy shortages and imbalances, increasingly competitive prices for natural gas vis-à-vis coal, and greater competition among China’s stateowned oil companies for shares of the natural gas market—a result of industrial reform. Fertilizer and chemical plants currently consume most of China’s natural gas, but the government has targeted the urban industrial and residential sectors and the transportation sector for greater natural gas use. 74 The Chinese government has stepped up its efforts to develop domestic gas reserves. The participation of foreign oil companies in gas development projects is encouraged because of the technological and financial constraints faced by China’s oil companies and the government’s desire to bring reserves on line as quickly as possible. CNPC and Shell recently signed a letter of intent to develop the Changbei natural gas field at the border of northern China’s Shaanxi Province and the Inner Mongolia autonomous region. It is projected that after this US$3 billion project is completed in 2004, it will annually supply 105.9 tcf of gas to eastern China within 20 years. 75 The Chinese government has also approved a proposed natural gas pipeline from the Xinjiang autonomous region to Shanghai municipality. Construction is expected to begin in 2001 at an estimated cost of US$7.23 billion for the pipeline alone and an additional US$6 billion for gas exploration in Xinjiang. CNPC plans to be the dominant shareholder. Foreign participation in the project is welcome. However, according to a Chinese official, foreign investors will not be granted access to the project’s operations because of energy security concerns—possibly a fear of foreign control over China’s gas resources. 76

#### --- Timeframe for solving is at least a decade

Mandel – 1AC author – 12 (Jenny, Reporter for EnergyWire, a daily publication covering the unconventional oil and gas sectors, Previous positions with E%26E include editing Land Letter and writing news and feature stories for Greenwire, ClimateWire, and other news outlets, "Will U.S. shale technology make the leap across the Pacific?," EnergyWire: Tuesday, July 17, 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/07/17/1)

The University of Alberta's Jiang said Chinese shale interests, including both government and industry players, are undecided on how to move forward and how much to focus on domestic development versus lower-cost production overseas. "I don't think they have reached a conclusion one way or the other," he said. As a result, the country pursues "a two legs walking approach -- on the one side they want to explore domestic possibilities, on the other they want to explore possibilities with lower ... prices" elsewhere.

**That likely means a timeline of a decade, at a minimum, before Chinese shale gas resources are well-understood and a clear path to their development emerges, and potentially as long as two decades**, observers say.

### CCP Collapse Defense

#### CCP is resilient

Kurlantzick 11— Fellow at the USC School of Public Diplomacy and the Pacific Council on International Policy. Frmr visiting scholar in the China program at Carnegie. (Joshua, Beijing has bought itself a respite from middle class revolt, 7 March 2011, http://www.thenational.ae/thenationalconversation/comment/beijing-has-bought-itself-a-respite-from-middle-class-revolt?pageCount=0)

As governments across North Africa have been overthrown or are seemingly near the verge of collapse, some Chinese writers and activists are hopeful that this democratic wave might sweep over the world's largest and most powerful authoritarian state. Unknown Chinese activists have anonymously posted an online manifesto calling for their own "Jasmine Revolution". Groups of protesters - even joined by the American ambassador to China - have gathered in Beijing to heed the call for revolt. The Chinese authorities, taking no chances, **quickly shut down protests** and apparently jailed some of the demonstrators. They have also been blocking any internet discussion of activists' "Jasmine Manifesto".

But despite Beijing's quick response, in reality China's leadership has far less to fear than Hosni Mubarak or Muammar Qaddafi. For one thing, unlike in many parts of the Middle East, **China's urbanised centres haven't turned against the regime.** Instead, most city residents essentially support, or at least tolerate, the regime. And why not? The government has been very, very good to them, as Minxin Pei, a professor at Claremont McKenna College, documented in his book China's Trapped Transition.

After the 1989 Tiananmen protests, the Chinese Communist Party, recognising the power of educated urban protesters, delivered a raft of new incentives to co-opt the urban middle class.
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The government directed growth to urban areas, and launched other pro-middle class programmes. These included higher salaries for academics and other professionals; restrictions on rural people's housing and schools so that peasants cannot attend many of the best urban institutions; and opening the Party to membership for entrepreneurs, many of whom eagerly joined as a business networking opportunity. The Party reinforces the middle class content with the status quo by using speeches and state media to suggest that, in a democracy, total freedom of movement would allow rural peasants to swamp the cities, ruining the standard of living in wealthier urban areas.

All these incentives are reasons why Chinese city residents in polls show high appreciation of the current state of affairs. In one recent survey, nearly 90 per cent of Chinese expressed satisfaction with the current station of their nation; since these polls, conducted by telephone, are focused on urban areas, they represent more closely the views of the urban middle class.

China's leaders also are not as out of touch, isolated or brittle as some of those in the Middle East. The Communist Party may be an authoritarian regime and there is certainly plenty of corruption - one Chinese scholar estimates that corruption costs China more than $80 billion (Dh294 billion) in growth each year. Still, the leadership now is a collective one, and no single official amasses the type of enormous wealth of leaders like Tunisia's Zine El Abidine Ben Ali. China's collective leadership, unlike in Mao's time, also has some ability to listen to and respond to public opinion. In 2008, for example, protests in Tibet initially were met by a relatively moderate response from the central government. But angry online sentiment - the Chinese blogosphere is highly nationalist and often conservative - partly prompted a tougher crackdown, according to Chinese officials and scholars.

Perhaps most importantly, unlike much of the Middle East, China's economy is booming, and not simply because of resource extraction. In Tunisia, and then in Egypt, protests erupted after immolations by young men and women who, although they had undergraduate degrees, were unable to find work in economies that could not keep pace with growing populations. Although Chinese university graduates certainly have a tougher time finding jobs than they did several years ago, the Chinese economy continues to boom: China grew by more than 9 per cent last year, during a global economic crisis, and will likely grow at least as much this year, a rate it has kept up for roughly three decades (the Chinese premier, Wen Jiabao, downgraded that to 7 per cent this week). Educated young men and women still can find high-paying jobs, particularly if they are willing to move to interior cities that have been prioritised by the central government.

And, unlike in places like Egypt, foreign powers such as the United States - which has sold roughly $2 trillion in government debt to China - do not have much leverage over the People's Republic. In the early 1990s, when China remained a global pariah because of the 1989 Tiananmen crackdown, America had more leverage to push Beijing on human rights and democracy, and President Bill Clinton, during a visit to the country, publicly and harshly criticised China's record on rights.

Today, the story is much different. Dependent on China not only to keep the American economy propped up but also for cooperation on global issues like trade and climate change, the Obama administration has taken a much softer approach to Beijing. When Barack Obama headed to China for the first time as president in the fall of 2009, he agreed to a "press conference" with the Chinese president Hu Jintao at which the two actually took no questions, and when the American president held a town forum with Chinese students, he delivered none of the broadsides against China's rights record that his predecessor had.

Any change that happens in China in the future is going to come from domestic events, not from external pressure. **But don't expect that change to happen anytime soon.**

### China/Russia War Defense

#### No Sino/Russia war

Weitz 11---Director, Center for Political-Military Analysis Senior Fellow Hudson Institute. PhD in pol sci from Harvard (Richard, China-Russia relations and the United States: At a turning point?, <http://en.rian.ru/valdai_op/20110414/163523421.html>)

Since the end of the Cold War, the improved political and economic relationship between Beijing and Moscow has affected a range of international security issues. China and Russia have expanded their bilateral economic and security cooperation. In addition, they have pursued distinct, yet parallel, policies regarding many global and regional issues.

Yet, Chinese and Russian approaches to a range of significant subjects are still largely uncoordinated and at times in conflict. Economic exchanges between China and Russia remain minimal compared to those found between most friendly countries, let alone allies.

Although stronger Chinese-Russian ties could present greater challenges to other countries (e.g., the establishment of a Moscow-Beijing condominium over Central Asia), several factors make it unlikely that the two countries will form such a bloc.

The relationship between the Chinese and Russian governments is perhaps the best it has ever been. The leaders of both countries engage in numerous high-level exchanges, make many mutually supportive statements, and manifest other displays of Russian-Chinese cooperation in what both governments refer to as their developing strategic partnership.

The current benign situation is due less to common values and shared interests than to the fact that Chinese and Russian security concerns are predominately directed elsewhere.

Although both countries have experienced a geopolitical resurgence during the past two decades, Chinese and Russian security concerns are not directed at each other but rather focus on different areas and issues, with the notable exceptions of maintaining stability in Central Asia and constraining North Korea’s nuclear activities.

Most Chinese policy makers worry about the rise of separatist movements and Islamist terrorism in western China and about a potential military clash with the United States in the Asia-Pacific region, especially regarding Taiwan and the contested maritime regions of the South China and East China Seas.

In contrast, most Russian analysts see terrorism in the North Caucasus, maintaining influence in Europe, and managing security relations with Washington as the main security challenges to their country.

Neither Chinese nor Russian military experts perceive a near-term military threat from the other’s

MARK

country. The Russian government has even provided sophisticated navy, air, and air defense platforms to the Chinese military, confident that the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) would only employ these systems, if at all, against other countries. In addition, China and Russia have resolved their longstanding border disputes as well as contained their rivalries in Central Asia, the Korean Peninsula, and other regions.

Since the Soviet Union’s disintegration in the early 1990s, China and Russia have resolved important sources of their Cold War-era tensions. Through protracted negotiations, the two governments have largely solved their boundary disputes, which had erupted in armed border clashes in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The stoking of anti-Chinese sentiment by politicians in the Russian Far East impeded the ability of Russia’s first President, Boris Yeltsin, to make substantial progress during the 1990s in demarcating the Russia-China border. These politicians sought to rally local support by accusing Moscow of planning to surrender territory to Beijing. By the mid-2000s, Yeltsin’s successor, Vladimir Putin, managed to centralize sufficient political power in the Kremlin to ignore these local sentiments. Furthermore, Russia and China have demilitarized their lengthy shared frontier through a series of arms control and disarmament measures.

Chinese and Russian leaders share a commitment to a philosophy of state sovereignty (non-interference) and territorial integrity (against separatism). Although Russian and Chinese leaders defend national sovereignty by appealing to international law, their opposition also reflects more pragmatic considerations---a shared desire to shield their human rights and civil liberties practices, and those of their allies, from Western criticism.

Chinese and Russian officials refuse to criticize each other’s foreign and domestic policies in public. They also have issued many joint statements calling for a multi-polar world in which no one country (e.g., the United States) dominates. During the past few years, their leaders have commonly blamed American economic mismanagement for precipitating the global recession.

They regularly advocate traditional interpretations of national sovereignty that exempt a government’s internal policies from foreign criticism. Beijing and Moscow oppose American democracy promotion efforts, U.S. missile defense programs, and Washington’s alleged plans to militarize outer space.

The two countries strive to uphold the authority of the United Nations, where the Chinese and Russian delegations frequently collaborate to dilute resolutions seeking to impose sanctions on Burma, Iran, Zimbabwe, and other governments they consider friendly. In July 2008, they finally demarcated the last pieces of their 4,300-km (2,700 mile) frontier, one of the world’s longest land borders, ending a decades-long dispute.

Chinese and Russian officials have expressed concern about the efforts by the United States and its allies to strengthen their ballistic missile defense (BMD) capabilities. Their professed fear is that these strategic defense systems, in combination with the strong American offensive nuclear capabilities, might enable the United States to obtain nuclear superiority over China and Russia.

Both governments have also expressed unease regarding U.S. military programs in the realm of outer space. Russian and Chinese experts claim that the United States is seeking to acquire the means to orchestrate attacks in space against Russian and Chinese reconnaissance satellites and long-range ballistic missiles, whose trajectories passes through the upper atmosphere. In response, the Russian and Chinese governments have proposed various arms control initiatives purportedly aimed at preventing the militarization of space.

For example, the Russian and Chinese representatives have unsuccessfully sought for years at the UN Conference on Disarmament to negotiate a treaty on the “Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space,” which would seek to prohibit the militarization of outer space. More recently, China and Russia have submitted a joint Space Treaty to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, which would impose legal constraints on how the United States could use outer space. They have sought to link progress on other international arms control initiatives to the adoption of these space limitations.

The bilateral defense relationship has evolved in recent years to become more institutionalized and better integrated. As befits two large and powerful neighbors, the senior military leaders of Russia and China now meet frequently in various formats. Their direct encounters include annual meetings of their defense ministers and their armed forces chiefs of staff. Since 1997, they have also organized yearly “strategic consultations” between their deputy chiefs of the general staff. In March 2008, the Chinese defense minister established a direct telephone line with his Russian counterpart, the first such ministerial hotline ever created by China and another country. In December 2008, the chiefs of the Chinese and Russian general staffs created their own direct link.

Senior Russian and Chinese defense officials also typically participate in the regular heads of government meetings between Russia and China, which occur about once a year as bilateral summits. They also confer frequently at sessions of multinational gatherings, such as at meetings of the SCO, which host regular sessions for defense ministers. Contacts are even more common among mid-level military officers, especially those in charge of border security units and military units in neighboring Chinese and Russian territories.

Russian and Chinese military experts also engage in regular direct discussions related to their functional expertise such as communications, engineering, and mapping. Substantial academic exchanges also regularly occur. More than 1,000 Chinese students have studied at over 20 Russian military academies since 1996. The two defense communities conduct a number of larger exchanges and engagements. The best known are the major biennial military exercises that they have been holding since 2005, but smaller-scale engagements also frequently occur.

Chinese and Russian leaders also have developed shared perspectives and independent offensive capabilities regarding governmental activities in the cyber domain. The two governments have been developing their information warfare capabilities and now possess an extensive variety of offensive and defensive tools in this domain.

Furthermore, recent revelations regarding Chinese cyber-espionage activities suggest the extent to which Chinese operatives have penetrated Western information networks. In Russia’s case, cyber attacks against Estonia, Georgia, and other countries illustrate the extensive offensive capabilities available to that country’s forces. Russia’s hybrid August 2008 campaign against Georgia was particularly effective in disabling Georgia’s infrastructure as well as demonstrating a potential capacity to inflict widespread physical damage.

Both countries appear to have already conducted extensive surveying of U.S. digital vulnerabilities and to have prepared targeted campaign plans to exploit U.S. network vulnerabilities if necessary. Although these offensive and defensive preparations are being conducted independently, the Chinese and Russian governments are collaborating, along with other Eurasian allies in the SCO, to deny Internet resources to civil liberties groups and other opponents of their regimes.

Central Asia perhaps represents the geographic region where the security interests of China and Russia most overlap. Although China and Russia often compete for Central Asian energy supplies and commercial opportunities, the two governments share a desire to limit potential instability in the region. They especially fear ethnic separatism in their border territories supported by Islamic fundamentalist movements in Central Asia. Russian authorities dread the prospect of continued instability in the northern Caucasus, especially Chechnya and neighboring Dagestan. China’s leaders worry about separatist agitation in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region.

The shared regional security interests between Beijing and Moscow have meant that the newly independent states of Central Asia---Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan---have become a generally unifying element in Chinese-Russian relations. Their overlapping security interests in Central Asia have manifested themselves most visibly in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO).\

### Sino/India War Defense

#### China and India will cooperate – they’re on the same side of all major issues

Jing 10 (Huang Jing - Professor, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, served as interlocutor the Dalai Lama and Chinese authorities. “India, China need each other to change the world,” July 23, 2010, http://news.rediff.com/column/2010/jul/23/india-china-need-each-other-to-change-the-world.htm)

Fundamental changes have taken place since the 1990s, and these changes have made cooperation the only option for China and India to sustain their ascendancy. First and foremost, unlike previous powers whose rise was preconditioned by the global reach of their military capability, China and India cannot rise through expansion backed by military might in today's world. Rather, China and India are rising through integration into the existing world system amidst globalisation; and, this world system is based on capitalism and is dominated by developed countries. Thus, reform, not military power, has been the precondition for the rise of China and India. Only by changing themselves first, in order to join the world, can a rising China and India help change the world. The pursuit of a similar path in their ascendancy has resulted in common interests and demands. Rising as status quo powers, India and China have a shared demand to reform the existing world system, so that it can continuously facilitate, rather than hinder, their development. This explains why on major global issues -- from environmental concerns to food security and from restructuring the world financial system to trade policies -- India and China are naturally on the same side.
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Beneath these common interests lies the fact that India and China are facing the same fundamental challenge in their endeavours for modernisation. Yet the established model to achieve this goal -- modernisation through industrialisation -- is unsustainable because the experience of the developed countries shows that industrialisation means massive consumption of natural resources and rampant urbanisation. Given the combined population of 2.5 billion people, western-style industrialisation in India and China would bring doomsday. Thus, it is a joint mission for India and China to find an alternative path and, moreover, to persuade the developed countries to support this mission and help pay up the environmental deficit that had been accumulated in their modernisation process. Bilateral cooperation also serves the interests of India and China on other more pressing issues. "Water shortage looms for China, India" -- this eye-catching Bloomberg headline on May 31, 2010 indicates a looming crisis of water in India, China and all the Asian-continental countries, where the flowing water comes from the same place. As water has become a vital economic resource and an important strategic asset, bilateral cooperation between the two big powers in Asia is the key to solve this problem. Confrontation will only make everyone the loser. Nowadays, India and China also find convergent concern rather than divergent interest on the Pakistan issue. Lingering instability, rapid expansion of fundamentalist influences, and persistent military dominance since the start of the Afghan war have dramatically increased Pakistan's profile in China's security concerns, especially after the violent, explosive riot in Xinjiang on July 5, 2009. China and India will have to work together to promote stability and development in Pakistan, with a military under solid civilian control and an economy integrated regionally. Even on the thorny border issue, bilateral cooperation brings more benefits. Beijing [ Images ] and New Delhi [ Images ] have keenly realised that the border dispute involves strong nationalistic resentment because it roots deep in the injustice both nations had endured during the colonial period. Any compromise on this issue -- even if necessary -- can provoke damaging backlashes in domestic politics. Thus, the bilateral approach towards the border dispute, as indicated by the dialogue between National Security Advisor M K Narayanan and State Councilor Dai Bingguo in August 2009, is to seek effective management, rather than a premature solution. Obviously, it takes constant consultations to manage the dispute and prevent explosive escalation. Indeed, bilateral cooperation demands a forward-looking vision. The explosive increase in Sino-India trade -- from merely $2 billion in 2000 to over $60 billion in 2009 -- is but a footnote of the unfolding momentum in bilateral relations. It is true that Sino-India trade was less than 3 per cent of China's total trade volume -- $2007.2 billion -- in 2009. But bilateral trade -- if its annual increase keeps just half of the 50 per cent annual rate in the past decade -- will be over $400 billion in 2020, which is larger than the present trade between China and America. No doubt that there are conflicts of interest between the two rising powers. But this only highlights the importance and necessity of bilateral cooperation, not just because common interests far outweigh conflictual ones, but because confrontation would surely make both losers. It is high time for China and India to make a joint effort to promote bilateral exchanges and, specifically, to institutionalise bilateral summits and high-level dialogues. An Asian Group of Two -- the institutionalised management of bilateral cooperation -- is necessary to promote and sustain a peaceful and constructive relationship between the two rising Asian powers, whose success is essential for peace and prosperity in the entire region.

### Naval War Defense

#### No Chinese naval threat – can’t project through Africa or South America.

Polmar 9 (Norman Polmar, 4/27/09, “China’s ‘Increasing Naval Threat’ Overstated” http://defensetech.org/2009/04/27/chinas-increasing-naval-threat-overstated/)

China’s Navy — officially the Peoples Liberation Army’s Navy — held an impressive naval review in the historic port city of Qingdao on 23 April, the 60th anniversary of the founding of the PLA Navy. By any criteria, the event was a great success. Beyond a Chinese contingent of 2 nuclear and 2 diesel-electric submarines, 5 missile destroyers, and 6 frigates, there were 21 ships representing 14 other nations at the review. The U.S. Navy’s contribution to the anniversary celebration was the Aegis missile destroyer Fitzgerald (DDG 62). By the criteria of many American newspapers and, of course, bloggers, the event revealed the increasing “threat” to Western interests from China’s Navy. Indeed, a Time magazine blog showed an Associated Press (AP) photo of a Chinese warship with the caption, “A Chinese navy soldier guards on a battleship at Quingdao port…” The photo, however, shows what is probably a frigate. China does not have any battleships; nor does any other nation. Other articles — some citing official Chinese statements indicating that aircraft carriers will be constructed “in the future” — tell how the Chinese Navy is about to overtake the U.S. Navy, although by which measures is usually ignored. Indeed, one AP article declares that Chinese nuclear-propelled submarines “are considered just a notch below cutting-edge U.S. and Russian craft.” Reality is quite different. First, simplistic numerical comparisons are too often misleading. But quantity does provide a quality. For example: \* Nuclear aircraft carriers (CVN) U.S. = 11 China = 0 \* VSTOL/helicopter carriers (LHA/LHD) U.S. = 11 China = 0 \* Guided missile cruisers (CG) U.S. = 22 China = 0 \* Destroyers (DDG/DD) U.S. = 60 China = 27 \* Frigates (FF/FFG) U.S. = 30 China = 48 \* Ballistic missile submarines (nuclear)(SSBN) U.S. = 14 China = 3 \* Attack/cruiser missile submarines (nuclear) (SSN/SSGN) U.S. = 57 China = 6 \* Attack submarine (non-nuclear) (SS/SSK) U.S. = 0 China = 55 Second, numbers alone to not convey an adequate comparison. For example, each U.S. CVN-type carrier can operate 60 or more high-performance aircraft. All U.S. cruisers and destroyers have the Aegis advanced radar/fire control system; only a few Chinese ships have the equivalent. Similarly, all U.S. cruisers and destroyers have vertical-launch systems for firing long-range Tomahawk strike (land-attack) missiles as well as surface-to-air missiles. The Chinese have no ship-launched strike weapons and their surface-to-air missiles are inferior.
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Further, there is no public evidence that the Chinese SSBNs have an operational missile, and none is known to have undertaken a long-range patrol. No long-range patrols have been reported of nuclear torpedo-attack submarines (SSN), and relatively few are made by diesel-electric undersea craft. The one category in which the Chinese Navy does pose a potential threat to the U.S. Navy — in this writer’s opinion — is in non-nuclear submarines. The Chinese Navy has modern, Russian-built Kilo (Project 877EKM) submarines as well indigenous-built diesel-electric submarines. An Air-Independent Propulsion (AIP) submarine program is underway. The U.S. Navy’s ability to detect these craft, especially in littoral areas is limited. This was demonstrated for two years when the U.S. Navy operated against a Swedish AIP submarine, the Gotland, “loaned” for anti-submarine exercises. According to the Swedish officers, the U.S. carrier battle groups operating against the Gotland off the southern California coast invariably failed to locate the craft. Less is publicly known about the results/lessons of several South American diesel-electric submarines that periodically exercise with the U.S. Navy. The Chinese Navy, supported by a large, land-based air arm and land-based anti-ship missiles, could most likely deny U.S. surface and air operations off of the lengthy Chinese coast, and in the Taiwan Strait. At this time U.S. (nuclear) submarine operations in those areas appear to be feasible. Those submarines, armed with torpedoes, mobile mines, and Tomahawk missiles provide a considerable war-fighting capability. But the most likely scenarios for a U.S.-Chinese conflict appear to be in Third World, resource-rich areas, such as Africa and South America. And today, and for the foreseeable future, the Chinese Navy cannot project meaningful political or military power to those distances. To develop such a capability would take at least a decade, and most likely longer.

### SCS Defense

#### No south china sea conflict

Andrew H. Ring 12, Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Navy and former Federal Executive Fellow at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University, "A U.S. South China Sea Perspective: Just Over the Horizon," July 4, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, projects.iq.harvard.edu/sites/projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/fellows/files/ring.pdf

China has maintained peaceful relations with the fourteen countries it shares land borders with for over thirty years. This peaceful environment helped China’s rise. It allowed a majority of China’s resources to be poured into economic development versus defense infrastructure, and encouraged foreign investment and trade. China’s continued ascendancy will depend in part on Chinese leaders’ ability to maintain this peaceful environment and effectively address the emerging domestic issues (e.g., the demands of the rising middle class, entitlements, and its aging population). With its growing sphere of influence comes a need, and some may say, a responsibility, to maintain a peaceful environment within the South China Sea as well. China realizes that needless aggressive military action against its Southeast Asian neighbors will likely draw world powers into the South China Sea dispute.

### Iran Advantage

### 1NC Iran Defense

#### No impact to nuclear Iran – doesn’t snowball or cause aggression

**Layne 9** – Int’l Affairs Prof, Texas A&M, Visiting Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies, Cato Institute (Christopher, America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq, Review of International Studies 35, Cambridge Journals)

Of course, hard-line US neoconservatives reject this approach and argue that a nuclear-armed Iran would have three bad consequences: there could be a nuclear arms race in the Middle East; Iran might supply nuclear weapons to terrorists; and Tehran could use its nuclear weapons to blackmail other states in the region, or to engage in aggression. Each of these scenarios, however, is improbable.24 A nuclear Iran will not touch off a proliferation snowball in the Middle East. Israel, of course, already is a nuclear power. The other three states that might be tempted to go for a nuclear weapons capability are Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey. However, each of these states would be under strong pressure not to do so, and Saudi Arabia lacks the industrial and engineering capabilities to develop nuclear weapons indigenously. Notwithstanding the Bush administration’s hyperbolic rhetoric, Iran is not going to give nuclear weapons to terrorists. This is not to deny Tehran’s close links to groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. However, there are good reasons that states – even those that have ties to terrorists – draw the line at giving them nuclear weapons (or other WMD): if the terrorists were to use these weapons against the US or its allies, the weapons could be traced back to the donor state, which would be at risk of annihilation by an American retaliatory strike.25 Iran’s leaders have too much at stake to run this risk. Even if one believes the administration’s claims that rogue state leaders are indifferent to the fate of their populations, they do **care very much** about the survival of their regimes, which means that they can be deterred. For the same reason, Iran’s possession of nuclear weapons will not invest Tehran with options to attack, or intimidate its neighbours. Israel’s security with respect to Iran is guaranteed by its own formidable nuclear deterrent capabilities. By the same token, just as it did in Europe during the Cold War, the US can extend its own deterrence umbrella to protect its clients in the region – Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states, and Turkey. American security guarantees not only will dissuade Iran from acting recklessly, but also restrain proliferation by negating the incentives for states like Saudi Arabia and Turkey to acquire their own nuclear weapons. Given the overwhelming US advantage in both nuclear and conventional military capabilities, Iran is not going to risk national suicide by challenging America’s security commitments in the region. In short, while a nuclear-armed Iran hardly is desirable, neither is it ‘intolerable’, because it could be contained and deterred successfully by the US.

#### No middle east war

Cook 7**—**CFR senior fellow for Mid East Studies. BA in international studies from Vassar College, an MA in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and both an MA and PhD in political science from the University of Pennsylvania(Steven, Ray Takeyh, CFR fellow, and Suzanne Maloney, Brookings fellow, 6 /28, Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast, http://www.iht.com/bin/print.php?id=6383265, AG)

Underlying this anxiety was a scenario in which Iraq's sectarian and ethnic violence spills over into neighboring countries, producing conflicts between the major Arab states and Iran as well as Turkey and the Kurdistan Regional Government. These wars then destabilize the entire region well beyond the current conflict zone, involving heavyweights like Egypt. This is scary stuff indeed, but with the exception of the conflict between Turkey and the Kurds, the scenario is far from an accurate reflection of the way Middle Eastern leaders view the situation in Iraq and calculate their interests there. It is abundantly clear that major outside powers like Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey are heavily involved in Iraq. These countries have so much at stake in the future of Iraq that it is natural they would seek to influence political developments in the country. Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, **the region has** also **developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.**

#### No impact---Iranian prolif will be stabilizing

Robert D. Kaplan 11 is a national correspondent for The Atlantic and a senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security, AND Stephen S. Kaplan is a research associate in the Brookings Institution, “America Primed” Feb 23 http://nationalinterest.org/article/america-primed-4892

Moreover, a nuclear-armed Iran is not a worst-case scenario. Tehran would have a few uncertain weapons, though perhaps with a confident missile arsenal of various ranges, and an early-warning system the United States and Israel could penetrate at will, even as they would bear down on Iran with all the might of their own, far-vaster nuclear arsenals. In addition, a nuclear Islamic Republic would further weaken the influence of Egypt and Saudi Arabia, and force them to rely on Israel and the United States for deterrence, even as they might develop their own nuclear arsenals as a response.

An Egypt and a Saudi Arabia forced to rely implicitly more on Israel for deterrence against Iran are more likely to put pressure on the West Bank Palestinians to conclude a peace deal with the Jewish state (though, it must be said, prospects for Middle East peace are slim under almost any circumstance). As much as liberal internationalists and neoconservatives rightly trumpet the broad benefits of democracy during this unprecedented time of democratic upheaval, it has been only Arab autocrats who have thus far come to an accord with Israel. Autocrats can act boldly, even as they can efficiently purge dissenting members of their own circles who disagree with new policies, exactly as Egypt’s President Anwar el-Sadat and Jordan’s King Hussein did in making peace with Israel. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas’s ability to act likewise is questionable.

Indeed, the ascent of Iranian influence is not an altogether bad development. It was lethargic Sunni Arab dictatorships, nominally pro-American, whose societies supplied the social and political conditions for the emergence of the 9/11 terrorists. The toppling of Saddam Hussein, and the consequent rise of Shia Iran as a regional power, has finally shocked sclerotic Arab leaders into actions that benefit U.S. interests: moving a bit nearer to Israel and working more closely with America. An Iranian Shia power that balances against a Sunni Arab world, democratic or not, would be an ideal outcome were Iran to go through a whole or even partial political transformation. Shia power in the future will not necessarily speak with one voice, given the prospect of ongoing tensions between Tehran and Baghdad. For even a weak Shia state in Iraq will offer a political and theological alternative to the Islamic Republic. (This is not to justify the costs of invading Iraq, only to mention the few benefits that have emerged from the effort.) And Turkey, whose Islamic democracy makes the United States uncomfortable, still has an appeal to the Arab masses on the basis of religion rather than ethnicity which serves a useful purpose: it implicitly checks Iran.

A divided Middle East, coupled with an Arab world weakened by domestic strife, has much to recommend itself for the future of American power. And demographic, cultural and other indicators point to a positive ideological and philosophical shift in Iranian politics in the future. This prognosis, coupled with the difficulties inherent in a wholly successful U.S. strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities, leads to the containment of a nuclear Iran—should sanctions and industrial sabotage not work in the long run—as the least-bad option, and the one least likely to embroil the United States even deeper in the Middle East.

#### No chance of a terrorist attack

Mueller 8/2—IR prof at Ohio State. PhD in pol sci from UCLA (2 August 2011, John, The Truth about Al Qaeda, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68012/john-mueller/the-truth-about-al-qaeda?page=show)

As a misguided Turkish proverb holds, "If your enemy be an ant, imagine him to be an elephant." The new information unearthed in Osama bin Laden's hideout in Abbottabad, Pakistan, suggests that the United States has been doing so for a full decade. Whatever al Qaeda's threatening rhetoric and occasional nuclear fantasies, its potential as a menace, particularly as an atomic one, has been much inflated.

The public has now endured a decade of dire warnings about the imminence of a terrorist atomic attack. In 2004, the former CIA spook Michael Scheuer proclaimed on television's 60 Minutes that it was "probably a near thing," and in 2007, the physicist Richard Garwin assessed the likelihood of a nuclear explosion in an American or a European city by terrorism or other means in the next ten years to be 87 percent. By 2008, Defense Secretary Robert Gates mused that what keeps every senior government leader awake at night is "the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear." Few, it seems, found much solace in the fact that an al Qaeda computer seized in Afghanistan in 2001 indicated that the group's budget for research on weapons of mass destruction (almost all of it focused on primitive chemical weapons work) was some $2,000 to $4,000.

In the wake of the killing of Osama bin Laden, officials now have more al Qaeda computers, which reportedly contain a wealth of information about the workings of the organization in the intervening decade. A multi-agency task force has completed its assessment, and according to first reports, it has found that al Qaeda members have primarily been engaged in dodging drone strikes and complaining about how cash-strapped they are. Some reports suggest they've also been looking at quite a bit of pornography.

#### Prefer our ev---theirs exaggerates minor differences and falsely hypes the risk of conflict---recent events prove

Steers 11—Huffington Post writer (Julia, Jordan: Why It's Not A Domino In The Middle East, 2/21/11, [www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/21/jordan\_n\_825896.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/21/jordan_n_825896.html))

In early February, Agence France Press, a leading French news service, published two reports saying the 36 tribesmen, out of a tribal population of over 2 million, had warned Jordan's royal family that their country "will sooner or later be the target of an uprising similar to the ones in Tunisia and Egypt due to the suppression of freedoms and the looting of public funds."

The royal family shot back with a statement condemning the AFP's coverage of the tribal warnings as unsubstantiated and defamatory, and threatening to "pursue legal action" against the news service. Many media outlets pounced saying the face-off meant that deep-seated unrest was brewing in Jordan, just as it was elsewhere in the region.

Unless, of course, it wasn't.

Some analysts say that the rush to define fast-moving, seismic protests has sometimes trumped accuracy in the coverage of the Middle East.

"This frenzy has caught the West by surprise and has resulted in events being reported without analysis, background or research," said Dr. Safwan M. Masri, Director of the Columbia University Middle East Research Center, in an interview with The Huffington Post.

Jordan is an anomaly of sorts, one of the Middle East's few constitutional monarchies. The King wields real executive power, and appoints the the prime minister and the Senate, but the country has a bicameral parliament, with a democratically elected Lower House. Their multi-ethnic population--the country has absorbed many Iraqi and Palestinian refugees in recent decades--is viewed domestically as a source of stability that sets Jordan apart from nearby countries prone to ethnic clashes. The Bedouin tribes, which make up close to 40 percent of the population, have historically been loyal to the monarchy.

**US security guarantees check**

**Hagerty 9**—Associate Professor in UMBC's political science department (Devin, The long shadow: nuclear weapons and security in 21st century Asia, ed. Alagappa, 315)

In the final analysis, these states have long since accommodated themselves to the reality of a nuclear-armed Israel, in large part because they derive reassurance from their ties with the United States. A robust. Iranian-driven Shia revival—under Tehran's nuclear umbrella—might inspire a more hawkish reaction, but on balance, U.S. security guarantees are likely to limit the follow-on effects of Iran's nuclearization. The recently announced U.S. military aid increases, described earlier, are explicitly geared toward containing Iran,
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stiffening the spines of U.S. allies in the Persian Gulf, and demonstrating that Washington is engaged in the region for the long haul. In seeking congressional approval tor the expanded arms sales to friendly governments, U.S. officials will undoubtedly argue, as they did with respect to Pakistan in the 1980s, that conventional military assistance to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and the five smaller GCC states will give these countries the security reassurance they need to forswear the development of nuclear weapons in response to Iranian nuclearization.33 //"Iran leaves the NPT and goes overtly nuclear, and (fits critical nuclear installations are not destroyed in U.S. or—more likely—Israeli preventive attacks, the most optimistic regional scenario is one in which Iran and Israel settle uneasily into a strategic equation of mutual nuclear deterrence, while the United States pointedly reaffirms its alliances with Israel and Turkey and undertakes to guarantee the security of its Sunni Arab allies as long as they refrain from pursuing nuclear weapons. Although the evolution of a regional security system along these lines is far from ideal, it bears comparison with other potential scenarios that may be far worse.

**Timeframe is super long**

**Cirincione 10**—president, Ploughshares fund, focused on nuclear weapons policy—AND—Elise Connor (Joseph, How Iran Can Build a Bomb, 1 July 2010, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/07/01/how\_iran\_can\_build\_a\_bomb?page=0,0)

In fact, it is much harder to build a deliverable weapon than most pundits assume. Panetta's estimate leans toward the worst-case scenario, in which the weapons-building process proceeds perfectly smoothly. But the best expert assessments indicate that it would actually take Iran about three to five years to develop a nuclear bomb. Here's how that process would probably unfold -- and the reasons why it's not likely to happen in the timeline the doomsayers would have you believe. Step 1: The Decision Iran is certainly moving to acquire the technology that would enable it to make a weapon. But, as a 2009 Joint Threat Assessment by the EastWest Institute concludes, "[I]t is not clear whether [Iran] has taken the decision to produce nuclear weapons. "The regime must weigh the political and security costs of developing nuclear weapons before moving ahead. And Iran might decide, like Japan, that its needs are best served by approaching the threshold of building a bomb (acquiring the technical capability and know-how) but not actually crossing the line and risking an arms race among its rivals or a pre-emptive attack from the United States or Israel. "Nobody knows if Iran has taken this decision," Sharon Squassoni, director of the Proliferation Prevention Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, told Agence France-Press on June 28. "It's more in their interest to have this ambiguity." Step Two: The Right Stuff Should Iran decide to proceed, it must accumulate a sufficient quantity of the indispensable component for the core of the bomb -- highly enriched uranium (HEU) or plutonium. Iran is pursuing production paths for both, though its uranium enrichment capabilities are years ahead of its plutonium reprocessing plans. There are two ways for Iran to produce HEU, uranium that includes 90 percent of the isotope U-235. Using its centrifuges at the Natanz facility, it could take natural uranium, composed of 0.07 percent U-235, and steadily enrich it to weapons-grade material. This would be a flagrant violation of its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). If Iran chose this route, it would have to withdraw from the treaty and kick out international inspectors. Running full tilt at Natanz, it then would take Iran about one year to enrich enough uranium for one bomb. More likely, Iran could continue its current path of increasing its stockpile of low-enriched uranium (3 percent U-235), which it claims is for peaceful purposes. At some point, Iran could then leave the NPT, kick out the inspectors, and pump the uranium back through the centrifuges to enrich it to higher levels. The Joint Threat Assessment estimates this path could produce one bomb's worth of HEU within three to six months. Panetta seemed to say that, using this method, Iran could have enough HEU to construct two bombs in one year. Still, recent technological difficulties could prolong the process: In February, the Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security reported that the number of working Iranian centrifuges, the machines that enrich uranium, had decreased since mid-2009. Although Iran continues to install centrifuges, it operates nearly 1,000 fewer centrifuges than it did in May 2009. Recently, Iran has enriched uranium to about 20 percent, purportedly as fuel for its research reactor. If Iran accumulated enough 20 percent-enriched uranium -- it had 11 kilograms at the end of May -- and used this as source material, it could produce weapon-quality HEU even more quickly. In all cases, it would take Iran an additional six months to convert the HEU from its current gaseous form into metal for a bomb. Step 3: The Gadget The technical path to a bomb does not end with HEU. To produce a crude nuclear device would take an additional year, assuming Iran has a workable design and the components to build it. But the leap to a sophisticated nuclear warhead, one that could be used as a weapon, could take an additional two to five years.

MARK

During this period, Iran would need to manufacture the nonnuclear components, test and refine them, and ultimately, conduct one or more nuclear explosive tests. Troubleshooting the nonnuclear components might go undetected, but global monitors would detect any nuclear test explosion, surely leading to increased pressure on Iran. Vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. James Cartwright, confirmed this timeline before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 14. He said a "deliverable weapon that is usable tactically" would take "another two to three, potentially out to five years." Step 4: Honey, I Shrunk the Warhead Iran could make a very heavy crude nuclear device, deliverable by truck, approximately one year after it produced the HEU. But this heavier device, though useful as a weapon, would be too large to deliver on Iran's planes or missiles, which can't carry a weapon that weighs over 1,000 kilograms. A smaller, more sophisticated weapon is needed if Iran is to develop a credible nuclear deterrent -- and shrinking a nuclear warhead doesn't happen overnight. Retired U.S. Gen. Eugene Habiger says that "the miniaturization of a nuclear warhead is probably the most significant challenge that any proliferant would have to face." Habiger noted: The first U.S. ICBM's [intercontinental ballistic missiles], the warheads on those ICBM's, were in the 4,000-5,000 kg range. That's the best we could come up with when we first started ... Only after six to eight years, of very intensive engineering development and aggressive testing, did we get down to 1,000 kg. Step 5: Deliverance Iran would also have to develop a re-entry vehicle for its weapon. A ballistic missile follows a parabolic trajectory, shooting up through the atmosphere, traveling a short distance through outer space, and re-entering the atmosphere to strike its target. The warhead must be sturdy enough to survive the extreme conditions it encounters along this flight path, and developing this technology is no small task. It is one thing to test a nuclear weapon in carefully controlled conditions. It is another to build a weapon that can withstand the fierce vibrations, G-forces, and high temperatures of launch and re-entry into the atmosphere. Iran has not demonstrated the capability to build such a re-entry vehicle thus far.

# Round 5 v. Minnesota SS

## 1NC

### 1NC

#### Energy production is the generation of power from raw materials – excludes extraction

Vaekstfonden 6 Vaekstfonden is a Danish government backed investment fund that facilitates the supply of venture capital in terms of start-up equity and high-risk loans "THE ENERGY INDUSTRY IN DENMARK- perspectives on entrepreneurship andventure capital" No Specific Cited, Latest Data From 2006 s3.amazonaws.com/zanran\_storage/www.siliconvalley.um.dk/ContentPages/43667201.pdf

In all, 20 industry experts were interviewed about the composition and dynamics of the Danish energy sector. Insights from a minimum of 3 industry experts have been assigned to each of the stages in the value chain. Following is a brief description of what the different stages encompass.¶ Raw material extraction¶ This stage encompass the process before the actual production of the energy. As an example it is increasingly expensive to locate and extract oil from the North Sea. Likewise coal, gas and waste suitable for energy production can be costly to provide.¶ Energy production¶ Energy production encompasses the process, where energy sources are transformed into heat and power. Transmission and distribution¶ Energy transmission and distribution is in this report defined as the infrastructure that enables the producers of energy to sell energy to consumers.¶ Consumption¶ The last stage in the value chain is consumption. This stage encompasses products and services that geographically are placed near the consumers. As an example, decentralized energy production via solar power systems is part of the consumption stage.

#### Vote negative---including extraction doubles the size of the topic and makes it bidirectional by allowing affs to affect both supply and demand sides of each energy---overstretches our research burden and undermines preparedness for all debates

### 1NC

#### Obama’s ahead but the race is close---voters are paying attention which means the plan could cause a shift

Cooper 10/25 Michael is a writer at the New York Times’ Caucus blog. “Has Romney’s Rise in Polls Stopped?” 2012, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/25/has-romneys-rise-in-polls-stopped/?gwh=20374120E0C2B79985262EFF8E8CD19D

A debate has been raging among polling analysts and commentators about whether Mitt Romney is still gaining ground, as he did after the first debate, or if his bounce has slowed or stalled. But while some Republicans say that they still have the wind at their backs, several polling analysts weighed in recently to argue that the data suggests there is no longer a Romney surge.¶ Mark Blumenthal, the senior polling editor of the Huffington Post and the founding editor of Pollster.com, wrote a piece this morning with the headline: “Presidential Polls Counter Romney Surge Myth.”¶ “While Romney gained significantly in the wake of the first presidential debate in early October,’’ he wrote, “the lack of a continuing trend over the past two weeks helps counter a theme in some campaign coverage that Romney’s support continues to ‘surge’ nationwide.”¶ Sam Wang, who analyzes state polls at the Princeton Election Consortium, wrote this week that the Mr. Obama’s plunge after the first debate had **stopped with him still ahead**, and delivered the following verdict: “Indeed **the race is close,** but it seems stable. For the last week, there is no evidence that conditions have been moving toward Romney. There is always the chance that I may have to eat my words — but that will require movement that is not yet apparent in polls.”¶ Nate Silver, who writes the FiveThirtyEight blog in The New York Times, wrote Thursday: “Mr. Romney clearly gained ground in the polls in the week or two after the Denver debate, putting himself in a much stronger overall position in the race. However, it seems that he is no longer doing so.”¶ With the race so close in so many places, it can be difficult to assess the true state of play. ¶ Most major national polls, with the exception of a few tracking polls, have shown the race to be essentially tied for months. Some polls in crucial swing states where Mr. Obama has been leading have tightened between the two candidates since the first debate, including Ohio, which is closer than it was a month ago. And **now is the point where many voters pay more attention** to the election, **which can move the polls**. But even with the proliferation of polls and the increased reliance on aggregated polls — lumping or averaging many polls together — it can be difficult to get a realistic picture on any given day in the closing weeks, given that some polls do not reach voters who use only cellphones, and many polls have struggled in an environment where fewer people want to respond to questions.

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

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

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

#### Base turnout is key---newest evidence

Cohn 10/26 Nate is an elections expert at The New Republic. “Why Undecided Voters Matter Less And Turnout Matters More Than Ever Before,” 2012, <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/109171/why-undecided-voters-matter-less-and-turnout-matters-more-ever>

Heading into the final stretch of one of the closest presidential elections in recent history, many are beginning to handicap the potential behavior of undecided voters and Obama’s vaunted ground operation. But while undecided voters could make a difference in the few tightest states, as William Galston argues elsewhere on this website, **turnout is the most critical outstanding question.**¶ Although undecided voters represent 3 to 6 percent of the electorate in most swing states, **they're unlikely to break overwhelmingly toward one candidate**. Historically, candidates usually exceed their final share of the vote in the polls and the exits show late deciders breaking roughly evenly, at least in comparison to supposed and unsubstantiated rules about undecided voters breaking entirely for the challenger. In 2004, Bush actually performed better than the final polls, which showed Bush leading Kerry by just 1.5 points in 2004 with less than 49 percent, compared to Bush's eventual 2.4 point victory with 50.7 percent of the vote. And although the exit polls showed Kerry winning late deciders, there is a distinction between “undecided” in a final poll and deciding late in the exits. Many polls push undecided voters to enunciate their preference, and their un-polled counterparts don’t finally “make up their mind” until the final week, even though they knew their decision deep down and would have said so if they had been pushed hard enough.¶ In this election, **the number of undecided voters is so small** that there are only few states where a clear break would be sufficient to flip the outcome. In Wisconsin and Nevada, Obama already exceeds 49 percent, suggesting that undecided voters could only influence the outcome if Obama supporters turn out at lower rates than the polls anticipate. One state where Romney still retains a narrow path to victory through undecided voters is Ohio, where Obama holds a very slight lead of just 2.1 points in the RealClearPolitics average, 47.9 to 45.8. But if Romney won 55 percent of undecided voters and one percentage point vote for a third party candidate, Obama would still win Ohio by a 1.6-point margin, 50.3 to 48.7. Romney would need nearly 70 percent of undecided voters to carry the state—an exceptional performance. Colorado and Virginia are the two states close enough for undecided voters to more realistically make a difference, but, even there, turnout is a more critical question. ¶ According to national polls, Obama is performing four points better among registered voters than likely voters. That’s well above the more typical 1 or 2 point gap and the main culprit appears to be strong Republican enthusiasm combined with low enthusiasm among young, Latino, and Democratic-leaning independent voters. Since Obama’s coalition is unusually dependent on low-frequency voters, **Obama has more to gain from a strong turnout operation than previous candidates**. Although it’s unclear whether Obama’s vaunted ground operation can rejuvenate turnout among infrequent Obama '08 voters, the difference between a modest and high turnout among young and minority Obama supporters could easily decide the election. And it's not just that turnout is important, it's that Obama's larger advantage among registered voters makes it an open question whether Obama could actually lose if minority and youth turnout rates approach '08 levels, even if undecided voters broke in Romney's direction.

#### Romney causes massive foreign backlash and nuclear wars globally

Bandow 12 Doug is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. “Mitt Romney: The Foreign Policy of Know-Nothingism,” 5/15, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/mitt-romney-foreign-policy-knownothingism>

Republican politicians continue to **beat the war drums**. All of this cycle’s GOP presidential contenders, save Rep. Ron Paul, charged President Barack Obama with weakness, indeed, almost treason. But the public isn’t convinced. The president who increased military spending, twice upped troop levels in Afghanistan, started his own war with Libya, talked tough to North Korea, loudly threatened Iran and Syria, and oversaw the hit on Osama bin Laden just doesn’t look like a wimp.¶ In fact, a recent Washington Post-ABC poll found that Americans prefer Barack Obama to Mitt Romney on international issues by 53 percent to 36 percent. Republican apparatchiks Karl Rove and Ed Gillespie nevertheless claim, “the president is strikingly vulnerable in this area,” but so far Romney is convincing only as a blowhard with a know-nothing foreign policy. Noted Jacob Heilbrunn of the National Interest, the GOP is “returning to a prescription that led to trillion-dollar wars in the Middle East that the public loathes.”¶ Romney’s overall theme is American exceptionalism and greatness, slogans that win public applause but offer no guidance for a bankrupt superpower that has squandered its international credibility. “This century must be an American century,” Romney proclaimed. “In an American century, America leads the free world and the free world leads the entire world.” He has chosen a mix of advisers, including the usual neocons and uber-hawks — Robert Kagan, Eliot Cohen, Jim Talent, Walid Phares, Kim Holmes, and Daniel Senor, for instance — that gives little reason for comfort. Their involvement suggests Romney’s general commitment to an imperial foreign policy and force structure. ¶ Romney is no fool, but he has never demonstrated much interest in international affairs. He brings to mind George W. Bush, who appeared to be largely ignorant of the nations he was invading. Romney may be temperamentally less likely to combine recklessness with hubris, but he would have just as strong an incentive to use **foreign aggression** to win conservative acquiescence to domestic compromise. This tactic worked well for Bush, whose spendthrift policies received surprisingly little criticism on the right from activists busy defending his war-happy foreign policy. ¶ The former Massachusetts governor has criticized President Obama for “a naked political calculation or simply sheer ineptitude” in following George W. Bush’s withdrawal timetable in Iraq and for not overriding the decision of a government whose independence Washington claims to respect. But why would any American policymaker want to keep troops in a nation that is becoming ever more authoritarian, corrupt, and sectarian? It is precisely the sort of place U.S. forces should not be tied down. ¶ In contrast, Romney has effectively taken no position on Afghanistan. At times he appears to support the Obama timetable for reducing troop levels, but he has also proclaimed that “Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan under a Romney administration will be based on conditions on the ground as assessed by our military commanders.” Indeed, he insisted: “To defeat the insurgency in Afghanistan, the United States will need the cooperation of both the Afghan and Pakistani governments — we will only persuade Afghanistan and Pakistan to be resolute if they are convinced that the United States will itself be resolute,” and added, “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban.” ¶ Yet it’s the job of the president, not the military, to decide the basic policy question: why is the U.S. spending blood and treasure trying to create a Western-style nation state in Central Asia a decade after 9/11? And how long is he prepared to stay — forever? On my two trips to Afghanistan I found little support among Afghans for their own government, which is characterized by gross incompetence and corruption. Even if the Western allies succeed in creating a large local security force, will it fight for the thieves in Kabul? ¶ Pakistan is already resolute — in opposing U.S. policy on the ground. Afghans forthrightly view Islamabad as an enemy. Unfortunately, continuing the war probably is the most effective way to destabilize nuclear-armed Pakistan. What will Romney do if the U.S. military tells him that American combat forces must remain in Afghanistan for another decade or two in order to “win”? ¶ The ongoing AfPak conflict is not enough; Romney appears to desire war with Iran as well. No one wants a nuclear Iran, but Persian nuclear ambitiions began under America’s ally the Shah, and there is no reason to believe that the U.S. (and Israel) cannot deter Tehran. True, Richard Grenell, who briefly served as Romney’s foreign-policy spokesman, once made the astonishing claim that the Iranians “will surely use” nuclear weapons. Alas, he never shared his apparently secret intelligence about the leadership in Tehran’s suicidal tendencies. The Iranian government’s behavior has been rational even if brutal, and officials busy maneuvering for power and wealth do not seem eager to enter the great beyond. Washington uneasily but effectively deterred Joseph Stalin and Mao Zedong, the two most prolific mass murderers in history. Iran is no substitute for them. ¶ Romney has engaged in almost infantile ridicule of the Obama administration’s attempt to engage Tehran. Yet the U.S. had diplomatic relations with Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia. Washington came to regret not having similar contact with Mao’s China. Even the Bush administration eventually decided that ignoring Kim Jong-Il’s North Korea only encouraged it to build more nuclear weapons faster. ¶ Regarding Iran, Romney asserted, “a military option to deal with their nuclear program remains on the table.” Building up U.S. military forces “will send an unequivocal signal to Iran that the United States, acting in concert with allies, will never permit Iran to obtain nuclear weapons... Only when the ayatollahs no longer have doubts about America’s resolve will they abandon their nuclear ambitions.” Indeed, “if all else fails... then of course you take military action,” even though, American and Iranian military analysts warn, such strikes might **only delay** development of nuclear weapons. “Elect me as the next president,” he declared, and Iran “will not have a nuclear weapon.” ¶ Actually, **if Tehran becomes convinced** that **an attack** and attempted regime change **are likely**, **it will have** no choice **but to develop nuclear weapons**. How else to defend itself? The misguided war in Libya, which Romney supported, sent a clear signal to both North Korea and Iran never to trust the West. ¶ Iran’s fears likely are exacerbated by Romney’s promise to subcontract Middle East policy to Israel. The ties between the U.S. and Israel are many, but their interests often diverge. The current Israeli government wants Washington to attack Iran irrespective of the cost to America. Moreover, successive Israeli governments have decided to effectively colonize the West Bank, turning injustice into state policy and making a separate Palestinian state practically impossible. Perceived American support for this creates enormous hostility toward the U.S. across the Arab and Muslim worlds. ¶ Yet Romney promises that his first foreign trip would be to Israel “to show the world that we care about that country and that region” — as if anyone anywhere, least of all Israel’s neighbors, doesn’t realize that. He asserted that “you don’t allow an inch of space to exist between you and your friends and allies,” notably Israel. The U.S. should “let the entire world know that we will stay with them and that we will support them and defend them.” Indeed, Romney has known Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for nearly four decades and has said that he would request Netanyahu’s approval for U.S. policies: “I’d get on the phone to my friend Bibi Netanyahu and say, ‘Would it help if I say this? What would you like me to do?’” Americans would be better served by a president committed to making policy in the interests of the U.S. instead. ¶ Romney’s myopic vision is just as evident when he looks elsewhere. For instance, he offered the singular judgment that Russia is “**our number one geopolitical foe**.” Romney complained that “across the board, it has been a thorn in our side on questions vital to America’s national security.” ¶ The Cold War ended more than two decades ago. Apparently Romney is locked in a time warp. Moscow manifestly does not threaten vital U.S. interests. Romney claimed that Vladimir “Putin dreams of ‘rebuilding the Russian empire’.” Even if Putin has such dreams, they don’t animate Russian foreign policy. No longer an ideologically aggressive power active around the world, Moscow has retreated to the status of a pre-1914 great power, concerned about border security and international respect. Russia has no interest in conflict with America and is not even much involved in most regions where the U.S. is active: Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. ¶ Moscow has been helpful in Afghanistan, refused to provide advanced air defense weapons to Iran, supported some sanctions against Tehran, used its limited influence in North Korea to encourage nuclear disarmament, and opposes jihadist terrorism. This is curious behavior for America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” ¶ Romney’s website explains that he will “implement a strategy that will seek to discourage aggressive or expansionist behavior on the part of Russia,” but other than Georgia where is it so acting? And even if Georgia fell into a Russian trap, Tbilisi started the shooting in 2008. In any event, absent an American security guarantee, which would be madness, the U.S. cannot stop Moscow from acting to protect what it sees as vital interests in a region of historic influence. ¶ Where else is Russia threatening America? Moscow does oppose NATO expansion, which actually is foolish from a U.S. standpoint as well, adding strategic liabilities rather than military strengths. Russia strongly opposes missile defense bases in Central and Eastern Europe, but why should Washington subsidize the security of others? Moscow opposes an attack on Iran, and so should Americans. Russia backs the Assad regime in Syria, but the U.S. government once declared the same government to be “reformist.” Violent misadventures in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya demonstrate that America has little to gain and much to lose from another attempt at social engineering through war. If anything, the Putin government has done Washington a favor keeping the U.S. out of Syria. ¶ This doesn’t mean America should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But **treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to** act like one.Doing so especially will make Moscow more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union. Naturally, Romney wants to “encourage democratic political and economic reform” in Russia — a fine idea in theory, but meddling in another country’s politics rarely works in practice. Just look at the Arab Spring. ¶ Not content with attempting to start a **mini-Cold War**, Mitt Romney dropped his nominal free-market stance to demonize Chinese currency practices. He complained about currency manipulation and forced technology transfers: “China seeks advantage through systematic exploitation of other economies.” ¶ On day one as president he promises to designate “China as the currency manipulator it is.” Moreover, he added, he would “take a holistic approach to addressing all of China’s abuses. That includes unilateral actions such as increased enforcement of U.S. trade laws, punitive measures targeting products and industries that rely on misappropriations of our intellectual property, reciprocity in government procurement, and countervailing duties against currency manipulation. It also includes multilateral actions to block technology transfers into China and to create a trading bloc open only for nations genuinely committed to free trade.” ¶ Romney’s apparent belief that Washington is “genuinely committed to free trade” is charming nonsense. The U.S. has practiced a weak dollar policy to increase exports. Washington long has subsidized American exports: the Export-Import Bank is known as “Boeing’s Bank” and U.S. agricultural export subsidies helped torpedo the Doha round of trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization. ¶ Of course, Beijing still does much to offend Washington. However, the U.S. must accommodate the rising power across the Pacific. Trying to keep China out of a new Asia-Pacific trade pact isn’t likely to work. America’s Asian allies want us to protect them — no surprise! — but are not interested in offending their nearby neighbor with a long memory. The best hope for moderating Chinese behavior is to tie it into a web of international institutions that provide substantial economic, political, and security benefits. ¶ Beijing already has good reason to be paranoid of the superpower which patrols bordering waters, engages in a policy that looks like containment, and talks of the possibility of war. Trying to isolate China economically would be taken as a direct challenge. Romney would prove Henry Kissinger’s dictum that even paranoids have enemies. ¶ Naturally, Romney also wants to “maintain appropriate military capabilities to discourage any aggressive or coercive behavior by China against its neighbors.” However, 67 years after the end of World War II, it is time for Beijing’s neighbors to arm themselves and cooperate with each other. Japan long had the second largest economy on earth. India is another rising power with reason to constrain China. South Korea has become a major power. Australia has initiated a significant military build-up. Many Southeast Asian nations are constructing submarines to help deter Chinese adventurism. Even Russia has much to fear from China, given the paucity of population in its vast eastern territory. But America’s foreign-defense dole discourages independence and self-help. The U.S. should step back as an off-shore balancer, encouraging its friends to do more and work together. It is not America’s job to risk Los Angeles for Tokyo, Seoul, or Taipei. ¶ Romney similarly insists on keeping the U.S. on the front lines against North Korea, even though all of its neighbors have far more at stake in a peaceful peninsula and are able to contain that impoverished wreck of a country. The Romney campaign proclaims: “Mitt Romney will commit to eliminating North Korea’s nuclear weapons and its nuclear-weapons infrastructure.” Alas, everything he proposes has been tried before, from tougher sanctions to tighter interdiction and pressure on China to isolate the North. What does he plan on doing when Pyongyang continues to develop nuclear weapons as it has done for the last 20 years? ¶ The American military should come home from Korea. Romney complained that the North’s nuclear capability “poses a direct threat to U.S. forces on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere in East Asia.” Then withdraw them. Manpower-rich South Korea doesn’t need U.S. conventional support, and ground units do nothing to contain North Korea’s nuclear ambitions. Pull out American troops and eliminate North Korea’s primary threat to the U.S. Then support continuing non-proliferation efforts led by those nations with the most to fear from the North. That strategy, more than lobbying by Washington, is likely to bring China around. ¶ Romney confuses dreams with reality when criticizing President Obama over the administration’s response to the Arab Spring. “We’re facing an Arab Spring which is out of control in some respects,” he said, “because the president was not as strong as he needed to be in encouraging our friends to move toward representative forms of government.” Romney asked: “How can we try and improve the odds so what happens in Libya and what happens in Egypt and what happens in other places where the Arab Spring is in full bloom so that the developments are toward democracy, modernity and more representative forms of government? This we simply don’t know.” ¶ True, the president doesn’t know. But neither does Mitt Romney. The latter suffers from the delusion that bright Washington policymakers can remake the world. Invade another country, turn it into a Western-style democracy allied with America, and everyone will live happily every after. But George W. Bush, a member of Mitt Romney’s own party, failed miserably trying to do that in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The Arab Spring did not happen because of Washington policy but in spite of Washington policy. And Arabs demanding political freedom — which, unfortunately, is not the same as a liberal society — have not the slightest interest in what Barack Obama or Mitt Romney thinks. ¶ Yet the latter wants “convene a summit that brings together world leaders, donor organizations, and young leaders of groups that espouse” all the wonderful things that Americans do. Alas, does he really believe that such a gathering will stop, say, jihadist radicals from slaughtering Coptic Christians? Iraq’s large Christian community was destroyed even as the U.S. military occupied that country. His summit isn’t likely to be any more effective. Not everything in the world is about Washington. ¶ Which is why Romney’s demand to do something in Syria is so foolish. Until recently he wanted to work with the UN, call on the Syrian military to be nice, impose more sanctions, and “increase the possibility that the ruling minority Alawites will be able to reconcile with the majority Sunni population in a post-Assad Syria.” Snapping his fingers would be no less effective. ¶ Most recently he advocated arming the rebels. But he should be more cautious before advocating American intervention in another conflict in another land. Such efforts rarely have desirable results. Iraq was a catastrophe. Afghanistan looks to be a disaster once American troops come home. After more than a decade Bosnia and Kosovo are failures, still under allied supervision. Libya is looking bad. ¶ Even without U.S. “help,” a full-blown civil war already threatens in Syria. We only look through the glass darkly, observed the Apostle Paul. It might be best for Washington not to intervene in another Muslim land with so many others aflame. ¶ Despite his support for restoring America’s economic health, Romney wants to increase dramatically Washington’s already outsize military spending. Rather than make a case on what the U.S. needs, he has taken the typical liberal approach of setting an arbitrary number: 4 percent of GDP. It’s a dumb idea, since America already accounts for roughly half the globe’s military spending — far more if you include Washington’s wealthy allies — and spends more in real terms than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War, and real outlays have nearly doubled since 2000. By any normal measure, the U.S. possesses far more military resources than it needs to confront genuine threats. ¶ What Romney clearly wants is a military to fight multiple wars and garrison endless occupations, irrespective of cost. My Cato colleague Chris Preble figured that ¶ Romney's 4 percent gimmick would result in taxpayers spending more than twice as much on the Pentagon as in 2000 (111 percent higher, to be precise) and 45 percent more than in 1985, the height of the Reagan buildup. Over the next ten years, Romney's annual spending (in constant dollars) for the Pentagon would average 64 percent higher than annual post-Cold War budgets (1990-2012), and 42 percent more than the average during the Reagan era (1981-1989). ¶ If Mitt Romney really believes that the world today is so much more dangerous than during the Cold War, he should spell out the threat. He calls Islamic fundamentalism, the Arab Spring, the impact of failed states, the anti-American regimes of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela, rising China, and resurgent Russia “powerful forces.” It’s actually a pitiful list — Islamic terrorists have been weakened and don’t pose an existential threat, the Arab Spring threatens instability with little impact on America, it is easier to strike terrorists in failed states than in nominal allies like Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, one nuclear-armed submarine could vaporize all four hostile states, and Russia’s modest “resurgence” may threaten Georgia but not Europe or America. Only China deserves to be called “powerful,” but it remains a developing country surrounded by potential enemies with a military far behind that of the U.S. ¶ In fact, the greatest danger to America is the blowback that results from **promiscuous intervention** in conflicts not our own. Romney imagines a massive bootstrap operation: he wants a big military to engage in social engineering abroad which would require an even larger military to handle the violence and chaos that would result from his failed attempts at social engineering. Better not to start this vicious cycle. ¶ America faces international challenges but nevertheless enjoys unparalleled dominance. U.S. power is buttressed by the fact that Washington is allied with every industrialized nation except China and Russia. America shares significant interests with India, the second major emerging power; is seen as a counterweight by a gaggle of Asian states worried about Chinese expansion; remains the dominant player in Latin America; and is closely linked to most of the Middle East’s most important countries, such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq. If Mitt Romney really believes that America is at greater risk today than during the Cold War, he **is not qualified to be president**. ¶ In this world the U.S. need not confront every threat, subsidize every ally, rebuild every failed state, and resolve every problem. Being a superpower means having many interests but few vital ones warranting war. Being a bankrupt superpower means exhibiting judgment and exercising discretion. ¶ President Barack Obama has been a disappointment, amounting in foreign policy to George W. Bush-lite. But Mitt Romney sounds even worse. His rhetoric suggests a return to the worst of the Bush administration. The 2012 election likely will be decided on economics, but foreign policy will prove to be equally important in the long-term. America can ill afford another know-nothing president.
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#### The plan collapses oil prices overnight---the link is huge and unique

Poruban 12 Steven Poruban "API: Raising US oil supplies key to lowering gasoline prices" 3/26 www.ogj.com/articles/print/vol-110/issue-3c/general-interest/api-raising-us-oil.html

A major component to relieving upward pressure on gasoline prices in the US will come from increasing domestic oil production and not from raising taxes, American Petroleum Institute Pres. and Chief Executive Officer Jack Gerard told reporters Mar. 20 during a conference call from Washington, DC.

He said President Barack Obama's administration needs a "reality check" as well as a revision to the unclear signals it is sending the market. This is something that US voters understand as well, Gerard noted, citing statistics from a poll conducted earlier this month by Harris Interactive on behalf of API among 1,009 registered voters in the US.

"Voters understand that raising taxes is not a solution for high gasoline prices," Gerard said, adding, "No economist in the world will tell you gas prices can be reduced by increasing taxes, and the Congressional Research Service just released a study saying so," Gerard said.

"A true all-of-the-above energy strategy would include greater access to areas that are currently off limits, a regulatory and permitting process that supported reasonable timelines for development, and immediate approval of the Keystone XL pipeline to bring more Canadian oil to US refineries. This would send a positive signal to the market and could help put downward pressure on prices," he said.

A large majority of these polled voters, API said, "also believe that more US oil and natural gas development could reduce gasoline prices (81%), lead to more American jobs (90%), and enhance America's energy security (84%)."

Gerard said, "Most US resources have been placed off-limits. The US oil and natural gas industry is currently allowed to explore, develop, and produce on less than 15% of the federal offshore areas. More than 85% of those areas are off limits, denying all Americans the benefits of producing those resources—benefits like greater supplies of crude oil and natural gas, job creation, and significant returns on our treasury in taxes, rents, royalties, and bonus bids."

Market perception

The very notion that the Obama administration is proposing the release of oil supplies from the nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve or asking other countries, such as Saudi Arabia, to boost oil production, is a "clear admissions that supply matters" in the case of relieving gasoline price pressure, Gerard said.

Markets are largely driven by perception, Gerard said, and when Obama in his early days in office sent out the message to the market that oil and gas production from the Gulf of Mexico, for example, would be higher today than it was then, that is part of the reason we're experiencing higher gasoline prices in the US.

To illustrate this point about clear market signals, Gerard recalled the example of when US gasoline prices were surpassing $4/gal during George W. Bush's presidency, his administration lifted the moratorium on offshore drilling and in a matter of days, oil prices fell by $15-16/bbl.

#### Oil prices are key to Iraqi stability

Gartenstein-Ross & Goodman 9 \*director of the Center for Terrorism Research at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies AND \*\*CTR deputy director “The Global Economic Crisis and Iraq’s Future,” http://www.jewishpolicycenter.org/966/global-economic-crisis-iraq-future

Last summer, when oil prices reached all-time highs virtually every day, it seemed that one of the few silver linings was a more stable future for Iraq. Surging oil prices appeared to give Iraq a windfall; experts forecast an improving economy that could diminish support for the insurgency and increase resources for Iraq's nascent security forces. But now that the collapse in the world's economy has caused oil prices to plummet, what does the future hold for Iraq?

While estimates of Iraq's dependence on oil revenues vary wildly, oil clearly lies at the heart of the country's economy. Indeed, median estimates hold that oil accounts for more than 80 percent of its revenues. Iraq now faces several challenges spawned by the global recession. These challenges come just as the U.S.—pursuant to agreements with Iraq's government—is due to cease its patrols of cities. While a spiral into chaos is not inevitable, there is a clear opening for insurgent factions.

#### Iraqi instability causes regional conflict

Pollack 11—Director for Persian Gulf affairs at the National Security Council. Seven years in the CIA as a Persian Gulf military analyst. PhD from MIT (Kenneth, 11/15/11, Prospects for Increased Iranian Influence in Iraq, www.brookings.edu/testimony/2011/1115\_iran\_iraq\_pollack.aspx)

Renewed civil war. Historically, this may actually be Iraq's most likely future. Although academic studies of intercommunal civil war show some variance, a considerable body of work—including the best and most recent studies—indicate that states that have undergone one such round of conflict (as Iraq did in 2005-2007) have anywhere from a 1-in-3 to a 1-in-2 likelihood of sliding back into civil war within about five years of a ceasefire (which in Iraq came in 2008). Since the U.S. invasion in 2003, Iraq has followed the quintessential pattern for how states descend into civil war, how they emerge from it, and now how they fall back into it. Everything that is going on in Iraq today as American peacekeepers prepare to leave—the resumption of violence, the rapid deterioration of trust, the expectation that things are going to get more violent and corrupt, the unwillingness of leaders to compromise, the determination of actors across the spectrum to take short-sighted actions to protect themselves at the expense of others' trust and security—shows that Iraq continues to hew closely to these awful patterns. Indeed, even Maliki's unconscious bid for dictatorship is probably more likely to produce civil war than a return to centralized autocracy. If he keeps pushing in this direction, the Sunnis and Kurds will likely revolt, the military will fragment (a la Lebanon) and the result will be civil war, not a stable tyranny.

Civil war would be bad for Iran. Indeed, it might actually be the worst scenario for Iran in that it would likely produce very significant spillover into Iran. It could easily radicalize large segments of Iranian society, perhaps prompting the Kurds and Arabs of Iran to revolt, or convincing Iran's dominant Shi’ah to become more actively anti-Sunni. It would doubtless encourage Iran to intervene heavily in Iraq, which would stress Iran's limited resources and provoke a counter intervention by Iraq's Sunni neighbors. Given the high degrees of popular antipathy toward the regime, and the willingness of Iranians to risk physical harm by the regime to voice their grievances, spillover from civil war in Iraq could generate new popular protests or even renewed rebellion in Iran (especially if intervention in Iraq taxed the Iranian state and its military the way that the First World War did Tsarist Russia, or the wars against England taxed Bourbon France). It could also bring Iran into covert or even overt conflict with Iraq's Sunni neighbors as the Congolese civil war turned into "Africa's world war" and the Lebanese civil war sparked conflict between Israel and Syria.

Nevertheless, civil war in Iraq would also be disastrous for the United States for a variety of reasons. One of them would be that in the short term, Iran would likely find itself able to dominate significant areas of Iraq by backing Shi'a militias in the fighting—militias that would have no one to turn to except Iran, as was the case in 2005-2007. Moreover, the radicalization of Iraq's Shi'a would likely spillover into Kuwait, Bahrain and even Saudi Arabia, creating new opportunities for Iran to stoke unrest in those states, possibly with disastrous results.

#### Escalates and goes nuclear

Jain 11—August, Ash, visiting fellow at the Washington Institute, JD and Masters from Georgetown SFS, formber member of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, "Nuclear Weapons and Iran's Global Ambitions", The Washington Institute, <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PolicyFocus114.pdf>

As it looks for plausibly deniable ways to intimidate and subvert Gulf monarchies, an emboldened Iran could decide to direct terrorist attacks in the Gulf, possibly even targeting U.S. interests. Moreover, Gulf efforts to contain and deter Iran could escalate tensionsin the region and increase the risk of violence and conflict. A military confrontation between Iran and the Gulf states—both potentially armed with nuclear weapons—could have drastic consequences. While crisis diplomacy might succeed in containing its impact, any such confrontation could seriously undermine regional security, disrupt global energy supplies, and threaten global economic and financial stability. U.S. military intervention might also be necessary at some point—though this could be complicated in the face of a nuclear Iran.

#### OCS drilling kills U.S.-EU energy cooperation---that’s key to overall relations which solve prolif, Russian expansion, Middle East stability and a peaceful Chinese rise

David Koranyi 9-4 is the deputy director of the Atlantic Council's Dinu Patriciu Eurasia Center, 9/4/12, “An Emerging Transatlantic Rift on Energy?” http://www.naturalgaseurope.com/romney-energy-policy-emerging-transatlantic-rift-on-energy

Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney recently unveiled his energy plans for the United States, which promises to fulfill the country’s four-decades’-old dream of energy independence. It has the potential to do so. But the price could ultimately be high: a breakdown in global climate negotiations and a rift in relations with Europe.

American and European energy markets are on a diverging path. The US has edged closer to self-sufficiency with respect to fossil fuels, due mostly to the extensive development of its unconventional resources. From 60 percent in 2005, net petroleum imports were down to 45 percent of the US supply last year. By 2020, this rate could be further reduced close to zero, excluding Canada and Mexico. Shale gas made the United States the number one natural gas producer in the world, overtaking Russia, and revitalized manufacturing and the chemical industry.

Meanwhile, climate-conscious Europe's already high energy import dependence continues to grow. Use of renewable resources mandated by the European Union are spreading dynamically, but will take time to mature. Indigenous unconventional gas faces mixed reactions in some member states. In the wake of the Fukushima accident, nuclear energy is on decline in most countries. Ironically, coal use has increased lately in Germany, due to the nuclear power plant closures and flaws in the EU's cap-and-trade system.

Romney has proposed a plan that would widen the transatlantic gap further. He proposes to accelerate the development of America's considerable on- and offshore oil and natural resources by opening up federal lands and wildlife refuges, relaxing legislation, extending tax breaks, and approving Keystone XL that would carry shale oil from Canada; to rehabilitate coal by reverting the Environmental Protection Agency's prohibitive clean air standards introduced by the current administration; and to revitalize nuclear power by streamlining the permitting procedures.

The underlying tenet of the plan is a complete disregard for the threat of climate change, a term the document does not use. Romney renounces the "myth of green jobs creation" and promotes new jobs in the oil, gas, and coal sectors instead. The plan also stipulates that renewables can compete with other resources on a "level playing field," and implies the cessation of government support for renewable energy projects.

The plan, not to mention its implementation, will cause outrage in Europe. To most European policymakers, and the general public alike, shale oil and coal are anathemas, and the "drill baby drill" mentality is considered environmentally reckless. Brussels and other European capitals already resent that President Obama has not spent enough political capital on global climate change negotiations. Europeans worry that a Romney Administration would derail the timeframe agreed to in Cancun last December.

Moreover, Europeans believe that a pursuit of US energy independence could prove both elusive and counter-productive. Even if complete self-sufficiency is achieved, oil prices are determined on the global oil market. The United States might miss breakthroughs in technologies and business opportunities that are offered by the global scramble for renewables. While global challenges to stable energy markets prevail, an illusion of energy independence might prompt a more isolationist stance in US foreign policy and a reduced commitment to strategic interests like Europe's energy security.

A transatlantic friction is looming. Would the United States and Europe ultimately be able to reconcile their visions? The transatlantic partners share strategic interests and face common threats and challenges closely linked to energy issues, such as the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a resurgent Russia, an unstable Middle East, or China’s insatiable appetite for resources and its repercussions around the globe. The United States and Europe are uniquely positioned to develop technology, leverage financing, and share experiences in legislative and regulatory developments. In times of austerity, identifying synergies and pooling resources is paramount.

There is also plenty to build upon. Owed largely to the increased use of cheap natural gas in electricity generation, to the detriment of coal and measures like enhanced vehicle fuel economy standards, last week the US Energy Information Administration reported that energy-related CO2 emissions in the first three months of the year were the lowest since 1992 (though still much higher per capita than in Europe). While Congress and the US government are paralyzed, more than thirty US states adopted renewable energy portfolio standards similar to the EU's 20 percent target by 2020. Regional emission trading schemes are on the rise in the absence of a federal one. Texas is becoming a renewable energy technology hotspot and wind and solar powerhouse. Many in Europe are willing to learn from the US how to unlock their own shale gas potential that can serve as a bridge fuel to the EU's preferred zero-carbon future as gas emits much less CO2. Conversely, the US is looking to exploit four decades of European experience in energy efficiency improvements and demand reduction. Though politically and financially tricky, both EU member states and the United States should revisit nuclear energy as an essential component in providing affordable and sustainable energy. The list goes on.

The benefits of transatlantic cooperation are beyond doubt. The consequences of a falling out between the United States and the EU after the elections are far-reaching. A continued dialogue launched in the framework of the US-EU Energy Council in 2009 would be a way to avoid that. Joint efforts to address climate change, innovation, and investment in clean energy technologies, risk sharing, and cost reduction; joint research and development and harmonized energy diplomacy should be the cornerstones. A value gap that will undermine trust within the alliance is in nobody’s interest.

#### EU relations solve extinction

Maria João Rodrigues 11, Professor at the European Studies Institute-Université Libre de Bruxelles and at the Lisbon University Institute, Special Advisor on European Economic Policies, 2011, “Transatlantic cooperation for jobs and a new growth model,” in The Agenda for the EU-US strategic partnership, online: http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Transatlantic2011.pdf

The strategic priorities previously described in this chapter do not constitute a wrong or a risky choice because they might create a competitive handicap for the US and Europe. On the contrary, they can provide them with the long-term competitive advantage of being at the vanguard of setting an agenda of global priorities which will be emulated by other powers, if the planet is able to create a win-win game and thus avoid extreme fragmentation and collapse. We are assuming that countries are condemned to a certain level of strategic convergence if they want to secure the planet’s future.

Moreover, these strategic priorities can be seen as realistic as most of the required technological solutions are already known. The real difficulty is whether the political process is large and democratic enough to drive this kind of ‘grand transformation’. It is important to make the right choices when dealing with the various dilemmas that these priorities entail.

Recovering growth and jobs creation and reducing carbon emissions are not irreconcilable objectives: these goals can be achieved by refocusing investment, production, consumption and jobs creation on low-carbon solutions. It is also possible to recover growth and speed up the transition to a smarter economy by actively supporting innovation at all levels and in all companies as well as by providing people with the skills and training that will enable them to transition to the new jobs. Finally, it is possible to recover growth and reduce the public debt – which is now much higher after the massive expenditure entailed by the recent stimulus packages and the financial bail-outs – by actively supporting job creation, redirecting public expenditure to key investments and by reviewing the sources of taxation.

This active search for a new growth model, involving not only policymakers but also the relevant civil society stakeholders, urgently needs to be put higher on the agenda of transatlantic cooperation.

#### Russian aggression causes nuclear war

Blank 9 – Dr. Stephen Blank is a Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, March 2009, “Russia And Arms Control: Are There Opportunities For The Obama Administration?” http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub908.pdf

Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation.168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need.169 Simultaneously,¶ The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD**.** First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author170) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD.171¶ Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes,¶ But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.172
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#### Text: The Unites States Supreme Court should devolve authority over restrictions on oil drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf to the 50 states and all relevant territories. The 50 states and all relevant territories should substantially reduce restrictions on offshore oil drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf.

#### Giving regulatory power to the states solves better – leaving power in the hands of the federal government guts solvency – THIS IS THE END OF THEIR SOLVENCY ARTICLE

Spakovsky and Loris 12 Hans A. von Spakovsky is a Senior Legal Fellow in the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, and Nicolas D. Loris is the Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, at The Heritage Foundation, August 13, 2012, “Offshore Drilling: Increase Access, Reduce the Risk, and Stop Hurting American Companies”, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/08/offshore-drilling-increase-access-reduce-the-risk-and-stop-hurting-american-companies>

\*\*\*\*\*Minnesota Card Begins Here\*\*\*\*\*\*

No New Access in the New OCS Plan¶ The recent lease sale in the Central Gulf of Mexico was a welcoming sign (especially since the Administration delayed part of the sale in 2010), but the new five-year leasing plan for 2012–2017 is extremely disappointing. The Administration failed to unlock the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as well as the Eastern Gulf of Mexico and areas off Alaska’s coast. As a result, a meager 15 percent of America’s territorial waters are available for oil and gas exploration. The Minerals Management Service estimates that 101 billion barrels of oil and 480 trillion cubic feet of natural gas of proven reserves and undiscovered resources are awaiting exploration in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). Opening these areas would generate hundreds of thousands of new jobs, generate hundreds of billions of dollars in government revenue, and bring more oil to the world market, thereby lowering gas prices.[9]¶ Congress Should Open Access, Reduce Risk¶ Opening access and reducing the onerous regulatory risk would give companies the certainty they need to expand job creation and increase energy supplies. Specifically:¶ Congress should require the Department of the Interior to open all of America’s territorial waters for leasing, exploration, and drilling. The Offshore Petroleum Expansion Now (OPEN) Act of 2012, for instance, would replace President Obama’s 2012–2017 Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program with a much more robust plan that opens areas in the Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf of Mexico, and off Alaska’s coast.¶

\*\*\*\*\*Minnesota Card Ends Here\*\*\*\*\*\*

Congress should require the Department of the Interior to honor the permit deadlines (as required by law) unless the Interior finds specific and significant faults with the application. If Interior concludes that the permit application is not complete, it should outline specific steps the applicant could take to complete it. If Interior does not find fault with the application before the deadline expires, the permit application should be considered accepted upon expiration of the deadline so that companies can proceed with exploration and drilling.¶ Congress should reform liability caps for oil spills. Given the fact that uncapped tort liability yields frivolous lawsuits, removing the cap entirely without implementing a new system would subject covered industries to artificially high costs. Congress should reform liability caps in a way that accurately assigns risk and liability to those companies engaged in covered activities.[10]¶ **Congress should ultimately transition the permitting process to state regulators, who are best able to balance economic growth and environmental protection**. The permitting process needs to be taken out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats who report to a President hostile to oil and gas production—a Chief Executive who can arbitrarily stop such energy development across the nation by executive fiat.

### 1NC

#### The United States federal government should grant substantial exemptions to restrictions on offshore oil drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf for a company if and only if that company includes in all exploration, production or development plans an oil spill containment and cleanup plan capable of handling a worst-case scenario spill.

#### Conditioning drilling permits on an oil spill plan is key – the aff’s unconditional elimination of restrictions makes spills inevitable

Niki Tsongas, Rep. D-MA, 5-12-2011, “Tsongas introduces legislation to ensure that any offshore drilling is done responsibly,” Congressional Documents and Publications, ln

This afternoon, Congresswoman Niki Tsongas introduced the Save America from Environmentally Reckless Drilling Act, or the SAFER Drilling Act, legislation that would ensure that any drilling that takes place in U.S. coastal waters is done responsibly so a disaster similar to the BP oil spill cannot happen again. Congresswoman Niki Tsongas, a member of the Natural Resources Committee, released the following statement. "Barely more than a year ago, we experienced the worst environmental disaster in our nation's history," said Congresswoman Niki Tsongas. "Today, the House voted on H.R 1231, legislation that would open up the East Coast of the United States for oil exploration, including off of Massachusetts. To hasten drilling, the bill would suppress existing environmental protections that are designed to ensure that oil companies are drilling safely. "It is inconceivable that after the BP disaster in the Gulf we would allow drilling to take place in our public waterways and lands without oil companies clearly demonstrating their ability to prevent, mitigate, or clean up a continuous spill. That is why I am introducing the SAFER Drilling Act today. It would require oil companies to include in all exploration and production and development plans an oil spill containment and cleanup plan capable of handling a worst-case scenario spill. The legislation is similar to an amendment I offered to H.R 1231 on the floor yesterday which received bipartisan support but which was ultimately defeated by the Republican majority. "The lack of such a requirement during the BP oil spill led to a disorganized, ineffective response by BP and government officials that cost our nation billions of dollars and did irreparable harm to the Gulf Coast. A similar spill off the Massachusetts coast would devastate our fishing industry, harm our beaches and disrupt our economy." "Ensuring that the oil industry can contain and clean-up its spills is fundamental to preventing future disasters," said Michael Jasny, Senior Policy Analyst at the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). "Under Rep. Tsongas' common-sense legislation, companies would have to show they can control the damage before they start drilling off our coasts." "Drilling for oil miles below the earth's surface in ocean depths of 5000 feet is an inherently risky undertaking. As such, it is essential that all necessary safety precautions are taken and all scenarios are planned for appropriately, especially when an accident can hold such dire consequences for our environment and our economy," Tsongas concluded.

#### Unchecked oil spills crush marine oxygen

Paul Stephen Dempsey, Law Prof @ Denver, Summer 1984, “Oil Pollution of the Marine Environment by Ocean Vessels,” 6 NW. J. INT'L L. & BUS. 459, ln

Although large amounts of oil remain on the surface, much of it is mixed into the water column, either through wave action or the use of dispersants applied to oil slicks. Unfortunately, as the spill breaks up, the environmental hazard does not disappear; it increases. Dissolved oil and oil globules fall through the water column, growing more toxic as they approach bottom. Concentrations of dissolved oil from 0.2 to 1 part per billion, a harmful level already found in coastal waters near many cities, can skyrocket to as high as 250 parts per billion. n26 [\*467] High levels of dissolved oil increase the concentration of toxic chemicals in commercial fish and severely disrupt the marine food chain. Oil pollution reduces the ocean's phytoplankton in coastal areas, where most of the world's commercial fish and oxygen are produced. Sea beds, an essential source of food for bottom dwelling commercial fish, become contaminated and sterile. The ramifications of introducing such high concentrations of petroleum pollution into the oceans are severe. Oil pollution disrupts phytoplankton, the microscopic plant life in the ocean that forms algae and serves an important function in the ecosystem. First, oil interferes with phytoplankton photosynthesis. Such interference may eventually reduce the oxygen output and the carbon dioxide uptake of ocean. Moreover, increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere may cause a "greenhouse effect," such that heat will not be allowed to radiate into space, causing an increase in global temperatures. As a long term effect, the ice caps could eventually melt, causing the sea level to increase up to 200 feet, submerging most coastal cities. n27

#### Extinction

Donald A. Bryant, Dep. Biochem @ Penn. State, 2003, “The Beauty in small things revealed,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, http://www.pnas.org/content/100/17/9647.full

Oxygenic photosynthesis accounts for nearly all the primary biochemical production of organic matter on Earth. The byproduct of this process, oxygen, facilitated the evolution of complex eukaryotes and supports their/our continuing existence. Because macroscopic plants are responsible for most terrestrial photosynthesis, it is relatively easy to appreciate the importance of photosynthesis on land when one views the lush green diversity of grasslands or forests. However, Earth is the “blue planet,” and oceans cover nearly 75% of its surface. All life on Earth equally depends on the photosynthesis that occurs in Earth's oceans. A rich diversity of marine phytoplankton, found in the upper 100 m of oceans, accounts only for ≈1% of the total photosynthetic biomass, but this virtually invisible forest accounts for nearly 50% of the net primary productivity of the biosphere (1). Moreover, the importance of these organisms in the biological pump, which traps CO2 from the atmosphere and stores it in the deep sea, is increasingly recognized as a major component of the global geochemical carbon cycle (2). It seems obvious that it is as important to understand marine photosynthesis as terrestrial photosynthesis, but the contribution of marine photosynthesis to the global carbon cycle was grossly underestimated until recently. Satellite-based remote sensing (e.g., NASA sea-wide field sensor) has allowed more reliable determinations of oceanic photosynthetic productivity to be made (refs. 1 and 2; see Fig. 1).

### Economy Advantage

### Econ Decline Defense

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Global economy resilient

Zakaria 9—PhD in pol sci from Harvard. Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, The Secrets of Stability, 12 December 2009, http://www.fareedzakaria.com/articles/articles.html)

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 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.

### AT: Unemployment

#### **Unemployment low now**

Adler 10-25 – Lee Adler, writer for the Wall Street Examiner, October 25th, 2012, "Initial Unemployment Claims Get Back To Trend With 8.2% Year to Year Decline" wallstreetexaminer.com/2012/10/25/initial-unemployment-claims-get-back-to-trend-with-8-2-year-to-year-decline/

The Labor Department reported that seasonally adjusted (SA) first time claims for unemployment fell by 23,000 to 369,000 from a revised 392,000 (previously 388,000) in the advance report for the week ended October 20, 2012. The consensus estimate of 375,000 was a miss, although somewhat less off the mark than usual. This week’s data partially corrected the calendar issues that impacted last week’s report bringing the number more in line with the trend.¶ Along with the headline seasonally adjusted data, which is the only data the media reports, the Department of Labor (DOL) reports the not seasonally adjusted data. It said in today’s press release, “The advance number of actual initial claims under state programs, unadjusted, totaled 342,702 in the week ending October 20, a decrease of 20,032 from the previous week. There were 377,156 initial claims in the comparable week in 2011.” [Added emphasis mine]

### AT: Protectionism Impact

#### No protectionism

Ikenson, 9associate director for the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute (Daniel, “A Protectionism Fling: Why Tariff Hikes and Other Trade Barriers Will Be Short-Lived,” 3/12, http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/FTBs/FTB-037.html

But despite the occasional anti-trade rhetoric of the Democratic Congress and the protectionist-sounding campaign pledges of President Obama, the United States is unlikely to alter its strong commitment to the global trading system. There is simply too much at stake. Like businesses in other countries, U.S. businesses have become increasingly reliant on transnational supply chains. Over 55 percent of U.S. import value in 2007 was of intermediate goods, which indicates that U.S. producers depend highly on imported materials, components, and capital equipment. And there is also the fact that 95 percent of the world's population lives outside of the United States, so an open trade policy is an example to uphold.

#### Interdependence doesn’t solve war

May 5**—**Professor Emeritus (Research) in the Stanford University School of Engineering and a senior fellow with the Institute for International Studies at Stanford University. Former co-director of Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation. Principal Investigator for the DHS. (Michael, “The U.S.-China Strategic Relationship,” September 2005, http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/si/2005/Sep/maySep05.asp)

However important and beneficial this interdependence may be from an economic point of view, it is not likely to be a significant factor for strategic stability. Famously, economists before World War I sounded clear warnings that Europe had become economically interdependent to an extent that war there would ruin Europe. The war was fought nevertheless, Europe was duly ruined, and the ensuing political consequences haunted Europe to the end of World War II. Other cases exist. Modern war has been an economic disaster. Economic realities, including economic interdependence, play little role in whether a country goes to war or not. Economic myths certainly do and they usually affect strategic stability quite negatively. This is another reason why domestic perceptions matter: they determine which myths are believed.

### AT: Trade Deficit

#### Trade deficit doesn’t hurt the economy---the balance of payments reaches zero and it stimulates growth

Weinberger 12 David, Heritage Foundation. “Is the Trade Deficit a Drag on the U.S. Economy?” May 15, http://blog.heritage.org/2012/05/15/is-the-trade-deficit-a-drag-on-the-u-s-economy/

Popular opinion demonizes the U.S. for importing more goods than it exports, or running a “trade deficit.” This view maintains that the trade deficit is costing jobs and slowing economic growth. “The $600 billion annual deficit is the most significant barrier to achieving a robust economic recovery and creating jobs,” charges a recent column. Yet this popular understanding, which is based on an incomplete assessment of the trade equation, is wrong.¶ The prevailing view assumes that exchanging U.S. currency for foreign goods leaks money out of circulation. The reason for this confusion is that gross domestic product (GDP)—the total value of everything produced in the U.S.—is determined by removing imports from the final calculation. This is merely because imports aren’t produced within the U.S., but it does not mean that money exchanged for imported goods drops out of the economy.¶ Money channeled abroad must circulate back to the U.S. economy. If the dollars are not quickly spent on U.S. goods and services, they are invested in U.S. assets such as Treasuries, corporate bonds and stocks, and bank deposits. The balance of payments balances. As Heritage’s Bryan Riley reports, in 2011, the “overall U.S. international transactions deficit was $0. That means the number of dollars leaving the country and the number of dollars entering the country in 2011 balance out.”¶ Furthermore, far from hollowing out economic growth, trade gives Americans purchasing power, as the cheapest goods are available to them. More income is left for other investments and purchases as a result. Besides, money sent abroad that is invested back into the U.S. improves our productive capacity. It’s a win-win for growth.¶ The proof: “Since 1980, real U.S. GDP has grown at an annualized rate of 3.6 percent during those periods of rising trade deficits, compared to a sluggish 1.0 percent during periods of shrinking deficits,” according to the Cato Institute.¶ The words “trade deficit” may carry a negative connotation, which is what many politicians and talking heads would like us to believe. Slicing through the talking points and unearthing the full economic picture shows this view is too narrow-minded.

### AT: Price Shocks

#### Increased production doesn’t solve shocks even if it lowers the average price---means we still get our links but they don’t get their turns

**Bertrand 12** PIERRE BERTRAND, IBD, More US Domestic Oil Production Unlikely To Offset High Energy Costs, Says Report, may 11 www.ibtimes.com/articles/340198/20120511/oil-energy-price-congressional-budget-report-gasoline.htm

The now-familiar call for Washington to lower energy costs by increasing domestic production of oil may not be the most effective policy, according to this month's Congressional Budget Office report on the nation's energy security.

"Policies that promoted greater production of oil in the United States would probably not protect U.S. consumers from sudden worldwide increases in oil prices stemming from supply disruptions elsewhere in the world, even if increased production lowered the world price of oil on an ongoing basis," said the report, which outlines possible policy solutions to help insulate U.S. consumers from energy and fuel price fluctuations resulting from global oil supply disruptions.

### AT: Manufacturing

#### Not key to the economy

Chapman, 12 -- Tribune editorial board member

(Steve, "Manufacturing an economic myth," Chicago Tribune, 3-18-12, articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-03-18/news/ct-oped-0318-chapman-20120318\_1\_manufacturing-sector-rick-santorum-products, accessed 10-3-12)

Manufacturing accounts for a **shrinking slice** of the total economy mainly because as we grow wealthier, we spend a smaller portion of our income on physical products, like carsand appliances, and a bigger one on services, from health care to cellphone contracts to restaurant meals. That phenomenon holds across the developed world. It's the result of the free market at work, endlessly shifting resources to accommodate changes in consumer demand. Politicians don't think they should tell Americans to eat at Burger King instead of Chipotle, or buy baseball bats instead of soccer balls. They didn't insist we keep our typewriters when personal computers came along. For the most part, our leaders take it as normal and sensible to defer to consumer demand, rather than try to dictate it. Given that, why do they think they ought to rig the tax code to push consumption dollars from services, which Americans want, to goods, which they don't want quite so much? Why should they divert investment from more popular businesses to less popular ones? That's what the measures offered by Santorum and Obama would do. The point is to ease the tax burden of manufacturers at the expense of other companies, on the superstition that the former are more valuable than the latter. It's hard to see the fairness or the economic logic. When the president unveiled his proposal, Jade West of the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors complained to The New York Times, "My guys are totally freaked out by manufacturing getting a different tax rate than we do. They're not more important in the economy than retail or distribution or anything else." In fact, manufacturing is bound to be a diminishing share of any advanced economy. Obama and Santorum can fling money into the teeth of that trend. But any time politicians want to resist powerful and beneficial economic forces, bet on the economic forces.

### AT: EU

#### The EU fails to resolve conflict

Hinderaker11/18/10John, lawyer and fellow at the Claremont Institute “Hoping the EU Fails” http://www.powerlineblog.com/archives/2010/11/027718.php

Actually, I do think that Europeans–which is to say, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Spaniards, Greeks, etc.–would be better off without the EU. The Common Market, a free-trade zone, was a good idea; political union is not, in my opinion. A few years ago, I was on board an airplane waiting to take off for London. A flight attendant was talking to a man sitting across the aisle from me who was on his way home. “Where are you from?” she asked. The man answered, “Europe.” She followed up, trying to get him to name a country, but he replied stubbornly, “Europe.” Maybe he was an EU bureaucrat from Brussels; be that as it may, he certainly was in the minority. A place is not a country unless its citizens believe it is, and most Europeans consider themselves French, Dutch, German, or whatever. The European Union is largely a *coup* by Europe’s governing class to take power from that continent’s people and put it in the hands of its elites. Moreover, they are trying to take the continent in a more leftward direction than its citizens would prefer. So on balance, I consider the EU to be a bad thing. It is true that the EU consists of “a community of democracies,” but the EU itself undermines those democracies and exists in large part because many of Europe’s leaders find democracy inconvenient. And I don’t think the EU deserves any significant credit for the fact that “centuries of strife” in Europe have come to an end. On the contrary, forcing Europe’s inhabitants into a currency and political union that most of them don’t want is likely to stimulate, not inhibit, strife.

### Industry

### No Environment Impact

#### Environmental collapse can’t cause extinction---nuke war outweighs---magnitude and probability

David Schweickart 10 is Professor at Loyola University Chicago. He holds a Ph.D. in Mathematics (University of Virginia), and a Ph.D. in Philosophy (Ohio State University). “Is Sustainable Capitalism Possible?” Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 41 (2010) 6739–6752

It is not true either that the various ecological crises we are facing will bring about “the end of the world.” Consider the projections of the Stern Review, the recently released report commissioned by the British Government. If nothing is done, we risk “major disruption to economic and social activity, later in this century and the next, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and economic depression of the first half of the 20th century.”

This is serious. Some sixty million people died in World War Two. The Stern Review estimates as many as 200 million people could be permanently displaced by rising sea level and drought. But this is not “the end of the world.” Even if the effects are far worse, resulting in billions of deaths—a highly unlikely scenario—there would still be lots of us left. If three-quarters of the present population perished, that would still leave us with 1.6 billion people—the population of the planet in 1900.

I say this not to minimize the potentially horrific impact of relentless environmental destruction, but to caution against exaggeration. We are not talking about thermonuclear war—which could have extinguished us as a species. (It still might.) And we shouldn’t lose sight of the fact that millions of people on the planet right now, caught up in savage civil wars or terrorized by U.S. bombers (which dropped some 100,000 lbs. of explosives on a Baghdad neighborhood during one ten-day period in January 2008—the amount the fascists used to level the Basque town of Guernica during the Spanish Civil War), are faced with conditions more terrible than anyone here is likely to face in his or her lifetime due to environmental degradation.

### AT: Chem Industry

#### No impact—if the chemical industry causes innovation, then they would innovate to adapt to shocks—empirically proven

#### Chemical industry inevitable—nanotech boom and other countries fill in

Harper 7 (Tim, 4/30, Nanotech And The Chemical Industry, http://www.mabico.com/en/news/20070430/foreign\_exchange/article74463/)

In 2006, the global chemical industry spent some $2.9 billion dollars on nanotech-related research and development (R&D); that??™s almost three times what the US government spent on nanotech. And while government funding will remain fairly flat--how many national nanotech centers of excellence do you actually need--we see chemical industry growth continuing at some 25 to 30 percent a year until 2012. Globally, the market for nanomaterials is some $80 billion already, although the vast majority of this is business-to-business trade--supplies of bulk chemicals, particles, polymers adhesives, catalysts, etc.--will never end up in the hands of consumers. The industry also has more than 35,000 people worldwide directly engaged in nano-related research, the highest of any industrial sector outside the semiconductor industry (most of whose products are nanoscale already).

#### Energy prices will decline

AP 7/29/09 Energy prices slide as unused crude piles up, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5i4\_q7DtiEHvUTVNlJoaJ9ufkd1kgD99OA0CO0

The government is set to report natural gas inventories on Thursday. Analysts expect U.S. stockpiles to grow even more.

At the pump, gas prices have climbed for a week, adding less than a penny overnight to a new national average of $2.511 a gallon, according to auto club AAA, Wright Express and Oil Price Information Service. Regular unleaded gas peaked in June, and a gallon is 12.8 cents cheaper than the same time last month. It's also $1.43 cheaper than the same time last year.

The unexpected surge in oil supplies, combined with falling equities markets and a rising dollar, pushed energy prices lower across the board. Gas futures, heating oil and natural gas contracts all fell at least 3 percent.

### AT: Naval Power

#### Naval power inevitable - reject their evidence

**Farley 7** (Roberts, Assistant Professor @ the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, "The False Decline of U.S. Navy," Oct 23, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the\_false\_decline\_of\_the\_us\_navy,)

We live in strange times. While the United States is responsible for close to 50 percent of aggregate world military expenditure, and maintains close alliances with almost all of the other major military powers, a community of defense analysts continues to insist that we need to spend more. In the November issue of The Atlantic, Robert Kaplan asserts that United States hegemony is under the threat of “elegant decline,” and points to what conventional analysts might suggest is the most secure element of American power; the United States Navy. Despite the fact that the U.S. Navy remains several orders of magnitude more powerful than its nearest rival, Kaplan says that we must beware; if we allow the size of our Navy to further decline, we risk repeating the experience of the United Kingdom in the years before World War I. Unfortunately, since no actual evidence of U.S. naval decline exists, Kaplan is forced to rely on obfuscation, distortion, and tendentious historical analogies to make his case. The centerpiece of Kaplan’s argument is a comparison of the current U.S. Navy to the British Royal Navy at the end of the 19th century. The decline of the Royal Navy heralded the collapse of British hegemony, and the decline of the U.S. Navy threatens a similar fate for the United States. The only problem with this argument is that similarities between the 21st century United States and the 19th century United Kingdom are more imagined than real. It’s true that the relative strength of the Royal Navy declined at the end of the 19th century, but this was due entirely the rise of the United States and Germany. But the absolute strength of the Royal Navy increased in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as the United Kingdom strove to maintain naval dominance over two countries that possessed larger economies and larger industrial bases than that of Great Britain. In other words, the position of the Royal Navy declined because the position of the United Kingdom declined; in spite of this decline, the Royal Navy continued to dominate the seas against all comers until 1941. Britain’s relative economic decline preceded its naval decline, although the efforts to keep up with Germany, the United States, and later Japan did serious damage to the British economy. The United States faces a situation which is in no way similar. Returning to the present, Kaplan takes note of the growth of several foreign navies, including the Indian, Chinese, and Japanese. He points out that the Japanese Navy has a large number of destroyers and a growing number of submarines. He warns that India “may soon have the world’s third largest navy” without giving any indication of why that matters. Most serious of all, he describes the threat of a growing Chinese Navy and claims that, just as the Battle of Wounded Knee opened a new age for American imperialism, the conquest of Taiwan could transform China into an expansionist, imperial power. The curious historical analogies aside, Kaplan is careful to make no direct comparisons between the growing navies of foreign countries and the actual strength of the United States Navy. There’s a good reason for this oversight; there is no comparison between the U.S. Navy and any navy afloat today. The United States Navy currently operates eleven aircraft carriers. The oldest and least capable is faster, one third larger, and carries three times the aircraft of Admiral Kuznetsov, the largest carrier in the Russian Navy. Unlike China’s only aircraft carrier, the former Russian Varyag, American carriers have engines and are capable of self-propulsion. The only carrier in Indian service is fifty years old and a quarter the size of its American counterparts. No navy besides the United States’ has more than one aircraft carrier capable of flying modern fixed wing aircraft. The United States enjoys similar dominance in surface combat vessels and submarines, operating twenty-two cruisers, fifty destroyers, fifty-five nuclear attack submarines, and ten amphibious assault ships (vessels roughly equivalent to most foreign aircraft carriers). In every category the U.S. Navy combines presumptive numerical superiority with a significant ship-to-ship advantage over any foreign navy. This situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. The French Navy and the Royal Navy will each expand to two aircraft carriers over the next decade. The most ambitious plans ascribed to the People’s Liberation Army Navy call for no more than three aircraft carriers by 2020, and even that strains credulity, given China’s inexperience with carrier operations and the construction of large military vessels. While a crash construction program might conceivably give the Chinese the ability to achieve local dominance (at great cost and for a short time), the United States Navy will continue to dominate the world’s oceans and littorals for at least the next fifty years. In order to try to show that the U.S. Navy is insufficient in the face of future threats, Kaplan argues that we on are our way to “a 150 ship navy” that will be overwhelmed by the demands of warfighting and global economic maintenance. He suggests that the “1,000 Ship Navy” proposal, an international plan to streamline cooperation between the world’s navies on maritime maintenance issues such as piracy, interdiction of drug and human smuggling, and disaster relief, is an effort at “elegant decline,” and declares that the dominance of the United States Navy cannot be maintained through collaboration with others. It’s true that a 600 ship navy can do more than the current 250-plus ship force of the current U.S. Navy, but Kaplan’s playing a game of bait and switch. The Navy has fewer ships than it did two decades ago, but the ships it has are far more capable than those of the 1980s. Because of the collapse of its competitors, the Navy is relatively more capable of fighting and winning wars now than it was during the Reagan administration. Broadly speaking, navies have two missions; warfighting, and maritime maintenance. Kaplan wants to confuse the maritime maintenance mission (which can be done in collaboration with others) with the warfighting mission (which need not be). A navy can require the cooperation of others for the maintenance mission, while still possessing utter military superiority over any one navy or any plausible combination of navies on the high seas. Indeed, this is the situation that the United States Navy currently enjoys. It cannot be everywhere all at once, and does require the cooperation of regional navies for fighting piracy and smuggling. At the same time, the U.S. Navy can destroy any (and probably all, at the same time) naval challengers. To conflate these two missions is equal parts silly and dishonest. The Navy has arrived at an ideal compromise between the two, keeping its fighting supremacy while leading and facilitating cooperation around the world on maritime issues. This compromise has allowed the Navy to build positive relationships with the navies of the world, a fact that Kaplan ignores. While asserting the dangers posed by a variety of foreign navies, Kaplan makes a distortion depressingly common to those who warn of the decline of American hegemony; he forgets that the United States has allies. While Kaplan can plausibly argue that growth in Russian or Chinese naval strength threatens the United States, the same cannot reasonably be said of Japan, India, France, or the United Kingdom. With the exception of China and Russia, all of the most powerful navies in the world belong to American allies. United States cooperation with the navies of NATO, India, and Japan has tightened, rather than waned in the last ten years, and the United States also retains warm relations with third tier navies such as those of South Korea, Australia, and Malaysia. In any conceivable naval confrontation the United States will have friends, just as the Royal Navy had friends in 1914 and 1941. Robert Kaplan wants to warn the American people of the dangers of impending naval decline. Unfortunately, he’s almost entirely wrong on the facts. While the reach of the United States Navy may have declined in an absolute sense, its capacity to fight and win naval wars has, if anything, increased since the end of the Cold War. That the United States continues to embed itself in a deep set of cooperative arrangements with other naval powers only reinforces the dominance of the U.S. Navy on the high seas. Analysts who want to argue for greater U.S. military spending are best advised to concentrate on the fiascos in Iraq and Afghanistan.

## 2NC

My 2NC doc didn’t save for some reason in this round. Email me if you want specific cites. I extended the elections DA and case so most of this is obsolete by now anyway.

## 1NR

### Industry Advantage

#### More evidence – oil and gas prices are decoupled

Webber 12 – Michael Webber is the Josey Centennial Fellow in Energy Resources, Co-Director of the Clean Energy Incubator at the Austin Technology Incubator, and Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at The University of Texas at Austin. He has authored more than 150 scientific articles, columns, books and book chapters. Michael's education includes a B.A. with High Honors (Plan II Liberal Arts) and B.S. with High Honors (Aerospace Engineering) from The University of Texas at Austin, and an M.S. (Mechanical Engineering) and Ph.D. (Mechanical Engineering, Minor in Electrical Engineering) from Stanford University, where he was a National Science Foundation Fellow from 1995-1998. May 2012, "The Looming Natural Gas Transition in the United States," www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf

One of the most important recent trends has been the decoupling of natural gas and petroleum prices. Figure 4 shows the U.S. prices for natural gas and petroleum (wellhead, and WTI Cushing, respectively) from 1988 to 2012.4 5 While natural gas and petroleum prices have roughly tracked each other in the U.S. for decades, their **trends started to diverge in 2009 as global oil supplies remained tight, yet shale gas production increased.** This recent divergence has been particularly stark, as it’s driven by the simultaneous downward swing in natural gas prices and upward swing in petroleum prices. For many years, the ratio in prices (per million BTU, or MMBTU) between petroleum and natural gas oscillated nominally in the range of 1–2, averaging 1.6 for 2000– 2008. However, after the divergence began in 2009, this spread became much larger, averaging 4.2 for 2011 and, remarkably, achieving ratios greater than 9 spanning much of the first quarter of 2012 (for example, natural gas costs approximately $2/MMBTU today, whereas petroleum costs $18/MMBTU).

#### *Naval power inevitable - reject their evidence*

*Farley 7**(Roberts, Assistant Professor @ the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, "The False Decline of U.S. Navy," Oct 23, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the\_false\_decline\_of\_the\_us\_navy,)*

*We live in strange times. While the United States is responsible for close to 50 percent of aggregate world military expenditure, and maintains close alliances with almost all of the other major military powers, a community of defense analysts continues to insist that we need to spend more. In the November issue of The Atlantic, Robert Kaplan asserts that United States hegemony is under the threat of “elegant decline,” and points to what conventional analysts might suggest is the most secure element of American power; the United States Navy. Despite the fact that the U.S. Navy remains several orders of magnitude more powerful than its nearest rival, Kaplan says that we must beware; if we allow the size of our Navy to further decline, we risk repeating the experience of the United Kingdom in the years before World War I. Unfortunately, since no actual evidence of U.S. naval decline exists, Kaplan is forced to rely on obfuscation, distortion, and tendentious historical analogies to make his case. The centerpiece of Kaplan’s argument is a comparison of the current U.S. Navy to the British Royal Navy at the end of the 19th century. The decline of the Royal Navy heralded the collapse of British hegemony, and the decline of the U.S. Navy threatens a similar fate for the United States. The only problem with this argument is that similarities between the 21st century United States and the 19th century United Kingdom are more imagined than real. It’s true that the relative strength of the Royal Navy declined at the end of the 19th century, but this was due entirely the rise of the United States and Germany. But the absolute strength of the Royal Navy increased in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as the United Kingdom strove to maintain naval dominance over two countries that possessed larger economies and larger industrial bases than that of Great Britain. In other words, the position of the Royal Navy declined because the position of the United Kingdom declined; in spite of this decline, the Royal Navy continued to dominate the seas against all comers until 1941. Britain’s relative economic decline preceded its naval decline, although the efforts to keep up with Germany, the United States, and later Japan did serious damage to the British economy. The United States faces a situation which is in no way similar. Returning to the present, Kaplan takes note of the growth of several foreign navies, including the Indian, Chinese, and Japanese. He points out that the Japanese Navy has a large number of destroyers and a growing number of submarines. He warns that India “may soon have the world’s third largest navy” without giving any indication of why that matters. Most serious of all, he describes the threat of a growing Chinese Navy and claims that, just as the Battle of Wounded Knee opened a new age for American imperialism, the conquest of Taiwan could transform China into an expansionist, imperial power. The curious historical analogies aside, Kaplan is careful to make no direct comparisons between the growing navies of foreign countries and the actual strength of the United States Navy. There’s a good reason for this oversight; there is no comparison between the U.S. Navy and any navy afloat today. The United States Navy currently operates eleven aircraft carriers. The oldest and least capable is faster, one third larger, and carries three times the aircraft of Admiral Kuznetsov, the largest carrier in the Russian Navy. Unlike China’s only aircraft carrier, the former Russian Varyag, American carriers have engines and are capable of self-propulsion. The only carrier in Indian service is fifty years old and a quarter the size of its American counterparts. No navy besides the United States’ has more than one aircraft carrier capable of flying modern fixed wing aircraft. The United States enjoys similar dominance in surface combat vessels and submarines, operating twenty-two cruisers, fifty destroyers, fifty-five nuclear attack submarines, and ten amphibious assault ships (vessels roughly equivalent to most foreign aircraft carriers). In every category the U.S. Navy combines presumptive numerical superiority with a significant ship-to-ship advantage over any foreign navy. This situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. The French Navy and the Royal Navy will each expand to two aircraft carriers over the next decade. The most ambitious plans ascribed to the People’s Liberation Army Navy call for no more than three aircraft carriers by 2020, and even that strains credulity, given China’s inexperience with carrier operations and the construction of large military vessels. While a crash construction program might conceivably give the Chinese the ability to achieve local dominance (at great cost and for a short time), the United States Navy will continue to dominate the world’s oceans and littorals for at least the next fifty years. In order to try to show that the U.S. Navy is insufficient in the face of future threats, Kaplan argues that we on are our way to “a 150 ship navy” that will be overwhelmed by the demands of warfighting and global economic maintenance. He suggests that the “1,000 Ship Navy” proposal, an international plan to streamline cooperation between the world’s navies on maritime maintenance issues such as piracy, interdiction of drug and human smuggling, and disaster relief, is an effort at “elegant decline,” and declares that the dominance of the United States Navy cannot be maintained through collaboration with others. It’s true that a 600 ship navy can do more than the current 250-plus ship force of the current U.S. Navy, but Kaplan’s playing a game of bait and switch. The Navy has fewer ships than it did two decades ago, but the ships it has are far more capable than those of the 1980s. Because of the collapse of its competitors, the Navy is relatively more capable of fighting and winning wars now than it was during the Reagan administration. Broadly speaking, navies have two missions; warfighting, and maritime maintenance. Kaplan wants to confuse the maritime maintenance mission (which can be done in collaboration with others) with the warfighting mission (which need not be). A navy can require the cooperation of others for the maintenance mission, while still possessing utter military superiority over any one navy or any plausible combination of navies on the high seas. Indeed, this is the situation that the United States Navy currently enjoys. It cannot be everywhere all at once, and does require the cooperation of regional navies for fighting piracy and smuggling. At the same time, the U.S. Navy can destroy any (and probably all, at the same time) naval challengers. To conflate these two missions is equal parts silly and dishonest. The Navy has arrived at an ideal compromise between the two, keeping its fighting supremacy while leading and facilitating cooperation around the world on maritime issues. This compromise has allowed the Navy to build positive relationships with the navies of the world, a fact that Kaplan ignores. While asserting the dangers posed by a variety of foreign navies, Kaplan makes a distortion depressingly common to those who warn of the decline of American hegemony; he forgets that the United States has allies. While Kaplan can plausibly argue that growth in Russian or Chinese naval strength threatens the United States, the same cannot reasonably be said of Japan, India, France, or the United Kingdom. With the exception of China and Russia, all of the most powerful navies in the world belong to American allies. United States cooperation with the navies of NATO, India, and Japan has tightened, rather than waned in the last ten years, and the United States also retains warm relations with third tier navies such as those of South Korea, Australia, and Malaysia. In any conceivable naval confrontation the United States will have friends, just as the Royal Navy had friends in 1914 and 1941. Robert Kaplan wants to warn the American people of the dangers of impending naval decline. Unfortunately, he’s almost entirely wrong on the facts. While the reach of the United States Navy may have declined in an absolute sense, its capacity to fight and win naval wars has, if anything, increased since the end of the Cold War. That the United States continues to embed itself in a deep set of cooperative arrangements with other naval powers only reinforces the dominance of the U.S. Navy on the high seas. Analysts who want to argue for greater U.S. military spending are best advised to concentrate on the fiascos in Iraq and Afghanistan.*

#### Our fleet can take anyone’s—no challengers

Robert O. Work 12, United States Under Secretary of the Navy and VP of Strategic Studies @ Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, "The Coming Naval Century," May, Proceedings Magazine - Vol. 138/5/1311, US Naval Institute, www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2012-05/coming-naval-century

For those in the military concerned about the impact of such cuts, I would simply say four things:¶ • Any grand strategy starts with an assumption that all resources are scarce, requiring a balancing of commitments and resources. As political commentator Walter Lippmann wrote: “The nation must maintain its objectives and its power in equilibrium, its purposes within its means, and its means equal to its purposes.”¶ • The upcoming defense drawdown will be less severe than past post–World War II drawdowns. Accommodating cuts will be hard, but manageable.¶ • At the end of the drawdown, the United States will still have the best and most capable armed forces in the world. The President well appreciates the importance of a world-class military. “The United States remains the only nation able to project and sustain large-scale military operations over extended distances,” he said. “We maintain superior capabilities to deter and defeat adaptive enemies and to ensure the credibility of security partnerships that are fundamental to regional and global security. In this way our military continues to underpin our national security and global leadership, and when we use it appropriately, our security and leadership is reinforced.”¶ • Most important, as the nation prioritizes what is most essential and brings into better balance its commitments and its elements of national power, we will see the beginning of a Naval Century—**a new golden age of American sea power**.¶ The Navy Is More Than Ships¶ Those who judge U.S. naval power solely by the number of vessels in the Navy’s battle force are not seeing the bigger picture. Our battle force is just one component—albeit an essential one—of a powerful National Fleet that includes the broad range of capabilities, capacities, and enablers resident in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. It encompasses our special-mission, prepositioning, and surge-sealift fleets; the ready reserve force; naval aviation, including the maritime-patrol and reconnaissance force; Navy and Marine special operations and cyber forces; and the U.S. Merchant Marine. Moreover, it is crewed and operated by the finest sailors, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, civilian mariners, and government civilians in our history, and supported by a talented and innovative national industrial base.¶ If this were not enough, the heart of the National Fleet is a Navy–Marine Corps team that is transforming itself from an organization focused on platforms to a total-force battle network that interconnects sensors, manned and unmanned platforms with modular payloads, combat systems, and network-enabled weapons, as well as tech-savvy, combat-tested people into a cohesive fighting force. This Fleet and its network would make short work of any past U.S. Fleet—and of any potential contemporary naval adversary.

### Oil DA

### Overview

### UQ

#### Declining production will keep prices high---magnifies the link

BPN 8/32 Bunker Ports News, Barclays' Brent Crude Oil forecast for 2013 is $125/bl; $180/bl by 2020 www.bunkerportsnews.com/News.aspx?ElementId=86b8fe0d-c717-482b-9dd0-9686132ac0f9

The key difference Barclays sees between oil and most other energy markets is supply, where the challenge is replacing declining oil production. Demand, by contrast, responds to economic weakness to similar degrees across the energy spectrum. And with 3Q12 looking as if it will see a very significant tightening of the oil market, Barclays' key Global Energy Outlook recommendation is to stay leveraged to oil and to oil-biased equities and credits.

“Beyond our quarterly and annual oil price forecasts, we map the longer-term supply/demand picture, and the signals here are stark. Oil supply from existing fields is falling by close to 4m bls/d per year due to natural decline; global demand is rising by more than 1m bls/d each year, even in the current weak environment.” the bank said.

“Hence, the supply gap that needs to be filled each year from new fields is more than 5m bls/d. This presents a material challenge for the energy industry. While this long-term supply squeeze may have been less apparent in the quarter just past, 3Q12 looks as if it will see a significant tightening of the oil market, with a 2m bls/d upswing in demand and falls in both OPEC and non-OPEC supply.” the Bank added in a special report.

To this one can add minimal spare capacity and heightened geopolitical tensions in several regions. A release of US strategic reserves would provide only a slight and temporary respite.

“Thus, we continue to have strong oil price conviction, and our Brent forecast for 2013 is $125/bl. For the longer term, we expect prices to follow an inexorable, if volatile rise to above $180/bl before the decade closes.” Barclays predicted.

#### Prices will stay high long-term because of supply concerns---the plan reverses that---best forecasts

Arabian Business 9/29 Analysts raise oil price forecasts for 2012, 2013 www.arabianbusiness.com/analysts-raise-oil-price-forecasts-for-2012-2013-471309.html

Analysts have raised their oil price forecasts for this year and 2013 due to supply concerns and to expectations for a further round of monetary policy stimulus, which could improve prospects for economic growth, a Reuters poll found.

The Reuters monthly oil poll, based on forecasts from 28 analysts, forecast Brent at an average of $109.50 a barrel in 2012, up $1.20 from the figure in the July poll.

Brent has averaged about $112 per barrel so far this year, up from $111 in 2011.

"We have revised our near-term forecasts higher to reflect the ongoing support from hopes of global policy stimulus and fears over tensions in the Middle East," Capital Economics analyst Julian Jessop said.

### AT: Inevitable

#### US not key—global economies decoupling

Caryl, Sr. Fellow @ MIT, 10 [Christian Caryl is a Editor at Foreign Policy and Newsweek and a Senior Fellow of the CSIS at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Crisis? What Crisis?” 4/5/10 http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/04/05/crisis\_what\_crisis?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full]

We went through a terrifying moment back in the fall of 2008. The financial system in the United States was imploding. It was impossible to predict how the effects would ripple through the rest of the world, but one outcome seemed inevitable: Developing economies were going to take a terrible hit. There was just no way they could escape the maelstrom without seeing millions of their citizens impoverished. Many emerging-market countries did experience sharp drops in GDP. Their capital markets tanked. Dominique Strauss-Kahn, managing director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), sounded downright apocalyptic: "All this will affect dramatically unemployment, and beyond unemployment for many countries it will be at the roots of social unrest, some threat to democracy, and maybe for some cases it can also end in war." The Economist recently noted, "The Institute of International Finance (IIF), a think-tank in Washington, DC, forecast that net private capital flows into poor countries in 2009 would be 72% lower than at their peak in 2007, an unprecedented shrinkage." Virtually everyone expected to see the countries that had benefited so dramatically from growth in the years leading up to the crisis to suffer disproportionately in its wake. An entirely rational assumption -- except it hasn't turned out that way at all. To be sure, there were far too many poor people in the world before the crisis, and that still remains the case. Some 3 billion people still live on less than $2.50 a day. But the global economic crisis hasn't added appreciably to their ranks. Just take China, India, and Indonesia, Asia's three biggest emerging markets. Although growth in all three slowed, it never went into reverse. China's robust growth through the crisis has been much publicized -- but Indonesia's, much less conspicuously. Those countries, as well as Brazil and Russia, have rebounded dramatically. The Institute of International Finance -- the same people who gave that dramatically skepticism-inducing estimate earlier -- now says that net private capital flows to developing countries could reach $672 billion this year (double the 2009 amount). That's less than the high point of 2007, to be sure. But it still seems remarkable in light of the dire predictions. In short, the countries that have worked the hardest to join the global marketplace are showing remarkable resilience. It wasn't always this way. Recall what happened back in 1997 and 1998, when the Thai government's devaluation of its currency triggered the Asian financial crisis. Rioting across Indonesia brought down the Suharto government. The administration of Filipino President Joseph Estrada collapsed. The turbulence echoed throughout the region and into the wider world, culminating in the Russian government default and August 1998 ruble devaluation. Brazil and Argentina trembled. The IMF was everywhere, dispensing advice and dictating conditions. It was the emerging markets that bore the brunt of that crisis. So what's different this time around? The answers differ from place to place, but there are some common denominators. Many of the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, China) learned vital lessons from the trauma of the late 1990s, hence the IMF's relatively low-key profile this time around. (The fund has been most active in Africa, where they still need the help -- unless you count Greece, of course.) Many emerging economies entered the 2008-2009 crisis with healthy balance sheets. In most cases governments reacted quickly and flexibly, rolling out stimulus programs or even expanding poverty-reduction programs. Increasingly, the same countries that have embraced globalization and markets are starting to build social safety nets. And there's another factor: Trade is becoming more evenly distributed throughout the world. China is now a bigger market for Asian exporters than the United States. Some economists are talking about "emerging market decoupling." Jonathan Anderson, an emerging-markets economist at the Swiss bank UBS, showed in one recent report how car sales in emerging markets have actually been rising during this latest bout of turmoil -- powerful evidence that emerging economies no longer have to sneeze when America catches a cold. Aphitchaya Nguanbanchong, a consultant for the British-based aid organization Oxfam, has studied the crisis's effects on Southeast Asian economies. "The research so far shows that the result of the crisis isn't as bad as we were expecting," she says. Indonesia is a case in point: "People in this region and at the policy level learned a lot from the past crisis." Healthy domestic demand cushioned the shock when the crisis hit export-oriented industries; the government weighed in immediately with hefty stimulus measures. Nguanbanchong says that she has been surprised by the extent to which families throughout the region have kept spending money on education even as incomes have declined for some. And that, she says, reinforces a major lesson that emerging-market governments can take away from the crisis: "Governments should focus more on social policy, on health, education, and services. They shouldn't be intervening so much directly in the economy itself." This ought to be a big story. But you won't have much luck finding it in the newspapers -- perhaps because it runs so contrary to our habitual thinking about the world economy. The U.N. Development Programme and the Asian Development Bank recently published a report that attempts to assess what effect the crisis will have on the world's progress toward the U.N. Millennium Development Goals, benchmarks that are supposed to be achieved by 2015. At first glance the report's predictions are daunting: It states that 21 million people in the developing world are "at risk" of slipping into extreme poverty and warns that the goals are unlikely to be met. Many experts wonder, of course, whether the V-shaped crisis we've witnessed so far is going to turn into a W, with another sharp downturn still to come. Some argue that the Great Recession's real damage has yet to be felt. Yet the report also contains some interesting indications that this might not be the case. "The global economic crisis has been widely predicted to affect international migration and remittances adversely," it notes. "But as the crisis unfolds, it is becoming clear that the patterns of migration and remittances may be more complex than was previously imagined." In other words, these interconnections are proving to be much more resilient than anyone might have predicted earlier. As the report notes, receipts of remittances have so far actually increased in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, and Sri Lanka. Perhaps migrant workers -- those global experts in entrepreneurship and risk-taking -- know something that a lot of the rest of us don't. So why should we care? Anirudh Krishna, a Duke University political scientist who studies poverty reduction, says that there's a moral to the story: "Certainly cutting countries and people off from markets is no longer a sensible thing to do. Expanding those connections, bringing in a larger part of a talent pool into the high-growth sector -- that is what would make most countries grow faster and more individuals climb out of poverty." Echoing Nguanbanchong, he argues that governments are well-advised to concentrate on providing their citizens with education and health care -- the great enablers in the fight for social betterment. Microfinance and income subsidy programs can fill important gaps -- as long as they aim to empower future entrepreneurs, not create cultures of entitlement. This is not to say the outlook is bright on every front, of course. As the Economist noted, the number of people facing hunger recently topped 1 billion, the highest since 1970. The reason for that has more to do with the 2007-2008 spike in food prices than with the financial crisis. (Remember how the price of rice shot up?) We are still a long way from conquering poverty. There is still a huge -- and in some cases growing -- gap between the world's rich and poor. Yet how remarkable it would be if we could one day look back on the 2008-2009 crisis as the beginning of a more equitable global economy**.**

### AT: Hoffman Lyon

#### Their Hoffman and Lyon evidence will lose them this debate – these are direct quotes from the un-underlined portions of their card:

The U.S. Department of Energy issued a report on offshore drilling last year, which found that “access to the Pacific, Atlantic, and eastern Gulf regions would not have a significant impact on domestic crude oil and natural gas production or prices before 2030. Leasing would begin no sooner than 2012, and production would not be expected to start before 2017

#### This means that even if the entire OCS was opened right now they could not access a single impact until 2017 – our market perception links mean we crush them on timeframe alone

### *AT: OPEC*

#### *The plan collapses oil prices overnight---the link is huge and unique*

*Poruban 12 Steven Poruban "API: Raising US oil supplies key to lowering gasoline prices" 3/26 www.ogj.com/articles/print/vol-110/issue-3c/general-interest/api-raising-us-oil.html*

*A major component to relieving upward pressure on gasoline prices in the US will come from increasing domestic oil production and not from raising taxes, American Petroleum Institute Pres. and Chief Executive Officer Jack Gerard told reporters Mar. 20 during a conference call from Washington, DC.*

*He said President Barack Obama's administration needs a "reality check" as well as a revision to the unclear signals it is sending the market. This is something that US voters understand as well, Gerard noted, citing statistics from a poll conducted earlier this month by Harris Interactive on behalf of API among 1,009 registered voters in the US.*

*"Voters understand that raising taxes is not a solution for high gasoline prices," Gerard said, adding, "No economist in the world will tell you gas prices can be reduced by increasing taxes, and the Congressional Research Service just released a study saying so," Gerard said.*

*"A true all-of-the-above energy strategy would include greater access to areas that are currently off limits, a regulatory and permitting process that supported reasonable timelines for development, and immediate approval of the Keystone XL pipeline to bring more Canadian oil to US refineries. This would send a positive signal to the market and could help put downward pressure on prices," he said.*

*A large majority of these polled voters, API said, "also believe that more US oil and natural gas development could reduce gasoline prices (81%), lead to more American jobs (90%), and enhance America's energy security (84%)."*

*Gerard said, "Most US resources have been placed off-limits. The US oil and natural gas industry is currently allowed to explore, develop, and produce on less than 15% of the federal offshore areas. More than 85% of those areas are off limits, denying all Americans the benefits of producing those resources—benefits like greater supplies of crude oil and natural gas, job creation, and significant returns on our treasury in taxes, rents, royalties, and bonus bids."*

*Market perception*

*The very notion that the Obama administration is proposing the release of oil supplies from the nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve or asking other countries, such as Saudi Arabia, to boost oil production, is a "clear admissions that supply matters" in the case of relieving gasoline price pressure, Gerard said.*

*Markets are largely driven by perception, Gerard said, and when Obama in his early days in office sent out the message to the market that oil and gas production from the Gulf of Mexico, for example, would be higher today than it was then, that is part of the reason we're experiencing higher gasoline prices in the US.*

*To illustrate this point about clear market signals, Gerard recalled the example of when US gasoline prices were surpassing $4/gal during George W. Bush's presidency, his administration lifted the moratorium on offshore drilling and in a matter of days, oil prices fell by $15-16/bbl.*

#### Previous dips don’t disprove the DA---states used to be able to rely on 30 dollars a barrel and prolonged downturn is key

Hulbert 12 Matthew Hulbert is an analyst at the Netherlands Institute for International Relations "The political perils of low oil prices" July 9 2012 www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3796&id\_mailing=295&toegang=49182f81e6a13cf5eaa496d51fea6406

The starting point: pricing peril

Current spot prices may be worrisome for producer states, but the real issue is how long prices will remain depressed. On the face of it, OPEC has never had it so good. Brent prices averaged historic highs of $114/b from January to June. The problem is that OPEC states have gotten used to high prices. Unless average prices continue to hold up over $100/b, financing gaps will start to show - even at benchmarks around the $80-90/b mark. That's a staggering indictment of how badly resource rich states have managed their wealth over the past few years. '$100/b' is the new '$30/b' from the early 2000s required to keep producer states in the political black.

#### Cyclical short-term dips don’t matter---it’s all about sustained market changes

Ijtehadi 12 Yadullah Ijtehadi is an international journalist focused on global markets "GCC breakeven oil price declines" Jun 18 www.zawya.com/story/GCC\_breakeven\_oil\_price\_declines-ZAWYA20120618051634/

"We are not expecting the fall-out from the break-up of the euro to be as bad as that which followed the collapse of Lehman Brothers, provided the core holds together," noted Mr. Jessop. "But it is worth remembering that the spot price of Brent fell below USD40 in early 2009."

While most of the major producers have built substantial reserves to sustain USD40 prices for a few months, a sustained period at that level will no doubt send alarm bells ringing across the oil producing world - Saudi Arabia and the UAE included.

### AT: Iraq Instability

#### *Oil prices are key to Iraqi stability*

*Gartenstein-Ross & Goodman 9 \*director of the Center for Terrorism Research at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies AND \*\*CTR deputy director “The Global Economic Crisis and Iraq’s Future,” http://www.jewishpolicycenter.org/966/global-economic-crisis-iraq-future*

*Last summer, when oil prices reached all-time highs virtually every day, it seemed that one of the few silver linings was a more stable future for Iraq. Surging oil prices appeared to give Iraq a windfall; experts forecast an improving economy that could diminish support for the insurgency and increase resources for Iraq's nascent security forces. But now that the collapse in the world's economy has caused oil prices to plummet, what does the future hold for Iraq?*

*While estimates of Iraq's dependence on oil revenues vary wildly, oil clearly lies at the heart of the country's economy. Indeed, median estimates hold that oil accounts for more than 80 percent of its revenues. Iraq now faces several challenges spawned by the global recession. These challenges come just as the U.S.—pursuant to agreements with Iraq's government—is due to cease its patrols of cities. While a spiral into chaos is not inevitable, there is a clear opening for insurgent factions.*

#### *Iraqi instability causes regional conflict*

*Pollack 11—Director for Persian Gulf affairs at the National Security Council. Seven years in the CIA as a Persian Gulf military analyst. PhD from MIT (Kenneth, 11/15/11, Prospects for Increased Iranian Influence in Iraq, www.brookings.edu/testimony/2011/1115\_iran\_iraq\_pollack.aspx)*

*Renewed civil war. Historically, this may actually be Iraq's most likely future. Although academic studies of intercommunal civil war show some variance, a considerable body of work—including the best and most recent studies—indicate that states that have undergone one such round of conflict (as Iraq did in 2005-2007) have anywhere from a 1-in-3 to a 1-in-2 likelihood of sliding back into civil war within about five years of a ceasefire (which in Iraq came in 2008). Since the U.S. invasion in 2003, Iraq has followed the quintessential pattern for how states descend into civil war, how they emerge from it, and now how they fall back into it. Everything that is going on in Iraq today as American peacekeepers prepare to leave—the resumption of violence, the rapid deterioration of trust, the expectation that things are going to get more violent and corrupt, the unwillingness of leaders to compromise, the determination of actors across the spectrum to take short-sighted actions to protect themselves at the expense of others' trust and security—shows that Iraq continues to hew closely to these awful patterns. Indeed, even Maliki's unconscious bid for dictatorship is probably more likely to produce civil war than a return to centralized autocracy. If he keeps pushing in this direction, the Sunnis and Kurds will likely revolt, the military will fragment (a la Lebanon) and the result will be civil war, not a stable tyranny.*

*Civil war would be bad for Iran. Indeed, it might actually be the worst scenario for Iran in that it would likely produce very significant spillover into Iran. It could easily radicalize large segments of Iranian society, perhaps prompting the Kurds and Arabs of Iran to revolt, or convincing Iran's dominant Shi’ah to become more actively anti-Sunni. It would doubtless encourage Iran to intervene heavily in Iraq, which would stress Iran's limited resources and provoke a counter intervention by Iraq's Sunni neighbors. Given the high degrees of popular antipathy toward the regime, and the willingness of Iranians to risk physical harm by the regime to voice their grievances, spillover from civil war in Iraq could generate new popular protests or even renewed rebellion in Iran (especially if intervention in Iraq taxed the Iranian state and its military the way that the First World War did Tsarist Russia, or the wars against England taxed Bourbon France). It could also bring Iran into covert or even overt conflict with Iraq's Sunni neighbors as the Congolese civil war turned into "Africa's world war" and the Lebanese civil war sparked conflict between Israel and Syria.*

*Nevertheless, civil war in Iraq would also be disastrous for the United States for a variety of reasons. One of them would be that in the short term, Iran would likely find itself able to dominate significant areas of Iraq by backing Shi'a militias in the fighting—militias that would have no one to turn to except Iran, as was the case in 2005-2007. Moreover, the radicalization of Iraq's Shi'a would likely spillover into Kuwait, Bahrain and even Saudi Arabia, creating new opportunities for Iran to stoke unrest in those states, possibly with disastrous results.*

#### Growth prospects are good but oil prices make or break its growth

RT News 12 "Oil prices: The make or break of the Russian economy - World Bank" March 27 rt.com/business/news/world-bank-report-russia-543/

Oil prices: The make or break of the Russian economy - World Bank

Russia has to thank high oil prices for the better state of its economy. A World Bank report says it has the edge over other emerging countries and the EU, but the rosy picture will become bleaker unless the country deals with a number of challenges.

The growth rose from 3.8% year-on-year in the first half to 4.8% in the second half of 2011 and in September was 0.3% better than predicted in the previous Russian Economic Report.

Restocking and growing consumptions were the most important growth drivers in 2011 after the sharp decline in 2009. Private consumption was supported by growing employment, solid wage growth, lower inflation, and a strong rouble in the first half of the year.

Although the Russian economy returned to pre-crisis level by the end of 2011, the recovery from the crisis was slower than that in 1998. By comparison, GDP took 7 quarters to recover to pre-crisis level after 1998 crisis, yet twice as long after the 2008 crisis. However consumption held up better in 2008 than in 1998 partly due to stronger fiscal policy. Imports recovered faster in 2008.

The capital investment showed slowest recovery in 2011. Overall investment reached 22% of GDP in the third quarter of 2011, some 4.4% of GDP below the pre-crisis level in the second quarter of 2008.

“It is going to be very important for the Russian government to make sure that investors want to put money in Russia,” said Kaspar Richter, World Bank's Lead Economist and Country Sector Coordinator for Russia. “Macroeconomic policy should emphasize stability; all buffers have to be rebuilt. So when the next crisis comes Russia is a good place to address this crisis”.

The lower inflation rate is among the major achievements of Russian economy, according to the World Bank. CPI inflation fell for 10 months in a row from 9.7% in April 2011 to 3.8% in February 2012, the lowest level since the early 1990s.

Russia’s labor market improved in 2011, as unemployment was 6.5 % in July, and remained around this level through to the end of the year, according to the report. Though real income growth was 1.1% in 2011, the lowest rate in many years, real wages increased 4.2%, although only 2% for the public sector.

In 2011 the Russian budget turned in a surplus thanks to surging oil prices and moderate spending. But the World Bank expects the budget to turn to a deficit in 2012 as spending on extra-budgetary funds and social policy is projected to jump from 5.8% of GDP in 2011 to 7.5% of GDP in 2013.

World Bank also warns against increasing reliance on resources exports as oil and gas revenues grew to 10.4% of GDP from 7.6% in 2009. “Even a moderate correction in the oil prices could reverse improvements on the revenue side achieved in 2011,” experts say.

#### *Escalates and goes nuclear*

*Jain 11—August, Ash, visiting fellow at the Washington Institute, JD and Masters from Georgetown SFS, formber member of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, "Nuclear Weapons and Iran's Global Ambitions", The Washington Institute,* [*http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PolicyFocus114.pdf*](http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PolicyFocus114.pdf)

*As it looks for plausibly deniable ways to intimidate and subvert Gulf monarchies, an emboldened Iran could decide to direct terrorist attacks in the Gulf, possibly even targeting U.S. interests. Moreover, Gulf efforts to contain and deter Iran could escalate tensions**in the region and increase the risk of violence and conflict. A military confrontation between Iran and the Gulf states—both potentially armed with nuclear weapons—could have drastic consequences. While crisis diplomacy might succeed in containing its impact, any such confrontation could seriously undermine regional security, disrupt global energy supplies, and threaten global economic and financial stability. U.S. military intervention might also be necessary at some point—though this could be complicated in the face of a nuclear Iran.*

#### *OCS drilling kills U.S.-EU energy cooperation---that’s key to overall relations which solve prolif, Russian expansion, Middle East stability and a peaceful Chinese rise*

*David Koranyi 9-4 is the deputy director of the Atlantic Council's Dinu Patriciu Eurasia Center, 9/4/12, “An Emerging Transatlantic Rift on Energy?” http://www.naturalgaseurope.com/romney-energy-policy-emerging-transatlantic-rift-on-energy*

*Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney recently unveiled his energy plans for the United States, which promises to fulfill the country’s four-decades’-old dream of energy independence. It has the potential to do so. But the price could ultimately be high: a breakdown in global climate negotiations and a rift in relations with Europe.*

*American and European energy markets are on a diverging path. The US has edged closer to self-sufficiency with respect to fossil fuels, due mostly to the extensive development of its unconventional resources. From 60 percent in 2005, net petroleum imports were down to 45 percent of the US supply last year. By 2020, this rate could be further reduced close to zero, excluding Canada and Mexico. Shale gas made the United States the number one natural gas producer in the world, overtaking Russia, and revitalized manufacturing and the chemical industry.*

*Meanwhile, climate-conscious Europe's already high energy import dependence continues to grow. Use of renewable resources mandated by the European Union are spreading dynamically, but will take time to mature. Indigenous unconventional gas faces mixed reactions in some member states. In the wake of the Fukushima accident, nuclear energy is on decline in most countries. Ironically, coal use has increased lately in Germany, due to the nuclear power plant closures and flaws in the EU's cap-and-trade system.*

*Romney has proposed a plan that would widen the transatlantic gap further. He proposes to accelerate the development of America's considerable on- and offshore oil and natural resources by opening up federal lands and wildlife refuges, relaxing legislation, extending tax breaks, and approving Keystone XL that would carry shale oil from Canada; to rehabilitate coal by reverting the Environmental Protection Agency's prohibitive clean air standards introduced by the current administration; and to revitalize nuclear power by streamlining the permitting procedures.*

*The underlying tenet of the plan is a complete disregard for the threat of climate change, a term the document does not use. Romney renounces the "myth of green jobs creation" and promotes new jobs in the oil, gas, and coal sectors instead. The plan also stipulates that renewables can compete with other resources on a "level playing field," and implies the cessation of government support for renewable energy projects.*

*The plan, not to mention its implementation, will cause outrage in Europe. To most European policymakers, and the general public alike, shale oil and coal are anathemas, and the "drill baby drill" mentality is considered environmentally reckless. Brussels and other European capitals already resent that President Obama has not spent enough political capital on global climate change negotiations. Europeans worry that a Romney Administration would derail the timeframe agreed to in Cancun last December.*

*Moreover, Europeans believe that a pursuit of US energy independence could prove both elusive and counter-productive. Even if complete self-sufficiency is achieved, oil prices are determined on the global oil market. The United States might miss breakthroughs in technologies and business opportunities that are offered by the global scramble for renewables. While global challenges to stable energy markets prevail, an illusion of energy independence might prompt a more isolationist stance in US foreign policy and a reduced commitment to strategic interests like Europe's energy security.*

*A transatlantic friction is looming. Would the United States and Europe ultimately be able to reconcile their visions? The transatlantic partners share strategic interests and face common threats and challenges closely linked to energy issues, such as the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a resurgent Russia, an unstable Middle East, or China’s insatiable appetite for resources and its repercussions around the globe. The United States and Europe are uniquely positioned to develop technology, leverage financing, and share experiences in legislative and regulatory developments. In times of austerity, identifying synergies and pooling resources is paramount.*

*There is also plenty to build upon. Owed largely to the increased use of cheap natural gas in electricity generation, to the detriment of coal and measures like enhanced vehicle fuel economy standards, last week the US Energy Information Administration reported that energy-related CO2 emissions in the first three months of the year were the lowest since 1992 (though still much higher per capita than in Europe). While Congress and the US government are paralyzed, more than thirty US states adopted renewable energy portfolio standards similar to the EU's 20 percent target by 2020. Regional emission trading schemes are on the rise in the absence of a federal one. Texas is becoming a renewable energy technology hotspot and wind and solar powerhouse. Many in Europe are willing to learn from the US how to unlock their own shale gas potential that can serve as a bridge fuel to the EU's preferred zero-carbon future as gas emits much less CO2. Conversely, the US is looking to exploit four decades of European experience in energy efficiency improvements and demand reduction. Though politically and financially tricky, both EU member states and the United States should revisit nuclear energy as an essential component in providing affordable and sustainable energy. The list goes on.*

*The benefits of transatlantic cooperation are beyond doubt. The consequences of a falling out between the United States and the EU after the elections are far-reaching. A continued dialogue launched in the framework of the US-EU Energy Council in 2009 would be a way to avoid that. Joint efforts to address climate change, innovation, and investment in clean energy technologies, risk sharing, and cost reduction; joint research and development and harmonized energy diplomacy should be the cornerstones. A value gap that will undermine trust within the alliance is in nobody’s interest.*

#### *EU relations solve extinction*

*Maria João Rodrigues 11, Professor at the European Studies Institute-Université Libre de Bruxelles and at the Lisbon University Institute, Special Advisor on European Economic Policies, 2011, “Transatlantic cooperation for jobs and a new growth model,” in The Agenda for the EU-US strategic partnership, online: http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Transatlantic2011.pdf*

*The strategic priorities previously described in this chapter do not constitute a wrong or a risky choice because they might create a competitive handicap for the US and Europe. On the contrary, they can provide them with the long-term competitive advantage of being at the vanguard of setting an agenda of global priorities which will be emulated by other powers, if the planet is able to create a win-win game and thus avoid extreme fragmentation and collapse. We are assuming that countries are condemned to a certain level of strategic convergence if they want to secure the planet’s future.*

*Moreover, these strategic priorities can be seen as realistic as most of the required technological solutions are already known. The real difficulty is whether the political process is large and democratic enough to drive this kind of ‘grand transformation’. It is important to make the right choices when dealing with the various dilemmas that these priorities entail.*

*Recovering growth and jobs creation and reducing carbon emissions are not irreconcilable objectives: these goals can be achieved by refocusing investment, production, consumption and jobs creation on low-carbon solutions. It is also possible to recover growth and speed up the transition to a smarter economy by actively supporting innovation at all levels and in all companies as well as by providing people with the skills and training that will enable them to transition to the new jobs. Finally, it is possible to recover growth and reduce the public debt – which is now much higher after the massive expenditure entailed by the recent stimulus packages and the financial bail-outs – by actively supporting job creation, redirecting public expenditure to key investments and by reviewing the sources of taxation.*

*This active search for a new growth model, involving not only policymakers but also the relevant civil society stakeholders, urgently needs to be put higher on the agenda of transatlantic cooperation.*

#### *Russian aggression causes nuclear war*

*Blank 9 – Dr. Stephen Blank is a Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, March 2009, “Russia And Arms Control: Are There Opportunities For The Obama Administration?” http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub908.pdf*

*Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation.168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need.169 Simultaneously,¶ The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD****.*** *First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author170) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD.171¶ Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes,¶ But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.172*

### Angola---1NC

#### High prices key to Angolan economic and political stability

Vines & Weimer 11 Alex Vines, research director for regional and security studies and head of the Africa Program at Chatham House, and Markus Weimer, research fellow in the Africa Program at Chatham House "Angola: Assessing Risks to Stability" June 2011 csis.org/files/publication/110623\_Vines\_Angola\_Web.pdf

Although urban poverty remains Angolas biggest challenge, it is unlikely to provoke social unrest on a large scale. The government skillfully manages grievances with a mixture of threats and welfare handouts. The security services maintain a tight grip. Furthermore, for many Angolans, all-too-recent memories of civil war act as a powerful disincentive to violent agitation against the regime. So far, calls for protests have gone largely unheeded. Nonetheless, the MPLA is alive to the threat and has realized the need to stave off potential unrest by delivering better services. Promises have been made to create jobs and opportunities for the urban population, build new homes, construct new cities, and decentralize government services.

Angola has the potential for both economic and social stress during the next decade. The country's oil-based economy is built on shaky foundations. It is highly susceptible to exogenous shocks caused by changes in oil prices, such as those seen in 2008 and 2009, when a sharp fall in world prices led to a budget squeeze. And in its leading oil-producing region, it also must contend with an ongoing low-level insurgency led by the Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabi-nda. This group caused major embarrassment to the government during Angolas staging of the Africa Cup of Nations in 2010 by attacking a bus carrying one of the competing teams.

Of these threats, the MPLA views the unbalanced nature of the country's economy as the more potent one. The government has realized the need for diversification, embarking on a number of infrastructure projects to link urban and rural areas, and promoting the development of the unex-ploited agricultural sector, which would provide much-needed jobs in rural areas. These initiatives have yet to result in qualitative improvements to the lives of most Angolans, and economic progress is being held back by state control and the difficulties of attracting foreign investors, with the notable exception of those from China.

#### Instability escalates across Africa

Nelson 11 Mike Prof @ Weslayan U.S.-Angola Relations Oct 6 2011 africanworldpolitics.site.wesleyan.edu/2011/10/06/u-s-angola-relations/

Since the end of the Cold War, economic interactions have become a defining aspect of U.S.- Angola relations, largely because of Angola’s oil production capabilities. Founded in 1991, the U.S.-Angola Chamber of Commerce, “dedicated to the promotion of mutual trade and investment between the two countries,” predates official diplomatic relations between the two countries.[ii] The oil industry has become a centerpiece of U.S. interest in Angola, and, in turn, has been linked to broader issues of economic stability and democratic governance. The Council on Foreign Relations report argues that as “the second-largest oil producer in Africa,” Angola “has implications for the stability of U.S. oil supply as well as the stability of central and southern Africa.”[iii] This direct identification of U.S. interests with Angolan oil can be seen as a determinant factor in current U.S. policy towards Angola, even as such policies also attempt to accomplish more humanitarian and developmental goals.

**African conflicts escalate to great power war**

**Glick 7** Caroline, Senior Middle East Fellow – Center for Security Policy, “Condi’s African Holiday”, 12-12, [http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/home.aspx?sid=56&categoryid=56&subcategoryid=90&newsid=11568](http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/home.aspx?sid=56&categoryid=56&subcategoryid=90&newsid=11568%29)

US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice introduced a new venue for her superficial and destructive stewardship of US foreign policy during her lightning visit to the Horn of Africa last Wednesday.

The Horn of Africa is a dangerous and strategically vital place. Small wars, which rage continuously, can easily escalate into big wars. Local conflicts have regional and global aspects. All of the conflicts in this tinderbox, which controls shipping lanes from the Indian Ocean into the Red Sea, can potentially give rise to regional, and indeed global conflagrations between competing regional actors and global powers.Located in and around the Horn of Africa are the states of Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Kenya. Eritrea, which gained independence from Ethiopia in 1993 after a 30-year civil war, is a major source of regional conflict. Eritrea has a nagging border dispute with Ethiopia which could easily ignite. The two countries fought a bloody border war from 1998-2000 over control of the town of Badme. Although a UN mandated body determined in 2002 that the disputed town belonged to Eritrea, Ethiopia has rejected the finding and so the conflict festers. Eritrea also fights a proxy war against Ethiopia in Somalia and in Ethiopia's rebellious Ogaden region. In Somalia, Eritrea is the primary sponsor of the al-Qaida-linked Islamic Courts Union which took control of Somalia in June, 2006. In November 2006, the ICU government declared jihad against Ethiopia and Kenya. Backed by the US, Ethiopia invaded Somalia last December to restore the recognized Transitional Federal Government to power which the ICU had deposed. Although the Ethiopian army successfully ousted the ICU from power in less than a week, backed by massive military and financial assistance from Eritrea, as well as Egypt and Libya, the ICU has waged a brutal insurgency against the TFG and the Ethiopian military for the past year. The senior ICU leadership, including Sheikh Hassan Dahir Aweys and Sheikh Sharif Ahmed have received safe haven in Eritrea. In September, the exiled ICU leadership held a nine-day conference in the Eritrean capital of Asmara where they formed the Alliance for the Re-Liberation of Somalia headed by Ahmed. Eritrean President-for-life Isaias Afwerki declared his country's support for the insurgents stating, "The Eritrean people's support to the Somali people is consistent and historical, as well as a legal and moral obligation." Although touted in the West as a moderate, Ahmed has openly supported jihad and terrorism against Ethiopia, Kenya and the West. Aweys, for his part, is wanted by the FBI in connection with his role in the bombing of the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998. Then there is Eritrea's support for the Ogaden separatists in Ethiopia. The Ogaden rebels are Somali ethnics who live in the region bordering Somalia and Kenya. The rebellion is run by the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF) which uses terror and sabotage as its preferred methods of warfare. It targets not only Ethiopian forces and military installations, but locals who wish to maintain their allegiance to Ethiopia or reach a negotiated resolution of the conflict. In their most sensationalist attack to date, in April ONLF terror forces attacked a Chinese-run oil installation in April killing nine Chinese and 65 Ethiopians. Ethiopia, for its part has fought a brutal counter-insurgency to restore its control over the region. Human rights organizations have accused Ethiopia of massive human rights abuses of civilians in Ogaden. Then there is Sudan. As Eric Reeves wrote in the Boston Globe on Saturday, "The brutal regime in Khartoum, the capital of Sudan, has orchestrated genocidal counter-insurgency war in Darfur for five years, and is now poised for victory in its ghastly assault on the region's African populations." The Islamist government of Omar Hasan Ahmad al-Bashir is refusing to accept non-African states as members of the hybrid UN-African Union peacekeeping mission to Darfur that is due to replace the undermanned and demoralized African Union peacekeeping force whose mandate ends on December 31. Without its UN component of non-African states, the UN Security Council mandated force will be unable to operate effectively. Khartoum's veto led Jean-Marie Guehenno, the UN undersecretary for peacekeeping to warn last month that the entire peacekeeping mission may have to be aborted. And the Darfur region is not the only one at risk. Due to Khartoum's refusal to carry out the terms of its 2005 peace treaty with the Southern Sudanese that ended Khartoum's 20-year war and genocide against the region's Christian and animist population, the unsteady peace may be undone. Given Khartoum's apparent sprint to victory over the international community regarding Darfur, there is little reason to doubt that once victory is secured, it will renew its attacks in the south. The conflicts in the Horn of Africa have regional and global dimensions. Regionally, Egypt has played a central role in sponsoring and fomenting conflicts. Egypt's meddling advances its interest of preventing the African nations from mounting a unified challenge to Egypt's colonial legacy of extraordinary rights to the waters of the Nile River which flows through all countries of the region.
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#### R&D isn’t T

#### Violates Energy production---it’s pre-production

Koplow 4 Doug Koplow is the founder of Earth Track in Cambridge, MA. He has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for 20 years, primarily in the energy sector "Subsidies to Energy Industries" Encyclopedia of Energy Vol 5 2004www.earthtrack.net/files/Energy%20Encyclopedia,%20wv.pdf

3. SUBSIDIES THROUGH THE FUEL CYCLE

Because no two fuel cycles are exactly the same, examining subsidies through the context of a generic fuel cycle is instructive in providing an overall framework from which to understand how common subsidization policies work. Subsidies are grouped into preproduction (e.g., R&D, resource location), production (e.g., extraction, conversion/generation, distribution, accident risks), consumption, postproduction (e.g., decommissioning, reclamation), and externalities (e.g., energy security, environmental, health and safety).

3.1 Preproduction

Preproduction activities include research into new technologies, improving existing technologies, and market assessments to identify the location and quality of energy resources.

3.1.1 Research and Development

R&D subsidies to energy are common worldwide, generally through government-funded research or tax breaks. Proponents of R&D subsidies argue that because a portion of the financial returns from successful innovations cannot be captured by the innovator, the private sector will spend less than is appropriate given the aggregate returns to society. Empirical data assembled by Margolis and Kammen supported this claim, suggesting average social returns on R&D of 50% versus private returns of only 20 to 30%.

However, the general concept masks several potential concerns regarding energy R&D. First, ideas near commercialization have much lower spillover than does basic research, making subsidies harder to justify. Second, politics is often an important factor in R&D choices, especially regarding how the research plans are structured and the support for follow-on funding for existing projects.

Allocation bias is also a concern. Historical data on energy R&D (Table III) demonstrate that R&D spending has heavily favored nuclear and fossil energy across many countries. Although efficiency, renewables, and conservation have captured a higher share of public funds during recent years, the overall support remains skewed to a degree that may well have influenced the relative competitiveness of energy technologies. Extensive public support for energy R&D may also reduce the incentive for firms to invest themselves. U.S. company spending on R&D for the petroleum refining and extraction sector was roughly one-third the multi-industry average during the 1956-1998 period based on survey data from the U.S. National Science Foundation. For the electric, gas, and sanitary services sector, the value was one-twentieth, albeit during the more limited 1995-1998 period.

3.1.2 Resource Location

Governments frequently conduct surveys to identify the location and composition of energy resources. Although these have addressed wind or geothermal resources on occasion, they most often involve oil and gas. Plant siting is another area where public funds are used, primarily to assess risks from natural disasters such as earthquakes for large hydroelectric or nuclear installations. Survey information can be important to evaluate energy security risks and to support mineral leasing auctions, especially when bidders do not operate competitively. However, costs should be offset from lease sale revenues when evaluating the public return on these sales. Similarly, the costs of siting studies should be recovered from the beneficiary industries.

3.2 Production

Energy production includes all stages from the point of resource location through distribution to the final consumers. Specific items examined here include resource extraction, resource conversion (including electricity), the various distribution links to bring the energy resource to the point of final use, and accident risks.

#### Violates incentives---they have to provide money to the private sector---r&D is distinct

CCES 9 Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (also called c2es) “Buildings and Emissions: Making the Connection” No specific date dated, most recent citation from 2009 www.c2es.org/technology/overview/buildings

Policy Options to Promote Climate-Friendly Buildings

The mosaic of current policies affecting the building sector is complex and dynamic involving voluntary and mandatory programs implemented at all levels of government, from local to federal. Government efforts to reduce the overall environmental impact of buildings have resulted in numerous innovative policies at the state and local levels. Non-governmental organizations, utilities, and other private actors also play a role in shaping GHG emissions from buildings through third-party “green building” certification, energy efficiency programs, and other efforts.

Various taxonomies have been used to describe the policy instruments that govern buildings, typically distinguishing between regulations, financial incentives, information and education, management of government energy use, and subsidies for research and development (R&D). Each of these is broadly described below.

-Standards and codes

Regulatory policies include building and zoning codes, appliance energy efficiency standards, clean energy portfolio standards, and electricity interconnection standards for distributed generation equipment. Building codes can require a minimum level of energy efficiency for new buildings, thus mandating reductions at the construction stage, where there is the most opportunity to integrate efficiency measures. Zoning codes can provide incentives to developers to achieve higher performance. Because of regional differences in such factors as climatic conditions and building practices, and because building and zoning codes are implemented by states and localities, the codes vary considerably across the country. While substantial progress has been made over the past decade, opportunities to strengthen code requirements and compliance remain.

Appliance and equipment standards require minimum efficiencies to be met by all regulated products sold; they thereby eliminate the least efficient products from the market. Federal standards exist for many residential and commercial appliances, and several states have implemented standards for appliances not covered by federal standards (see Appliance Efficiency Standards).

-Financial incentives

Financial incentives can best induce energy-efficient behavior where relatively few barriers limit information and decision-making opportunities (e.g., in owner-occupied buildings). Financial incentives include tax credits, rebates, low-interest loans, energy-efficient mortgages, and innovative financing, all of which address the barrier of first costs. Many utilities also offer individual incentive programs, because reducing demand, especially peak demand, can enhance the utility’s system-wide performance.

-Information and education

While many businesses and homeowners express interest in making energy-efficiency improvements for their own buildings and homes, they often do not know which products or services to ask for, who supplies them in their areas, or whether the energy savings realized will live up to claims. Requiring providers to furnish good information to consumers on the performance of appliances, equipment and even entire buildings is a powerful tool for promoting energy efficiency by enabling intelligent consumer choices.

-Lead-by-example programs

A variety of mechanisms are available to ensure that government agencies lead by example in the effort to build and manage more energy-efficient buildings and reduce GHG emissions. For example, several cities and states, and federal agencies (including the General Services Administration), have mandated LEED or LEED-equivalent certification for public buildings, and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 includes provisions for reduced energy use and energy efficiency improvements in federal buildings.

-Research and development (R&D)

In the long run, the opportunities for a low-greenhouse gas energy future depend critically on new and emerging technologies. Some technological improvements are incremental and have a high probability of commercial introduction over the next decade (such as low-cost compact fluorescents). Other technology advances will require considerable R&D before they can become commercially feasible (such as solid-state lighting). The fragmented and highly competitive market structure of the building sector and the small size of most building companies discourage private R&D, on both individual components and the interactive performance of components in whole buildings.

Building Technologies Center. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory’s Buildings Technology Center was established by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and performs research into issues including heating and cooling equipment, thermal engineering, weatherization, building design and performance, envelope systems and materials, and power systems.

Emerging Technologies. This U.S. DOE-sponsored program develops technology that would reduce energy use in residential and commercial buildings by 60-70 percent. Technologies are in fields including solid-state lighting, space conditioning and refrigeration, building envelopes, and analysis tools and design strategies that would facilitate the development of energy efficient buildings through software and computer-based building analysis.

#### Voting issue for limits and ground---creates an unmanageable topic of new speculative tech via government research that doesn’t interact with the market

**Dyson et al, 3** - International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (Megan, Flow: The Essentials of Environmental Flows, p. 67-68)

Understanding of the term ‘incentives’ varies and economists have produced numerous typologies. A brief characterization of incentives is therefore warranted. First, the term is understood by economists as incorporating both positive and negative aspects, for example a tax that leads a consumer to give up an activity that is an incentive, not a disincentive or negative incentive. Second, although incentives are also construed purely in economic terms, incentives refer to more than just financial rewards and penalties. They are the “positive and negative changes in outcomes that individuals perceive as likely to result from particular actions taken within a set of rules in a particular physical and social context.”80 Third, it is possible to distinguish between direct and indirect incentives, with direct incentives referring to **financial** or other inducements and indirect incentives referring to both variable and **enabling incentives**.81 Finally, incentives of any kind may be called ‘perverse’ where they work against their purported aims or have significant adverse side effects. ¶ Direct incentives lead people, groups and organisations to take particular action or inaction. In the case of environmental flows these are the same as the net gains and losses that different stakeholders experience. The key challenge is to ensure that the incentives are consistent with the achievement of environmental flows. This implies the need to compensate those that incur additional costs by providing them with the appropriate payment or other compensation. Thus, farmers asked to give up irrigation water to which they have an established property or use right are likely to require a payment for ceding this right. The question, of course, is how to obtain the financing necessary to cover the costs of developing such transactions and the transaction itself. ¶ Variable incentives are policy instruments that affect the relative costs and benefits of different economic activities. As such, they can be manipulated to affect the behaviour of the producer or consumer. For example, a government subsidy on farm inputs will increase the relative profitability of agricultural products, hence probably increasing the demand for irrigation water. Variable incentives therefore have the ability to greatly increase or reduce the demand for out-of-stream, as well as in-stream, uses of water. The number of these incentives within the realm of economic and fiscal policy is practically **limitless.**

### Off

#### Obama’s ahead but it’s close

Cooper 10/25 Michael is a writer at the New York Times’ Caucus blog. “Has Romney’s Rise in Polls Stopped?” 2012, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/25/has-romneys-rise-in-polls-stopped/?gwh=20374120E0C2B79985262EFF8E8CD19D

A debate has been raging among polling analysts and commentators about whether Mitt Romney is still gaining ground, as he did after the first debate, or if his bounce has slowed or stalled. But while some Republicans say that they still have the wind at their backs, several polling analysts weighed in recently to argue that the data suggests there is no longer a Romney surge.¶ Mark Blumenthal, the senior polling editor of the Huffington Post and the founding editor of Pollster.com, wrote a piece this morning with the headline: “Presidential Polls Counter Romney Surge Myth.”¶ “While Romney gained significantly in the wake of the first presidential debate in early October,’’ he wrote, “the lack of a continuing trend over the past two weeks helps counter a theme in some campaign coverage that Romney’s support continues to ‘surge’ nationwide.”¶ Sam Wang, who analyzes state polls at the Princeton Election Consortium, wrote this week that the Mr. Obama’s plunge after the first debate had stopped with him still ahead, and delivered the following verdict: “Indeed the race is close, but it seems stable. For the last week, there is no evidence that conditions have been moving toward Romney. There is always the chance that I may have to eat my words — but that will require movement that is not yet apparent in polls.”¶ Nate Silver, who writes the FiveThirtyEight blog in The New York Times, wrote Thursday: “Mr. Romney clearly gained ground in the polls in the week or two after the Denver debate, putting himself in a much stronger overall position in the race. However, it seems that he is no longer doing so.”¶ With the race so close in so many places, it can be difficult to assess the true state of play. ¶ Most major national polls, with the exception of a few tracking polls, have shown the race to be essentially tied for months. Some polls in crucial swing states where Mr. Obama has been leading have tightened between the two candidates since the first debate, including Ohio, which is closer than it was a month ago. And now is the point where many voters pay more attention to the election, which can move the polls. But even with the proliferation of polls and the increased reliance on aggregated polls — lumping or averaging many polls together — it can be difficult to get a realistic picture on any given day in the closing weeks, given that some polls do not reach voters who use only cellphones, and many polls have struggled in an environment where fewer people want to respond to questions.

#### Public hates nuclear fusion – perception carries nuclear stigma

Gibson 7 Lauren Kate Gibson, George Washington University Center for International Science and Technology Policy, “Developing Fusion as an Energy Source”, 2007 (date from latest citation), http://www.cspo.org/igscdocs/Lauren%20Kate%20Gibson.pdf

Of course, whether the United States is in a leadership position will be purely academic unless technology transfer occurs. The obstacles are both economic and social. Energy consumption is predicted to double by 2050, which is also when fusion electricity is predicted to be commercially available. 35 Industry, however, is not yet ready to discuss the possibility. It is simply too far into the future. 36 Industry would perhaps be more interested in the future if the stigma of nuclear energy is removed. The Chernobyl disaster and the issue of nuclear waste taint the public opinion even though neither would be issues with a nuclear fusion plant. It simply cannot melt down because there is not enough fuel present at any given time and the reaction requires constant tending, not to control, but to sustain. Several studies have concluded that fusion plants would be inherently safe. 37 The public needs to be educated about the differences between fission and fusion power before they would be comfortable with a plant being operated near them. For the most effectiveness, this campaign should be begun immediately. Contrary to public opinion, environmentalism would, in fact, support fusion if traditional means of producing electricity continue to pollute and policies are created to combat that. The spectacle of cold fusion taught us that despite seeming unpopularity the public would be behind fusion if researchers can ever get it to work and industry ever adapts it. While the future of technology transfer is generally positive, it is by no means assured. Policy makers can improve this outlook through certain steps.

#### That swings the election

Seattle Times 12"Not just the economy: Secondary issues may play role in election," 7/14, http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2018688463\_electionissues15.html

WASHINGTON — As the economy colors and polarizes voters' attitudes, the Election Day outcome for President Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney may be decided on the margins by narrower issues that energize small but crucial slivers of the population.¶ For three months, the economy by most measures has faltered. Yet the White House contest has remained locked in place, with the incumbent holding on to a slight national lead or in a virtual tie with his rival. Analysts from both parties have no doubt that absent a defining, unpredictable moment, the race will remain neck and neck until November.

#### Romney causes massive foreign backlash and nuclear wars globally

Bandow 12 Doug is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. “Mitt Romney: The Foreign Policy of Know-Nothingism,” 5/15, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/mitt-romney-foreign-policy-knownothingism>

Republican politicians continue to beat the war drums. All of this cycle’s GOP presidential contenders, save Rep. Ron Paul, charged President Barack Obama with weakness, indeed, almost treason. But the public isn’t convinced. The president who increased military spending, twice upped troop levels in Afghanistan, started his own war with Libya, talked tough to North Korea, loudly threatened Iran and Syria, and oversaw the hit on Osama bin Laden just doesn’t look like a wimp.¶ In fact, a recent Washington Post-ABC poll found that Americans prefer Barack Obama to Mitt Romney on international issues by 53 percent to 36 percent. Republican apparatchiks Karl Rove and Ed Gillespie nevertheless claim, “the president is strikingly vulnerable in this area,” but so far Romney is convincing only as a blowhard with a know-nothing foreign policy. Noted Jacob Heilbrunn of the National Interest, the GOP is “returning to a prescription that led to trillion-dollar wars in the Middle East that the public loathes.”¶ Romney’s overall theme is American exceptionalism and greatness, slogans that win public applause but offer no guidance for a bankrupt superpower that has squandered its international credibility. “This century must be an American century,” Romney proclaimed. “In an American century, America leads the free world and the free world leads the entire world.” He has chosen a mix of advisers, including the usual neocons and uber-hawks — Robert Kagan, Eliot Cohen, Jim Talent, Walid Phares, Kim Holmes, and Daniel Senor, for instance — that gives little reason for comfort. Their involvement suggests Romney’s general commitment to an imperial foreign policy and force structure. ¶ Romney is no fool, but he has never demonstrated much interest in international affairs. He brings to mind George W. Bush, who appeared to be largely ignorant of the nations he was invading. Romney may be temperamentally less likely to combine recklessness with hubris, but he would have just as strong an incentive to use foreign aggression to win conservative acquiescence to domestic compromise. This tactic worked well for Bush, whose spendthrift policies received surprisingly little criticism on the right from activists busy defending his war-happy foreign policy. ¶ The former Massachusetts governor has criticized President Obama for “a naked political calculation or simply sheer ineptitude” in following George W. Bush’s withdrawal timetable in Iraq and for not overriding the decision of a government whose independence Washington claims to respect. But why would any American policymaker want to keep troops in a nation that is becoming ever more authoritarian, corrupt, and sectarian? It is precisely the sort of place U.S. forces should not be tied down. ¶ In contrast, Romney has effectively taken no position on Afghanistan. At times he appears to support the Obama timetable for reducing troop levels, but he has also proclaimed that “Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan under a Romney administration will be based on conditions on the ground as assessed by our military commanders.” Indeed, he insisted: “To defeat the insurgency in Afghanistan, the United States will need the cooperation of both the Afghan and Pakistani governments — we will only persuade Afghanistan and Pakistan to be resolute if they are convinced that the United States will itself be resolute,” and added, “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban.” ¶ Yet it’s the job of the president, not the military, to decide the basic policy question: why is the U.S. spending blood and treasure trying to create a Western-style nation state in Central Asia a decade after 9/11? And how long is he prepared to stay — forever? On my two trips to Afghanistan I found little support among Afghans for their own government, which is characterized by gross incompetence and corruption. Even if the Western allies succeed in creating a large local security force, will it fight for the thieves in Kabul? ¶ Pakistan is already resolute — in opposing U.S. policy on the ground. Afghans forthrightly view Islamabad as an enemy. Unfortunately, continuing the war probably is the most effective way to destabilize nuclear-armed Pakistan. What will Romney do if the U.S. military tells him that American combat forces must remain in Afghanistan for another decade or two in order to “win”? ¶ The ongoing AfPak conflict is not enough; Romney appears to desire war with Iran as well. No one wants a nuclear Iran, but Persian nuclear ambitiions began under America’s ally the Shah, and there is no reason to believe that the U.S. (and Israel) cannot deter Tehran. True, Richard Grenell, who briefly served as Romney’s foreign-policy spokesman, once made the astonishing claim that the Iranians “will surely use” nuclear weapons. Alas, he never shared his apparently secret intelligence about the leadership in Tehran’s suicidal tendencies. The Iranian government’s behavior has been rational even if brutal, and officials busy maneuvering for power and wealth do not seem eager to enter the great beyond. Washington uneasily but effectively deterred Joseph Stalin and Mao Zedong, the two most prolific mass murderers in history. Iran is no substitute for them. ¶ Romney has engaged in almost infantile ridicule of the Obama administration’s attempt to engage Tehran. Yet the U.S. had diplomatic relations with Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia. Washington came to regret not having similar contact with Mao’s China. Even the Bush administration eventually decided that ignoring Kim Jong-Il’s North Korea only encouraged it to build more nuclear weapons faster. ¶ Regarding Iran, Romney asserted, “a military option to deal with their nuclear program remains on the table.” Building up U.S. military forces “will send an unequivocal signal to Iran that the United States, acting in concert with allies, will never permit Iran to obtain nuclear weapons... Only when the ayatollahs no longer have doubts about America’s resolve will they abandon their nuclear ambitions.” Indeed, “if all else fails... then of course you take military action,” even though, American and Iranian military analysts warn, such strikes might only delay development of nuclear weapons. “Elect me as the next president,” he declared, and Iran “will not have a nuclear weapon.” ¶ Actually, if Tehran becomes convinced that an attack and attempted regime change are likely, it will have no choice but to develop nuclear weapons. How else to defend itself? The misguided war in Libya, which Romney supported, sent a clear signal to both North Korea and Iran never to trust the West. ¶ Iran’s fears likely are exacerbated by Romney’s promise to subcontract Middle East policy to Israel. The ties between the U.S. and Israel are many, but their interests often diverge. The current Israeli government wants Washington to attack Iran irrespective of the cost to America. Moreover, successive Israeli governments have decided to effectively colonize the West Bank, turning injustice into state policy and making a separate Palestinian state practically impossible. Perceived American support for this creates enormous hostility toward the U.S. across the Arab and Muslim worlds. ¶ Yet Romney promises that his first foreign trip would be to Israel “to show the world that we care about that country and that region” — as if anyone anywhere, least of all Israel’s neighbors, doesn’t realize that. He asserted that “you don’t allow an inch of space to exist between you and your friends and allies,” notably Israel. The U.S. should “let the entire world know that we will stay with them and that we will support them and defend them.” Indeed, Romney has known Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for nearly four decades and has said that he would request Netanyahu’s approval for U.S. policies: “I’d get on the phone to my friend Bibi Netanyahu and say, ‘Would it help if I say this? What would you like me to do?’” Americans would be better served by a president committed to making policy in the interests of the U.S. instead. ¶ Romney’s myopic vision is just as evident when he looks elsewhere. For instance, he offered the singular judgment that Russia is “our number one geopolitical foe.” Romney complained that “across the board, it has been a thorn in our side on questions vital to America’s national security.” ¶ The Cold War ended more than two decades ago. Apparently Romney is locked in a time warp. Moscow manifestly does not threaten vital U.S. interests. Romney claimed that Vladimir “Putin dreams of ‘rebuilding the Russian empire’.” Even if Putin has such dreams, they don’t animate Russian foreign policy. No longer an ideologically aggressive power active around the world, Moscow has retreated to the status of a pre-1914 great power, concerned about border security and international respect. Russia has no interest in conflict with America and is not even much involved in most regions where the U.S. is active: Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. ¶ Moscow has been helpful in Afghanistan, refused to provide advanced air defense weapons to Iran, supported some sanctions against Tehran, used its limited influence in North Korea to encourage nuclear disarmament, and opposes jihadist terrorism. This is curious behavior for America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” ¶ Romney’s website explains that he will “implement a strategy that will seek to discourage aggressive or expansionist behavior on the part of Russia,” but other than Georgia where is it so acting? And even if Georgia fell into a Russian trap, Tbilisi started the shooting in 2008. In any event, absent an American security guarantee, which would be madness, the U.S. cannot stop Moscow from acting to protect what it sees as vital interests in a region of historic influence. ¶ Where else is Russia threatening America? Moscow does oppose NATO expansion, which actually is foolish from a U.S. standpoint as well, adding strategic liabilities rather than military strengths. Russia strongly opposes missile defense bases in Central and Eastern Europe, but why should Washington subsidize the security of others? Moscow opposes an attack on Iran, and so should Americans. Russia backs the Assad regime in Syria, but the U.S. government once declared the same government to be “reformist.” Violent misadventures in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya demonstrate that America has little to gain and much to lose from another attempt at social engineering through war. If anything, the Putin government has done Washington a favor keeping the U.S. out of Syria. ¶ This doesn’t mean America should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to act like one. Doing so especially will make Moscow more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union. Naturally, Romney wants to “encourage democratic political and economic reform” in Russia — a fine idea in theory, but meddling in another country’s politics rarely works in practice. Just look at the Arab Spring. ¶ Not content with attempting to start a mini-Cold War, Mitt Romney dropped his nominal free-market stance to demonize Chinese currency practices. He complained about currency manipulation and forced technology transfers: “China seeks advantage through systematic exploitation of other economies.” ¶ On day one as president he promises to designate “China as the currency manipulator it is.” Moreover, he added, he would “take a holistic approach to addressing all of China’s abuses. That includes unilateral actions such as increased enforcement of U.S. trade laws, punitive measures targeting products and industries that rely on misappropriations of our intellectual property, reciprocity in government procurement, and countervailing duties against currency manipulation. It also includes multilateral actions to block technology transfers into China and to create a trading bloc open only for nations genuinely committed to free trade.” ¶ Romney’s apparent belief that Washington is “genuinely committed to free trade” is charming nonsense. The U.S. has practiced a weak dollar policy to increase exports. Washington long has subsidized American exports: the Export-Import Bank is known as “Boeing’s Bank” and U.S. agricultural export subsidies helped torpedo the Doha round of trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization. ¶ Of course, Beijing still does much to offend Washington. However, the U.S. must accommodate the rising power across the Pacific. Trying to keep China out of a new Asia-Pacific trade pact isn’t likely to work. America’s Asian allies want us to protect them — no surprise! — but are not interested in offending their nearby neighbor with a long memory. The best hope for moderating Chinese behavior is to tie it into a web of international institutions that provide substantial economic, political, and security benefits. ¶ Beijing already has good reason to be paranoid of the superpower which patrols bordering waters, engages in a policy that looks like containment, and talks of the possibility of war. Trying to isolate China economically would be taken as a direct challenge. Romney would prove Henry Kissinger’s dictum that even paranoids have enemies. ¶ Naturally, Romney also wants to “maintain appropriate military capabilities to discourage any aggressive or coercive behavior by China against its neighbors.” However, 67 years after the end of World War II, it is time for Beijing’s neighbors to arm themselves and cooperate with each other. Japan long had the second largest economy on earth. India is another rising power with reason to constrain China. South Korea has become a major power. Australia has initiated a significant military build-up. Many Southeast Asian nations are constructing submarines to help deter Chinese adventurism. Even Russia has much to fear from China, given the paucity of population in its vast eastern territory. But America’s foreign-defense dole discourages independence and self-help. The U.S. should step back as an off-shore balancer, encouraging its friends to do more and work together. It is not America’s job to risk Los Angeles for Tokyo, Seoul, or Taipei. ¶ Romney similarly insists on keeping the U.S. on the front lines against North Korea, even though all of its neighbors have far more at stake in a peaceful peninsula and are able to contain that impoverished wreck of a country. The Romney campaign proclaims: “Mitt Romney will commit to eliminating North Korea’s nuclear weapons and its nuclear-weapons infrastructure.” Alas, everything he proposes has been tried before, from tougher sanctions to tighter interdiction and pressure on China to isolate the North. What does he plan on doing when Pyongyang continues to develop nuclear weapons as it has done for the last 20 years? ¶ The American military should come home from Korea. Romney complained that the North’s nuclear capability “poses a direct threat to U.S. forces on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere in East Asia.” Then withdraw them. Manpower-rich South Korea doesn’t need U.S. conventional support, and ground units do nothing to contain North Korea’s nuclear ambitions. Pull out American troops and eliminate North Korea’s primary threat to the U.S. Then support continuing non-proliferation efforts led by those nations with the most to fear from the North. That strategy, more than lobbying by Washington, is likely to bring China around. ¶ Romney confuses dreams with reality when criticizing President Obama over the administration’s response to the Arab Spring. “We’re facing an Arab Spring which is out of control in some respects,” he said, “because the president was not as strong as he needed to be in encouraging our friends to move toward representative forms of government.” Romney asked: “How can we try and improve the odds so what happens in Libya and what happens in Egypt and what happens in other places where the Arab Spring is in full bloom so that the developments are toward democracy, modernity and more representative forms of government? This we simply don’t know.” ¶ True, the president doesn’t know. But neither does Mitt Romney. The latter suffers from the delusion that bright Washington policymakers can remake the world. Invade another country, turn it into a Western-style democracy allied with America, and everyone will live happily every after. But George W. Bush, a member of Mitt Romney’s own party, failed miserably trying to do that in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The Arab Spring did not happen because of Washington policy but in spite of Washington policy. And Arabs demanding political freedom — which, unfortunately, is not the same as a liberal society — have not the slightest interest in what Barack Obama or Mitt Romney thinks. ¶ Yet the latter wants “convene a summit that brings together world leaders, donor organizations, and young leaders of groups that espouse” all the wonderful things that Americans do. Alas, does he really believe that such a gathering will stop, say, jihadist radicals from slaughtering Coptic Christians? Iraq’s large Christian community was destroyed even as the U.S. military occupied that country. His summit isn’t likely to be any more effective. Not everything in the world is about Washington. ¶ Which is why Romney’s demand to do something in Syria is so foolish. Until recently he wanted to work with the UN, call on the Syrian military to be nice, impose more sanctions, and “increase the possibility that the ruling minority Alawites will be able to reconcile with the majority Sunni population in a post-Assad Syria.” Snapping his fingers would be no less effective. ¶ Most recently he advocated arming the rebels. But he should be more cautious before advocating American intervention in another conflict in another land. Such efforts rarely have desirable results. Iraq was a catastrophe. Afghanistan looks to be a disaster once American troops come home. After more than a decade Bosnia and Kosovo are failures, still under allied supervision. Libya is looking bad. ¶ Even without U.S. “help,” a full-blown civil war already threatens in Syria. We only look through the glass darkly, observed the Apostle Paul. It might be best for Washington not to intervene in another Muslim land with so many others aflame. ¶ Despite his support for restoring America’s economic health, Romney wants to increase dramatically Washington’s already outsize military spending. Rather than make a case on what the U.S. needs, he has taken the typical liberal approach of setting an arbitrary number: 4 percent of GDP. It’s a dumb idea, since America already accounts for roughly half the globe’s military spending — far more if you include Washington’s wealthy allies — and spends more in real terms than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War, and real outlays have nearly doubled since 2000. By any normal measure, the U.S. possesses far more military resources than it needs to confront genuine threats. ¶ What Romney clearly wants is a military to fight multiple wars and garrison endless occupations, irrespective of cost. My Cato colleague Chris Preble figured that ¶ Romney's 4 percent gimmick would result in taxpayers spending more than twice as much on the Pentagon as in 2000 (111 percent higher, to be precise) and 45 percent more than in 1985, the height of the Reagan buildup. Over the next ten years, Romney's annual spending (in constant dollars) for the Pentagon would average 64 percent higher than annual post-Cold War budgets (1990-2012), and 42 percent more than the average during the Reagan era (1981-1989). ¶ If Mitt Romney really believes that the world today is so much more dangerous than during the Cold War, he should spell out the threat. He calls Islamic fundamentalism, the Arab Spring, the impact of failed states, the anti-American regimes of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela, rising China, and resurgent Russia “powerful forces.” It’s actually a pitiful list — Islamic terrorists have been weakened and don’t pose an existential threat, the Arab Spring threatens instability with little impact on America, it is easier to strike terrorists in failed states than in nominal allies like Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, one nuclear-armed submarine could vaporize all four hostile states, and Russia’s modest “resurgence” may threaten Georgia but not Europe or America. Only China deserves to be called “powerful,” but it remains a developing country surrounded by potential enemies with a military far behind that of the U.S. ¶ In fact, the greatest danger to America is the blowback that results from promiscuous intervention in conflicts not our own. Romney imagines a massive bootstrap operation: he wants a big military to engage in social engineering abroad which would require an even larger military to handle the violence and chaos that would result from his failed attempts at social engineering. Better not to start this vicious cycle. ¶ America faces international challenges but nevertheless enjoys unparalleled dominance. U.S. power is buttressed by the fact that Washington is allied with every industrialized nation except China and Russia. America shares significant interests with India, the second major emerging power; is seen as a counterweight by a gaggle of Asian states worried about Chinese expansion; remains the dominant player in Latin America; and is closely linked to most of the Middle East’s most important countries, such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq. If Mitt Romney really believes that America is at greater risk today than during the Cold War, he is not qualified to be president. ¶ In this world the U.S. need not confront every threat, subsidize every ally, rebuild every failed state, and resolve every problem. Being a superpower means having many interests but few vital ones warranting war. Being a bankrupt superpower means exhibiting judgment and exercising discretion. ¶ President Barack Obama has been a disappointment, amounting in foreign policy to George W. Bush-lite. But Mitt Romney sounds even worse. His rhetoric suggests a return to the worst of the Bush administration. The 2012 election likely will be decided on economics, but foreign policy will prove to be equally important in the long-term. America can ill afford another know-nothing president.

### Off

#### The State and Territorial Governments in the Department of Energy’s Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research should substantially increase financial support for federal programs for fusion energy generation in the United States.

#### DOE EPSCoR program empirically funds fusion research at national labs, including STEM students – states can contribute funds

Gary C. April, PhD, Associate Director Alabama DOE EPSCoR, 2005, “Alabama DOE EPSCoR,” http://www.netl.doe.gov/publications/proceedings/05/EPSCoR/pdf/abstracts/powell-abstract.pdf

The Alabama DOE EPSCoR Program is made up of three integrated components including Program Coordination, Human Resources Development, and Energy Research Clusters. All programmatic elements are coordinated through a statewide steering committee. The first Implementation Award for the Alabama DOE EPSCoR Program (1994-2000) had three energy research clusters: Fusion Energy, Novel Organic Semiconducting Materials, and Petroleum Reservoir Characterization. Alabama’s second Implementation Award (2001- 2007) builds on the success of these clusters and expands the interest and focus of energy related research through Fuel Cell technology and manufacturing. Collectively, the success of the first three energy research clusters can be measured against the record that they established during the six-year tenure of their work. For an investment of $3.4 MM from DOE and $4.4MM from institutional/state matching, these programs supported the research of: a) 21 research professors, b) 32 post-doctoral associates, c) 40 doctoral-level graduate students, and d) 41 undergraduate research students. Their research also brought in an additional $18MM in non-DOE EPSCoR funding. Add to these numbers the $1.5MM from DOE, state and institutional sources for Human Resources Development activities elevating energy awareness among K – post doctoral participants, an additional $1.2MM from DOE Traineeship Awards and success in the DOE State Laboratory Partnership Awards by six investigators at a total of nearly $2.1MM and the true impact of the support base for energy-related programs in Alabama is quite evident. The Fuel Cell energy research cluster is located at the University of Alabama and Alabama A&M University (HBCU). The program is in its fourth year of the second Implementation Award. DOE awarded the Fuel Cell group a total of $1.2MM for four years with matching support from institutional/state matching. To date, the program has supported: a) 13 research faculty, b) 10 undergraduates, c) 15 graduates, and d) three post-doctoral associates. Their research has thus far produced an additional $5MM in non-DOE EPSCoR funding. The Human Resources Development Travel and Enhancement Grant Programs are intended to help cover the costs incurred by young Alabama researchers seeking an opportunity to visit a Federal Laboratory for the purpose of on-site research or developing collaborative research between institutions. Since the programs were initiated, 12 research faculty from four EPSCoR institutions, including one HBCU, one visiting scholar, one undergraduate student, 10 graduate students, and one post-doctoral associate have participated in research efforts at Argonne, Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratories.

### Off

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially augment funding for production of liquid fluoride thorium reactors in the United States.

#### The United States Federal Government should eliminate all US financial support for fusion research.

#### LFTR solve every aff advantage and would be streamlined – can’t melt down, solve prolif, are cost competitive, solve waste and desal and can be built as SMRs

Kirk Sorenson, Co-founder and Chief Technologist at Flibe Energy, chief nuclear technologist at [Teledyne Brown Engineering](http://www.linkedin.com/company/teledyne-brown-engineering?trk=ppro_cprof), aerospace engineer at NASA, 2009, <http://energyfromthorium.com/lftradsrisks.html>

Some of the many advantages of the LFTR system over other nuclear reactor designs are outlined below. While LWRs can produce U233 from thorium, they will not provide the various advantages outlined below, because of their use of thorium in solid form. It is the unique combination of the thorium cycle and the liquid fluoride reactor that grants all of the following advantages only from the LFTR system.¶ ¶ Safety--LFTRs are designed to take advantage of the physics of the thorium cycle for optimum safety. The fluid in the core is not pressurized, thus eliminating the driving force of radiation release in conventional approaches. The LFTR reactor cannot melt down because of a runaway reaction or other nuclear reactivity accidents (such as at Chernobyl), because any increase in the reactor's operating temperature results in a reduction of reactor power, thus stabilizing the reactor without the need for human intervention. Further, the reactor is designed with a salt plug drain in the bottom of the core vessel. If the fluid gets too hot or for any other reason including power failures, the plug naturally melts, and the fluid dumps into a passively cooled containment vessel where decay heat is removed. This feature prevents any Three Mile Island-type accidents or radiation releases due to accident or sabotage and provides a convenient means to shut down and restart the system quickly and easily.¶ Proliferation Resistance--For all practical purposes, U233 is worthless as a nuclear weapons material, and indeed no nation has attempted to weaponize U233 because of the abundance of difficulties. U233 is considered an unsuitable choice for nuclear weapons material because whenever U233 is generated, uranium-232 (U232) contamination inevitably occurs. U232 rapidly decays into other elements, including thallium-208, a hard-gamma-ray emitter whose signature is easily detectable. The hard gamma rays from thallium-208 cause ionization of materials destroying the explosives and electronics of a nuclear weapon, and heavy lead shielding is required to protect personnel assembling the warhead. It is possible to generate U233 with little U232 contamination using specialized reactors (such as at the Hanford Site), but not with an LFTR. Any attempt to increase production of U233 in an LFTR reactor will generate U232 contamination and any attempt to steal quantities of U233 results in the reactor shutting down.¶ Energy Production--Because nearly all of the thorium is used up in an LFTR (versus only about 0.7% of uranium mined for an LWR), the reactor achieves high energy production per metric ton of fuel ore, on the order of 300 times the output of a typical uranium LWR. The LFTR allows much higher operating temperatures than does a typical LWR therefore a higher thermodynamic efficiency. The turbine system believed best suited for its operation is a triple-reheat closed-cycle helium turbine system, which should convert 50% of the reactor heat into electricity compared to today's steam cycle (~25% to 33%). This efficiency gain translates to about 4.11 million barrels of crude oil equivalent per year more than that generated by a steam system. Capital costs are lower due to smaller reactor & turbo-machinery size, low reactor pressures and minimal redundant safety systems. The greater energy production capability of LFTRs means we estimate the cost for electricity from a LFTR plant could be 25% to over 50% less than that from a LWR.¶ Waste--In theory, LFTRs would produce far less waste along their entire process chain, from ore extraction to nuclear waste storage, than LWRs. A LFTR power plant would generate 4,000 times less mining waste (solids and liquids of similar character to those in uranium mining) and would generate 1,000 to 10,000 times less nuclear waste than an LWR. Additionally, because LFTR burns all of its nuclear fuel, the majority of the waste products (83%) are safe within 10 years, and the remaining waste products (17%) need to be stored in geological isolation for only about 300 years (compared to 10,000 years or more for LWR waste). Additionally, the LFTR can be used to "burn down" waste from an LWR (nearly the entirety of the United States' nuclear waste stockpile) into the standard waste products of an LFTR, so long-term storage of nuclear waste would no longer be needed.¶ Supply--Thorium is abundant in the Earth's crust. It is the 36th most plentiful element in the crust--four times as common as uranium and 5,000 times as plentiful as gold. According to the U.S. Geological Survey's 2006 Mineral Yearbook, the United States is estimated to have 300,000 tons of thorium reserves (about 20% of the world's supply), more than half of which is easily extractable. Considering only the readily accessible portion, this national resource translates to nearly 1 trillion barrels of crude oil equivalent--five times the entire oil reserves of Saudi Arabia. In addition to the naturally occurring reserves, the United States currently has 3,200 metric tons of processed thorium nitrate buried in the Nevada desert. That supply is roughly equivalent to 21 billion barrels of crude oil equivalent when used in an LFTR with only minimal processing effort.¶ Secondary Products--Because an LFTR is so energy dense, the electricity and excess heat from the reactor can be used to fuel other industries beyond electricity production, including economical desalinization of water, cracking of hydrogen from water or hydrocarbons, generation of ammonia for fertilizer and fuel cells, and extraction of hydrocarbons from oil shale and tar sands. Additionally, the nuclear waste products from the LFTR include stable rhodium and ruthenium, rare elements needed in modern electronics; technetium-99, which offers great promise as a catalyst similar to platinum; iodine-131 and cesium-137 for medical applications; strontium-90 for radioisotope power; and xenon, used in commercial products and industrial processes. The Risks While LFTRs offer much promise, several economic and engineering issues need to be addressed before this technology can become a reality. Thorium as a Fuel--Thorium has never actually been continually processed for fuel in a fully operational liquid fluoride reactor. The MSRE used U233 as a fuel, but the U233 was generated in another reactor. A follow-on reactor design was planned to do the full-system tests, which the MSRE was too cost-constrained to perform, but it was never funded. A prototype reactor based on the ORNL design work would need to be built and the continuous thorium cycle processing validated as the fuel source in an operational LFTR. Turbine System--The gas turbo-machinery is similar engineering to the well-developed open-cycle turbine (e.g., jet aircraft engine). However, this kind of closed-cycle electric generation system has never been built. A new triple-reheat closed-cycle Brayton system would need to be built and tested along with the LFTR. However, this is a minimal engineering risk in obtaining the overall efficiency of the electricity generation system. If the close cycle turbine system proves not to be economically viable, a steam system can be used. Cost of Thorium--The price of thorium ore is difficult to quantify. On one hand, some will argue that it is expensive, citing the lack of demand and the consequently limited market supply. On the other hand, the case can be made that thorium is nearly worthless in light of the U.S. government's decision to essentially "throw away" 3,200 metric tons of processed thorium by burying it in the Nevada desert. We cannot predict how the price of thorium would be affected if the world's thorium reserves were exploited for use in LFTRs. However, thorium does not incur a cost of enrichment as uranium does, mostly due to the fact that natural thorium occurs only in one isotope. We believe that if the world's thorium supplies were exploited for energy, its price would drop to be comparable to--or even lower than--current uranium ore prices. Cost of Thorium Reactors--Even though a full-scale LFTR has never been built, we expect the lifecycle cost of thorium reactors could be at least 30% to 50% less than equivalent-power uranium-based LWRs. Nevertheless, the engineering, fabrication and licensing of any energy-dense endeavourer is never certain and subject to many outside factors. Because of the various advantages afforded by the LFTR technology, we expect there will be a reduced regulatory burden, which would lessen costs and accelerate startups. For full-scale construction of LFTRs, factory-built modular construction can be used to provide scalable reactors from 100-kilowatt to multi-gigawatt production. This flexibility in site location eliminates the largest risk facing new U.S. commercial power plants today. Further, LFTRs have operational cost advantages over both types of reactors currently licensed. Unlike pressurized water reactors, LFTRs will not have to be shut down for extensive periods for refueling. Unlike boiling water reactors, LFTRs do not radioactively contaminate the turbines used for electrical generation, which should translate into significantly reduced operational and maintenance costs for this portion of the power plant and reduced amounts of low-level waste for end-of-life disposal.

### Off

#### Demonstration of fusion would spark pure fusion weaponization and arms racing

Makhijani 98 Arjun, Ph.D. and Pres. Inst. for Energy and Environmental Research, and Hisham Zerriffi, Project Scientist, 7-15, “Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest: The Potential of Explosive Fusion Research for the Development of Pure Fusion Weapons,” IEER, http://ieer.org/resource/reports/dangerous-thermonuclear-quest/

In the long term, facilities such as the National Ignition Facility and MTF facilities pose even greater threats to both the CTBT and the disarmament process. As discussed above, if ignition is demonstrated in the laboratory, the weapons labs and the DOE would likely exert considerable pressure to continue investigations and to engage in preliminary design activities for a new generation of nuclear weapons (even if it is just to keep the designers interested and occupied). Ignition would also boost political support and make large-scale funding of such activities more likely. Even without the construction of actual weapons, these activities could put the CTBT in serious jeopardy from forces both internal and external to the United States. Internally, those same pressures, which could lead to the resumption of testing of current generation weapons, could also lead to the testing of new weapons (to replace older, less safe or less reliable weapons). Externally, the knowledge that the United States or other weapons states were engaging in new fusion weapons design activities could lead other states to view this as a reversal of their treaty commitments. Comparable pressures to develop pure fusion weapons would be likely to mount in several countries. This would have severe negative repercussions for both non-proliferation and complete nuclear disarmament. The time to stop this dangerous thermonuclear quest for explosive ignition is now, before its scientific feasibility is established.

#### Nuclear war

Cohen and Douglass 2 Sam, nuclear weapons analyst and Joe, national security analyst, both members of the Los Alamos Tactical Nuclear Weapons panel, 3-11, “Nuclear Threat That Deesn’t Exist – Or Does It?” Rense, http://rense.com/general35/doex.htm

The comparison of a pure-fusion warhead with a normal fission warhead is even more stark. The lethal area to military troops of a 10 ton (high explosive equivalent yield) pure-fusion device would be approximately the same as the lethal area of a fission warhead several hundred times larger; that is, one in the kiloton range! The cost of a pure-fusion warhead is also reduced. In terms of the precious nuclear material that is required, namely, tritium and deuterium, pure-fusion devices are extremely cheap. Because the pure-fusion warhead does not need active nuclear material, such as plutonium, to "trigger" the deuterium-tritium burn, they can be made for a fraction of the cost of one fission-fusion neutron bomb of the 1980s. The inherent consequences of a pure-fusion device go far beyond low cost and greatly reduced explosive yield. Most significant, pure-fusion warheads, in contrast to warheads that use fissionable material, are not covered by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Any country can, in terms of international law, legally possess and even sell such weapons and not be in violation of the NPT. Also, deuterium-tritium fuel can be purchased openly on the international market. The spirit of the NPT may be in violation, but not the letter. Still further, because there is no fissionable component and because the explosive yield is so small, full operational tests of a pure-fusion device could be conducted in any country and not be detected by systems set up to monitor nuclear weapons tests. If tests were conducted underground at a moderate depth, say 50 to 100 meters, even the local inhabitants would suspect nothing. These consequences drive a stake through the heart of U.S. non-proliferation policies. These policies are based on preventing those who want to "go nuclear" from having access to the active nuclear material. A warhead or "device" that does not use active nuclear material (uranium or plutonium) is not prohibited. To make matters worse, in no sense can they be termed weapons of "mass destruction." Indeed, the pure-fusion devices are even more discriminant than the neutron bomb because there is, in comparison, negligible physical damage and a total absence of fission by-products and related contaminating fallout. Because of this, the pure-fusion device represents the worst fear of those whose personal crusade is to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and preserve the fire break in a hope that this will prevent a nuclear war. The pure-fusion device is less destructive than most conventional bombs, is reasonably cheap, and can be tested with impunity. It produces no fission radioactive by-products or fallout of serious concern. That is, the pure-fusion device renders the unthinkable thinkable. This is why officials do not want to discuss the possibility of pure-fusion warheads and, as will be seen, will do their best to deny their possible existence.

### Case

### Leadership

### No Impact to Heg

#### Hegemony isn’t key to peace

Fettweis 11 Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that **there is** no evidence **to support a direct relationship between** the relative level of **U.S. activism and** international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: **The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces.** No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current **peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S.** military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a **global policeman.** Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

#### Unipolarity causes policy failure---they can’t access any impact

Charles L. Glaser 11, professor in the Elliott School of International Affairs and the Department of Political Science at the George Washington University and the director of the Elliott School’s Institute for Security and Conﬂict Studies, June 2011, “Why unipolarity doesn’t matter (much),” Cambridge Review of International Affairs, Vol. 24, No. 2, p. 135-147

A still different type of argument holds that unipolar powers tend to adopt expanded interests and associated goals that unipolarity then enables them to achieve. To the extent that these goals are actually in the unipole’s true interest, unipolarity is good for the unipole. In broad terms, this argument follows the claim that states’ interests and goals grow with their power. 19¶ These expanded goals can be attributed to three different types of factors. 20 The ﬁrst is a permissive structure, which allows the state to pursue more ambitious goals. The state’s interests do not change, but its increased ability to pursue them results in a redeﬁnition of its goals. A state could have goals that were previously unachievable at acceptable cost; by lowering the costs, unipolarity places these goals within reach, enabling the state to make itself better off. A unipole’s desire for a higher degree of security can be an example of this type of expanded goal, reﬂecting the means that it can wield. Second, the state can acquire new interests, which are generated by the unipole’s greater territorial and institutional reach. For example, a state that controls more territory may face new threats and, as a result, conclude that it needs to control still more territory, acquire still more power, and/or restructure international institutions to further protect its interests. Third, the unipole’s goals can be inﬂuenced by what is commonly described as human nature and by psychology. A unipolar state will be inclined to lose track of how secure it is and consequently pursue inappropriate policies that are designed to increase its security but turn out to be too costly and/or to have a high probability of backﬁring. One variant of this type of argument expects unipolar powers to conclude that they need to spread their type of governance or political ideology to be secure. These dangers can be reinforced by a tendency for a unipolar power to see its new interests, which are optional, as necessary ones.¶ The ﬁrst two types of expanded interests and goals can make the unipole better off. The question here is whether the interests the United States might ﬁnd within its reach due to its unipolar position are very valuable. With respect to security, the answer is ‘no’. For the reasons summarized above, the United States can be very secure in bipolarity, and unipolarity is important only in an extreme and unlikely case. Other US goals, for example, spreading democracy and free markets, do not depend on unipolarity, at least not its military dimension. Instead, whether these liberal systems spread will depend most heavily on their own effectiveness. Regarding the down side, there does not appear to be an overwhelming reason that the United States cannot avoid the dangers of unipolar overreach. The Bush administration certainly proved itself vulnerable to these dangers and the United States is continuing to pay for its ﬂawed judgments. Arguably, strands of overreach can be traced back to the Clinton administration’s emphasis on democratic enlargement, although the means that it chose were much more in line with US interests. 21 And the Obama administration’s decision to escalate the war in Afghanistan may well be an example of striving for too much security. Nevertheless, none of the basic arguments about unipolarity explain why these errors are unavoidable. The overreach claim is more an observation about the past than a well-supported prediction about the future. We do not have strong reasons for concluding that the United States will be unable to beneﬁt from analyses of its grand strategy options, learning to both appreciate how very secure it is and at the same time to respect the limits of its power.¶ In sum, then, under current conditions, unipolarity does little to enable the United States to increase its security. Given the limited beneﬁts of unipolarity and the not insigniﬁcant dangers of unipolar overreach, the United States will have to choose its policies wisely if it is going to be better off in a unipolar world than a bipolar one.

### Squo Solves

#### Natural gas solves US energy leadership

Jaffe 11 (Amy Myers Jaffe is director of the Baker Institute Energy Forum at Rice University and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, “The Americas, Not the Middle East, Will Be the World Capital of Energy”, October 2011, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/the_americas_not_the_middle_east_will_be_the_world_capital_of_energy?page=0,0>)

This hydrocarbon-driven reordering of geopolitics is already taking place. The petropower of Iran, Russia, and Venezuela has faltered on the back of plentiful American natural gas supply: A surplus of resources in the Americas is sending other foreign suppliers scrambling to line up buyers in Europe and Asia, making it more difficult for such exporters to assert themselves via heavy-handed energy "diplomacy." The U.S. energy industry may also be able to provide the technical assistance necessary for Europe and China to tap unconventional resources of their own, scuttling their need to kowtow to Moscow or the Persian Gulf. So watch this space: America may be back in the energy leadership saddle again.

#### Squo solves

Steyer and Podesta 12 TOM STEYER And JOHN PODESTA, writers for the Wall Street Journal, “We Don't Need More Foreign Oil and Gas “, January 24, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203718504577178872638705902.html

Under President Obama's leadership, we appear to be at the beginning of a domestic gas and oil boom. After a four-decade decline in oil production, the U.S. is now producing more than half of our oil domestically. This can free us from our addiction to foreign-sourced barrels, particularly if we utilize our dramatically larger and cheaper natural gas reserves. Natural gas now costs the equivalent of less than $15 per barrel, versus the $100-plus barrels we import from the Middle East.¶ There are critical environmental questions associated with developing these resources, particularly concerning methane leakage and water pollution. Yet as long as we ensure high regulatory standards and stay away from the riskiest and most polluting of these activities, we can safely assemble a collection of lower-carbon, affordable and abundant domestic-energy assets that will dramatically improve our economy and our environment. Under President Obama's watch, increased domestic production from developing these reserves has already created 75,000 new gas and oil-production jobs since 2009. And we have much further to go.¶ At the same time, the U.S. is well on its way to becoming a global clean-energy leader. America is the largest clean-energy investor, after reclaiming this title from China last year. Our companies make over 75% of all venture investments in clean technologies world-wide. Overall, because of U.S. public and private investments in clean energy—including renewables, efficiency, transportation and infrastructure—the clean economy grew by 8.3% from 2008 to 2009, even during the depths of the recession.

#### Squo solves the internal links cited in their ev –

#### a) Fuel standards

NYT 12 “U.S. Sets Higher Fuel Efficiency Standards”, August 28, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/29/business/energy-environment/obama-unveils-tighter-fuel-efficiency-standards.html?\_r=0

DETROIT — The Obama administration issued on Tuesday the final version of new rules that require automakers to nearly double the average fuel economy of new cars and trucks by 2025. ¶ The standards — which mandate an average fuel economy of 54.5 miles per gallon for the 2025 model year — will increase the pressure on auto manufacturers to step up development of electrified vehicles as well as sharply improve the mileage of their mass-market models through techniques like more efficient engines and lighter car bodies.¶ Current rules for the Corporate Average Fuel Economy, or CAFE, program mandate an average of about 29 miles per gallon, with gradual increases to 35.5 m.p.g. by 2016.¶ The new rules represent a victory for environmentalists and advocates of fuel conservation, but were attacked by opponents, including the Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney, as too costly for consumers.

#### b) Solar

WSJ 12 “Fueled by Cheap Chinese Panels, U.S. Solar Use Soars”, September 9, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390443589304577637333545350176.html

The solar-power business is expanding quickly in the U.S., helping lift the cloud that has surrounded the industry since the demise of Solyndra LLC a year ago.¶ But the growth isn't coming from U.S. solar-panel manufacturing, despite the money and rhetoric devoted to the industry by the Obama administration. Instead, it is in installations of largely foreign-made panels, whose falling price has made solar more competitive with other forms of power.¶ "There should be little emphasis put on where the panels are made," said Lyndon Rive, chief executive of SolarCity Corp., which finances and installs rooftop solar systems. "Most of the jobs are in delivery and they're long-term, permanent jobs."¶ The U.S. is on pace to install as much solar power this year as it did in this century's entire first decade: at least 2,500 megawatts, the equivalent of more than two nuclear-power plants. The U.S. added about 742 megawatts of solar capacity in the second quarter, or enough to power about 150,000 homes, the Solar Energy Industries Association said in a report scheduled for release Monday.

#### c) Wind

Koch 12 Wendy Koch, writer for USA Today, “U.S. solar and wind industries expand”, March 14, 2012, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/story/2012-03-14/solar-wind-energy/53517526/1

Despite last year's bankruptcies of several solar manufacturers, including government-backed Solyndra, the U.S. solar and wind industries continue to expand in the face of obstacles this year.¶ Newly installed solar panels produced 109% more electricity nationwide last year than in 2010, reaching a record 1,855 megawatts, as the price of these panels plummeted by more than 50%, according to a report today by the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA), an industry group, and GTM Research.¶ "The U.S. remains the innovative center of the solar industry worldwide," says Rhone Resch, SEIA's president. He says "run-of-the-mill" panels may increasingly be made overseas, but the U.S. still will make the most advanced solar components and post double-digit annual growth. He expects solar power, which now produces less than 1% of U.S. electricity, to generate 10% by 2020.¶ "There's no bubble" bursting in the clean-tech sector, Resch says, although he cautions that more companies likely will fail as the industries mature and cope with decreased government subsidies.¶ Other recent reports indicate that the U.S. clean-tech sector remains strong despite Republican criticism of President Obama's half-billion-dollar loan guarantee to Solyndra and his other support for renewable energy.¶ Wind power increased 31% last year, says the American Wind Energy Association, and venture capital invested in clean technology grew from $3.8 billion in 2010 to $4.3 billion last year, the National Venture Capital Association says.

### STEM Adv

### Squo Solves

#### US education is unmatched—guarantees strong military

Joffe, pol sci prof, 9—Senior Fellow of Stanford's Freeman-Spogli Institute for International Studies. Fellow in International Relations at the Hoover Institutionand. Associate of the Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University (Josef, The Default Power: The False Prophecy of America's Decline, Foreign Affairs Sep/Oct 2009. Vol. 88, Iss. 5; pg. 21, 15 pgs, )

LAST MAN STANDING COMPOUND-INTEREST games are entertaining but not enlightening, since power, the most elusive concept in political science, is not just a matter of growth rates. What, then, makes a country great? A large population, a large economy, and a large military are necessary but not sufficient conditions. What puts the United States in a league of its own? For one, the world's most sophisticated military panoply, fed by a defense budget that dwarfs all comers and gives the United States the means to intervene anywhere on the planet. But there is even more: an unmatched research and higher-education establishment that continues to drive excellence. All projections that show China surpassing the United States in the first half of this century leave out these two unspectacular - but critical - sources of power. Of the world's top 20 universities, all but three are American; of the top 50, all but 11 are located in the United States. By contrast, India's two best universities are tucked away in the world's 300^0-400 tier. China does a bit better, its top three - Nanjing University, Peking University, and Shanghai University - are in the 20o-to-3oo group of the world's 500 best. Harvard and Stanford are not quaking, and neither are Cambridge and Oxford. China's public spending on education, meanwhile, has been in the range of 2.0-2.5 percent of gdp over the last quarter century - this for a population four times as large as the United States' and an economy four times as small. In the United States, average spending has been close to six percent, higher than that of India, Japan, Russia, and the eu. The same pattern holds for research and development (R & D) outlays, with the U.S. rate almost twice as high as China's - again as a fraction of a vastly larger gdp. Education and R & D are critical because they condition future performance. True, an increasing number of U.S. graduates in the hard sciences are foreign born or first-generation immigrants. But far from betraying a failure on the United States' part, this trend actually dramatizes a unique advantage: no other country draws so many of the world's best and brightest to its labs and universities, especially from China and India.

#### US Science and tech competitiveness high

Hosek, economics prof, 7—prof, Pardee RAND Grad School. Editor, RAND Journal of Economics. PhD in economics, U Chicago. BA in English, Cornell—AND—Titus Galama—Ph.D. and M.Sc. in physics, University of Amsterdam; M.B.A., INSEAD (James, U.S. Competitiveness in Science and Technology, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND\_MG674.pdf, )

We find that the United States continues to lead the world in science and technology. The United States grew faster in many measures of S&T capability than did Japan and Europe, and developing nations such as China, India, and South Korea showed rapid growth in S&T output measures, but they are starting from a small base. These developing nations do not yet account for a large share of world innovation and scientific output, which continues to be dominated by the United States, Europe, and Japan. The United States accounts for 40 percent of total world R&D spending and 38 percent of patented new technology inventions by the industrialized nations of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), employs 37 percent (1.3 million) of OECD researchers (FTE), produces 35 percent, 49 percent, and 63 percent, respectively, of total world publications, citations, and highly cited publications, employs 70 percent of the world’s Nobel Prize winners and 66 percent of its most-cited individuals, and is the home to 75 percent of both the world’s top 20 and top 40 universities and 58 percent of the top 100. A comparison of S&T indicators for the United States with those of other nations/regions reveals the following: Other nations/regions are not significantly 􀁴􀀁 outpacing the United States in R&D expenditures. China and South Korea, which are showing rapid growth in R&D expenditures, are starting from a small base, and the EU-15 and Japan are growing slower than the United States. 􀁴􀀁 Other nations/regions are not outpacing the United States in S&T employment, as growth in researchers in the EU-15 was comparable to, and that of Japan considerably lower than, that of the United States. China, however, added about the same number of researchers as the United States did and overtook Japan during the period 1995 to 2002. 􀁴􀀁 Other nations/regions are rapidly educating their populations in S&T, with the EU-15 and China graduating more scientists and engineers than the United States. 􀁴􀀁 China, India, and South Korea are starting to account for a significant portion of the world’s S&T inputs and activities (R&D funding in dollars at purchasing power parity, research jobs, S&T education, etc.) and are showing rapid growth in outputs and outcomes, yet they account for a very small share of patents, S&T publications, and citations. 􀁴􀀁 percentage-point loss in world share in publications, citations, and top 1 percent highly cited publications between 1993–1997 and 1997–2001. 􀁴􀀁 On measures such as additions to the S&T workforce and patented innovations, U.S. growth in S&T was on par with, or above, world average trends. By comparison, Japan grew more slowly in additions to the S&T workforce, and both the EU-15 and Japan had slower growth in patented innovations. High growth in R&D expenditures, patents, and S&E employment, combined with continuing low unemployment of S&E workers, suggest that U.S. S&E has remained vibrant. These signs do not support the notion that jobs are being lost at substantial rates as a result of the outsourcing and offshoring of S&T. U.S. gains in S&T occur against a backdrop in which R&D expenditures, S&E employment, and patents are also increasing in the EU-15, Japan, China, Korea, and many other nations/regions. Studies of the offshoring of high-skill work suggest that it does not result in job losses in the originating country, as it is increasingly driven by the need to access scarce talent, but rather that the overall number of jobs is increasing. A future in which a significant share of new technologies is invented elsewhere will benefit the United States as long as it maintains the capability to acquire and implement technologies invented abroad. Technology is an essential factor of productivity, and the use of new technology (whether it was invented in the United States or elsewhere) can result in greater efficiency, economic growth, and higher living standards. The impact of globalization on U.S. innovative activity is less clear. On the one hand, significant innovation and R&D elsewhere may increase foreign and domestic demand for U.S. research and innovation if the United States keeps its comparative advantage in R&D. On the other hand, the rise of populous, low-income countries may threaten this comparative advantage in R&D in certain areas if such countries develop the capacity and institutions necessary to apply new technologies and have a well-educated, low-wage S&T labor force. Looking only at federal expenditures on R&D a few years ago might have left the impression that the United States was underinvesting in R&D at the end of the Cold War: Total federal R&D spending grew at 2.5 percent per year from 1994 to 2004, much lower than its long-term average of 3.5 percent per year from 1953 to 2004 (in real terms, i.e., after correction for inflation). Yet federal R&D accounted for only $86 billion of $288 billion total U.S. R&D expenditures in 2004. Industrial R&D expenditures, the largest source of R&D, grew rapidly, at an average rate of 5.4 percent and 5.3 percent per year for the periods 1953–2004 and 1994–2004, respectively, and accounted for most of the growth in total R&D (4.7 percent and 4.4 percent for the periods 1953–2004 and 1994–2004, respectively). As a result, growth in total R&D was on par with the world’s average growth: Measured in dollars at purchasing power parity (PPP), U.S. R&D expenditures grew at an average rate of 5.8 percent per annum from 1993 to 2003, close to the world’s average of 6.3 percent. Further, total basic research showed the greatest rate of increase, at an average of 6.2 percent and 5.1 percent per year (4.7 percent and 4.4 percent for total R&D) for the periods 1953–2004 and 1994–2004, respectively. Also, federally funded basic research grew by 3.4 percent per year over the period 1970–2003 and 4.7 percent per year over the period 1993–2003. As industrial and federal R&D grew, universities and colleges managed to increase their R&D by an average of 6.6 percent and 5.1 percent per year for 1953–2004 and 1994–2004, respectively. This is reassuring, given the importance of basic and academic research to innovation. However, most of the increase in federally funded basic research was in the life sciences, whereas basic research funding for the physical sciences was essentially flat. The allocation of federal R&D dollars presumably was based on an assessment that the potential payoffs were far higher in the life sciences than in the physical sciences, just as physical sciences had received the major portion of federal R&D funds in the decade after Sputnik. Still, taken as a whole, total basic research and federally funded basic research have increased rapidly in real terms (constant dollars) on average, by between 3 percent and 6 percent per year for the last three decades.

#### No nuclear labor shortage – new agreement to use ex-Navy

World Nuclear News, 8-23-2012, “More options open for US workforce,” WNN, http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/NP-More\_options\_open\_for\_US\_workforce-2308127.html

Nuclear-trained ex-servicemen and women from the US Navy should be able to seamlessly transition to employment in the country's civil nuclear power industry under a groundbreaking agreement between the US Naval Propulsion Program and representatives of the nuclear industry. Randy Edington of Arizona Public Service Co, Steve Trautman of the US Navy Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program and Steve Kuczynski of Southern Nuclear Operating Co at the signing ceremony (Image: NEI) The agreement of understanding, announced by US industry organisation the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), was signed on behalf of the Naval Propulsion Program by deputy director Steve Trautman. Some 31 nuclear industry representatives, including nuclear companies and the Institute of Nuclear Power Operators, have added their names to the list of signatories. The agreement forms the first ever formal partnership between the US Navy and the civilian industry aimed at helping nuclear-trained veterans to move into the domestic nuclear energy field, giving veterans the option of having their contact information forwarded directly to civil industry recruiters at the end of their service commitment. The agreement works in two directions: it also allows the US Navy to recruit directly from the 38 partner colleges in the Nuclear Uniform Curriculum Program (NUCUP), a partnership which aims to ensure a pipeline of nuclear industry talent trained to high, consistent standards. NUCUP was founded following efforts by the NEI to address anticipated skills shortage in a growing US nuclear energy industry. The US nuclear industry expects to hire some 25,000 more workers over the next five years, according to NEI senior vice president and chief nuclear officer Tony Pietrangelo. The new agreement "allows us to bring in experienced, highly skilled people who deserve rewarding civilian careers after selfless service to their country," he explained. "The beauty of this agreement is that it provides a multi-avenue flow for training the next generation of nuclear workers who can gain the skills and experience needed through formal education in or out of the military, on-the-job training or both that ensures a bright future in a growing industry," he said. Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program deputy director Steve Trautman noted that the new agreement would facilitate the navy's access to NUCUP graduates while allowing former sailors to use their skills after leaving the service. "Both of these are right for the Navy and the nation," he said.

### Nuclear Primacy Inev

#### The stockpile isn’t decaying---we’re upgrading the counterforce capabilities of every leg of the triad

McDonough 9 – David S. McDonough, Doctoral Fellow at the Centre for Foreign Policy Studies at Dalhousie University, March 2009, “Tailored Deterrence: The ‘New Triad’ and the Tailoring of Nuclear Superiority,” online: http://www.canadianinternationalcouncil.org/download/resourcece/archives/strategicd~2/sd\_no8\_200

Less noticed is the continuing modernization of the existing arsenal. The remaining low-yield Minuteman III ICBM warheads will be replaced by the high-yield MX warhead and further augmented by the inclusion of GPS guidance systems. The SLBM force of highly accurate and high-yield D-5 warheads will also benefit from the addition of GPS accuracy and ground-burst capability. Even the bomber force will become armed with stealthy and low-flying cruise missiles – ideal to avoid an adversary’s early warning radar. The nuclear force may indeed be smaller, but it is also becoming more accurate and more lethal, and ideal for disarming counterforce strikes.

### No Impact

#### Conventional deterrence is more credible and effective against regional adversaries

Gormley 9 – Dennis Gormley, Senior Fellow in the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute for International Studies, Fall 2009, “The Path to Deep Nuclear Reductions: Dealing with American Conventional Superiority,” online: http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite\_defense/PP29\_Gormley.pdf

Of course, the decided advantage that precision conventional weapons have over nuclear weapons is that an adversary knows full well that the United States is highly likely to use its conventional advantage should its security interests become seriously threatened. As for nuclear threats, the only ones that may prove salient are ones that threaten nuclear retaliation during an ongoing conventional war against a regional state in possession of a small nuclear capability. But still, U.S. reliance on precision conventional weapons represents the best form of deterrence – pre-war and intra-war – if only because of the declining value of the threat of nuclear use. As previously noted, Paul Nitze argued in 1994 that nuclear weapons were unlikely to deter regional aggressors as well as precision conventional weapons, not least because of the growing effectiveness of non-nuclear options but also because American presidents would be unwilling to use nuclear weapons.22 Notably, after the 1991 Persian Gulf War, Colin Powell dismissed the utility to nuclear use, while his commander-in-chief, President George H.W. Bush, acknowledged in his memoir that he had ruled out a nuclear response in that war.23

#### ( ) Primacy adds nothing to U.S. coercive leverage and generates asymmetric responses from adversaries

Lantis 7 – Jeffrey Lantis, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at The College of Wooster, 2007, “Correspondence: The Short Shadow of U.S. Primacy?,” International Security, Vol. 31, No. 3, p. 174-193

Keir Lieber and Daryl Press's recent article presents a compelling case for the rise of U.S. nuclear primacy in the twenty-first century. The authors, however, fail to address what they maintain is a central question in international relations scholarship: "Does nuclear primacy grant the superior side real coercive leverage in political disputes?"1 Their passing discussion of the theme does little justice to the merit of the question, and as a result the article seems incomplete. In fact, the United States already enjoys primacy in the vast majority of its relations with other countries, but recent events suggest that this preponderance of power has not led to coercive leverage.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, nuclear primacy may cast a very short shadow on global politics. Evidence for this argument can be found in great power relations (characterized by Lieber and Press as near primacy) and in U.S. dealings with other states (true primacy). For example, the United States has gained little leverage against China and Russia even though it sits on the "cusp of nuclear primacy" today (p. 8). A 2006 Pentagon report warns of changes in China's conventional strategy designed to shape its military into a "more modern force capable of fighting short-duration, high-intensity conflicts against high-tech adversaries."2 Meanwhile, Russia is pursuing a war on insurgents in its periphery and has even used its energy supplies as a weapon against its neighbors. The U.S. inability both to slow China's military modernization and its aggressive rhetoric toward Taiwan and to constrain Vladimir Putin's increasingly authoritarian turn in Russia, as well as the United States' failure to bring [End Page 174]China and Russia on board to halt the pace of nuclear proliferation in Iran, are but a few examples of the limits of near primacy today.

#### ( ) Zero coercive leverage from primacy---nuclear threats aren’t credible enough to prevent even rogue prolif

Lantis 7 – Jeffrey Lantis, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at The College of Wooster, 2007, “Correspondence: The Short Shadow of U.S. Primacy?,” International Security, Vol. 31, No. 3, p. 174-193

There are no clearer cases of the short shadow of primacy than in U.S. dealings with "axis of evil" nations since 2001. The United States enjoys true primacy in relation to these countries, yet in a real sense seems unable to prevent them from developing weapons of mass destruction. The Iraq case illustrates this dilemma. Even though the Iraqi regime abandoned its drive for weapons of mass destruction in the decade after the 1991 Persian Gulf War, Saddam Hussein sought to maintain the illusion that it had a viable program. In the buildup to the 2003 Iraq war, no action by the United States or its allies seemed to effectively convey the message that the coalition would strike to prevent Iraqi rearmament. According to a report by the U.S. Joint Forces Command that was declassified in February 2006, Hussein remained "very confident" in the months before the war "that the United States would not dare attack Iraq, and that if it did, it would be defeated."3 Nuclear primacy granted essentially no leverage in this case, and the United States is still paying the price for this breakdown in coercive diplomacy.

Iran and North Korea are moving forward with their nuclear programs in defiance of international condemnation and threats.4 A secret Pentagon report leaked in April 2006 even suggested that U.S. military planners were considering the use of tactical nuclear weapons to destroy Iranian facilities.5 These and other efforts to signal the Iranian regime, however, have fallen on deaf ears. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has celebrated scientific achievements in enrichment, boasted of the potential of Iran's nuclear programs, rejected international pressure to change course, and threatened to withdraw from the nonproliferation regime altogether. In addition, after years of limited progress in the six-party talks, the George W. Bush administration recently switched gears to focus on a peace treaty for the Korean Peninsula as a step toward greater security. If U.S. primacy cannot prevent rival nations from taking the ultimate decision to develop nuclear arsenals of their own, then scholars must carefully reassess its utility for international security in the twenty-first century.

### Fusion Adv

### AT: Navy

#### Naval power inevitable - reject their evidence

**Farley 7** (Roberts, Assistant Professor @ the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, "The False Decline of U.S. Navy," Oct 23, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the\_false\_decline\_of\_the\_us\_navy,)

We live in strange times. While the United States is responsible for close to 50 percent of aggregate world military expenditure, and maintains close alliances with almost all of the other major military powers, a community of defense analysts continues to insist that we need to spend more. In the November issue of The Atlantic, Robert Kaplan asserts that United States hegemony is under the threat of “elegant decline,” and points to what conventional analysts might suggest is the most secure element of American power; the United States Navy. Despite the fact that the U.S. Navy remains several orders of magnitude more powerful than its nearest rival, Kaplan says that we must beware; if we allow the size of our Navy to further decline, we risk repeating the experience of the United Kingdom in the years before World War I. Unfortunately, since no actual evidence of U.S. naval decline exists, Kaplan is forced to rely on obfuscation, distortion, and tendentious historical analogies to make his case. The centerpiece of Kaplan’s argument is a comparison of the current U.S. Navy to the British Royal Navy at the end of the 19th century. The decline of the Royal Navy heralded the collapse of British hegemony, and the decline of the U.S. Navy threatens a similar fate for the United States. The only problem with this argument is that similarities between the 21st century United States and the 19th century United Kingdom are more imagined than real. It’s true that the relative strength of the Royal Navy declined at the end of the 19th century, but this was due entirely the rise of the United States and Germany. But the absolute strength of the Royal Navy increased in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as the United Kingdom strove to maintain naval dominance over two countries that possessed larger economies and larger industrial bases than that of Great Britain. In other words, the position of the Royal Navy declined because the position of the United Kingdom declined; in spite of this decline, the Royal Navy continued to dominate the seas against all comers until 1941. Britain’s relative economic decline preceded its naval decline, although the efforts to keep up with Germany, the United States, and later Japan did serious damage to the British economy. The United States faces a situation which is in no way similar. Returning to the present, Kaplan takes note of the growth of several foreign navies, including the Indian, Chinese, and Japanese. He points out that the Japanese Navy has a large number of destroyers and a growing number of submarines. He warns that India “may soon have the world’s third largest navy” without giving any indication of why that matters. Most serious of all, he describes the threat of a growing Chinese Navy and claims that, just as the Battle of Wounded Knee opened a new age for American imperialism, the conquest of Taiwan could transform China into an expansionist, imperial power. The curious historical analogies aside, Kaplan is careful to make no direct comparisons between the growing navies of foreign countries and the actual strength of the United States Navy. There’s a good reason for this oversight; there is no comparison between the U.S. Navy and any navy afloat today. The United States Navy currently operates eleven aircraft carriers. The oldest and least capable is faster, one third larger, and carries three times the aircraft of Admiral Kuznetsov, the largest carrier in the Russian Navy. Unlike China’s only aircraft carrier, the former Russian Varyag, American carriers have engines and are capable of self-propulsion. The only carrier in Indian service is fifty years old and a quarter the size of its American counterparts. No navy besides the United States’ has more than one aircraft carrier capable of flying modern fixed wing aircraft. The United States enjoys similar dominance in surface combat vessels and submarines, operating twenty-two cruisers, fifty destroyers, fifty-five nuclear attack submarines, and ten amphibious assault ships (vessels roughly equivalent to most foreign aircraft carriers). In every category the U.S. Navy combines presumptive numerical superiority with a significant ship-to-ship advantage over any foreign navy. This situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. The French Navy and the Royal Navy will each expand to two aircraft carriers over the next decade. The most ambitious plans ascribed to the People’s Liberation Army Navy call for no more than three aircraft carriers by 2020, and even that strains credulity, given China’s inexperience with carrier operations and the construction of large military vessels. While a crash construction program might conceivably give the Chinese the ability to achieve local dominance (at great cost and for a short time), the United States Navy will continue to dominate the world’s oceans and littorals for at least the next fifty years. In order to try to show that the U.S. Navy is insufficient in the face of future threats, Kaplan argues that we on are our way to “a 150 ship navy” that will be overwhelmed by the demands of warfighting and global economic maintenance. He suggests that the “1,000 Ship Navy” proposal, an international plan to streamline cooperation between the world’s navies on maritime maintenance issues such as piracy, interdiction of drug and human smuggling, and disaster relief, is an effort at “elegant decline,” and declares that the dominance of the United States Navy cannot be maintained through collaboration with others. It’s true that a 600 ship navy can do more than the current 250-plus ship force of the current U.S. Navy, but Kaplan’s playing a game of bait and switch. The Navy has fewer ships than it did two decades ago, but the ships it has are far more capable than those of the 1980s. Because of the collapse of its competitors, the Navy is relatively more capable of fighting and winning wars now than it was during the Reagan administration. Broadly speaking, navies have two missions; warfighting, and maritime maintenance. Kaplan wants to confuse the maritime maintenance mission (which can be done in collaboration with others) with the warfighting mission (which need not be). A navy can require the cooperation of others for the maintenance mission, while still possessing utter military superiority over any one navy or any plausible combination of navies on the high seas. Indeed, this is the situation that the United States Navy currently enjoys. It cannot be everywhere all at once, and does require the cooperation of regional navies for fighting piracy and smuggling. At the same time, the U.S. Navy can destroy any (and probably all, at the same time) naval challengers. To conflate these two missions is equal parts silly and dishonest. The Navy has arrived at an ideal compromise between the two, keeping its fighting supremacy while leading and facilitating cooperation around the world on maritime issues. This compromise has allowed the Navy to build positive relationships with the navies of the world, a fact that Kaplan ignores. While asserting the dangers posed by a variety of foreign navies, Kaplan makes a distortion depressingly common to those who warn of the decline of American hegemony; he forgets that the United States has allies. While Kaplan can plausibly argue that growth in Russian or Chinese naval strength threatens the United States, the same cannot reasonably be said of Japan, India, France, or the United Kingdom. With the exception of China and Russia, all of the most powerful navies in the world belong to American allies. United States cooperation with the navies of NATO, India, and Japan has tightened, rather than waned in the last ten years, and the United States also retains warm relations with third tier navies such as those of South Korea, Australia, and Malaysia. In any conceivable naval confrontation the United States will have friends, just as the Royal Navy had friends in 1914 and 1941. Robert Kaplan wants to warn the American people of the dangers of impending naval decline. Unfortunately, he’s almost entirely wrong on the facts. While the reach of the United States Navy may have declined in an absolute sense, its capacity to fight and win naval wars has, if anything, increased since the end of the Cold War. That the United States continues to embed itself in a deep set of cooperative arrangements with other naval powers only reinforces the dominance of the U.S. Navy on the high seas. Analysts who want to argue for greater U.S. military spending are best advised to concentrate on the fiascos in Iraq and Afghanistan.

### AT: Sea-Skimming Missiles

#### Even if they win a unique internal—takes 20 years and way more action than just spinoff research

CCAS 9, Coalition for the Commercial Application of Superconductors, Superconductivity Present and Future Applications, http://www.ccas-web.org/pdf/ccas\_brochure\_web.pdf

Recent progress in superconductivity follows a pattern that marked previous developments in new materials - for example, in transistors, semiconductors and optical fibers. Materials-based technology development entails high risk and uncertainty compared to more incremental innovations. It typically takes 20 years to move new materials from the laboratory to the commercial arena. Yet products using new materials often yield the most dramatic benefits for society in the long run.¶ The long lead times inherent in HTS technology development necessitates a sustained government role, and government-industry partnerships play a pivotal role in this process. These partnerships require stable and consistent funding and a tolerance for risk. Careful planning is required to ensure parallel progress in related fields, such as cryogenics, to assure broad commercial acceptance of new LTS and of HTS technology. Prospective customers such as electric utilities require a stable and symmetrical climate for investment in research, development and demonstration projects.

#### Their Gsponer evidence concludes the military has already accrued the R&D benefits they isolate from ITER

Gsponer Their Evidence 8 (Dr. Andre, Director and Senior Researcher – Independent Scientific Research Institute, “ITER: The International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor and the NuclearWeapons Proliferation Implications of ThermonuclearFusion Energy Systems”, 2-2, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/physics/0401110v3.pdf>)

\*\*WHERE MSUs EVIDENCE STARTS\*\*

2.7.2 Military spinoffs¶ of MCF technology¶ In a compilation of several surveys, itwas found that themost numerous technology¶ transfers from magnetic fusion research to other areas of science and technology¶ were in the domains of magnet technology, power supplies, materials technology,¶ particle beams, power supplies and vacuum technology [73]. These types of¶ spinoffs¶ are similar to those found for highenergy¶ particle accelerator physics¶ research, a domain which like MCF produces relatively few spinoffs¶ of direct¶ importance to industrial development.¶ Superconductive magnet are of great importance for strategic military developments¶ in outer space and ballistic missile defense, as well as for tactical developments¶ such as electromagneticpulse¶ generators and electromagnetic guns.¶ The use of cryogenic and superconductive magnets in space is been investigated¶ for pulsedpower¶ generation, power conditioning and energy storage, and was¶ expected to play a major role in the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program¶ [74].¶ Superconductive magnets are also of great interest for the “plasma separation¶ process” [59] which is potentially the most attractive technique for veryhigh¶ throughput isotope separation [75, 76]. Large scale isotope enrichment is important¶ for the production of 235U as well as for the enrichment of various types ofmedium¶ weight nuclear species if “isotopic tailoring” becomes an important feature of new¶ materials. Such materials are expected to be necessary for making the first wall of¶ MCF fusion vessels (in order to minimize their erosion and radioactivation due to¶ the intense neutron bombardment from the burning plasma) as well for a number¶ of military applications where similar or related properties are important.

\*\*WHERE MSUs EVIDENCE ENDS\*\*

2.7.3 Examples of spinoff¶ technologies expected from ITER¶ To conclude this section, we quote in extenso the examples given in section 5.13¶ devoted to the spinoff¶ benefits of fusion technologies in the summary of the report¶ of the Special Committee on the ITER Project of the Japanese Atomic Energy¶ Commission. This is not to imply that the examples given by the Committee are¶ necessarily relevant to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, but an illustration that¶ they are indeed mostly dual purpose¶ technologies of great military significance:¶ “Driving force of spinoff¶ technologies¶ Since fusion development requires gathering knowledge from a myriad¶ of advanced technologies, it is now making significant progress as¶ 48¶ a seed of these technologies. The fusion device is based on diverse¶ research fields and fashioned from advanced technologies, such as¶ physics, mechanical engineering, electric and electronic engineering,¶ materials engineering, thermodynamics, heat transfer flow and thermal¶ engineering, nuclear engineering, cryogenic engineering, electromagnetic¶ dynamics, chemical engineering, and control engineering¶ and instrumentation. Therefore, the development of this compound¶ technology not only advances individual fusion technology but also¶ raises the potential capability of all science and technology by mutual¶ stimulation between different fields of science. The resultant spinoff¶ benefits are seen in commercial technologies, such as the semiconductor¶ industry and the large, precision machine tool¶ industry. Fusion¶ research also contributes to the development of advanced technology¶ and basic science of other fields, such as physics, space science, materials¶ science, medicine, communications, and environmental science.¶ These applied sciences include accelerator technology, superconductor¶ technology, diagnosing techniques, plasma application technology,¶ heatproof and heavy irradiation proof¶ materials technology, impurity¶ removal techniques, and computer simulation techniques.¶ Examples of spinoff¶ technologies¶ Examples of spinoff¶ technologies include the development of large¶ superconducting coils for ITER, which reduced the cost by 75% of¶ niobium/tin superconducting wire material necessary of the generation¶ of the high magnetic¶ fields. This has allowed the high magnetic¶ field MRI used for medical diagnostics to become relatively commonplace.¶ At the same time, the AC loss has been reduced by 80% of¶ that for conventional superconductors, even at the strong magnetic¶ field of 13 tesla. This makes it feasible to increase the stored energy¶ in a superconducting power storage system by a factor of 5–7 when¶ compared with a system designed with conventional technology and¶ operating at 5–6 tesla. In addition, vacuum pumps for high thermal¶ efficiency refrigerating machines, which operate below4 K, have been¶ developed and have been adopted at the Fermi National Accelerator¶ Laboratory in the US and CERN in Europe. This also demonstrates¶ the enormous contribution of fusion research to the frontiers of science.¶ The technology of producing large positiveionbeam¶ currents,¶ originally developed for the heating of fusion plasmas, has already¶ pervaded into the technologies for products used in daily life, such¶ the semiconductors used in the home electric appliances. In addition,¶ the large negative ion beam¶ current technology developed for ITER¶ 49¶ is expected to give birth to completely new research fields, such as the¶ creation of previously unknown materials. The negative ion¶ beam,¶ which has monochromatic energy, is also suitable for manufacture of¶ intricate semiconductor devices. This allows the realization of low cost,¶ mass produced¶ single crystal silicon thin films for solar cells.¶ Furthermore, high power¶ radiofrequency¶ sources used for plasma¶ heating are already applied to the manufacture of high performance¶ ceramics. Potential applications of these sources extend from solving¶ environmental problems to the radar used in outer space. The integration¶ of component technology for the fusion reactor also advances the¶ systematic development of technologies addressing integration, such¶ as system engineering, control engineering, and safety engineering.¶ Additionally, an exploratory investigation related to the processing¶ of radioactive waste by utilizing a fusion reactor itself as an intense¶ neutron source is also being carried out and seems promising” [6,¶ p.274275].

#### Squo X-Band radar solves the entirety of their Iran scenario

Tarantola 12, 6-1, Andrew, Staff Writer at Gizmodo, “This X-Band Radar System Is What Keeps Iran and Israel from Nuking Each Other”, http://gizmodo.com/5914595/this-x+band-radar-system-is-what-keeps-iran-and-israel-from-nuking-each-other

This X-Band Radar System Is What Keeps Iran and Israel from Nuking Each Other¶ One hundred US soldiers—the only foreign troops in all of Israel—are stationed atop Mt. Keren, deep in the Negev Desert. Their mission: To monitor Iranian airspace 1000 miles to the Northeast for any sign of a missile launch. Their weapon: The THAAD radar, the most advanced mobile radar array on Earth.¶ Originally known as the Missile Defense Agency's Forward-Based X-Band Radar-Transportable (FBX-T) system but now designated as the Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance, AN/TPY-2, it is a high-resolution, X-band radar array that has been integrated into missile interceptor systems like the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD)—hence the nickname, THAAD radar. It can also take its cues from nearby Aegis sites or overhead early warning spy satellites, as well as take command of those same Aegis systems or launch a Ground Based Interceptor (GBI) against incoming threats.¶ The AN/TPY-2 is designed to search, acquire, track, and differentiate inbound threats. It's a highly mobile, flexible, self-powered system capable of being deployed worldwide by land, sea, or air to provide additional early warning against ballistic missile launches. The AN/TPY-2 is composed of four subsystems: the antenna unit (comprising more than 25,000 X-band modules with an aperture surface area of 99 square feet), the electronics unit, a cooling unit, and the prime power source—either from a generator or the local grid.¶ The AN/TPY-2 has two modes of operation, either as a forward-based system (as in Israel) or as a terminal in a larger missile shield defense scheme such as THAAD. In forward-based mode, the AN/TPY-2 runs the show. When it detects a missile launch, it begins tracking the object, its flight path, and ballistics. It then shunts that info into a secondary system for detailed analysis before transmitting its findings back to the Command and Control unit for human verification. Once the C&C confirms the threat, the system launches counter-measures. In terminal mode, AN/TPY-2 acts more like a cog in a wheel**,** working closely with the integrated weapons system (say, THAAD) to detect, track, and destroy the threat.¶ This advanced warning is invaluable on the battlefield. It allows friendly forces more time to react to incoming threats, thereby increasing their defensive capabilities. That means that missiles fired from North Korea can be intercepted over the Sea of Japan, not Northern Japan and rockets leaving Tehran can be dealt with potentially before they even exit Iranian airspace. And it is especially valuable given the AN/TPY-2's stellar track record.¶ Since testing began in 2005, the AN/TPY-2 has yet to miss a target in over 50 system flight test missions and over a thousand satellite tracking exercises. "It's a very sophisticated, eye-watering type of system, with a very powerful capability of precision," an unnamed U.S. missile expert told Time. "It was an X-band radar which was used in Operation Burnt Frost when we shot down that satellite from an Aegis ship several years back that was in a low, decaying orbit. We didn't just hit a bullet with a bullet, we hit a spot on a bullet." Indeed, the portable radar system is so sensitive it can identify and track a game of catch up to 2,900 miles away.¶ That sensitivity is especially useful for Israeli forces. The system's capability for near-instantaneous warning of missile launches provides Israeli authorities an additional seven minutes or so of lead time to sound air raid sirens, and launch at least two rounds of GBIs if necessary. And shooting down the threat sooner increases the likelihood of wreckage hitting less densely-populated areas. However, this system does have two drawbacks, which is why some Israeli lawmakers refer to it as the "golden handcuffs."¶ First, while the US shares all data regarding potential inbound strikes with its Israeli ally, the US does not share all collected data. This tethers any potential Israeli response to an American chain of command located in California, at the U.S. Missile Defense Agency . "We share a lot, but there's a valve on the pipeline, and it's a one-way valve," a Western military official involved in the program told Time. Second, the hyper-accurate detection works both ways. AN/TPY-2 is just as capable of noticing an Israeli surprise first strike against Iran as it is the other way round. This prevents both sides from throwing up missiles willy-nilly; and that fact alone could be keeping us from World War III.

#### You should reject on face their Williams impact evidence—he bases his analysis on biblical prophesy

Williams Their Author No Date, Lawrence Prabhakar, http://www.blogger.com/profile/01571565667646392135

I affirm my faith and conviction on the indispensable primacy of Biblical Prophecy in world affairs.I am an academic and policy research analyst with interests in Defence-strategic affairs, nuclear and missile issues, maritime security and Grand strategy studies.

### 1NC Solvency Frontline

#### Fusion is impossible and even the best case is 60 years – obstacles are enormous

Chris Rhodes, Sussex University, Physical Chemistry Professor, 6/10/2012, The Progress made in the Different Fields of Nuclear Fusion, oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/The-Progress-made-in-the-Different-Fields-of-Nuclear-Fusion.html

When I was about 10, I recall hearing that nuclear fusion power would become a reality "in about thirty years". The estimate has increased steadily since then, and now, forty odd years on, we hear that fusion power will come on-stream "in about fifty years". So, what is the real likelihood of fusion-based power stations coming to our aid in averting the imminent energy crisis? Getting two nuclei to fuse is not easy, since both carry a positive charge and hence their natural propensity is to repel one another. Therefore, a lot of energy is required to force them together so that they can fuse. To achieve this, suitable conditions of extremely high temperature, comparable to those found in stars, must be met. A specific temperature must be reached in order for particular nuclei to fuse with one another. This is termed the "critical ignition temperature", and is around 400 million degrees centigrade for two deuterium nuclei to fuse, while a more modest 100 million degrees is sufficient for a deuterium nucleus to fuse with a tritium nucleus. For this reason, it is deuterium-tritium fusion that is most sought after, since it should be most easily achieved and sustained. One disadvantage of tritium is that it is radioactive and decays with a half-life of about 12 years, and consequently, it exists naturally in only negligible amounts. However, tritium may be "bred" from lithium using neutrons produced in an initial deuterium-tritium fusion. Ideally, the process would become self-sustaining, with lithium fuel being burned via conversion to tritium, which then fuses with deuterium, releasing more neutrons. While not unlimited, there are sufficient known resources of lithium to fire a global fusion programme for about a thousand years, mindful that there are many other uses for lithium, ranging for various types of battery to medication for schizophrenics. The supply would be effectively limitless if lithium could be extracted from the oceans. In a working scenario, some of the energy produced by fusion would be required to maintain the high temperature of the fuel such that the fusion process becomes continuous. At the temperature of around 100 - 300 million degrees, the deuterium/lithium/tritium mixture will exist in the form of a plasma, in which the nuclei are naked (having lost their initial atomic electron clouds) and are hence exposed to fuse with one another. The main difficulty which bedevils maintaining a working fusion reactor which might be used to fire a power station is containing the plasma, a process usually referred to as "confinement" and the process overall as “magnetic confinement fusion” (MCF). Essentially, the plasma is confined in a magnetic bottle, since its component charged nuclei and electrons tend to follow the field of magnetic force, which can be so arranged that the lines of force occupy a prescribed region and are thus centralised to a particular volume. However, the plasma is a "complex" system that readily becomes unstable and leaks away. Unlike a star, the plasma is highly rarefied (a low pressure gas), so that the proton-proton cycle that powers the sun could not be thus achieved on earth, as it is only the intensely high density of nuclei in the sun's core that allows the process to occur sustainably, and that the plasma is contained within its own gravitational mass, and isolated within the cold vacuum of space. In June 2005, the EU, France, Japan, South Korea, China and the U.S. agreed to spend $12 billion to build an experimental fusion apparatus (called ITER) by 2014. It is planned that ITER will function as a research instrument for the following 20 years, and the knowledge gained will provide the basis for building a more advanced research machine. After another 30 years, if all goes well, the first commercial fusion powered electricity might come on-stream. The Joint European Torus (JET) I attended a fascinating event recently - a Cafe' Scientifique meeting held in the town of Reading in South East England. I have also performed in this arena, talking about "What Happens When the Oil Runs Out?", which remains a pertinent question. This time it was the turn of Dr Chris Warrick from the Culham Centre for Fusion Energy based near Abingdon in Oxfordshire, which hosts both the MAST (Mega Amp Spherical Tokamak) and the better known JET (Joint European Torus) experiments. In the audience was a veteran engineer/physicist who had worked on the pioneering ZETA4 experiment in the late 1950s, from which neutrons were detected leading to what proved later to be false claims that fusion had occurred, their true source being different versions of the same instability processes that had beset earlier machines. Nonetheless, his comment was salient: "In the late 50s, we were told that fusion power was 20 years away and now, 50-odd years later it is maybe 60 years away." Indeed, JET has yet to produce a positive ratio of output power/input energy, and instability of the plasma is still a problem. Dr Warrick explained that while much of the plasma physics is now sorted-out, minor aberrations in the magnetic field allow some of the plasma to leak out, and if it touches the far colder walls of the confinement chamber, it simply "dies". In JET it is fusion of nuclei of the two hydrogen isotopes, deuterium and tritium that is being undertaken, a process that as noted earlier, requires a "temperature" of 100 million degrees. I say "temperature" because the plasma is a rarefied (very low pressure) gas, and hence the collisions between particles are not sufficiently rapid that the term means the same distribution of energy as occurs under conditions of thermal equilibrium. It is much the same as the temperatures that may be quoted for molecules in the atmospheric region known as the thermosphere which lies some 80 kilometres above the surface of the Earth. Here too, the atmosphere is highly rarefied and thus derived temperatures refer to translational motion of molecules and are more usefully expressed as velocities. However expressed, at 100 million degrees centigrade, the nuclei of tritium and deuterium have sufficient translational velocity (have enough energy) that they can overcome the mutual repulsion arising from their positive charges and come close enough that they are drawn together by attractive nuclear forces and fuse, releasing vast amounts of energy in the process. JET is not a small device, at 18 metres high, but bigger machines will be necessary before the technology is likely to give out more energy than it consumes. Despite the considerable volume of the chamber, it contains perhaps only one hundredth of a gram of gas, hence its very low pressure. There is another matter and that is how long the plasma and hence energy emission can be sustained. Presently it is fractions of a second but a serious "power station" would need to run for some hours. There is also the problem of getting useful energy from the plasma to convert into electricity even if the aforementioned and considerable problems can be overcome and a sustainable, large-scale plasma maintained. The plan is to surround the chamber with a "blanket" of lithium with pipes running through it and some heat-exchanger fluid passing through them. The heated fluid would then pass on its heat to water and drive a steam-turbine, in the time-honoured fashion used for fossil fuel fired and nuclear power plants. Now my understanding is that this would not be lithium metal but some oxide material. The heat would be delivered in the form of very high energy neutrons that would be slowed-down as they encounter lithium nuclei on passing through the blanket. In principle this is a very neat trick, since absorption of a neutron by a lithium nucleus converts it to tritium, which could be fed back into the plasma as a fuel. Unlike deuterium, tritium does not exist is nature, being radioactive with a half-life of about 12 years. However produced, either separately or in the blanket, lithium is the ultimate fuel source, not tritium per se. Deuterium does exist in nature but only to the extent of one part in about two thousand of ordinary hydrogen (protium) and hence the energy costs of its separation are not inconsiderable. The neutron flux produced by the plasma is very high, and to enhance the overall breeding efficiency of lithium to tritium the reactor would be surrounded with a “lithium” blanket about three feet thick. The intense neutron flux will render the material used to construct the reactor highly radioactive, to the extent that it would not be feasible for operators to enter its vicinity for routine maintenance. The radioactive material will need to be disposed of similarly to the requirements for nuclear waste generated by nuclear fission, and hence fusion is not as "clean" as is often claimed. Exposure to radiation of many potential materials necessary to make the reactor, blanket, and other components such as the heat-exchanger pipes would render them brittle, and so compromise their structural integrity. There is also the possibility that the lithium blanket around the reactor might be replaced by uranium, so enabling the option of breeding plutonium for use in nuclear weapons. Providing a fairly intense magnetic field to confine the plasma (maybe Tesla - similar to that in a hospital MRI scanner) needs power (dc not ac as switching the polarity of the field would cause the plasma to collapse) and large power-supply units containing a lot of metals including rare earths which are mined and processed using fossil fuels. The issue of rare earths is troublesome already, and whether enough of them can be recovered to meet existing planned wind and electric car projects is debatable, let alone that additional pressure should be placed upon an already fragile resource to build a first generation of fusion power stations. World supplies of lithium are also already stressed, and hence getting enough of it not only to make blankets for fusion reactors and tritium production but also for the millions-scale fleet of electric vehicles needed to divert our transportation energy demand away from oil is probably a bridge too far, unless we try getting it from seawater, which takes far more energy than mining lithium minerals. The engineering requirements too will be formidable, however, most likely forcing the need to confront problems as yet unknown, and even according to the most favourable predictions of the experts, fusion power is still 60 years away, if it will arrive at all. Given that the energy crisis will hit hard long before then, I suggest we look to more immediate solutions, mainly in terms of energy efficiency, for which there is ample scope. To quote again the ZETA veteran, "I wonder if maybe man is not intended to have nuclear fusion," and all in all, other than from solar energy I wonder if he is right. At any rate, garnering real electrical power from fusion is so far distant as to have no impact on the more immediately pressing fossil fuels crisis, particularly for oil and natural gas. Fusion Power is a long-range "holy grail" and part of the illusion that humankind can continue in perpetuity to use energy on the scale that it presently does. Efficiency and conservation are the only real means to attenuate the impending crisis in energy and resources.

#### Even if it’s theoretically possible, fusion can’t be commercialized – prefer our ev, it’s from the grandfather of fusion---also proves elections link

Robert L. Hirsch, PhD, former director of the US Fusion Energy Program with the Atomic Energy Commission, and part of basically every major energy and fusion institute in existence, 10-19-2012, “A Veteran of Fusion Science Proposes Narrowing the Field,” NYT, http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/19/a-veteran-of-fusion-science-proposes-narrowing-the-field/

Many outstanding people turned to the pursuit of fusion power. A number of fusion concepts emerged and were investigated. Soon it became painfully clear that practical fusion power would not happen quickly. First, we had to develop the science of plasma physics. After decades of effort, a great deal has been learned and accomplished, but a practical fusion power concept has not been forthcoming. Note that I said ”practical fusion power.” Unlike fire, fusion power has to compete against a number of other options. The word “practical” means that a fusion power system must be desirable, based on the realities of the society into which it will be introduced. An unfortunate problem today is that many people in fusion research believe that producing a fusion-something that simply works is the goal, but that is definitely wrong! Fusion power and fire are distinctly different. Let’s consider some specific criteria for practical fusion power. In 1994, the U.S. Electric Power Research Institute – EPRI – convened a panel of utility technologists to develop “Criteria for Practical Fusion Power Systems.” The result was a four-page folder that outlined “Three principal types of criteria:” Economics, Public Acceptance, and Regulatory Simplicity. The criteria are almost self-explanatory, but let me quote from the Economics Criteria: “To compensate for the higher economic risks associated with new technologies, fusion plants must have lower lifecycle costs than competing technologies available at the time of commercialization.” Details for the criteria are given in the report, which I commend to anyone motivated to help develop fusion power. Against these criteria, let’s consider tokamak fusion, the centerpiece of which is ITER – the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor – under construction in France. As we know, it’s an enormously large machine, which is generally considered to be a prototype of a practical fusion power plant. Comparing the ITER and the core of a comparable commercial fission reactor shows an enormous difference in size – a factor of 5-10 — ITER being huge by comparison to a fission reactor core. It is known in engineering and technology development that the cost of a finished machine or product is roughly proportional to the mass of the device. Eyeballing ITER compared to a fission reactor core, it’s obvious that an ITER-like machine is many times more massive. Yes, you can argue details, like the hollow bore of a tokamak, but the size of the huge superconducting magnets and their heavy support structures provides no relief. Bottom line – On the face of it, an ITER-like power system will be much more expensive than a comparable fission reactor, so I believe that tokamak fusion loses big-time on cost, independent of details. Next, consider the fact that deuterium-tritium fusion inherently emits copious neutrons, which will induce significant radioactivity in adjacent tokamak structural and moderating materials. Accordingly, a tokamak power system will become highly radioactive as soon as it begins to operate and, over time, radiation damage will render those same materials structurally weak, requiring replacement. In the U.S., as elsewhere in the world, we have a Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which will almost certainly be given the task of ensuring that the public is safe from mishaps associated with tokamak power system failures. Expected regulation will require all kinds of safety features, which will add further costs to tokamak power. While the character of the plasma in a tokamak power reactor will not likely represent a large energy-release safety issue, the superconducting magnets would contain a huge amount of stored energy. If those magnets were to go normal – lose their superconducting properties – the energy release would be very large. It can be argued that the probability of that happening will be small, but it will nevertheless not be zero, so the regulators will require safety features that will protect the public in a situation where the magnets go normal, releasing very large amounts of energy. Accordingly, it is virtually certain that the regulators will demand a containment building for a commercial tokamak reactor that will likely resemble what is currently required for fission reactors, so as to protect the public from normal-going superconducting magnet energy release. Because an ITER-like tokamak reactor is inherently so large, such a building will be extremely expensive, further increasing the costs of something that is already too expensive. Next, there’s the induced radioactivity in the structure and moderator of a tokamak power reactor. Some tokamak proponents contend that structure might be made out of an exotic material that will have low induced radioactivity. Maybe, but last I looked, such materials were very expensive and not in common use in the electric power industry. So if one were to decide to use such materials, there would be another boost to cost, along with an added difficulty for industry to deal with. No matter what materials are chosen, there will still be neutron-induced materials damage and large amounts of induced radioactivity. There will thus be remote operations required and large amounts of radioactive waste that will have to be handled and sent off site for cooling and maybe burial. That will be expensive and the public is not likely to be happy with large volumes of fusion-based radioactivity materials being transported around the country. Remember the criteria of public acceptance. I could go on with other downsides and showstoppers associated with tokamak fusion power, but I won’t. It is enough to say that tokamak fusion power has what I believe are insurmountable barriers to practicability and acceptability. By the way, my arguments assume that tokamak physics and technology works well and is reasonably simple, meaning that not many more components will have to be added to the system to allow it to operate on a steady basis for very long periods of time between the long shutdowns needed to change out radiation-damaged, radioactive materials. What I’ve just described is not a happy story. At some point, probably in a matter of years, a group of pragmatic power industry engineers will be convened to seriously scrutinize tokamak fusion, and they are virtually certain to declare that it cannot become a practical power system. That will certainly be a calamity for the people involved and for the cause of fusion power. Let’s review what I’ve said. First, we have to recognize that practical fusion power must measure up to or be superior to the competition in the electric power industry. Second, it is virtually certain that tokamak fusion as represented by ITER will not be practical.

#### Money doesn’t change the calculus – more fusion research doesn’t speed up commercialization

Hank Campbell, 10-15-2012, “Fusion In A Coffee Mug,” Science 2.0, http://www.science20.com/science\_20/fusion\_coffee\_mug-95126

They are basically correct about one part. Fusion is not ready yet. It may be another 50 years before it is ready. But, as much as it will send some in the broad audience into hysterical shrieks to read it, we have that 50 years and it will be time well spent. CO2 from energy companies have plummeted and the dirtiest source, coal, is in steep decline and producing levels of emissions not seen since Reagan was in his first term. Our current energy is getting cleaner and nothing else is ready to take its place - we'd need to build a nuclear plant every day for the next 50 years to meet our energy needs and even then we can do it only because fission energy is relatively efficient; if we instead tried to use solar power, the environmental energy darling du jour, it would be close to impossible. The 'greenmail' and environmental lawsuits that appear every time a decent-sized solar plant is even proposed makes it too flaky in a nation that wants a reliable energy plan.(1) Politicians think about 'the now' and fusion is not exciting people, despite its potential. Like solar power, it's already been promised for 60 years and made no huge advances. If a president comes into power who is a believer, it may get tens of billions of dollars in subsidies thrown at it, like solar power has, but here on Science 2.0 we would still ridicule it because you can't just throw money at a company or a school and have a basic research miracle spring to life. It takes time, and mistakes, and increments, before anything revolutionary happens. Instead of invoking yet another Cold War military-industrial pipe dream - government loves to build "Manhattan Project of X" behemoths despite none of them working since the actual Manhattan Project - a smaller, nimbler, 21st century way of doing science makes more sense when it comes to fusion. Lots of programs that are outside Big Science may lead to a real breakthrough and aren't 'all or nothing' financially. It's being done now, in both corporate- and government-funded science, and one recent program may be worth getting excited about.

## 2NC

### Elections

### Turns Case

#### Obama reelection key to break gridlock over the fiscal cliff – otherwise we’ll go over the edge

Sloan 9/4 Steven is a writer for Politico. "Charles Schumer: GOP, Dems in talks to avoid fiscal cliff,” 2012, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/80678.html>

CHARLOTTE, N.C. — Congress won’t return for a lame-duck session until after the election, but Sen. Chuck Schumer says top lawmakers are already holding talks about how to avoid falling off the fiscal cliff. "There are conversations going on now about ways to avoid the fiscal cliff between Democrats and Republicans," Schumer said at a POLITICO event here Tuesday evening. Schumer said Richard Durbin of Illinois, the Senate's No. 2 Democrat, is involved in the discussions, but he didn’t name any of the GOP members. Schumer said that if Mitt Romney wins the election in November and the Senate flips to the Republicans, action on the fiscal cliff isn't likely **until January**. If President Barack Obama is re-elected and Democrats retain the Senate, however, **a deal before the end of the year is more likely**, he said. "That will give greater strength to the mainstream Republicans to cut some deals with us," he said. He said the "most likely solution" is a deal that would allow the tax and appropriations committees in Congress to spend time next year — up until June, perhaps — to work out the details of cutting the deficit. He said the year-end deal could include a "real trigger." "If it doesn't happen, there's serious stuff," Schumer said. Unless Congress acts by Dec. 31, $1.2 trillion in spending cuts will take effect, the Bush-era tax cuts will expire and millions of Americans will be subject to the alternative minimum tax.

#### Turns nuclear primacy

Reuters 11 "Defense Secretary Warns of Consequences of Budget Cuts" www.usnews.com/news/articles/2011/11/15/defense-secretary-warns-of-consequences-of-budget-cuts, 11/15

"Such a large cut, applied in this indiscriminate manner, would render most of our ship and construction projects **unexecutable** -- you cannot buy three-quarters of a ship or a building," Panetta wrote.¶ "We would also be forced to separate many of our civilian personnel involuntarily and, because the reduction would be imposed so quickly, we would almost certainly have to furlough civilians in order to meet the target," he added, saying that such a move would "seriously damage" military readiness.¶ Over the longer run, the Pentagon would have to impose cuts that could lead to termination of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the military's largest procurement program, which aims to buy 2,447 of the radar-evading fighter jets in the coming decades.¶ The cuts also could force the Pentagon to **end its European missile defense program**, terminate its new littoral combat ship, end all ground combat vehicle modernization programs and kill Army helicopter modernization efforts, Panetta wrote.¶ The cuts also could **affect the U.S.** nuclear deterrent. Panetta said the spending limits could force the Pentagon to **delay its next-generation ballistic missile submarine** and **get rid of its intercontinental ballistic missiles** -- two systems maintained to ensure deliver of nuclear weapons if needed.¶ Reacting to Panetta's letter, McCain and Graham said the forced cuts would "set off a swift decline of the United States as the world's leading military power."¶ "We are staunchly opposed to this draconian action. This is not an outcome that we can live with, and it is certainly not one that we should impose on ourselves," they wrote.

#### Turns heg and navy

Calvert 8/5 Ken is a writer at the Press Enterprise citing the House Armed Services Committee. "NATION: Obama, Congress must avert huge, automatic defense cuts," 2012, http://www.pe.com/opinion/local-views-headlines/20120805-nation-obama-congress-must-avert-huge-automatic-defense-cuts.ece

While the president has not instructed his administration to plan for sequestration, various government and private sector entities have conducted analysis of its impacts. Since it is hard to imagine what exactly $492 billion in national security cuts would mean, the House Armed Services Committee put the number into military capability terms. Sequestration would mean: a Navy fleet of 238 ships, **the lowest number since World War I**; 478 fewer Air Force fighters and significant cuts to our fifth-generation Joint Strike Fighter; 34 fewer strategic bombers and 157 strategic and tactical airlift aircraft, **limiting our ability to project power**; and 200,400 fewer soldiers and Marines, which would **impact our ability to conduct offensive, defense and humanitarian missions around the world**. In short, if sequestration goes into effect, America will compromise a legacy of superiority on the land, sea and in the air.

### Uniqueness Wall

#### Silver votes neg

Silver 10/26 Nate is an elections expert for the NYT. “Oct. 25: The State of the States,” 2012, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/26/oct-25-the-state-of-the-states/?gwh=9157D2A2D5EC17B9DE2F9DF51818F651>

Thursday was a busy day for the polls, with some bright spots for each candidate. But it made clear that Barack Obama maintains a narrow lead in the polling averages in states that would get him to 270 electoral votes. Mr. Obama also remains roughly tied in the polls in two other states, Colorado and Virginia, that could serve as second lines of defense for him if he were to lose a state like Ohio.¶ The day featured the release of 10 national polls, but there was little in the way of a consistent pattern in them. On average, the polls showed a tied race. Furthermore, among the nine polls that provided for a comparison to another poll conducted after the first presidential debate in Denver, the net result was unchanged, on average, with Mr. Obama gaining one percentage point or more in three polls, but Mr. Romney doing so in three others.¶ Mr. Obama held the lead in nine polls of battleground states on Thursday, as compared to three leads for Mr. Romney and two polls showing a tied race.¶ This tally exaggerates the lopsidedness of the polling a bit, since the state polls released on Thursday were something of a Democratic-leaning bunch, some of which had shown strong numbers for Mr. Obama previously.¶ Mr. Romney’s strongest number came in a Fox News poll of Virginia, which had him 2 points ahead there – a sharp reversal from a 7-point advantage there for Mr. Obama before the Denver debate. However, Mr. Romney’s worst poll of the day was probably also in Virginia, where Public Policy Polling showed Mr. Obama’s lead expanding to 5 points from 2.¶ Among the 10 polls that provided for a comparison to another poll conducted after the Denver debate, Mr. Obama gained 1 percentage point, on average. The past week of polling suggests that Mr. Romney is no longer improving his position in the race.¶ Whether Mr. Obama has any momentum of his own, such as because of this week’s debate in New York, is less clear. To me, it looks more like a gradual reversion to the mean than anything all that assertive.¶ At the same time, Mr. Obama has led in the polling averages all year in states that would allow him to win the Electoral College, and that remains the case now.

#### Prefer Nate Silver

LB 10 Leigh Bureau, the world’s preeminent lecture bureau, “Nate Silver,” 2010, http://www.leighbureau.com/speaker.asp?id=498

Nate Silver has been called a "spreadsheet psychic" and "number-crunching prodigy" by New York Magazine.¶ Nate comes out of the world of baseball statistics, but during the 2008 presidential election primaries, he turned his sights and his amazing predictive abilities and forecasting models to the game of politics and current events — with incredible results.¶ He began by predicting 2008 primary election results with stunning accuracy — and often in opposition to the better-known political pollsters. He then moved on to the general election, where he correctly predicted the presidential winner in 49 states and the District of Columbia.

#### Obama will win---swing states, models, ground game, enthusiasm, early voting

Klein 10/25 Ezra is a politics writer for the Washington Post. “Where the 2012 presidential election is right now,” 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/10/25/where-the-2012-presidential-election-is-right-now/?wprss=rss\_ezra-klein

State polls: Barack Obama holds a slight but persistent lead in the battleground states. Real Clear Politics puts him up in Ohio, New Hampshire, Iowa, Nevada, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan — which is **more than enough to win the election**. Romney is up in Florida, Colorado and North Carolina. Virginia is tied. The Pollster.com list is exactly the same, save for Obama holding slight leads in Colorado and Virginia. Note that in all the polling averages, Obama’s lead in Ohio is larger than Romney’s lead in Florida.¶ Models: At this point, I don’t know of any continuously updated model that shows Romney ahead. Nate Silver’s model gives Obama a 71 percent chance of winning. Sam Wang’s meta-analysis predicts 293 electoral votes for Obama. Drew Linzer’s Votamatic predicts 332 electoral votes for Obama.¶ Ground game: No one pretends that Romney’s ground game is anything close to what the Obama campaign has put together. Conventional wisdom is that a good ground game can get you about 2 percentage points in the polls. If that proves true here, **it will be decisive**. (For more on this, read Molly Ball’s excellent survey of the two ground games.) ¶ Enthusiasm: The conventional wisdom through much of this election is that Democrats face an enthusiasm gap. But that’s become hard to spot in the polls. The latest Washington Post/ABC News tracker, for instance, puts Romney up by 1 point among likely voters, and reports that 95 percent of Obama’s supporters say they’re enthusiastic about voting and 93 percent of Romney voters say the same.¶ Early voting: Absolutely everything I’ve heard suggests the Obama campaign is meeting and exceeding its early voting targets. You can see some on-the-ground evidence of this from Jon Ralston’s look at early voting in Nevada, which is showing huge numbers for the Democrats, and the Time poll of Ohio, which showed a huge lead for Democrats among early voters. Democrats also appear to lead in early voting in North Carolina. Note that Obama is casting a highly publicized early vote in Chicago today. Aaron Blake’s survey of the early voting — which includes some evidence that Republicans are beginning to tighten the margin — is worth reading.

#### Err neg---polls underestimate true turnout for Obama and he’s ahead where it matters

Wright 10/25 Robert is a senior editor at The Atlantic. “It's Official: Romney Has Zero Momentum,” 2012, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/10/its-official-romney-has-zero-momentum/264141/

[1] Obama's numbers in swing states are running ahead of his numbers nationally. When the national polls were moving in Romney's direction, this gap may have been partly due to the fact that, because swing states polls were being done less often than national polls, swing state polls were lagging indicators. But when, as now, national polls are flat, and swing state polls are being conducted more and more often, that ceases to be a plausible explanation for the difference.¶ [2] **The polls, especially in swing states, may underpredict Obama's election day** numbers. These polls count only the responses of "likely voters"--a subset of the "registered voters" the pollsters interview. Obama tends to do better with the latter than the former. And some people think that, because Obama's "ground game" is better than Romney's, more Obama voters whom pollsters put in the "registered but not likely" category will wind up voting.¶ These two factors explain why, though Romney is slightly ahead in national "likely voter" polls, **Obama is a clear favorite** in the betting markets. As I write this, Intrade gives him a 62 percent chance of winning.

### AT: Votes Locked In

#### The race could still shift---every swing state is close

Cohn 10/24 Nate is an elections expert at The New Republic. “Expect the Unexpected: Diverse Battleground States Mean the Race Can Shift in Any Number of Ways,” 2012, http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/109067/diverse-and-competitive-electoral-map-introduces-more-possibilities-surprisi

With a deadlocked popular vote all eyes turn toward the electoral college, where the conventional wisdom holds that the state of the race is pretty straightforward: Romney leads in North Carolina and Florida, but Obama leads in Ohio, Nevada, and Wisconsin, states worth 271 electoral votes. As an advocate of the polling average as the principal means to understand the state of the race, I don’t fundamentally disagree with this view. But this year’s battleground states are so close and so diverse that it would be wise to remain open to unexpected outcomes.¶ That's because the battleground states are all so different demographically. States once deemed microcosmic of the country like Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Missouri have been swept off the map for being a few points too Republican or Democratic, and they’ve been replaced with a diverse set of states that add up to a tight race. “New coalition” states like Virginia and Colorado hold exceptionally well-educated and affluent populations. More than 20 percent of the Virginia and North Carolina electorates might be black in 2012—far more than any battleground state of 2004. Nevada and the once dispositive Orlando area have been dramatically reshaped by an exploding Latino population. Northeast Ohio is full of manufacturing workers, something absent from many other battleground states.¶ Today, the national polls show a truly deadlocked race, and the nine battleground states each appear to rest within about three points on either side of a tie. With diverse battlegrounds, there are plenty of moving pieces that could potentially nudge a state one or two percentage points in either side’s direction without influencing the other battlegrounds. For instance, if Romney sweeps undecided and disaffected white working class voters, it won’t do him much additional good in Virginia but could make the difference in Ohio. If Obama’s GOTV efforts rejuvenate Latino turnout, it barely matters in Iowa but probably ends Romney’s chances in Nevada. If Mourdock comments cause a new round of abortion coverage, it might make a difference in Colorado without any consequence for Ohio or Florida. A strong black turnout wouldn't swing New Hampshire but could be decisive in Virginia.¶ Making matters worse, several of the most important questions of the election are issues that pollsters struggle with the most. While the average of polls is the best available indicator of the state of the race, the polls are neither perfect nor infallible. The RealClearPolitics average, for instance, usually misses its mark by an average of 2 or 3 points, even without systemic bias toward either party and even in years when it gets all the states right. And unlike unscientific criticisms of polls (ie: the party-ID wars), there are many substantive and defensible criticisms of the continuing accuracy of polling in an era of low response rates, including their ability to reach out to Latino voters and people with cell phones. For good measure, likely voter screens are imprecise, to say the least. While all of these issues were potentially problematic a decade ago, many were not as serious. Cell phones weren't yet ubiquitous, and an enclave of Cubans in Miami were the most important Latinos to the election. Young voters were not as critical to the Democratic coalition, since the age gap was far smaller than it is today. These issues give more reason to avoid placing too much faith in a 2-point lead in a polling average, but they could also manifest unevenly across the electoral map. If the polls miss Latino turnout in 2012, that potentially changes the outcome of Colorado, Nevada, and Florida without much of a consequence for Iowa or Ohio. And it’s worth remembering that something like this may have been responsible for Reid and Bennet’s upset victories in 2010. ¶ None of these scenarios are particularly probable, especially individually. But one way or another, we could easily be surprised between now and the time the election is called in 13 days. The polls are pretty good, but they are not perfect, and with observers paying so much attention to the slight distinctions between Obama's 1.9 point lead in Ohio and .6 point lead in Virginia, unrealistic levels of precision may be necessary to avoid surprises. And that's before accounting for the possibility that the race could shift over the final two weeks in subtle ways that move particular demographic groups and states without similar changes in others. The nine battleground states are so close and so diverse that late movement among specific demographic groups or slight errors in the polling could easily reshape the electoral map before November 6.

### Link Wall

#### Angry voter theory means that backlash will be more salient than any gains

Harpuder 3 Brian, PhD in Philosophy at Ohio State University. “Electoral behavior in U.S. senate elections, a simultaneous choice model,” http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Harpuder%20Brian%20Eric.pdf?osu1069347453

With respect to evaluations of the economy and personal finances the research clearly shows support for the angry voter hypothesis. Citizens who are dissatisfied with the state of the national economy, angry voters, are more likely to turnout than those who are satisfied. Their dissatisfaction is expressed toward incumbents because they become more likely to vote for the challenging party. Personal financial evaluations are also shown to have a limited impact on electoral behavior.

#### Voters hate fusion

BN 8 Burnaby Now is your online source of local news on Burnaby, “Generating nuclear fusion”, April 23, 2008, http://www.canada.com/burnabynow/news/business/story.html?id=f8fc8807-a2e1-4e4e-a700-fa76e87a0444

Public perception of nuclear fusion and the environmental lobby are two of the bigger hurdles. They are working with an environmental group to do studies on magnetized target fusion, seeing how it fits in with the group's mandate. But convincing a public that equates the word 'nuclear' with disasters, meltdowns and bombs that this is something different: that's going to be trickier, Richardson admits.

#### Plan unpopular --- cost overruns

Economist 10 “Funding for nuclear fusion Expensive Iteration”, Jul 22nd 2010, http://www.economist.com/node/16635938

VIABLE nuclear fusion has been only 30 years away since the idea was first mooted in the 1950s. Its latest three-decade incarnation is ITER, a joint effort by the European Union (EU), America, China, India, Japan, Russia and South Korea to construct a prototype reactor on a site in Cadarache, France, by 2018. If all goes to plan, in about 30 years it will be reliably producing more energy than is put in.¶ The International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor became plain ITER following public anxiety about anything that has “thermonuclear” next to “experimental” in its name. ITER aims to produce energy by fusing together the nuclei of hydrogen atoms, confined in a magnetic field at high temperatures—a process akin to that which powers the sun.¶ For all its cosmic ambition, ITER has run into the earthiest of difficulties: spiralling costs. The project was never going to be cheap. Initial projections in 2006 put its price at €10 billion ($13 billion): €5 billion to build and another €5 billion to run and decommission the thing. Since then construction costs alone have tripled. ¶ As the host, the EU is committed to covering some 45% of these, with the other partners contributing about 9% each. In May the European Commission, the EU's executive branch, asked member states to stump up an additional €1.4 billion to tide the project over to 2013. They rejected the request and suggested instead tapping the EU's existing research budget.¶ On July 20th the commission offered a compromise: one-third of the shortfall would come from cash earmarked for other research, the rest from unspent agricultural funds.¶ Such a proposal may yet be scuppered by EU governments. Nor has it entirely mollified European scientists who rightly fear that ITER will eat indiscriminately into other programmes. This comes at a time when most European governments are slashing spending on science as part of larger efforts to plug budget deficits.¶ The proposal also needs approval from the European Parliament. Some Green MEPs have called for ITER to be ditched altogether, and its finances diverted to less grandiose ventures. A decision is unlikely in time for a meeting of ITER's governing body on July 27th and 28th, when the project's scope and cost are to be discussed.¶ Unfazed by budgetary wobbles, Fusion for Energy, ITER's European arm, has begun in earnest to divvy out construction work. On July 19th a consortium led by Iberdrola, a Spanish engineering giant, signed a €156m contract to build “winding packs”—massive reactor components that each weigh about 110 tonnes, as much as a jumbo jet.¶ This testifies to the project's technical daring. But the commissioning of these parts also illustrates one of its biggest flaws. The European consortium will build only ten of the planned 19 winding packs; the remaining nine will be forged independently by a Japanese contractor.¶ Unlike the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), another huge international physics experiment near Geneva, ITER does not pool its funds. Instead, each partner orders bits and bobs, typically from compatriots, hoping that everything will dovetail nicely in Cadarache. Moreover, some parties have not got what they had hoped for out of the project, notably Japan, which had wanted to host the reactor. So it has been promised a sweetener in the form of a smaller reactor and a supercomputer. All this is a recipe for duplication.¶ Cost overruns are common in projects as complex as ITER or the LHC. Loosening the purse-strings for energy research and development surely makes sense: government spending on energy research has been falling since the early 1980s, both as a share of GDP and as a proportion of total research budgets, according to the International Energy Agency.¶ That said, it is far from clear whether the best way of countering this trend in energy funding is to plough yet more money into the fusion project, with its vested political interests, at the expense of less prominent scientific endeavours.

#### Plan causes environmental backlash

Leo Hickman, The Guardian, 8/23/11, Fusion power: is it getting any closer?, [www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/aug/23/fusion-power-is-it-getting-closer](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/aug/23/fusion-power-is-it-getting-closer)

But ITER's projected costs are already rocketing, and politicians across Europe have expressed concern, demanding that budgets be capped. Fusion energy also has its environmental detractors. When the ITER project was announced in 2005, Greenpeace said it "deplored" the project, arguing that the money could be better spent building offshore wind turbines. "Advocates of fusion research predict that the first commercial fusion electricity might be delivered in 50-80 years from now," said Jan Vande Putte, Greenpeace International's nuclear campaigner. "But most likely, it will lead to a dead end, as the technical barriers to be overcome are enormous." Meanwhile, there is criticism from some plasma physicists that the design of ITER is wrong and alternative designs might produce better results for much less money.

#### The environmental base is key to swing Obama over the edge

Bloomberg 11 Mark Drajem and Jim Efstathiou Jr. “Green Vote Cools Toward Obama Risking A Replay Of Gore-Nader,” Aug 30, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-31/green-vote-cools-to-obama-over-pipeline-concerns.html

Democratic Vice President Al Gore paid a price in his 2000 presidential campaign for the splintering of environmentalists’ votes. Leaders of some groups, including in Florida, endorsed the independent candidacy of Ralph Nader instead.¶ Gore, who later won the Nobel Peace Prize for his advocacy of limits on greenhouse-gas emissions, lost Florida by 537 votes in the official tally, making Republican George W. Bush president. Nader garnered 97,488 votes in the state.¶ Nader predicted in April that Obama will win re-election, in part because “the liberal base has nowhere to go to send a message” this time. Still, apathy among voters sympathetic to environmentalist goals may prove costly to Obama, according to Doug Schoen, who was a strategist for President Bill Clinton.¶ “Obama won the election because the left, young people who are disproportionately environmentalists, came out in huge numbers,” Schoen said in an interview yesterday. “If he doesn’t have the kind of support he had from the left, from young people, from environmentalists, he is not going to be re- elected. It’s as simple as that.”

### AT: Nuclear Thumper

#### Advocating nuclear would be election suicide for Obama---he’s backing off it now

Levine 9/7 Gregg is a contributing editor and former managing editor of Firedoglake. “Obama Drops Nuclear from Energy Segment of Convention Speech,” 2012, http://capitoilette.com/2012/09/07/obama-drops-nuclear-from-energy-segment-of-convention-speech/

That Duke’s CEO thought to highlight efficiency is interesting. That President Obama, with his well-documented ties to the nuclear industry, chose **not to even mention nuclear power** is important. In the wake of Fukushima, where hundreds of thousands of Japanese have been displaced, where tens of thousands are showing elevated radiation exposure, and where thousands of children have thyroid abnormalities, no one can be cavalier about promising a safe harnessing of the atom. And in a world where radioisotopes from the breached reactors continue to turn up in fish and farm products, not only across Japan, but across the northern hemisphere, no one can pretend this is someone else’s problem. Obama and his campaign advisors know all this and more. They know that most industrialized democracies have chosen to shift away from nuclear since the start of the Japanese crisis. They know that populations that have been polled on the matter want to see nuclear power **phased out**. And they know that in a time of deficit hysteria, nuclear power plants are an **economic sinkhole**. And so, on a night when the president was promised one of the largest audiences of his entire campaign, **he and his team decided that 2012 was not a year to throw a bone to Obama’s nuclear backers.** Obama, a consummate politician, made the decision that for his second shot at casting for the future, nuclear power is political deadweight.

### AT: Hurricane Pounder

#### Won’t impact the election --- only impacts Northeastern states that are already voting for Obama + they’ll postpone voting

Reuters 10-26, “UPDATE 1-Hurricane Sandy rains on U.S. presidential campaign”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/26/usa-campaign-weather-idUSL1E8LQF8G20121026

Election officials said they would do everything possible to ensure that voting goes on, even if problems from the storm persisted until Nov. 6.¶ "I have heard from some states like Virginia and Maryland that they are definitely working on contingency plans for problems that may arise as a result of the storm," said Kay Stimson, communications director for the National Association of Secretaries of State.¶ "They are always preparing for any kinds of problems, any thing that could arise that could potentially pose problems for elections," she said.¶ The rules for rescheduling voting in case of bad weather vary from state to state.¶ Virginia election officials said they were monitoring the situation and encouraging in-person absentee voting - the form of early voting allowed in the state - to continue as long as conditions remained safe.¶ In heavily Democratic Maryland, which Obama is expected to carry easily, the state of emergency declared by Governor Martin O'Malley would allow for changes, if necessary, including the postponement of the election in all or part of the state.

**Only a risk hurricane helps Obama.**

Reuters 10-26-12. www.haaretz.com/news/u-s-elections-2012/obama-romney-brace-for-hurricane-sandy-as-election-day-nears-1.472556

But disasters can give the president and other incumbents opportunities to remind voters that they stand with the victims of natural disasters.¶ For Democrats in particular, an effective government response to a crisis also helps counteract Republican contentions that "big government" is bad for America.

### AT: Bandow Changed Mind

#### Romney decks US-Russia Relations – threatens global insecurity, prolif, and extinction

Felton 12 Emmanuel Felton is a Toni Stable Fellow at the Columbia School of Journalism. "Mitt Romney Russia Quotes Signal Big Problems For Future US-Russian Relations," March, http://www.policymic.com/articles/6202/mitt-romney-russia-quotes-signal-big-problems-for-future-us-russian-relations

The importance of America’s alliance with Russia is highlighted by the very context of Obama and Medvedev’s conversation. Obama and Medvedev were speaking in private at the Nuclear Security Summit in Seoul, South Korea. Russia is an important U.S. ally in fight against nuclear proliferation. Of the nearly 20,000 nuclear weapons that are in existence, Russia has 10,000 and the United States 8,500. Most will agree that this number is simply far too high. **An alliance with Russia is essential to reducing the cold-war stockpile of nuclear weapons that** **continue to threaten humanity.** Flexibility is critical to any alliance. Despite the strategic importance of a relationship with Russia, Republicans have signaled that any compromise on the issue of the missile defense system will be a non-starter if they gain control of the White House and Capitol Hill. The initial criticisms of Obama’s comments went something like this: “What plans are he formulating, that make his “last election” relevant? What is he planning to do that, if the American people were aware of it, would make him unelectable?” While the initial responses to Obama’s comments were purely motivated by November’s elections, Mitt Romney’s remarks went much further. Romney called Russia America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” While you could argue that this is another etch-a-sketch moment, Romney’s comments show a complete disregard for any U.S.-Russian alliance. Romney’s comments are particularly important because he is the most likely to succeed Obama in the fall. His comments have signaled to the world that Republicans don’t necessarily believe that any alliance exists in the first place. This gives Russia free reign to take more hardline positions on nuclear proliferation issues. While Romney’s comments were clearly motivated by election year politics, they also indicate that the party has not escaped Cold War thinking, an approach that says any compromise with Russia is tantamount to weakening America’s strategic position. Until that mindset is broken, global security will continue to be undermined by an increasingly hostile Kremlin.

#### US-Russia relations key to solve extinction

Allison 11 (Graham, 10/30, Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar [CTR] Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions.

#### Romney will start a trade war with China---this time is different---collapses the global economy

Bohan 10/3 Caren is a writer for the National Journal and White House correspondent for Reuters. “Why China-Bashing Matters,” 2012, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/why-china-bashing-matters-20120927>

Mitt Romney is blasting China on the campaign trail as a trade cheat and a thief of American ideas and technology. He has pledged that if he’s elected president, **one of his first acts would be to label the country a currency manipulator**. It’s a theme the Republican nominee hopes will play well in Midwestern industrial states where workers have seen factories—and their jobs—move overseas. President Obama is talking tough, too. In Ohio this month, he announced a push to try to get the World Trade Organization to sanction China over its subsidies of autos and auto parts.¶ China-bashing by U.S. presidential candidates is nothing new. On the stump in 2008, Obama and Democratic rival Hillary Rodham Clinton both vowed to confront Beijing over a yuan currency that U.S. manufacturers say is kept artificially low. As president, Obama has followed a pragmatic approach, using a combination of pressure and cajoling over the currency while pursuing trade actions in cases involving such goods as tires and autos. Like his predecessor George W. Bush, he has stopped short of branding China a currency manipulator, a step that would sharply ratchet up tensions and possibly ignite a trade war. The interdependence of the United States and its biggest creditor has led many analysts to predict that no matter who wins the White House on Nov. 6, the tough talk on China will soon fade away.¶ But this time could be different.¶ After years of robust, export-fueled expansion, the world’s second-largest economy is slowing. China is grappling with an uneven pace of growth within its borders as it faces a once-in-a-decade leadership transition, with Xi Jinping expected to succeed Hu Jintao as the top leader. And with Europe in crisis, the global economy is fragile, shrinking the market for Chinese-made goods and increasing the temptation for Beijing to use a weak currency to allow it to sell cheap exports. Meanwhile, as American workers struggle with a stagnating jobs market and unemployment above 8 percent, U.S. frustrations over China could grow, **putting pressure on politicians in Washington to keep the heat on Beijing.** All of this could add up to **heightened trade frictions** between the two countries.¶ “I think U.S.-China relations are about to go into a period as difficult as we’ve seen since the early 1990s, when we were in the throes of almost constant tension with the Japanese,” said David Rothkopf, head of the international advisory firm Garten Rothkopf.¶ Rothkopf, a former Commerce Department official under President Clinton, said analysts have a tendency to dismiss the campaign rhetoric as “par for the course.” But he added, “What may make it different is that if we’re in a slow economy for a protracted period of time, as seems likely, and we’re not creating jobs in the way we would like to … we could be entering a period where we’re seeing not just U.S.-China tension but we may well see much broader trade tension in the world.”¶ One irony of the campaign-trail sparring over China is that Romney is actually running to the left of Obama on this issue. Romney has accused the president of being a “doormat” on China, leading Obama to fire back by accusing Romney of helping to ship jobs to China through his former role as head of the private-equity firm Bain Capital. The pledge to slap the currency-manipulator label on China is popular with union workers and has found more favor among Democratic lawmakers than Republicans. House Speaker John Boehner has opposed legislation to penalize China over its currency, saying it could lead to a “dangerous” trade war. Boehner’s worries echo those of many in the business community. Although numerous manufacturers would like to see a stronger push on the yuan, large retailers and other companies benefit from trade. Many experts worry that protectionism could worsen the global economy’s woes.¶ In response to Romney’s attacks on China’s currency, the official Xinhua News agency has called his plans foolish and said they would lead to a trade war.¶ Obama’s Treasury Department has so far declined to label China a currency manipulator. It has another chance to do so on Oct. 15, when a report on the currency is due. But the administration could decide to postpone the report until after the election.¶ China ended its fixed peg for the yuan, also known as the renminbi, in 2005. Under pressure from the United States, it allowed the yuan to rise gradually during the later years of the Bush administration and during the Obama administration. But U.S. officials still consider the currency undervalued.¶ Despite Romney’s pledge to label China a currency manipulator, some analysts remain doubtful he would follow through, especially given the business community’s concerns.¶ “Time and again, we’ve seen that what candidates say about China on the campaign trail bears virtually no resemblance to what they do once they’re in office,” said Elizabeth Economy, a China expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. “Whatever political lift they get from scapegoating China on the economic front disappears once the task of governing becomes paramount.”¶ Still, Romney has hammered the currency theme repeatedly, and on his website he lists his vow to label the country a currency manipulator as one of his top priorities. It would be hard for him to back down if he wins the White House.¶ “When a candidate makes a promise as many times as he has made that one, I believe he would have to do it,” said Bonnie Glaser, a senior fellow with the Center for Strategic and International Studies. But Glaser said that the currency-manipulator label would do nothing to create a more level playing field with China. “It’s a feel-good measure. It doesn’t really get us anywhere,” she said.

**Global nuclear war**

Taaffe 5 Peter is a British political activist and the general secretary of the Socialist Party of England and Wales. “China, A New Superpower?” Nov 1, <http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article11.php?id=30>

While this conflict is unresolved, the shadow of a trade war looms. Some commentators, like Henry C.K. Liu in the Asia Times, go further and warn that "trade wars can lead to shooting wars." China is not the Japan of the 21st century. Japan in the 1980s relied on the U.S. military and particularly its nuclear umbrella against China, and was therefore subject to the pressure and blackmail of the U.S. ruling class. The fear of the U.S., and the capitalists of the "first world" as a whole, is that China may in time "out-compete" the advanced nations for hi-tech jobs while holding on to the stranglehold it now seems to have in labor-intensive industries. As the OECD commented recently: "In the five-year period to 2003, the number of students joining higher education courses has risen by three and a half times, with a strong emphasis on technical subjects." The number of patents and engineers produced by China has also significantly grown. At the same time, an increasingly capitalist China - most wealth is now produced in the private sector but the majority of the urban labor force is still in state industries - and the urgency for greater energy resources in particular to maintain its spectacular growth rate has brought it into collision on a world scale with other imperialist powers, particularly the U.S. In a new worldwide version of the "Great Game" - the clash for control of central Asia's resources in the nineteenth century - the U.S. and China have increasingly come up against and buffeted one another. Up to now, the U.S. has held sway worldwide due to its economic dominance buttressed by a colossal war machine accounting for 47% of total world arms spending. But Iraq has dramatically shown the limits of this: "A country that cannot control Iraq can hardly remake the globe on its own." (Financial Times) But no privileged group disappears from the scene of history without a struggle. Donald Rumsfeld, U.S. defense secretary, has stated: "Since no nation threatens China, one must wonder: why this growing [arms] investment? Why these continuing large and expanding arms purchases?" China could ask the same question of the U.S. In order to maintain its position, the U.S. keeps six nuclear battle fleets permanently at sea, supported by an unparalleled network of bases. As Will Hutton in The Observer has commented, this is not because of "irrational chauvinism or the needs of the military-industrial complex, but because of the pressure they place on upstart countries like China." In turn, the Chinese elite has responded in kind. For instance, in the continuing clash over Taiwan, a major-general in the People's Liberation Army baldly stated that if China was attacked "by Washington during a confrontation over Taiwan... I think we would have to respond with nuclear weapons." He added: "We Chinese will prepare ourselves for the destruction of all of the cities east of Xian. Of course, the Americans would have to be prepared that hundreds... of cities would be destroyed by the Chinese." This bellicose nuclear arms rattling shows the contempt of the so-called great powers for the ordinary working-class and peasant peoples of China and the people of the U.S. when their interests are at stake.

#### Romney causes Iran Strikes –Obama doesn't

AP 7/29 Kasie Hunt. "Adviser: Romney would back strike against Iran," 2012, http://news.yahoo.com/adviser-romney-back-strike-against-iran-072640314.html

JERUSALEM (AP) — Mitt **Romney would back an Israeli military strike against Iran** aimed at preventing Tehran from obtaining nuclear capability, a top foreign policy adviser said Sunday, outlining the aggressive posture the Republican presidential candidate will take toward Iran in a speech in Israel later in the day.¶ **Romney has said he has a** "zero tolerance" **policy toward Iran obtaining the capability to build a nuclear weapon.¶** "If Israel has to take action on its own, in order to stop Iran from developing the capability, the governor would respect that decision," foreign policy adviser Dan Senor told reporters ahead of the speech, planned for late Sunday near Jerusalem's Old City.¶ Romney believes the option of a U.S. attack should also be "on the table." He has said he will do "the opposite" of what U.S. President Barack Obama would do in his approach to Israel.¶ The Obama administration hasn't ruled out the military option, but Obama has so far been relying on sanctions and diplomatic negotiations to discourage Iran from building a nuclear bomb.

#### Extinction

Hirsch 5 - Professor @ UC San Diego (Jorge, “Can a nuclear strike on Iran be averted,” November 21st)

The Bush administration has put together all the elements it needs to justify the impending military action against Iran. [Unlike in the case of Iraq](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html), it will happen without warning, and most of the justifications will be issued after the fact. We will wake up one day to learn that facilities in Iran have been bombed in a joint U.S.-Israeli attack. It may even take another couple of days for the revelation that some of the U.S. bombs were nuclear. Why a Nuclear Attack on Iran Is a Bad Idea Now that we have outlined what is very close to happening, let us discuss briefly why everything possible should be done to prevent it. In a worst-case scenario, the attack will cause a violent reaction from Iran. Millions of "[human wave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_wave_attack)" Iranian militias will storm into Iraq, and just as Saddam [stopped them with chemical weapons](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2003/n01232003_200301234.html), the U.S. will stop them with nuclear weapons, resulting potentially in hundreds of thousands of casualties. The Middle East will explode, and popular uprisings in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and other countries with pro-Western governments could be overtaken by radical regimes. Pakistan already has nuclear weapons, and a nuclear conflict could even lead to Russia's and Israel's involvement using nuclear weapons. In a best-case scenario, the U.S. will destroy all nuclear, chemical, and missile facilities in Iran with conventional and low-yield nuclear weapons in a lightning surprise attack, and Iran will be paralyzed and decide not to retaliate for fear of a vastly more devastating nuclear attack. In the short term, the U.S. will succeed, leaving no Iranian nuclear program, civilian or otherwise. Iran will no longer threaten Israel, a regime change will ensue, and a pro-Western government will emerge. However, even in the best-case scenario, the long-term consequences are dire. The nuclear threshold will have been crossed by a nuclear superpower against a non-nuclear country. Many more countries will rush to get their own nuclear weapons as a deterrent. With no taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, they will certainly be used again. Nuclear conflicts will occur within the next 10 to 20 years, and will escalate until much of the world is destroyed. Let us remember that the destructive power of existing nuclear arsenals is approximately [one million times that of the Hiroshima bomb](http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/1997/00/00_babst_consequences.htm), enough to erase Earth's population many times over.

### Leadership Adv

### Unipolarity Fails---2NC

#### Unipolarity’s not useful---systemic constraints make it impossible for hegemons to effectively shape international outcomes

Jeffrey W Legro 11, the Randolph P Compton Professor at the University of Virginia, June 2011, “The mix that makes unipolarity: hegemonic purpose and international constraints,” Cambridge Review of International Affairs, Vol. 24, No. 2, p. 185-199

Brooks and Wohlforth assert that the US today has unprecedented power, that there are relatively few systemic constraints on global primacy, and that rather than clipping its talons, the American eagle should take wing and remake the international system, lo these many years after 9/11. They advocate a strategy of ‘primacy’ and reject alternative strategies such as engagement and off-shore balancing. This is a big argument, a delight to read, sure to provoke, carefully constructed, and ﬁlled with insights. It will have a central place in the contemporary political debate about US ‘decline’ and how the United States should manage its foreign relations in the age of Obama and after (Calleo 2008; Krauthammer 2009).¶ Their analysis, however, raises two key questions: if there are few systemic constraints and international activism would serve US interests, why has the US hegemon done so little to revise international institutions since 1991? And when it has tried to do so, why has it achieved so little success?¶ Brooks and Wohlforth cannot adequately respond to these puzzles because they offer mainly a negative claim—that a hegemon will not be subject to constraints. Their argument lacks an explicit positive argument that can tell us what we can expect from the unipole and unipolarity (beyond the important point that it will be peaceful)—and why that is so. Developing and demonstrating a positive theory is beyond the scope of this essay. What is possible, however, (thanks to Brooks and Wohlforth’s careful analysis) is to identify the three necessary foundations of a positive account of unipolarity: unipolar purpose, systemic constraints, and the interaction between purpose and constraints.¶ The ﬁrst is that the character of unipolarity depends on the purpose of the unipole. What the unipole wants and is likely to do in a world it has more of a free will to shape will affect that world. Unipole purpose is inﬂuenced, but not determined, by the distribution of power. The lopsided distribution of power under unipolarity may open the door to expansive hegemonic aims, **but does not push a state through it**. States can avoid such ambitions. In this respect, and reversing Waltzian style reasoning, we may get as much leverage in understanding international politics by studying an actor than by studying the systemic social-political structure: unit level traits of the top actor in unipolarity can deﬁne the system.¶ The second is that even under unipolarity, signiﬁcant systemic constraints exist that constrain the unipole from deciding the fate of international politics on its own. Despite their ‘no constraint’ thesis, Brooks and Wohlforth acknowledge some of these constraints piecemeal. To others they tend to give short shrift. But when all the constraints are considered in toto, the unipole, whatever its purpose, is checked by the system.¶ The third is that we must understand purpose and constraints not just as alternatives or as sub-vectors that can be added together to capture the whole picture. Unipolarity is a product of the interaction of the hegemon’s purpose and the web of international ties that constrain it. This view points scholarship towards how exactly the interaction between a powerful agent and the global structures in which it exists shape outcomes.¶ Since the collapse of the Berlin Wall, American purpose and systemic constraints have interacted in particular ways that help explain both why the United States has not adopted the expansive aims nor had the foreign policy success that might be expected from its power advantage. The interaction between purpose and constraints can also help clarify why the strategy of primacy that Brooks and Wohlforth advocate, if it is to succeed, may not look that different from the engagement strategy they critique.

### Squo Solves

#### Natural gas solves US energy leadership

Jaffe 11 (Amy Myers Jaffe is director of the Baker Institute Energy Forum at Rice University and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, “The Americas, Not the Middle East, Will Be the World Capital of Energy”, October 2011, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/the_americas_not_the_middle_east_will_be_the_world_capital_of_energy?page=0,0>)

This hydrocarbon-driven reordering of geopolitics is already taking place. The petropower of Iran, Russia, and Venezuela has faltered on the back of plentiful American natural gas supply: A surplus of resources in the Americas is sending other foreign suppliers scrambling to line up buyers in Europe and Asia, making it more difficult for such exporters to assert themselves via heavy-handed energy "diplomacy." The U.S. energy industry may also be able to provide the technical assistance necessary for Europe and China to tap unconventional resources of their own, scuttling their need to kowtow to Moscow or the Persian Gulf. So watch this space: America may be back in the energy leadership saddle again.

#### Squo solves

Steyer and Podesta 12 TOM STEYER And JOHN PODESTA, writers for the Wall Street Journal, “We Don't Need More Foreign Oil and Gas “, January 24, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203718504577178872638705902.html

Under President Obama's leadership, we appear to be at the beginning of a domestic gas and oil boom. After a four-decade decline in oil production, the U.S. is now producing more than half of our oil domestically. This can free us from our addiction to foreign-sourced barrels, particularly if we utilize our dramatically larger and cheaper natural gas reserves. Natural gas now costs the equivalent of less than $15 per barrel, versus the $100-plus barrels we import from the Middle East.¶ There are critical environmental questions associated with developing these resources, particularly concerning methane leakage and water pollution. Yet as long as we ensure high regulatory standards and stay away from the riskiest and most polluting of these activities, we can safely assemble a collection of lower-carbon, affordable and abundant domestic-energy assets that will dramatically improve our economy and our environment. Under President Obama's watch, increased domestic production from developing these reserves has already created 75,000 new gas and oil-production jobs since 2009. And we have much further to go.¶ At the same time, the U.S. is well on its way to becoming a global clean-energy leader. America is the largest clean-energy investor, after reclaiming this title from China last year. Our companies make over 75% of all venture investments in clean technologies world-wide. Overall, because of U.S. public and private investments in clean energy—including renewables, efficiency, transportation and infrastructure—the clean economy grew by 8.3% from 2008 to 2009, even during the depths of the recession.

#### Squo solves the internal links cited in their ev –

#### a) Fuel standards

NYT 12 “U.S. Sets Higher Fuel Efficiency Standards”, August 28, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/29/business/energy-environment/obama-unveils-tighter-fuel-efficiency-standards.html?\_r=0

DETROIT — The Obama administration issued on Tuesday the final version of new rules that require automakers to nearly double the average fuel economy of new cars and trucks by 2025. ¶ The standards — which mandate an average fuel economy of 54.5 miles per gallon for the 2025 model year — will increase the pressure on auto manufacturers to step up development of electrified vehicles as well as sharply improve the mileage of their mass-market models through techniques like more efficient engines and lighter car bodies.¶ Current rules for the Corporate Average Fuel Economy, or CAFE, program mandate an average of about 29 miles per gallon, with gradual increases to 35.5 m.p.g. by 2016.¶ The new rules represent a victory for environmentalists and advocates of fuel conservation, but were attacked by opponents, including the Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney, as too costly for consumers.

#### b) Solar

WSJ 12 “Fueled by Cheap Chinese Panels, U.S. Solar Use Soars”, September 9, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390443589304577637333545350176.html

The solar-power business is expanding quickly in the U.S., helping lift the cloud that has surrounded the industry since the demise of Solyndra LLC a year ago.¶ But the growth isn't coming from U.S. solar-panel manufacturing, despite the money and rhetoric devoted to the industry by the Obama administration. Instead, it is in installations of largely foreign-made panels, whose falling price has made solar more competitive with other forms of power.¶ "There should be little emphasis put on where the panels are made," said Lyndon Rive, chief executive of SolarCity Corp., which finances and installs rooftop solar systems. "Most of the jobs are in delivery and they're long-term, permanent jobs."¶ The U.S. is on pace to install as much solar power this year as it did in this century's entire first decade: at least 2,500 megawatts, the equivalent of more than two nuclear-power plants. The U.S. added about 742 megawatts of solar capacity in the second quarter, or enough to power about 150,000 homes, the Solar Energy Industries Association said in a report scheduled for release Monday.

#### c) Wind

Koch 12 Wendy Koch, writer for USA Today, “U.S. solar and wind industries expand”, March 14, 2012, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/story/2012-03-14/solar-wind-energy/53517526/1

Despite last year's bankruptcies of several solar manufacturers, including government-backed Solyndra, the U.S. solar and wind industries continue to expand in the face of obstacles this year.¶ Newly installed solar panels produced 109% more electricity nationwide last year than in 2010, reaching a record 1,855 megawatts, as the price of these panels plummeted by more than 50%, according to a report today by the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA), an industry group, and GTM Research.¶ "The U.S. remains the innovative center of the solar industry worldwide," says Rhone Resch, SEIA's president. He says "run-of-the-mill" panels may increasingly be made overseas, but the U.S. still will make the most advanced solar components and post double-digit annual growth. He expects solar power, which now produces less than 1% of U.S. electricity, to generate 10% by 2020.¶ "There's no bubble" bursting in the clean-tech sector, Resch says, although he cautions that more companies likely will fail as the industries mature and cope with decreased government subsidies.¶ Other recent reports indicate that the U.S. clean-tech sector remains strong despite Republican criticism of President Obama's half-billion-dollar loan guarantee to Solyndra and his other support for renewable energy.¶ Wind power increased 31% last year, says the American Wind Energy Association, and venture capital invested in clean technology grew from $3.8 billion in 2010 to $4.3 billion last year, the National Venture Capital Association says.

### STEM Adv

#### Status quo programs will fill the nuclear skills gap

GlobalData, 7-11-2012, “The US Must Foster Nuclear Education to Support the Industry,” http://www.globaldata.com/PressReleaseDetails.aspx?PRID=245&Type=Industry&Title=Nuclear+Energy

According to the US Department of Labor, employment of nuclear reactor operators is expected to grow by 19% throughout 2008–2018. Alongside the need for growing staff numbers, the trend will also be caused by a new NRC regulation limiting shift durations for staff working at nuclear power plants. The requirement for trained nuclear staff will face additional increases from other nuclear industry sub-sectors such as power systems and heavy components manufacturing, which are predicted to see expansions in the near future. Neighboring Canada is facing a similar struggle, as a report published in 2008 by the Canadian Nuclear Association (CNA) estimates that around 38% of workers in the nuclear industry are above the age of 50, and therefore approaching retirement age. A significant increase in the hiring of new employees is expected in the Canadian nuclear industry to curb this upcoming demand, and it is essential that the government manages knowledge transfer between the new and the old employees in order to maintain a high level of professional understanding. July 2002 saw the Canadian government establish the University Network of Excellence in Nuclear Engineering (UNENE) to support the development of nuclear human resources in Canada. This establishment aimed to ensure the sustainable supply of nuclear workforce requirements through university education. “We see a number of collaborative approaches to address the skills challenges in the nuclear power sector. Both the industry and the academe are expected to step up their efforts in developing a qualified nuclear workforce”, Jennifer Santos, GlobalData’s Head Consultant observed.

## 1NR

### Counterplan

## AT: Linkage---Miller

#### Next paragraph says DOE can coordinate funding from other places

Warren Miller, Prof and Assoc. Dir. Nuclear Security Science and Policy Inst. @ Texas A&M, February 2007, “Nuclear’s Human Element,” American Nuclear Society Special Committee on Federal Investment in Nuclear Education, http://www.ans.org/pi/fine/docs/finereport.pdf

DOE NSE university programs can be funded through a number of methods. One suggested approach is to “tax” the mission‐driven programs in DOE/NE to support an effort that would be centrally managed by a director. This has the advantage of keeping the university‐based effort closely aligned with the nuclear energy programmatic research effort. However, the broad array of “users” of NSE talent, including the nuclear security community, makes it inappropriate for the nuclear energy programs to be solely taxed. The NSE education customer base goes far beyond DOE/NE and, in fact, even goes beyond the DOE. A separately appropriated line item is a much better approach. In the long run, the program must take account of the long‐term research and education needs of a broader constituency than DOE/NE. Additionally, if the program is funded through a tax, the Committee is concerned that it will become more near‐term oriented than is consistent with DOE’s long‐term stewardship responsibility. The Committee is convinced that a separate line item is needed to support the stewardship responsibility. The need to monitor and support university‐based NSE research and education efforts, consistent with the Atomic Energy Act, requires a continuous federal government stewardship effort. Given the fact that NSE research and education serve a wide variety of government agencies including DOE, DOE/NNSA, DOE/SC (especially the fusion program), NRC, DHS, NASA, DOD, and others, it does not necessarily have to be resident within DOE/NE. The principal argument for keeping the program in DOE/NE is historical. In recent years, the effort has been quite effectively conducted from that office. On the other hand, given the breadth of needs for research products and graduates, to include nuclear security, an argument can be made to place the program in NNSA. Another point of view is to place the program in DOE/SC, which is charged with serving all the DOE mission agencies. It is the recommendation of the Committee to retain the present structure for the near term in order to minimize disruption. However, in the midterm (next few years), it is suggested that a DOE intra‐agency advisory committee be formed to provide long‐term guidance to the DOE/NE program. Under this scenario, the DOE/NE program managers would periodically seek the Committee’s advice on program structure and funding solicitations. The Committee would include representatives from DOE/NE, NNSA, SC, OCRWM, the Office of Environmental Management, and perhaps others. Although the research portfolio in the midterm should continue to focus on the DOE/NE long‐term research needs, the budget of the program should be increased, over time, to better reflect the research needs of the other DOE offices. Participation in the intra‐agency committee would have the added benefit of allowing better coordination of the university‐based, mission‐driven NSE research efforts of each of the DOE offices. In the long term, a governance mechanism is needed to include the needs of offices outside of DOE including NRC, DOD, DHS, NASA, and others. In addition to the current DOE/NE university program, the concept of a separate and broader federal NSE program, run by the DOE/SC, has gained significant traction in the U.S. Senate as part of the legislative effort to enact the recommendations of the “Rising Above the Gathering Storm” report. S. 2197, the PACE‐Energy Act (PACE standing for Protecting America’s Competitive Edge), authorizes a new “Nuclear Science Education” program designed in the words of the legislation “to address the decline in the number of and resources available to nuclear science programs of institutions of higher education; and … increase the number of graduates with degrees in nuclear science, an area of strategic importance to the economic competitiveness and energy security of the United States.” (The term “nuclear science” as used in S. 2197 is defined to include nuclear engineering.) S. 2197 would create competitively awarded grant programs for (a) new university‐based nuclear engineering programs, (b) expansion of existing programs, and (c) talent‐based scholarships. S. 2197 authorizes $20 million for the program in FY 2008, rising eventually to $50 million in FY 2011. The program would be overseen by DOE/SC through the Director of Mathematics, Science, and Engineering Education (a position created by the legislation and appointed by the DOE undersecretary of science). While S. 2197 was not enacted during the 109 th Congress, it has been incorporated into S.3936, The National Innovation Competitiveness Act, which was introduced by Senate majority leader Bill Frist (R‐TN) and minority leader Harry Reid (D‐NV) and has 40 bipartisan cosponsors. The Committee has been told that “competitiveness” legislation will receive a high priority in the 110 th Congress. This proposed legislation is consistent with the Committee’s view of the long‐term future needs of NSE education, and the Committee supports its enactment. Finally, the Committee recommends that federal agencies requiring university‐based NSE research (including DOE/NE, DOE/NNSA, etc.) continue their efforts to include universities in their mission‐driven programs. Often, this should include separate solicitations for university involvement so that direct competition with national laboratory researchers does not occur. In addition, national laboratories should aggressively reach out to university NSE programs to augment their unclassified research efforts as well as to provide easier access to the future laboratory NSE workforce.

## AT: Linkage---Deutch

#### The only warrant is certainty – but states solve better and the federal government funding kills it

Muro, 12

(Fellow-Brookings Institution, 1/12, “Funding Growth: State Clean Energy Funds Can Help Invent the Future,” http://www.cleanegroup.org/blog/funding-growth-state-clean-energy-funds-can-help-invent-the-future/)

In sum, our new paper proposes a much greater focus in U.S. clean energy finance on "bottom up," decentralized clean initiatives that rely on the states to catalyze regional economic development in regions. Such an approach -- which reflects the emergence of an emerging "pragmatic caucus" in U.S. economic life -- is currently demanded by federal inaction. However, it might also be the smartest, most durable way to develop the clean energy industries of the future without the partisan rancor and obtuseness **that has stymied federal energy policy.** State clean energy funds -- having funded thousands of individual projects -- bring significant knowledge to bear as they focus now on building whole industries. For that reason, the funds' transition from project development to industry creation should be nurtured and supported.

## AT: DOE Labs are Key

#### States can empirically fund energy research at national labs

Kay Corditz, 3-15-2010, “State Grant to Fund Advanced Battery Materials Partnership,” Brookhaven National Lab, http://www.bnl.gov/newsroom/news.php?a=21663

Funded by a $550,000 grant from the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA), Brookhaven National Laboratory will partner with battery materials researchers from leading New York State universities to explore new chemistries and synthesize new materials for long-lasting batteries. The Laboratory will partner with SUNY’s University at Buffalo and Binghamton University on three projects to develop improved batteries for use in stationary grid-scale energy storage applications, including lithium-air, lithium-ion, and lithium-titanate batteries. The Brookhaven effort, led by Brookhaven materials scientist Jason Graetz, will focus on the development and synthesis of new materials, and application of advanced experimental techniques to characterize these materials using Brookhaven’s National Synchrotron Light Source (NSLS). The SUNY-Buffalo lead is Esther S. Takeuchi, and the Binghamton University lead is M. Stanley Whittingham. “This partnership among Brookhaven and two leading SUNY schools will capitalize on the research strengths of each, and our materials characterization capabilities will be a key element of the project,” said James Misewich, Brookhaven’s Associate Laboratory Director for Basic Energy Sciences. The collaboration grew out of a workshop sponsored by Brookhaven and Stony Brook University’s Joint Photon Sciences Institute (JPSI) last spring. Chi-Chang Kao, NSLS Chair and Founding Director of JPSI, coordinated the collaboration’s successful proposal. “It is an excellent example of how universities, industries, and national laboratories can work together to address an important scientific challenge with major societal impact,” said Kao. Said Graetz: “NYSERDA’s funding of this program will give us the opportunity to expand our energy storage research to large-scale stationary energy storage systems, which are crucial for integrating intermittent renewable generation sources such as wind and solar. In the past, the vast majority of battery research investment has focused on the important problem of electrical energy storage for transportation. However, a different set of criteria exist for stationary systems, and this project will allow us to explore new electrode materials, like lithium titanate, that meet those criteria.”

## 50 State Fiat

#### Assessing desirability of federal v. state action is key to energy education

Kay 12 (David, Cornell Community and Regional Development Institute, “Energy Federalism: Who Decides?”, July, http://devsoc.cals.cornell.edu/cals/devsoc/outreach/cardi/programs/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=1071714)

Questions about energy production and consumption are acquiring renewed urgency in the 21st Century. **Among these questions are some that go to the heart of our nation’s system of federalism, as an underlying but ever-present friction mounts over the way in which decision making power has been divided between central and more locally distributed political units.** What is at stake? According to one author, **“the choice of regulatory forum often seems to determine the outcome of the controversy. That may explain why Americans have traditionally shed so much metaphorical and genuine blood deciding what are essentially jurisdictional disputes between governmental institutions.”**i

## AT: Crushes Innovation and Commercialization

#### EPSCoR allows state collaboration with national labs on fusion and solves all their “STEM students key” arguments

DOE, 3-16-2011, “Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research,” EPSCoR, http://science.energy.gov/bes/epscor/about/

Overview: DOE EPSCoR is located in the Office of Science and assists the Office by supporting basic and applied research and development across a wide range of interdisciplinary program areas including but not limited to: Advanced Scientific Computing Research, Basic Energy Sciences, Biological and Environmental Research, Fusion Energy Sciences, High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics. It also supports research that is relevant to other DOE Program Offices, including but not limited to: the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management; the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability; the Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy; the Office of Environmental Management; the Office of Fossil Energy; the Office of Legacy Management; and, the Office of Nuclear Energy. The participation of these other programs is critical to the success of EPSCoR applications and developing understanding of these programs should be long-term objective of all EPSCoR applicants. Goals of DOE EPSCoR: a) improve the capability of designated states and territories to conduct sustainable and nationally competitive energy-related research; b) jumpstart infrastructure development in designated states and territories through increased human and technical resources, training scientists and engineers in energy-related areas; and c) build beneficial relationships between scientists and engineers in the designated states and territories with the 10 world-class laboratories managed by the Office of Science, leverage DOE national user facilities, and take advantage of opportunities for intellectual collaboration across the DOE system. Through broadened participation DOE EPSCoR seeks to provide the most comprehensive network of energy-related research across the nation. DOE EPSCoR requests an annual budget of approximately $8 million per year and posts Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs) every one to two years. Program Priorities: DOE EPSCoR is a science-driven, merit-based program that supports basic and applied research activities spanning the broad range of science and technology programs within DOE. In addition, the program places high priority on increasing the number of scientists and engineers in energy-related areas. The program places particular emphasis and importance of collaboration with young faculty, postdoctoral associates, graduate and undergraduate students with scientists from the DOE national laboratories where unique scientific and technical capabilities are present. The program supports the most meritorious proposals based on merit and peer review. To maximize the effectiveness of the program, the development of the science and engineering resources component is closely coupled with the research part of the program.

## AT: Deros

#### Their evidence is about the MIT tokamak, which the CP definitely funds

Kimberly Derose, 3-3-2012, “Dire Prospects for Domestic Fusion Energy Research,” http://ascjweb.org/moneymarketsmedia/?p=433

There are countless items of interest hidden among the DOE’s itemized budget, especially given that the budget highlights alone encompass 91 pages. However, one of the most intriguing decisions is the choice to shutter MIT-based fusion experiment Alcator C-Mod in 2013. Alcator C-Mod consists of a doughnut-shaped vacuum chamber called a tokamak, which uses powerful magnetic fields to direct and shape high-energy plasma (a soup of energetic ions not to be confused with blood plasma). With the right experimental conditions, researchers hope to design a tokamak capable of heating the plasma inside to temperatures hotter than the center of the Sun. At such high temperatures, ions within the plasma would fuse together, releasing a tremendous amount of energy. A cadre of scientists and businessmen believe that if fusion technology is perfected, fusion reactors may provide help solve the world’s energy problems. Alcator C-Mod is one of only three working tokamaks in the United States (the others include NSTX at Princeton University and DIII-D at General Atomics in San Diego). While these tokamaks are far from working fusion reactors, they serve as useful testing grounds for new theories and technology. Tokamaks in many ways represent the laboratory archetype for wannabe mad scientists. Imagine whirring building-sized machines surrounded a dense forest of cables and instruments, all monitored by a mission control room that wouldn’t seem out of place at NASA.

## AT: Leadership

### AT: NM 12 (Federal Key Leadership)

#### NOT comparative to state funding of the DOE – and explicitly agrees the feds should cost share

New Millenium Nuclear Energy Partnership, June 2012, “A Strategy for the Future of Nuclear Energy,” http://content.thirdway.org/publications/540/Third\_Way\_Report\_-\_A\_Strategy\_for\_the\_Future\_of\_Nuclear\_Energy.pdf

The government should be responsible for maintaining a basic nuclear technology infrastructure and conducting long-term fundamental research for nuclear science and nuclear technology applications. Federally funded research should be guided and informed by input on viability from the industry and public policy sectors. For technologies that are ready for application, the government should establish cost-shared partnerships with industry to complete technical and licensing development, construct and operate nuclear energy demonstration facilities, and enable commercialization by industry.

## AT: Obama take lead

### AT: Lugar 8 (Fed Key Obama Leadership)

#### It’s about every renewable tech, not fusion

Dick Lugar, Senator R-IN, January 2008, “U.S. Energy Security and the 2008 Presidential Election,” http://lugar.senate.gov/energy/press/speech/brookings2.cfm

The development and deployment of new technologies is likely to be the difference between success and failure of our efforts at energy transformation. The next President must demand that research projects related to battery technology, cellulosic ethanol, carbon capture and storage, solar and wind power, and dozens of other technologies receive the highest priority within the Administration.

### States Solve – Fusion

#### Funding is the key roadblock to fusion – CP solves

Andrew Holland is a Senior Fellow and Nicholas Cunningham is a Policy Analyst for Energy and Climate at the American Security Project, a non-partisan think tank devoted to studying questions of America's long-term national security, 8/3/2012

http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/03/through-innovation-and-investment-the-u-s-can-lead-in-next-gen/?icid=apb2#page2

We know that fusion works, it is already being done in labs around the world. Here in the United States, the three major experiments for research into magnetically-confined fusion (which uses powerful magnets to confine the superheated plasma) are the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, the Plasma Science and Fusion Center at the Massachusetts Institute for Technology (MIT), and the DIII-D Research Program at General Atomics' Fusion Energy Research Lab in San Diego.

MARK

These experiments are supported by major scientific research institutions like Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee and by a range of businesses, contractors, and researchers in every corner of the country.

Up to now, the problem with fusion has been crafting new materials that are strong enough to withstand the heat of a fusion reaction, which needs to reach 100 million degrees, more than six times hotter than the surface of the sun. The other challenge is confining the hot plasma long enough for the reaction to take place; a process that scientists are experimenting with either magnets or lasers. But scientists, together with the private sector, are making progress in these areas. The next step is to build a fusion reactor that will produce net energy power (get more power out than is put in); one is currently under construction in France, with American support. Known as ITER, the facility is backed by seven nations including the United States, and should be completed by 2020.

Scientists are confident that the limitations to full commercialization of fusion reactors are not scientific, but budgetary. Exponential increases in power generation were achieved for twenty years leading up to the mid 1990s, but since then, budget cuts have caused delays. A program that had suffered years of atrophy was further harmed when President Obama's fiscal year 2013 budget request called for a $45 million cut from the domestic fusion program, a drastic reduction of 16%.

The budget cuts will force MIT's Plasma Science and Fusion Center to shut down. This facility's "Alcator C-Mod" is a critical component of our national research program.

Cuts like this would prevent American fusion labs and companies from capitalizing on the lessons learned from the ITER experiment. MIT is doubly important because it houses the largest collection of plasma science graduate students in the country; our next generation of scientists would be trained here. Unfortunately, the prospect of the budget cut has already caused the University to delay acceptances of the incoming 2012 graduate students.

Cutting the program will start to dismantle a world class scientific workforce and send the message to our brightest science students that their best chance for career advancement will come from working abroad in France, Japan, or China.

The U.S. has a remarkable track record in developing transformational technologies that revolutionize our way of life. With much needed investment, fusion energy can transform our energy system for the next generation.