### AT: Counterinterp

#### DOE agrees—energy production means conversion of energy into electricity – anything else isn’t

DOE 10 Department of Energy, FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENT U.S. Department of Energy Golden Field Office www1.eere.energy.gov/geothermal/pdfs/lt\_foa\_ammend\_0610.pdf

The intent of this FOA is to evaluate the feasibility of and demonstrate energy production (technically and economically) from nonconventional geothermal resources in an innovative manner. For the purposes of this FOA, energy production is defined as converting the thermal potential contained within geothermal fluids into electricity. Only projects that generate electricity from the heat contained within geothermal fluids will be considered; but projects that also use the chemical or kinetic energy of the fluids, or have additional direct use applications for the geothermal fluids will also be considered. Innovation may include but is not limited to: innovative cooling systems (e.g., air, water, or hybrid systems), use of innovative working fluids, use of more efficient heat exchanger materials, and/or maximization of energy utilization via combination of electricity generation and direct technologies.

#### They are energy extraction, not production – they’re distinct sectors

Caricom 4 Caricom (Caribbean Community and Common Market) Environmental Report “Environment in Figures”http://www.caricomstats.org/Files/Publications/Environment2004/Chp11-Waste.pdf

Sector Classifications:

-Agriculture and Forestry comprise the activities of growing crops, raising animals, harvesting timber, and harvesting other plants and animals from a farm or their natural habitats.

-Mining and quarrying include the extraction of minerals occurring naturally as solids (coal and ores), liquids (petroleum) or gases (natural gas). Extraction can be achieved by underground or surface mining or well operation.

-Manufacturing comprises units engaged in the physical or chemical transformation of materials, substances, or components into new products. The materials, substances, or components transformed are raw materials that are products of agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining or quarrying, as well as products of other manufacturing activities.

-Energy production includes electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply, which cover the activity of providing electric power, natural gas, and steam supply through a permanent infrastructure (network) of lines, mains and pipes.

-Construction includes general construction and special trade construction for buildings and civil engineering, building installation and building completion. It includes new work, repair, additions and alterations, the erection of prefabricated buildings or structures on the site and also construction of a temporary nature.

\*hyphens added for clarity in separation

### AT: Aff Ground

#### They say we over-limit:

### AT: Reasonability

#### This is infinitely regressive—

There is no bright line for determining what is and isn’t “reasonable.” The combination of all “reasonable” interpretations would saddle the neg with a massive research burden. The term “reasonable” is vague and arbitrary.

Stone 1923—Justice in the Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit [Sussex Land & Live Stock Co. v. Midwest Refining Co., 294 F. 597; 1923 U.S. App. LEXIS 2531; 34 A.L.R. 249, No. 6192; No. 6193, Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, December 5, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis]

Where the use of land affects others, the use must be "reasonable" to escape liability for resultant damage to others. What is "reasonable" depends upon a variety of considerations and circumstances. It is an elastic term which is of uncertain value in a definition. It has been well said that "reasonable," means with regard to all the interest affected, his own and his neighbor's and also having in view public policy. But, elastic as this rule is, both reason and authority have declared certain limitations beyond which it cannot extend. One of these limitations is that it is "unreasonable" and unlawful for one owner to physically invade the land of another owner. There can be no damnum absque injuria where there is such a trespass.

### UQ---Prices---2NC

#### 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.

### Repression I/L---2NC

#### Collapse of state budgets causes waves of repression that wreck internal stability of producer states

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

Fair enough, but what everyone wanted to know, and especially Iran, Venezuela, and Algeria, was how far and how fast Saudi was going to make cuts and 'balance' the market. With Brent prices regularly dipping well below $100 and WTI prices considerably lower, OPEC hawks are getting very nervous. Non-OPEC producers in Russia and Central Asia even more so. Assuming demand side dynamics don't drastically pick up in Asia, we can expect three things to sequentially happen.

The first is an international price war across all producer states to force Saudi Arabia to take assertive action to tighten the taps and raise prices. That will be a difficult process given Riyadh has its own strategic objectives to want a sustained period of moderate prices, well below $100/b.

Secondly, if petro-hawks lose this price war, their political bluster will subside, and a far 'cruder' trend will emerge. They will have to cut back on domestic spending, which is bound to lead to a new round of protests, and more importantly sharpened domestic repression.

Given repression is no longer the 'effective' tool it once was for producer states, that could well lead us to a third, and far more daunting prospect: any price floor will be set by producer states folding under the weight of political pressure when new crises hit. The flat price of crude will be influenced more by political unrest clipping production than by active supply restraint.

### Link Wall---Generic/Signal---2NC

#### **The link is huge and unique---no positive government signals for production now, but the plan reverses that---causes immediate price crash---and, high production rates are irrelevant without a government signal**

**Cross 12** Edward Cross is president of the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association "Obama has the power to put pressure on gas pricesBy Edward Cross" March 29 www.kansas.com/2012/03/29/2274545/obama-has-the-power-to-put-pressure.html

The U.S. cannot control the unrest in the Middle East, international supply disruptions or rising worldwide demand, but it can increase world supply of crude oil by developing more of our own ample oil resources. President Obama could announce his intent to change oil and gas tax and regulatory policies to encourage more domestic oil and natural gas production today, sending positive signals to the market and putting downward pressure on prices.

Increasing domestic oil and natural gas production helps secure our own energy future, create American jobs and provide billions more in revenue to the government.

If you recall, when President George W. Bush lifted the moratorium on the East and West Outer Continental Shelf in July 2008 – a time when the price of gasoline was nearly $4 a gallon – the 45-day price average for crude oil dropped $16 dollars per barrel, a 12 percent decline. While multiple factors affect crude price, this action and the resulting crude price decline demonstrated the clear link between anticipated supply and downward pressure on prices.

The Congressional Research Service released a study this month that says raising taxes on the oil and natural gas industry “will also raise the cost of exploration and production, with the possible result of higher consumer prices and more slowly increasing domestic production.”

Let’s take a look at the record: The Obama administration has eight federal departments and agencies contemplating new regulations or seeking to delay hydraulic fracturing, the technology critical for increasing oil and natural gas production. In addition, President Obama has proposed for the fourth year in a row the elimination of critical oil and natural gas tax provisions relied upon by small independent producers – the small businesses that account for 94 percent of the wells drilled in America.

Unfortunately, despite President Obama’s pledge that he wants an all-of-the-above energy strategy, his administration’s actions are out of step and appear to be about slowing oil and natural gas production, which sends the wrong signal to the energy markets: that supplies of domestic oil and natural gas could decline in the future.

U.S. oil production is the highest it has been in eight years largely because of private investments. President Obama’s policies have nothing to do with the rising American production.

I encourage President Obama to send a powerful signal today to the world crude oil markets that the U.S. is ready to lead in developing the domestic energy resources of oil and natural gas, the energy that is used to meet more than half of our energy demand and will continue to do so for decades despite advances in alternative fuels.

The question is not whether we will continue to use oil but whether we will use our own resources or import that oil. By responsibly developing our vast domestic resources, we can create American jobs, contribute to economic growth and send more money to federal and state governments.

President Obama has the power to encourage more domestic oil and natural gas. He can open new areas for responsible development. He has the power to propose tax policy that encourages more American oil and natural gas development. He can direct regulatory and oversight agencies to guard against any benchmark that tends to equate “good” or “better” regulation with “more” regulation.

I urge President Obama to do all of the above to immediately create downward pressure on crude prices to the benefit of consumers.

### 2NC Global Econ Resilient

#### Global economy is decoupled---no risk of global shocks---only nuclear war can collapse it, so the DA turns the case

Wolf 11 – Martin Wolf 11 is chief economics commentator at the Financial Times "In the grip of a great convergence" Financial Times Jan 5

What is unprecedented this time is **not convergence, but the scale**. Suppose China were to follow Japan’s path during the 1950s and 1960s. Then it would still have 20 years of very fast growth in front of it, reaching some 70 per cent of US output per head by 2030. At that point, **its economy would be a little less than three times as large as that of the US**, at PPP, and larger than that of the US and western Europe combined. India is further behind. At recent rates of growth, India’s economy would be about 80 per cent of that of the US by 2030, though its gross domestic product per head would still be less than a fifth of US levels.

China is today where Japan was in 1950, relative to US levels at that time. But its output per head is far higher in absolute terms, since US levels have themselves risen threefold. Today, China’s real GDP per head is roughly where Japan’s was in the mid-1960s and South Korea’s in the mid-1980s. India’s are where Japan was in the early 1950s and South Korea in the early 1970s.

In short, today’s divergent rates of growth between successful emerging economies and the high-income economies reflects the speed of the convergence of incomes between them. This divergence in growth is staggering. In an important speech in November, Ben Bernanke, chairman of the US Federal Reserve, noted that in the second quarter of 2010, the aggregate real output of emerging economies was 41 per cent higher than at the start of 2005. It was 70 per cent higher in China and about 55 per cent higher in India. But, in the advanced economies, real output was just 5 per cent higher. **For emerging countries,** the “great recession” was a blip. **For high-income countries, it was calamitous.**

The great convergence is a world-transforming event. Today, the west – defined to include western Europe and its “colonial offshoots” (the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) – contains 11 per cent of the world’s population. But China and India contain 37 per cent. The present position of the former group of countries will not be sustained. It is a product of the great divergence. It will end with the great convergence.

This assumes that the convergence itself will continue, if not necessarily at recent speeds. The best response to those who doubt this is: why not? Powerful market and technological forces are spreading the stock of knowledge across the globe. No one doubts that Chinese and Indian people are capable of applying it. They are quite as entrepreneurial and driven as westerners. Being poorer, they are surely far more so.

Until recently, political, social and policy obstacles were decisive. **This has not been true for several decades. Why should these re-emerge?** True, many reforms will be required if growth is to proceed, but growth itself is likely to transform societies and politics in needed directions. True, neither China nor India may surpass US output per head: Japan failed to do so. But they are far away today. Why should they be unable to reach, say, half of US productivity? That is Portugal’s level. Can China match Portugal? Surely.

Of course, catastrophes may intervene. But it is striking that even world wars and depressions merely interrupted the rise of earlier industrialisers. **If we** leave aside nuclear war, nothing **seems likely to halt the ascent of the big emerging countries,** though it may well be delayed. China and India are big enough to drive growth from their domestic markets if protectionism takes hold. Indeed, they are big enough to drive growth even in other emerging countries as well.

In the past few centuries, **what was once the European and then American periphery** became the core of the world economy. Now, the economies that became the periphery are re-emerging as the core. This is transforming the entire world.

### 2NC US Econ Resil

#### Tech and foreign investment checks

Bloomberg 9—Mayer of NYC. BS in electrical engineering, Johns Hopkins. MBA in Harvard Business School. (Michael, The Vibrant Promise of Cities, 13 August 2009, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/09\_34/b4144053830583.htm?chan=magazine+channel\_special+report)

**What a disaster the past year has been**. Fannie Mae (FNM), Freddie Mac (FRE), Lehman Brothers, Bear Stearns, AIG (AIG), Merrill Lynch (BAC), Chrysler, General Motors (GM), and other major enterprises—along with Washington Mutual (WAMUQ)) and more than 70 other banks—all collapsed. The stock market plunged, with many Americans losing much of their retirement savings. Housing foreclosures hit record highs, threatening the health of many neighborhoods. Unemployment soared to its highest level in 26 years. The pain is spread wide. Here in New York City, I hear it on the subways and in neighborhood diners—jarring stories of struggle and hardship. And we may not have hit bottom yet. So what is there to be optimistic about? Plenty, actually. This recession may well prove to be longer and deeper than the 1981-82 downturn. But the nation is better positioned to rebound than it was back then. One reason for this: America's urban revival. In the early '80s the future of American cities—historically the engines of economic growth—looked bleak. Violent crime was out of control. Factories were closing. Housing abandonment was common. The transportation infrastructure was crumbling. THE ADVENTUROUS YOUNG Today, though, many cities, including mine, have succeeded in cutting crime. (Far be it from me to boast—a New Yorker would never do that—but when you see people lounging on beach chairs in a traffic-free Times Square with no fear of being mugged, you know things have changed.) Safer streets have helped attract creative, entrepreneurial, ambitious people—especially the young—to once-blighted neighborhoods. Even in the area of domestic manufacturing, where cities have experienced a steady decline as the economy has gone global, there is reason for optimism. New York was once the garment-making capital of the world. Today our production is a fraction of what it used to be, as factories have moved overseas. But a crucial sector of the industry—design—has remained. It's the sector that relies on ideas. And to paraphrase Harvard University economist Edward Glaeser, the demand for ideas isn't going away. That's why even though the financial services industry has contracted around the world, other innovative and high-tech industries are stepping in, working to strengthen and stabilize cities like New York. Then there's our nation's entrepreneurial edge. Technology has stretched the bounds of entrepreneurialism. If you can dream it, you can build it, and the U.S. has always been a nation of dreamers, even in the toughest times. Indeed, a recent report by the Kauffman Foundation, which studies entrepreneurialism, points out that half of today's Fortune 500 companies were founded during a recession or a bear market. Consider this partial list: Procter & Gamble (PG) (1837), Hewlett-Packard (HPQ) (1939), FedEx (FDX) (1973), CNN (TWX)(1980), and one close to my heart, Bloomberg (1981). After being laid off from a Wall Street job in a downturn, I started Bloomberg as a four-person company with the aim of building a computer terminal that could give up-to-the-minute financial information to analysts and traders. Today the company employs 10,000 people. The current recession, too, will give rise to a new wave of entrepreneurs. The challenge that state and local governments face—one that Washington, too, should take up—is finding ways to encourage and attract this potential. In New York City, we're expecting a big payoff from what we're doing: opening business incubators, holding boot camps for entrepreneurs, organizing business-plan competitions, expanding the amount of early-stage seed capital for startups, and cutting taxes for the smallest small businesses. GLOBAL MAGNET As countries such as India and China expand their economies, the U.S. will profit, too. The businesses they create will open offices in areas with the highest concentrations of educated, highly skilled workers. America's deep pool of talent and technological knowhow will continue to make it a highly desirable location—and investment opportunity. And if Congress has the sense to fix our broken immigration system, our open society and world-class universities will remain a magnet for the world's best and brightest. That's important: Economists have estimated that every person arriving on an H1-B visa creates jobs for five native-born Americans. Competing for talent and capital will also require all levels of government to invest more in our quality of life—mass transit, parks, schools, and so forth. That will help raise our long-term standard of living, even if real incomes don't rise appreciably in the near term.

#### Global pandemics unlikely and don’t cause extinction

Ridley 8/17/12 [Matt Ridley, columnist for The Wall Street Journal and author of *The Rational Optimist: How Prosperity Evolves,* “Apocalypse Not: Here’s Why You Shouldn’t Worry About End Times,” http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2012/08/ff\_apocalypsenot/all/]

The emergence of AIDS led to a theory that other viruses would spring from tropical rain forests to wreak revenge on humankind for its ecological sins. That, at least, was the implication of Laurie Garrett’s 1994 book, The Coming Plague: Newly Emerging Diseases in a World Out of Balance. The most prominent candidate was Ebola, the hemorrhagic fever that starred in Richard Preston’s The Hot Zone, published the same year. Writer Stephen King called the book “one of the most horrifying things I’ve ever read.” Right on cue, Ebola appeared again in the Congo in 1995, but it soon disappeared. Far from being a harbinger, HIV was the only new tropical virus to go pandemic in 50 years.¶ In the 1980s British cattle began dying from mad cow disease, caused by an infectious agent in feed that was derived from the remains of other cows. When people, too, began to catch this disease, predictions of the scale of the epidemic quickly turned terrifying: Up to 136,000 would die, according to one study. A pathologist warned that the British “have to prepare for perhaps thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of cases of vCJD [new variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, the human manifestation of mad cow] coming down the line.” Yet the total number of deaths so far in the UK has been 176, with just five occurring in 2011 and none so far in 2012.¶ In 2003 it was SARS, a virus from civet cats, that ineffectively but inconveniently led to quarantines in Beijing and Toronto amid predictions of global Armageddon. SARS subsided within a year, after killing just 774 people. In 2005 it was bird flu, described at the time by a United Nations official as being “like a combination of global warming and HIV/AIDS 10 times faster than it’s running at the moment.” The World Health Organization’s official forecast was 2 million to 7.4 million dead. In fact, by late 2007, when the disease petered out, the death toll was roughly 200. In 2009 it was Mexican swine flu. WHO director general Margaret Chan said: “It really is all of humanity that is under threat during a pandemic.” The outbreak proved to be a normal flu episode.¶ The truth is, a new global pandemic is growing less likely, not more. Mass migration to cities means the opportunity for viruses to jump from wildlife to the human species has not risen and has possibly even declined, despite media hype to the contrary. Water- and insect-borne infections—generally the most lethal—are declining as living standards slowly improve. It’s true that casual-contact infections such as colds are thriving—but only by being mild enough that their victims can soldier on with work and social engagements, thereby allowing the virus to spread. Even if a lethal virus does go global, the ability of medical science to sequence its genome and devise a vaccine or cure is getting better all the time.

### Heg Impact---2NC

#### Leverage

WSJ 8 By: Roger Howard, author and columnist for the WSJ, “An Ode to Oil,” 11/29 Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122791647562165587.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

Instead, the dependency of foreign oil producers on their customers **plays straight into America's strategic hands**. Washington is conceivably in a position to **hold producers to ransom** by threatening to accelerate a drive to develop or implement alternative fuels, realizing the warning once uttered by Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, the former Saudi oil minister who pointed out that "the Stone Age did not end for lack of stone." Back in 1973, as they protested at Washington's stance on the Arab-Israeli dispute, Middle East producers were in a position to impose an oil embargo on the Western world. But a generation later, technological advances, and the strength of public and scientific concern about global warming, have turned the tables.

The United States has powerful political leverage over producers because it holds the key to future oil supply as well as market demand. The age of "easy oil" is over, and as fears grow that oil is becoming harder to get, so too will the dependency of producers on increasingly sophisticated Western technology and expertise.

Such skills will be particularly important in two key areas of oil production. One is finding and extracting offshore deposits, like the massive reserves reckoned to be under the Caspian and Arctic seas, or in Brazil's recently discovered Tupi field. The other is prolonging the lifespan of declining wells through enhanced "tertiary" recovery. Because Western companies have a clear technological edge over their global competitors in these hugely demanding areas, Washington exerts some powerful political leverage over exporters, many of whom openly anticipate the moment when their production peaks before gradually starting to decline.

#### Independence doesn’t solve security issues but wrecks US influence

Hulbert 12 Matthew Hulbert is senior fellow at the Clingendael International Energy Programme "America Will Deeply Regret Its Fixation On Energy Independence" 8/19/12 www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/08/19/why-america-will-deeply-regret-us-energy-independence/4/

It’s either that, or America knocks the energy independence narrative on the head, assures (and re-assures) other consumers that Washington will not only work to keep energy as a fungible, free flowing commodity, but that it remains the ultimate geopolitical backstop to oil supplies in the most vital producing regions in the world. That would give America ongoing leverage over the international status of the dollar, and indeed geopolitical red lines that emerging markets can and can’t cross. But keep spinning the U.S. energy independence yarn (with associated passive and active political practice), then expect to lose global status as the geopolitical lynchpin of the hydrocarbon world. That would be a crying shame for America, not least because ‘total’ energy independence is a myth, especially in the form U.S. politicians (and over excited analysts) are currently peddling. America will sacrifice its global geopolitical role on a hollow dream; energy independence, far from a dream, will become a living nightmare for America’s role in the world. U.S. politicians should think long and hard about that part of the debate, or spend an eternity regretting their global fall from grace.

### 2NC Parity Turn

**Iran prolif good—nuclear parity encourages Israel to disclose its arsenal and abandon aggression—this is the only chance for peace process success and long-term stability**

**Parsi 6** – president of the National Iranian American Council and an expert on US-Iranian relations, conducted more than 130 interviews with senior Israeli, Iranian and American decision-makers (Trita, Is nuclear parity with Iran a blessing in disguise for Israel?, Jane's Intelligence Review 18.1, p 34-37)

This mentality can mean that Israel misses opportunities to engage in peace talks with contiguous states, and its default reaction to apparently positive overtures can be to focus upon negative signals and dismiss conciliatory gestures. Although the Arab side in the Israeli-Palestinian dispute bears equal blame for the continuation of the conflict, many Israelis are concerned about the negative impact that the Israeli mentality has on peacemaking. Some of the most important critics of the present posture reside in the Israeli defence establishment itself, a significant minority of whom are concerned that the policy produces self-fulfilling prophecies. Most notably, Israel’s offensive military doctrine can create enemies where previously they did not exist. As technological advancements bring states previously located in Tel Aviv’s periphery into range, present doctrine demands that Israel must seek military dominance over an increasing number of distant countries, most notably Iran. Abrasive rhetoric from Tehran, most notably President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s call in October 2005 to wipe Israel off the map, does not help Israel to relinquish its longheld policy, even though there are no definitive signals indicating that Tehran is intent upon a return to its radical policies of the early 1980s. Nevertheless, for much of the last decade Israel has assumed the worst and spearheaded a campaign to isolate and weaken Iran. After 55 years of continuous conflict with the Islamic world, Israelis are exhausted. Even some of the most hawkish Israeli politicians are reaching the conclusion that the state cannot adhere to such a stance indefinitely, particularly as Israel’s military doctrine is bringing it into conflict with a state that has no historical grievances against them. According to a senior analyst with the Bureau of Defense Policy Planning, there is a general reluctance to accept this, as it offers de facto recognition of Iran’s nuclearisation and Israel losing its military edge. What some call resignation, others refer to as a change of mindset. Reuven Pedatzur, director of the Galilee Centre for Strategy and National Security, has long asserted that Israel’s defence establishment needs new patterns of thinking. But paradigm shifts are usually born out of momentous events, and the loss of Israel’s nuclear monopoly in the region may constitute such a trigger. Future doctrine If disparity is lost, it will most likely prompt two key developments that some argue can gain Israel the peace and stability that military superiority failed to produce. First, a new military doctrine will be adopted – mutual assured destruction (MAD). This will compel Israel to end its long-standing policy of nuclear ambiguity. The crystallising geopolitical rivalry between Israel and Iran has been ambiguous precisely because Israel felt it had the ability to pursue a complete victory. Under nuclear parity, however, that option will be lost and ambiguity will be replaced with deterrence. Unlike the current situation, deterrence requires communication. Ambiguities cannot be resolved and red lines established unless channels of communication are opened between Tehran and Tel Aviv. Increased communication “can have positive effects on the relationship between Iran and Israel,” according to Leon Hadar, an Israeli research fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington DC, as it will end the dangers inherent in the current state of uncertainty. The existence of nuclear weapons programmes can **tame the behaviour of both sides** and reduce the probability of overt aggression, since the cost of failure will be infinitely greater than at present. Deterrence also forces Israel to ascribe to Tehran a level of rationality presently absent in its thinking. For instance, Project Daniel, a report written by foreign policy and military experts delivered to Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon in 2004, argued that the existential threat to Israel was exacerbated by the fact that Arab and Iranian leaders were irrational and did not value self preservation. Such an approach can be viewed as political posturing consistent with Israel’s overarching military policy. As long as Israel’s strategic edge could be salvaged, all means had to be used to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear technology. This included the depiction of Iranian decision-makers as irrational in order to compel the international community to take action. As it becomes clear that disparity will be lost, such a portrayal will lose much of its political utility. Beyond the rhetoric Looking beyond the ‘mad mullah’ rhetoric, Israelis are careful not to underestimate Tehran. Yaari told JIR: “People here respect the Iranians and the Iranian regime. They take them as very serious, calculating players.” Most Israeli strategists differentiate between extremism and irrationality: although they view the Iranian government as extreme in its views, they do not see it as irrational. Therefore, deterring an Iranian nuclear threat has a strong chance of success, precisely because Tehran understands the price of a nuclear clash. Israel has already taken steps to strengthen its deterrence. In mid-November, it emerged that Israel’s government had signed a letter of intent with its German counterpart to receive two modified Dolphin-class advanced attack submarines (in addition to its existing three Dolphin-class submarines). Israel has repeatedly failed to confirm reports that the submarines are meant to create a second-strike capability to deter potential enemies who possess weapons of mass destruction. Israel refers to the Dolphin submarines as “national deterrence assets”, but an Israeli analyst confirmed to JIR that the submarines purchases were intended to signal a second-strike capability. In addition, the Israeli Air Force has an inventory of 25 F-15I aircraft with a range of 4,450 km. When combined with the Dolphin class submarines (and presuming that they afford a genuine second-strike capability) the F-15I ensure that Israel will be able to retaliate against a nuclear assault. Moreover, nuclear rivalry with Iran will increase the cost of Israel’s state of nonpeace with Syria, Lebanon and the Palestinians. Iran’s nuclear umbrella can embolden the radical Arabs and even prompt Israel’s more moderate neighbours into acting more aggressively. Fear of this scenario could compel Israel to accelerate the peace process as a preventive measure. Tel Aviv will not be able to afford a conflict with its regional adversaries and a nuclear rivalry with Tehran at the same time. Israel will be pushed to minimise its conflicts with its immediate neighbours in order to be better equipped to deal with the rivalry and threat catalysed by Iran. This pattern in Israeli behaviour has been evident before; one of Yitzhak Rabin’s primary motivations for making peace with the Palestinians in the early 1990s was to better prepare Israel for future conflict scenarios with states such as Iran. Furthermore, reduced tensions with Israel’s immediate neighbours will deprive Tehran of points of hostility that it can use against Tel Aviv. An understanding with Lebanon and Syria will significantly weaken the Iranian influence in those countries, as well as their need for military ties to Iran. Brigadier- General Shlomo Brom, former chief of the Strategic Planning Division of the Israeli Defense Forces, maintained: “If Israel succeeds in concluding an agreement with Syria, that will deny Iran a major instrument of friction with Israel.” Paradoxically, these factors – deterrence rather than domination and the increased communication between Iran and Israel that it entails, as well as Israel’s need to resolve disputes with its neighbours to limit friction with Iran – can serve to **advance stability** in the Middle East. Although the difficulty in maintaining Israel’s quantitative military supremacy is becoming clear to an increasing number of Israeli strategists, only liberal elements in the military and academia have so far openly argued for the benefits of parity. The difficulty in preventing advances in Iran’s nuclear programme is forcing many in Israel to look beyond the doomsday scenario Tel Aviv has portrayed it to be and reassess the implications of a nuclear balance of power. In particular, it is becoming increasingly clear that the only remedy to a nuclear Iran emboldening Syria, Hizbullah and the Palestinians is to hasten efforts to conclude peace deals with the Arabs and not to ‘bargain out’ and expect Israel’s military superiority to predetermine the result of the negotiations. The cost of continuing the state of ‘no war, no peace’ will outweigh the benefits of holding on to occupied territory at the expense of peace. As the prospects for nuclear parity force Israel to rid itself of the doctrine that has kept it in a state of perpetual conflict since the Yom Kippur War, it will be balance and not imbalance of power that finally will win Israel the peace it has craved for so long. “I think [that] in the long run, it will be good for the Middle East,” Pedatzur told JIR. “Because the deterrence will work just as it worked between the superpowers.” [1]

### AT Terrorism

No transfer to terrorists

Hagerty 9—Associate Professor in UMBC's political science department (Devin, The long shadow: nuclear weapons and security in 21st century Asia, ed. Alagappa, 309-10)

Would Iran transfer nuclear weapons or materials to terrorist allies for use against the United States, Israel, or American and Israeli targets around the world? On balance, probably not. While no Israeli or U.S. leader can in good conscience rule out this kind of nuclear leakage, especially given the history of the A. Q. Khan network and the ease with which it distributed nuclear technology and materials around the globe, Iran will have strong incentives not to diffuse its nuclear capabilities. Tehran is trying to turn itself into a regional and global power. Once it achieves a nuclear weapon capability, the imperative of protecting and sustaining that capability will likely push in the direction of careful nuclear stewardship. Notwithstanding its past deeds, Tehran is likely to portray itself to the world's nuclear establishment as a responsible nuclear power. Indeed, Iran's pragmatic conservatives are apt to argue that after several expensive, often frustrating decades of trying to develop nuclear weapons, leaking warheads or fissile materials to terrorists would represent a waste of precious time, effort, and resources. Another important factor here is that Al-Qaeda, the terrorist network with the greatest likelihood of using nuclear technology to devastating effect, has had historically difficult relations with Tehran (Hasten 2007). Competitiveness, mutual mistrust, and Sunni-Shia animosities argue against sharing Iran's hard-won nuclear capability with Al-Qaeda. That having been said, certain elements within the radical-conservative camp of Iran's power structure could make the case that Iran is now in a position to be the hero, even the savior, of the Islamic world by doing catastrophic damage to Israel or the United States through its Hezbollah allies, while still maintaining enough plausible deniability of Iran's role to escape punishment. Which path Tehran chooses will rest on three factors: the outcome of the ongoing intense competition among Iran's conservative factions, the estimates of Iranian leaders about how easy it would be for Israel and the United States to credibly attribute to Iran responsibility for nuclear-terrorist attacks,28 and how unambiguously the United States and Israel signal to Tehran that nuclear terrorist acts committed with transferred Iranian weapons or fissile material would eventuate in an appropriately ruinous nuclear response against Iran.29

### AT: China

#### Oil independence causes the US to retreat from the middle east---makes china perceive the US as a loose cannon and undermines relations and stability

Ma 12 Damien Ma. Damien Ma is a Washington, D.C.-based China analyst at the Eurasia Group, a global political risk research and consulting firm. "Dependence on Middle Eastern Oil: Now It's China's Problem, Too" July 19 www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/07/dependence-on-middle-eastern-oil-now-its-chinas-problem-too/259947/

But the difference is that China does not have an adequate foreign policy or the capabilities to accommodate the unavoidable economic realities. Moreover, some in China fear that increasing U.S. energy independence, particularly its enormous shale output, will make the Middle East is strategically dispensable for the U.S., providing Washington with more flexibility to "disrupt" the region in a way that would indirectly damage Chinese interests. In other words, if Middle Eastern oil no longer matters quite so much to the U.S., then it would have more freedom to do things that would risk disrupting Middle Eastern oil output, such as forcing "regime change" in unfriendly countries.

As simplistic as this may sound, such a view seems to be gaining some traction. One Chinese commentator, pointing out that U.S. oil imports from the Gulf have plummeted to 15 percent and that domestic gas production rose from 20.2 to 22.4 trillion cubic feet in just three years, argued that these developments give Washington more leverage to push around China through, for instance, Iran sanctions. Meanwhile, a researcher at CNOOC, one of China's big three national oil companies, echoed similar sentiments about America's diminishing role in the Arab world:

We understand that the United States' presence and influence in the Middle East is a key factor behind that region's stability, but China is the single greatest purchaser of Middle Eastern oil. The major reason that the United States is seeking energy self-sufficiency is its desire to reduce or even end imports of Middle Eastern oil...

...Nor do we wish to see the United States completely withdraw from the Middle East. We really don't want to see the Americans "transform" the Middle East or allow the region to fall into disorder once they are no longer reliant upon its petroleum. China has but little influence on the Middle East and even less power to control the region, but we need its oil, and we need a stable Middle East.

The discoveries of American shale gas, Canadian oil sand and Brazilian oil beneath salt beds has made the Americas into the "new Middle East" of the 21st century. In the foreseeable future, it is entirely possible for North and South America to become energy self-sufficient. In other words, the Middle East will no longer be an indispensable source of oil to the United States...

Ever suspicious of U.S. motives, this line of reasoning points to an inevitable conclusion that the United States, via its energy independence, is once again using economic weapons to constrain China's behavior. Of course, that's a bit more of a China-centric view of American policy than is probably warranted.

Such a logic also belies a fundamental distrust of the markets. There is little acknowledgment that decades of technological development and market evolution eventually culminated in successful and scalable U.S. shale production. Instead, some Chinese opinion leaders seem to ascribe a more sinister grand U.S. plot to achieve energy independence so that it can continue to assert dominance over China. For a certain set of Chinese elites, the market is to be dictated and manipulated to achieve political outcomes; it is not something to submit to.