# Warming

Turn- US hegemony is the VITAL internal link to international environmental policies

Falkner ‘5 (Robert Falkner, Department of International Relations, London School of Economics, “American Hegemony and the Global Environment”, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:lkf0-ouftCYJ:personal.lse.ac.uk/falkner/_private/2005%2520ISR%2520-%2520American%2520Hegemony.pdf+american+hegemony+and+the+global+environment&hl=en&gl=us>, 2005, LEQ)

Throughout the history of international environmental politics, the United States has played an active role in the creation and design of international regimes and has used its power to pursue its preferred policy objectives. To be sure, US he- gemony has not translated into international policy outcomes in a straightforward manner. Nor has US foreign environmental policy been consistent over time in terms of its overall direction. Depending on the environmental issue that is the focus of attention and its broader international context, America’s hegemony has formed the basis for both international leadership and veto power in environmental regime formation. There is, thus, no simple correlation between the US position in the international system and its environmental objectives. As will be argued below, the influence of competing domestic interest groups and the fragmented nature of the foreign policy system in the United States are largely responsible for the con- siderable variation in US foreign environmental policy over time and across issue areas. The first use of hegemony in international environmental politics revolves around the use of superior power in the interest of international regime building. Young (1989:88) has argued in International Cooperation: Building Regimes for Natural Re- sources and the Environment that, even though hegemonic states rarely impose in- ternational regimes against the wishes of other states, they play an important role in providing leadership in the creation of mutually agreeable environmental regimes. Although environmental leadership does not necessarily result from hegemonic power, it is closely linked to such power. Environmental leadership can take many different forms: policy entrepreneurship of individual actors in international bar- gaining that facilitates compromise and agreement in the interest of environmental causes (entrepreneurial leadership); diffusion and role model effects of national environmental policy (intellectual leadership); and the more explicit use of eco- nomic incentives and sanctions in pursuit of international environmental objectives (structural leadership) (Young 1991; Lake 1993; Vogel 1997; Tews 2004). Even though hegemony is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for the existence of environmental leadership, it is usually only powerful states that have a lasting effect on international negotiations and norm creation. Weaker states may assume a leading position when it comes to developing progressive environmental policies or demanding stringent international rules. But such initiatives will remain ineffective if they are not backed up by political and economic clout that can foster international agreement and induce compliance. For example, smaller European states such as Denmark and the Netherlands have often been in the vanguard of environmental policy innovation, but Germany, Europe’s largest economy, is usu- ally credited with providing the essential leadership for advancing environmental policies at the EU level. A similar picture emerges in the international system. It is mainly states that have dominant economic and political clout and whose position in the international economy affords them the possibility of exerting indirect or direct pressure on other states that can provide effective leadership on environmental issues. The United States is a good example of this conclusion. For much of the early phase of international environmental politics, the United States provided inter- national leadership in one form or the other. It was one of the first leading industrialized nations to develop comprehensive environmental legislation and reg- ulatory institutions. The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which was set up in 1970 to integrate the widely scattered programs and institutions dealing with environmental matters, instantly became a model for similar regulatory agencies that were created in other industrialized countries during the 1970s. Much of this state activity was underpinned by the world’s most dynamic environmental movement, which came into existence in the mid-1960s. US environmental groups ranging from the more traditional bodies (Sierra Club, National Audubon Society) to modern environmental nongovernmental organizations (Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, Greenpeace) worked to create broadly based domestic support for a more ambitious environmental policy at home and abroad. US scientists and activists came to play a leading role in the global envi- ronmental movement that began to emerge in the 1970s (Kraft 2004). At the international level, the United States began to claim the mantle of en- vironmental leader, first at the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972 (Hopgood 1998:96), and later in the context of the multilateral efforts to agree on environmental treaties. Having declared eight whale species endangered based on the Endangered Species Act of 1969, the United States took up the issue of whale preservation internationally and initiated a transformation of the international whaling regime to emphasize species protection rather than nat- ural resource usage. US diplomatic pressure and threat of sanctions were instru- mental in getting the International Whaling Commission to place a ban on commercial whaling in 1984 (Porter and Brown 1996:77–81; Fletcher 2001). Also in the 1970s, the United States began to support international efforts to take action against ozone layer depletion and in the 1980s became a key advocate of international restrictions on the use of ozone-depleting chemicals. During the ne- gotiations on the Montreal Protocol, the US government provided important lead- ership and exerted pressure on skeptical states, especially the European producers of ozone-depleting substances, that objected to strong international measures (Benedick 1991). Whereas the ozone negotiations provided the United States with an opportunity to display leadership in a multilateral context, US policy on the conservation of species took on a more unilateral character. More than any other country, the United States has used the threat of sanctions to change other nations’ behavior in areas that endanger threatened species. Using import restrictions on products made in an environmentally damaging way, the US government forced foreign fishing fleets to comply with American standards of protection of, for ex- ample, dolphins and sea turtles (DeSombre 2001). In these cases and others, the United States benefitted from its superior position as the world’s largest economy and import market for internationally traded goods. The nodal position that the US economy occupies in international economic flows affords it a unique opportunity to use economic pressure in the pursuit of environmental objectives. This is not to say that other nations are devoid of similar economic power; depending on the nature of the environmental issue, economic power can be more dispersed than concentrated in the international economy. In biodiversity protection, for example, none of the industrialized countries appear to have such decisive economic clout that it can force support of the global biodiversity regime; all they can do is provide financial side payments. Furthermore, the European Union has emerged as a potential contender to US environmental lead- ership not the least because it has assumed a coequal position in key areas of international policymaking, such as in international trade (Smith 2004). But the fact remains that on many environmental issues, the United States has unrivaled opportunities for exercising leadership. That it has not always acted on these opportunities does not alter the reality of America’s superior power.

# AT: China War

**Risk of war is exaggerated – experts agree**

Voice of America 9/4/12 “Will South China Sea Disputes Lead to War?”

But that doesn’t mean a war. Storey said an escalation into full-blown conflict is unlikely. “It is in no country’s interests to spill blood or treasure over this issue – the costs far outweigh the benefits,” Storey said. Other experts agree. James Holmes of the U.S. Naval War College says admires how China has been able to get its way in spreading it claims of sovereignty without becoming a bully. “[China] gradually consolidated the nation's maritime claims while staying well under the threshold for triggering outside -most likely American -intervention,” said Holmes. “Is war about to break out over bare rocks? I don't think so.” writes Robert D. Kaplan, Chief Political Strategist for the geopolitical analysis group Stratfor. Kaplan, however, doesn’t give much hope for negotiations. “The issues involved are too complex, and the power imbalance between China and its individual neighbors is too great,” he said. For that reason, Kaplan says China holds all the cards. Kaplan doesn’t look for Chinese military aggression against other claimants. That, he says, would be counterproductive for its goals in the region. “It would completely undermine its carefully crafted ‘peaceful rise’ thesis and push Southeast Asian countries into closer strategic alignment with the US,” said Kaplan. At the same time, he said Chinese leaders probably will be unable to compromise. “The primordial quest for status still determines the international system, and these bare rocks in the South China Sea have become, in effect, logos of nationhood,” Kaplan said.

# Weak Military Worse

A weak military is worse- this SUPERCHARGES our budget internal link- we would just lashout not pull back

Feaver ‘5 - Professor of Political Science at Duke (Peter, Armed servants: agency, oversight, and civil-military relations, p. 4-5)

The civil-military problematique is so vexing because it involves balancing two vital and potentially conflicting societal desiderata. On the one hand, the military must be strong enough to prevail in war. One purpose behind establishing the military in the first place is the need, or perceived need, for military force, either to attack other groups or to ward off attacks. The military primarily exists as a guard against disaster and should always be ready even if it is never used. Moreover, its strength should be sized appropriately to meet the threats confronting the polity. It serves no purpose to establish a protection force and then to vitiate it to the point where it can no longer protect. Indeed, an inadequate military institution may **be worse than none at all. It could be a paper tiger inviting outside aggression: strong enough**in appearance to threaten powerful enemies, but not strong **enough** in fact to defend against their predations. Alternatively, it could lull leaders into a false confidence, leading them to rash behavior and then failing in the ultimate military contest.

# Layne indict

**Layne’s analysis is flawed – reject it**

**Wohlforth 12**, William, Assistant Professor of International Relations in the Edmund A. Walsh School of. Foreign Service at Georgetown University [“How Not to Evaluate Theories,” International Studies Quarterly (2012) 56, 219–222]

At issue are not the facts, but their implications for scholarship. How come every theoretical implication Layne seeks to draw from these facts strikes me as clearly wrong? Cycling between the earlier writings of Layne and other balance-of-power realists, my own work, and Layne’s present essay yields an answer: a lack of analytical consistency. On vivid display in ‘‘This Time It’s Real,’’ this inconsistency is hardly random. Rather, it is all skewed toward an effort to claim that recent events vindicate Layne’s and other balance-of-power realists’ prediction from the early 1990s: unipolarity generates systemic pressures that rapidly move the system back to multipolarity. I argued elsewhere (Wohlforth 1999) that this prediction derives from an unreflective and ultimately flawed application of neorealist balance-of power theory to a novel unipolar setting. **There was no theoretical basis for the prediction that unipolarity would spark balancing that would rapidly usher in multipolarity**. And, as it turns out, there is no evidence that this has occurred or is about to occur. Layne is only able to imply otherwise by committing four **serious analytical missteps.**

# 1ar – winners win

**Substance wins provide long-term momentum**

Davis, 11 -- special counsel to President Clinton (Lanny, formerly served under the Clinton and Bush W. administrations, Washington attorney specializing in legal crisis management, "Column: Obama, be a sharp-elbowed centrist," USA Today, 8-17-11, www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/2011-08-17-obama-leadership-economy\_n.htm, accessed 9-1-12)

The time is now: Barack Obama needs to demonstrate a new style of leadership. The president is a basketball player. He knows that sharp elbows can hurt people when they are swung. **But they also open up** scoring opportunities. America faces two major problems that have shaken the country's confidence: debt and high unemployment. To lead on both issues, Obama needs to emulate two presidents from opposite parties who provided needed leadership by sometimes throwing an elbow or two at their own political bases. Anti-tax conservatives who now revere Ronald Reagan forget that back in 1982, Reagan infuriated them by supporting the largest peacetime tax increase in U.S. history and cutting a deal with Democratic Speaker Thomas "Tip" O'Neill to protect the solvency of Social Security, in part by raising taxes. Bill Clinton, known for the hatred he inspired on the far right of the Republican Party, also infuriated many in the left base of the Democratic Party by working with Republicans to balance the budget, enact welfare reform and approve NAFTA. President of the people This could be President Obama's moment to show that kind of fighting centrist leadership. Not tacking to the far left to shore up his base, but **becoming a president of the people, politics be damned.** By being proactive, for example, on the national debt and jobs creation issues, he can manage a triangulation message that isolates the extremes on the left and the right: those Democrats who say "no way" on entitlement reform, and those Republicans who say "not a chance" on tax increases. In doing so, he'd place himself — as Reagan and Clinton did so well — in the great center, where the majority of the American people are. On the debt and deficit issue, he should endorse, at long last, all the specific recommendations of the Simpson-Bowles Commission on fiscal responsibility. Call it the Obama Mulligan, since he ignored the commission last time around. As the 65-page report states at the outset, the recommendations were meant to be taken all together or not at all, and they included substantial cuts, new revenue and tax changes to spur economic growth. It also tackled Social Security and Medicare. If enacted, the result would be a $4 trillion debt reduction over 10 years, not just the $1.2 trillion that the upcoming "supercommittee" of Congress is supposed to achieve. On job creation, if John Kennedy can get America from the ground to the moon in less than eight years, then Obama can exercise all the powers of the presidency to get shovels in the ground and millions of Americans in new jobs within eight months. How? He can use executive orders to suspend regulations, award contracts and ultimately put men and women to work. Franklin Roosevelt stretched the power of the executive to help the country escape the Great Depression, and most recently George W. Bush did so in the wake of the 9/11 attacks. Not ideal, but over the course of our nation's history, presidents have flexed executive muscle in times of crisis in order to get the job done. The times call for no less by Obama. There is much to be done — building and fixing bridges, highways, railway lines, airports, office building energy retrofits, environmental cleanup, you name it. But these projects don't have to be debt-drivers. The money invested could be repaid from user-based fees, tolls and cash savings from reduced energy costs. Such bold and decisive moves by this president would be criticized as brash by some, reckless by others. But the American people would see the strength in a man standing up to the extremes of both parties to simply do what is best for this country. At a time when many Americans doubt the ability of the federal government to even function, these optics matter greatly. A decisive president — a leader leading — cannot be underestimated. Time to take a riskThus, Obama can no longer afford, as has often been his custom, to wait for Congress to act and then step in as a final mediator. He **needs to** take the risk to put a stake in the ground and lead, if necessary to get out in front of congressional and party leadership, even of public opinion. He needs to simply do what he thinks is right. By doing so, President Obama can show that he represents all the American people and is willing to fight for the national interest, that he is willing to strive to be Teddy Roosevelt's "man in the arena … who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement and who at the worse, if he fails, at least he fails while daring greatly." If anyone on the left or the right objects to Obama throwing a few elbows in the process, he can offer them simple advice, as he would in a basketball game: Get out of the way. That would be good politics for 2012. It would also be good for the nation.

**That’s key to swing states**

Tomasky 11. [Michael, Newsweek/Daily Beast special correspondent, editor of Democracy: A Journal of Ideas.” Obama’s 2012 Game Plan” Newsweek -- 6/26 -- <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/06/26/2012-how-obama-can-mobilize-his-liberal-base.html>]

It’s a solid inventory. But it’s countered by the undeniable reality that the country hasn’t noticeably moved in a more liberal direction (quite the opposite), and by the widely held perception among progressives that Obama will never wage fierce battle on behalf of liberal ideals. When I interviewed Justin Ruben, the executive director of MoveOn.org, whose 5 million members (many in swing states) must be revved up and mobilized if the president is to be reelected, he gave me four or five variants of the line “People need to feel like the president and the Democrats are really going to fight for their side.” Unfortunately, making tough, partisan economic arguments has never been the president’s strong suit. “Since the beginning of his candidacy in 2007, Barack has struggled to put together a sustained, winning economic argument,” said Simon Rosenberg of NDN, a Washington-based think tank. “With ‘Morning in America’ not really a viable option for 2012, he is going to have to draw brighter lines with the GOP, and particularly do much more to discredit their failed and reckless economic approach.” The base vote can still emerge in large numbers, but the dominant factor this time won’t be hope and change. Instead, the factors will be fear of the other side, state and local political conditions (think of how motivated Democrats are to regain control of their politics in Wisconsin), and demographic changes that are still redounding to the Democrats’ benefit. And because we elect presidents by states, the place to assess Obama’s prospects is on the ground. Wake County, N.C.; Arapahoe County, Colo.; Franklin County, Ohio—these are representative base Democratic counties. They are in swing states, which means the president will need a big vote in these places to offset a presumed high conservative turnout in other parts of these states. And they are counties that have only recently become solidly Democratic, because of demographic changes. “Obama’s majorities in these counties are not secure,” says Ruy Teixeira, coauthor of the 2002 book The Emerging Democratic Majority, which predicted the bluing of states like then-red Colorado. “He needs a full-bore mobilization effort in these counties to get his supporters out and develop the margins he needs to carry swing states like Ohio, Colorado, and North Carolina.” Cont… That’ll be about the strongest argument Obama can make to base voters: it could, and will, be a lot worse if you don’t vote for me. That’s true, and fear is usually a pretty good motivator in politics. But it still isn’t what people were hoping for, and it seems inevitable that some percentage of the most loyal Democrats will stay home. In these three counties and others like them, that percentage will be the difference between reelection and retirement.

**Romney leading in Ohio – newest polls.**

Tobin 10-5. [Jonathan, Senior Online Editor, "Did the Denver Debate Matter? Swing State Polls Say Yes as Romney Surges" Commentary -- www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/10/05/did-the-denver-debate-matter-swing-state-polls-say-yes-as-mitt-romney-surges/]

The poll of likely voters in three key swing states taken yesterday by We Ask America shows a remarkable swing in favor of Mitt Romney. Previous surveys by this firm as well as virtually every other pollster in Florida, Virginia and Ohio had shown Obama holding on to a firm lead. But according to the latest numbers, Romney has forged ahead in all three states. The Republican leads Obama by a margin of 49-46 percent in Florida, 48-45 percent in Virginia and 47-46 percent in Ohio. All three results are significant and very good news for the Republicans, but none more so than that in Ohio. Romney’s rebound after a tough few weeks in which his leads in Florida and Virginia had been turned into deficits is clear. Obama’s growing strength in Ohio had been moving it from a swing state to one that was starting to be considered to be firmly in the president’s column. Romney’s post-debate bounce has put it back into play on Real Clear Politics’ Electoral College map.

**Ohio’s key**

Silver, 12 -- 538 founder and chief analyst (Nate, "Aug. 29: So Much Depends Upon Ohio," fivethirtyeight, 8-29-12, fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/08/30/aug-29-so-much-depends-upon-ohio/, accessed 8-30-12)

The broader point is simply that Ohio is so important to the electoral calculus that it’s good news for a candidate when a polling firm shows him doing relatively well there compared with the other states that it polls. Ohio has a 30 percent chance of being the tipping-point state, meaning that it would cast the decisive votes in the Electoral College. That’s as much as the next two states on the list, Florida and Virginia, combined. It’s also as much as Colorado, Nevada, Iowa, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Michigan and North Carolina combined. All of these states are competitive. But really, they exist along a continuum of electoral power rather than falling into binary categories of “important” and “unimportant.” Ohio is at the extreme end of that continuum. The reason our tipping-point calculus rates **Ohio** so highly is because it **would** usually suffice to **provide** Mr. **Obama with** a winning map**, even if he lost many of those other states**. If you give Ohio to Mr. Obama, plus all the states where the forecast model now estimates that he has at least 75 percent chance of winning, he’s up to 265 electoral votes. That means he could win any one of Colorado, Virginia, Iowa, Wisconsin, Florida or North Carolina to put him over the top.

**Romney winning Colorado**

CBS News 10-3. ["Race still tight in battleground Colorado" -- www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57525123/race-still-tight-in-battleground-colorado/]

But while both sides agree that Obama has a slight edge over Mitt Romney in this state where the two men will hold their first debate Wednesday night, Colorado appears -- for now, at least -- to be more competitive than many of the swing states that have recently moved more clearly in the president's direction.¶ Four years ago, Obama won Colorado by 9 percent over John McCain, but the incumbent currently leads Romney by just 3.1 percent in the RCP polling average.¶ Colorado's unemployment rate of 8.2 percent is slightly higher than the national average of 8.1 percent, but according to observers of state politics, there is no single reason why the president's advantage here is less strong than it is in those other battlegrounds.¶ Some say the Centennial State's shift to the left in 2008 may simply not have had the staying power Democrats hoped would be the case.¶ "The history of this state is very much Republican-leaning," said Colorado political strategist Eric Sondermann. "If it's purple, it's on the reddish side of purple, as opposed to the bluish side of purple."¶ Before 2008, Colorado had voted for only one Democratic presidential candidate since 1968 (Bill Clinton in 1992).¶ And as of the end of September, registered Republicans in the state outnumbered Democrats by 871,275 to 806,876 -- with 798,422 voters registered without a party.¶ "You're basically split evenly between Democrats, Republicans and unaffiliated, so it's hard to get any major margin," said a senior Colorado operative working for the Obama campaign. "2008 was a great year but a little bit of an anomaly. That lead really didn't blow open even here until after the Lehman Brothers collapse."¶ The Romney campaign says that its polling indicates Jefferson and Arapahoe counties --two key swing jurisdictions surrounding Denver -- are starting to break their way, but the former Massachusetts governor has spent a significant amount of time and effort shoring up his conservative base far from the state's capital.

**Colorado’s key**

Burnett 12. [Sara, staff writer at the Denver Post “Colorado shapes up as a key swing state in presidential election” Denver Post -- June 11 -- http://www.denverpost.com/politics/ci\_20828446/colorado-shapes-up-key-swing-state-presidential-election#ixzz1yGkIDaIy]

Colorado basked in its newfound status as a swing state in 2008, playing host to the Democratic National Convention and candidate appearances from Denver to Durango. But for all that attention, several dynamics this year make the Centennial State even more competitive — and critical to winning the White House. Unlike 2008, when then-Sen. Barack Obama rode a wave of anti-Republican sentiment with promises of hope and change, there are fewer states this time around that are truly up for grabs. And while Florida and Ohio with their double-digit electoral votes are the big prizes, Obama and Mitt Romney are eyeing Colorado's nine electoral votes — in combination with other Western states such as Nevada, New Mexico and Arizona — to give them the win. "If you look at the map, Colorado and Nevada are two of the true battleground states," said Ethan Axelrod, communications director for Project New America, a progressive Denver-based research and strategy organization. "Both states are still very, very close, and I think they're going to stay that way until November." Paths to victory The campaigns use a combination of history, demographics and polling to determine which states are solidly or leaning red or blue and which states are considered tossups. From there, it's a matter of doing the math — finding ways to combine victories in winnable states to get the candidate to 270 electoral votes, the total needed to win the presidency. A series of polls released last week showed the race tightening in Colorado. A poll of 600 Coloradans by Purple Strategies found 48 percent favored Obama and 46 percent favored Romney. The poll's margin of error was plus or minus 4 percentage points. A Rasmussen Reports poll of 500 likely voters showed both candidates with 45 percent, while 6 percent preferred another candidate and 5 percent were undecided. The margin of error was plus or minus 4.5 percentage points.