### 2ac – A2: T – Can’t Be Moratorium

#### 1) We meet – Moratoriums reduce restrictions

Pence ‘11

Mike, Congressman from Indiana, Reducing Regulation, <http://www.mikepence.com/issues-reducing-regulation/>, jj

Reducing Regulation The State That Works: Reduce Regulatory Burdens to Create a Better Small Business Climate Policy Goal: Give Indiana the best small business climate in America by taking a regulatory time-out until existing regulations are reviewed and by addressing the regulatory barriers to employment. Vision Plan Goals Served: Goal #1: Increasing private sector employment Goal #2: Attracting new investment in Indiana, with emphasis on manufacturing, agriculture, life sciences and logistics Goal #5: Improving the quality of the Hoosier workforce Policy Steps: •Issue an executive order on day one placing a moratorium on new regulations, and initiate a process to review all existing regulations, with some exceptions.[1]

#### 2) Counter interp – reduce means to limit

Free Dictionary

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/reduce>, jj

reduce - narrow or limit; "reduce the influx of foreigners"

tighten

confine, limit, throttle, trammel, restrain, restrict, bound - place limits on (extent or access); "restrict the use of this parking lot"; "limit the time you can spend with your friends"

#### We meet: a moratorium limits regulations

Business Journal, Jan 11th 2012, http://www.bizjournals.com/milwaukee/morning\_roundup/2012/01/johnson-backs-bills-to-limit-federal.html

U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson has written bills to limit government spending by placing a moratorium on all federal regulations until employment improves and reducing the federal government work force. The two bills are part of Johnson's broader effort to improve the economy.

### Case

#### **The EPA air emissions restrictions will crush the natural gas industry**

ARI 12 – Advanced Resources International Inc. report for the American Petroleum Institute, "Estimate of Impacts of EPA Proposals to Reduce Air Emissions from Hydraulic Fracturing Operations,"www.api.org/~/media/Files/Policy/Hydraulic\_Fracturing/NSPS-OG-ARI-Impacts-of-EPA-Air-Rules-Final-Report.ashx

Depending on the REC-Set Use Rate scenario assumed, the following impacts from base case levels are projected in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect (through 2015):¶ • Overall **well drilling** for unconventional resources producing natural gas over 2012 - 2015 would be **reduced by** 31% to 52%, amounting to reductions in drilling ranging from 12,700 to 21,400 wells.¶ • 5.8 to 7.0 quadrillion Btu (Quads) of otherwise economic unconventional natural gas would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 9% to **11% reduction**.¶ • 1.0 to 1.8 billion barrels of otherwise economic unconventional liquids would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 21% to 37% reduction.¶ • Federal royalties of $7.0 to $8.5 billion that would otherwise be collected would not be paid in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ • State revenues from severance taxes amounting to $1.9 to $2.3 billion would be delayed beyond the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ Under either scenario of REC equipment availability, a significant slowdown in unconventional resource development **would occur, resulting in less reserve additions, less production, lower royalties to the Federal government and** private landowners, **and l**ower severance tax payments **to state governments**. The **delays in drilling results in delays in production, which result in the delays in** the **economic benefits** associated with that production. This analysis did not attempt to estimate lost jobs associated with reduced drilling, oil and gas supply services, and indirect employment.

### CP

1. ***presidential signal key to solve***

**Weinstein ‘12**

Bernard L. Weinstein, Associate Director, Maguire Energy Institute at the Southern Methodist University's Cox School of Business, National Journal, 1-17-12, What's Ahead for Natural Gas? http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/whats-ahead-for-natural-gas.php?mrefid=site\_search, jj

**The Presidential election cycle allows us to pin down** current and aspiring **politicians regarding their positions on the important issues** facing our country. While it’s easy to get caught up in the highly divisive and mostly irrelevant social issues that those on the fringes of political ideology stake their reputations, it is important to discuss issues of real substance as well. **In** President **Obama’s effort to establish his record as a job creator, there is one issue that he appears to have flipped on heading toward November, and the economy could benefit if his new stance is *consistent.*** A recent White House jobs report included a section titled “America’s Natural Resource Boom” intimating that the President supported development of natural gas resources in the Marcellus shale. The shale gas boom has already created tens of thousands of ancillary jobs in industries ranging from sand mining to steel pipe manufacturing, and it appears the Obama re-election campaign will try to capitalize on these jobs and use the shale gas boom to buffer the President resume as a jobs creator. **Until now, the Administration has remained skeptical of the drilling technique used to extract natural gas, buying into environmentalist rabble-rousing regarding ground water contamination**. This isn’t to say it’s not important to keep water supplies safe, but to date there hasn’t been a single clear case of ground water contamination resulting from natural gas drilling or fluid disposal. **Additionally, the divisive rhetoric being thrown at companies involved in gas production is hardly helpful as the industry has a vested interest in maintaining safe and secure drill sites to prevent accidents and potentially costly litigation**. **Unfortunately, the pro-development and anti-drilling factions are entrenched in their positions and the result is continued uncertainty regarding the future of natural gas production from shale formations. *Should the President step forward as a leader on this issue***, bringing all parties to the table to discuss the best steps forward to ensure continued investment in shale gas with reasonable regulatory oversight, **that would reassure the industry and the public that he truly embraces America’s natural resource boom as an economic generator. There is precedent for this kind of leadership from the current head of state.** When Harvard Professor Henry Louis Gates Jr. was arrested early in Obama’s term, the President invited him and the arresting officer to a beer summit at the White House to bury the hatchet. Why not pull a similar move on an issue that is infinitely more important for the future of the country? Instead, **key agencies have been responsible for establishing the administration stance on the issue, and the result has been costly delays and regulatory confusion.** The Wall Street Journal has called for Obama to fire Interior Secretary Kenneth Salazar and EPA Administrator Lisa P. Jackson – whose agencies are imposing roadblocks to natural gas development – to prove his commitment to the resource boom. While such actions may be a little extreme, **it is imperative that department heads align their agencies’ actions with the policies of the President** and Congress, as well as the public interest. **The very public platform upon which campaigns are carried out – including prime time television debates, massive advertising efforts, and direct contact with voters – offers voters and the media an opportunity to make the President lay out his plans for shale gas development. Will he send a directive to EPA mandating the timely creation of drilling rules, or leave regulation to the states? What are his targets for production**, domestic gas prices, exports, etc.? **To date, the President and his advisors have projected a mixed message regarding the future of fossil fuels.** **Drilling companies, state regulators, and agency officials are looking for clarity on these issues, and the upcoming election offers a great opportunity to find that clarity.**

#### Zero solvency --- Vermont doesn’t have natural gas

McLure 12 (Jason McLure, 5-8-12, Vermont poised to be first state to outlaw fracking, <https://www.tabroom.com/user/enter/ratings/ordinals_prefs.mhtml?school_id=34127&group_id=4303&entry_id=366437>, jj)

(Reuters) - Vermont will be the first state to outlaw a controversial oil and gas drilling method known as fracking when Governor Peter Shumlin signs a bill banning the practice, a largely symbolic move given the state's apparent lack of energy reserves. Hydraulic fracturing has helped companies tap potentially decades of gas supply and huge amounts of oil from previously inaccessible shale formations dotted across the United States in recent years. Environmentalists say the practice, which involves injecting millions of gallons of chemical-laced water into underground wells, may contaminate groundwater and trigger earthquakes. "Governor Shumlin does support the fracking ban," said Sue Allen, a spokeswoman for Vermont's Democratic governor. "He will sign the legislation when it reaches his desk." Vermont's House and Senate approved the measure last week and the bill is undergoing a final review by legislative staffers before being sent to the governor, Allen said. It is a largely token gesture, given that Vermont does not have any natural gas reserves to speak of, sitting just outside the boundaries of the vast Marcellus shale formation.

#### ) EPA will circumvent the ruling

Hamilton ‘12

Ken Hamilton, Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation Executive Vice President, April 2012, EPA regulatory over reach is slapped down – again! - April 2012 <http://www.wyfb.org/news-center/farm-bureau-views/273-epa-regulatory-over-reach-is-slapped-down-again-april-2012>, jj

This comment should not only send a message to EPA, but should also encourage Congress to step in. Instead of trying to remove the term “navigable” from the Clean Water Act, as is being contemplated, Congress should instead rein in potential future interpretation of federal authority abuses by the Agency or the Army Corp of Engineers. Congress should do this by amending the law to limit the reach of these mega agencies so the federal authority is clear; not open for interpretation by the agencies. We know from past law suits against EPA that they will not limit their own authority and even when the Courts limit their authority they dance around the meaning of the words in the decision in an effort to circumvent the decisions. A unanimous decision from the Supreme Court should give the legislative branch the courage to do what it needs to do.

#### 4) Links to elections – healthcare proves

Stephen Manual, 6/28/2012 (staff writer, “Will Supreme Court judgment help Obama win presidential election?” Accessed 7/26/2012 at <http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/12483143-will-supreme-court-judgment-help-obama-win-presidential-election>, rwg)

Finally, President Barack Obama has carried the day. He stood winner as the Supreme Court ruled on Thursday to uphold the Affordable Care Act. However, the president remained humble during his speech following the decision. He said that it was a victory for the American people and his administration would continue to work for betterment of the people. The Supreme Court judgment is clearly against the anticipation of Republicans, as they were predicting a contrary decision on the issue. The judgment can be called one of the biggest victories of the Obama administration in years. However, the question arises whether the Obama administration will be able to translate the victory into successful election campaign or not. Observers believe the administration would definitely exploit the judgment in its favor and try its best to convince electorates to cast vote for Obama in the upcoming presidential election. The visionary abilities of Obama would be highlighted and people would be told about revolutionary plans of Obama for the people and that all these plans would be implemented only if he is reelected into the office in November’s election. The judgment would also help the Obama administration to undermine capabilities of Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney. Observers opine the judgment dealt a heavy blow to the Republicans, as they believed the court would strike down the individual mandate – at the very least. They were planning to celebrate the judgment and shaming the Obama administration once the verdict was out, but they were shocked after the judgment was released. Observers believe that the Obama administration has got a fresh opportunity to set the house in order and focus more on public-related issues so that they could bag maximum votes in the upcoming presidential election. It is the best opportunity for Obama to sell his Health-Care law to the masses. Mitt Romney, while giving his reaction on the Supreme Court judgment, said that he would repeal the law if elected to the presidency in the November election. He even said that there was a need to get rid of Obama if people want to get rid of Obama-care. Definitely, Republicans would lash out at the law in their public meetings and try to invoke public anger on the issue. Republicans believe the ruling of the Supreme Court can hamper their campaign against Obama.

### Elections 2ac – o good

#### Non-unique:

#### Romney will win --- models predict --- but it’s close

Sherwood 10-26 (I-Hsien Sherwood, 10-26-12, Latino Post, <http://www.latinospost.com/articles/6119/20121026/yale-economists-historical-model-predicts-romney-win.htm>, jj)

One of those methods relies heavily on economics, judging a candidate's chances based on the state of the economy during the campaign. Ray Fair, an economist at Yale, has put together an algorithm that accurately models the outcome of nearly every election since 1916. Using several economic indicators, Fair has found that the adage "people vote their pocketbooks" is actually pretty true. According to The Wall Street Journal, his model looks at several factors: "The per capita growth rate of gross domestic product in the three quarters before the elections. (Voters seem to remember recent economic history more than they do over the span of the quarter). For the first three quarters of this year, GDP per capita grew at a 1.01% annual rate." "Inflation over the course of the entire presidential term, as measured by the GDP price index. The annual rate of inflation by this measure was 1.58%." "The number of quarters during the presidential term that GDP per capita growth exceeded 3.2%. There has been only one such "good news" quarter - the fourth quarter of last year, when GDP per capita grew 3.3%." Given the poor state of the economy, Fair's model favors Republican Mitt Romney as the winner in this year's election, though not by much.

1. ***And, Early voting***

The Week, 10/15/12 (“Early voting: Obama's secret weapon?,” http://theweek.com/article/index/234831/early-voting-obamas-secret-weapon)

Election day is still more than three weeks away, but [President Obama already has a lead](http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2012/10/15/obama_early_voters_incumbent_takes_the_lead_with_early_votes_according_to.html) over Mitt Romney. Forty states have begun early voting, and about 7 percent of likely voters [surveyed by Reuters/Ipsos](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/14/us-usa-campaign-poll-idUSBRE8991FR20121014) say they've already cast their ballots. (Even Mr. and Mrs. Obama are [voting early](https://twitter.com/markknoller/status/257903169005318144).) According toReuters/Ipsos, Obama is ahead with 59 percent of the early votes, compared to a measly 31 percent for Mitt Romney. The poll's sample size is relatively small — only 6,704 voters were surveyed — so its "credibility interval" is 10 percentage points. Even if it's off by that much, though, Obama still has a healthy lead. Of course, Romney has [caught up with Obama](http://theweek.com/article/index/234447/will-mitt-romneys-post-debate-bounce-last) in opinion polls since his big win in the first presidential debate. But is early voting still giving Obama the edge? Early ballots could clinch victory for Obama: "Early voting is hugely significant," [says Dan Hodges at Britain's Telegraph](http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/danhodges/100184978/romney-has-let-his-army-sit-in-the-barracks-while-obamas-troops-are-in-the-field-already/). A third of the ballots cast this year could be submitted before election day. Don't forget that in 2008, "John McCain won more votes than Barack Obama on the day of the poll itself, but Obama had already demolished him in postal ballots." This time around, Republicans are scrambling to play catch-up, "but it's too late." Obama is already halfway home. ["Romney has let his army sit in the barracks, while Obama's troops are in the field already"](http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/danhodges/100184978/romney-has-let-his-army-sit-in-the-barracks-while-obamas-troops-are-in-the-field-already/)

#### Plan not perceived by voters—Hurricane Sandy

Bob King, Politico, 10/26/12, Election in Sandy's shadow, dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=938E15A3-DAB9-4528-8471-303B15DEC7CC

4) The distraction: As with Hurricane Irene last year, Sandy is threatening the media epicenters of New York and Washington, guaranteeing that the networks will be in All Storm All the Time mode just as Obama and Romney are trying to make their final pitches to voters. That leaves a lot less time for talking heads to parse the details of Obama’s jobs plans, the economic policy speech that Romney gave Friday in Iowa, Friday’s report on GDP growth or whether it was right for the president to call his opponent a “bull——er.” This could mostly hurt Obama, who still trails in many national tracking polls and has been trying to recapture the momentum he had in September. Or it could keep Romney from closing the deal in states where he’s still behind, like Ohio.

#### Obama is pro-fracking now

**Loris ‘12**

Nicolas, 1-32, Heritage, The Fracking Truth on Government’s Role in Natural Gas Production <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/01/31/the-fracking-truth-on-governments-role-in-natural-gas-production/>, jj

President **Obama has been on a kick to promote natural gas production**. **He said in his State of the Union address, “And by the way, it was public research dollars, over the course of 30 years, that helped develop the technologies to extract all this natural gas out of shale rock—reminding us that government support is critical** in helping businesses get new energy ideas off the ground.”

#### Romney won’t label China currency manipulator

Dadush et. al ‘12

Uri Dadush is director of Carnegie’s International Economics Program. Shimelse Ali is an economist in the International Economics Program. Zaahira Wyne is the managing editor of Carnegie’s International Economic Bulletin.

August 2, 2012, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, What Does the U.S. Election Mean for the World Economy? <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/2012/08/02/what-does-u.s.-election-mean-for-world-economy/d5mp>, jj

Trade

Differences on trade policy are marginal. Both candidates intend to implement the three U.S. free trade agreements with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia and seem to generally agree on a Trans-Pacific Partnership as well as on reducing the red tape that accompanies trade with Europe. While Romney is a strong supporter of the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Obama continues to propose amending it by including tougher labor and environmental standards. Romney’s election rhetoric is tougher on China than is the incumbent’s. But, with China’s current account surplus declining sharply, designating Beijing as a currency manipulator, never mind imposing punitive tariffs, is unlikely—notwithstanding Romney’s campaign pledge to do so on his first day in office. In fact, trade agreements with China may get more attention, whether in an Obama second term—especially if Republicans regain the Senate—or in a Republican administration.

#### US China relations are resilient – election posturing won’t affect them

Ding 3-24 [Sheng, Associate Professor of Political Science at Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, “Don’t Worry About the China Bashing”, The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2012/03/24/don%E2%80%99t-worry-about-the-china-bashing/?all=true>]

Still, safe though the attacks on China might feel, they are also unlikely to have much impact on American voters. American voters as a whole are generally seen as having little interest in foreign policy issues, whether because of a lack of knowledge on foreign policy issues or a feeling that foreign policy has no particular relevance to their lives. Most American voters focus on domestic issues – jobs, taxes and gas prices, as well as social issues like gun violence, gay marriage and abortion. The fact is that although China is the United States’ most important bilateral relationship, American voters won’t be casting their votes on the basis of a candidate’s China policies. And anyway, the U.S. and Chinese economies are so integrated that U.S. policymakers can’t simply cut their constituencies off from China. So, does all this China bashing really matter – and does it risk inflaming already tense ties? There’s a long tradition, especially since the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet foe, of American presidential candidates attacking China. Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama all attacked their predecessor’s China policies. Some went further than rhetoric, taking key policy decisions to underscore their “toughness.” For example, in September 1992, President George H.W. Bush approved the sale of 150 F-16 jet fighters to Taiwan, a move viewed by the Chinese government as “the most hideous U.S. arms sale to Taiwan since 1979.” In March 1996, President Bill Clinton ordered two U.S. aircraft carrier battle groups to the Taiwan Strait in response to China’s provocative military exercises in the lead-up to Taiwan’s first democratic election. The move helped underscore Clinton’s readiness to stand up to China in support of a fledgling democracy. But election year posturing – and the ups and downs of U.S.-China relations more generally – shouldn’t overshadow the fact that successive U.S. and Chinese governments have made ongoing efforts to institutionalize bilateral relations. Yes, the two nations have different political and economic systems, and their peoples sometimes have very different world views. And these differences can lead to prejudice. But the communications revolution of the past two decades also means that there are constantly expanding opportunities for Americans and Chinese to interact on many different levels, which should eventually encourage greater understanding. The reality is that much of the heated political rhetoric over China will die down once the presidential election is over. Despite the claims by some candidates to the contrary, we can safely assume that come January, whoever comes out on top in November will deal with China in a pragmatic and constructive manner.

#### Obama makes war with china more likely

Ben Coes 9-30-11, a former speechwriter in the George H.W. Bush administration, & author, “The disease of a weak president”, The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2011/09/30/the-disease-of-a-weak-president/

The disease of a weak president usually begins with the Achilles’ heel all politicians are born with — the desire to be popular. It leads to pandering to different audiences, people and countries and creates a sloppy, incoherent set of policies. Ironically, it ultimately results in that very politician losing the trust and respect of friends and foes alike. In the case of Israel, those of us who are strong supporters can at least take comfort in the knowledge that Tel Aviv will do whatever is necessary to protect itself from potential threats from its unfriendly neighbors. While it would be preferable for the Israelis to be able to count on the United States, in both word and deed, the fact is right now they stand alone. Obama and his foreign policy team have undercut the Israelis in a multitude of ways. Despite this, I wouldn’t bet against the soldiers of Shin Bet, Shayetet 13 and the Israeli Defense Forces. But Obama’s weakness could — in other places — have implications far, far worse than anything that might ultimately occur in Israel. The triangular plot of land that connects Pakistan, India and China is held together with much more fragility and is built upon a truly foreboding foundation of religious hatreds, radicalism, resource envy and nuclear weapons. If you can only worry about preventing one foreign policy disaster, worry about this one. Here are a few unsettling facts to think about: First, Pakistan and India have fought three wars since the British de-colonized and left the region in 1947. All three wars occurred before the two countries had nuclear weapons. Both countries now possess hundreds of nuclear weapons, enough to wipe each other off the map many times over. Second, Pakistan is 97% Muslim. It is a question of when — not if — Pakistan elects a radical Islamist in the mold of Ayatollah Khomeini as its president. Make no mistake, it will happen, and when it does the world will have a far greater concern than Ali Khamenei or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a single nuclear device. Third, China sits at the northern border of both India and Pakistan. China is strategically aligned with Pakistan. Most concerning, China covets India’s natural resources. Over the years, it has slowly inched its way into the northern tier of India-controlled Kashmir Territory, appropriating land and resources and drawing little notice from the outside world. In my book, Coup D’Etat, I consider this tinderbox of colliding forces in Pakistan, India and China as a thriller writer. But thriller writers have the luxury of solving problems by imagining solutions on the page. In my book, when Pakistan elects a radical Islamist who then starts a war with India and introduces nuclear weapons to the theater, America steps in and removes the Pakistani leader through a coup d’état. I wish it was that simple. The more complicated and difficult truth is that we, as Americans, must take sides. We must be willing to be unpopular in certain places. Most important, we must be ready and willing to threaten our military might on behalf of our allies. And our allies are Israel and India. There are many threats out there — Islamic radicalism, Chinese technology espionage, global debt and half a dozen other things that smarter people than me are no doubt worrying about. But the single greatest threat to America is none of these. The single greatest threat facing America and our allies is a weak U.S. president. It doesn’t have to be this way. President Obama could — if he chose — develop a backbone and lead. Alternatively, America could elect a new president. It has to be one or the other. The status quo is simply not an option.

#### Obama causes defense cuts

Dreazen ‘12

Yochi Dreazen is a senior correspondent (military affairs and national security) for National Journal. 6-8-12, the Atlantic, How Obama and Romney Differ—and Don't—on Foreign Policy <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/06/how-obama-and-romney-differ-and-dont-on-foreign-policy/258283/>, jj

National-security and foreign-policy issues are taking a clear backseat to the economy in this year's presidential election. That's a shame, because the candidates offer voters clear choices on issues like the size of the armed forces and whether the U.S. should go it alone in dealing with Syria. At the same time, there is little daylight between them on the two most important national-security questions of the moment: the pace of the troop drawdown in Afghanistan and how far Washington should go to restrain Iran's nuclear ambitions. DOLLARS AND CENTS Romney and Obama have clashed over a pair of fundamental and complicated questions. First, in this era of diminished resources, what kind of role should the U.S. military play in the world? And second, can--or should--the United States continue to shoulder its long-standing duty as the world's policeman? Obama offers one set of answers to those questions. In December 2009, the president traveled to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point to announce his plan to surge 33,000 troops into Afghanistan. He promised, though, that he wouldn't keep troops there indefinitely because, simply put, the financial costs were too high. "I refuse to set goals that go beyond our responsibility, our means, or our interests," he said, noting that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan had already cost the United States $1 trillion that could have been spent at home. "We've failed to appreciate the connection between our national security and our economy.... We can't simply afford to ignore the price of these wars." The president has since announced plans to shave $487 billion from the Pentagon's budget over the next decade, partly by cutting 100,000 ground troops and buying fewer next-generation Air Force fighters and Navy warships. The "sequester," or across-the-board automatic budget reductions, slated to kick in at the end of the year will slice another $500 billion from Defense Department coffers. Obama has made it clear that he doesn't want to see those cuts take effect, but he says he's willing to suffer the consequences rather than let Congress off the hook on a deficit-reduction deal. He says he would veto Republican efforts to remove the defense cuts from the sequester. Romney has a starkly different national-defense philosophy. He has promised to reverse what he calls Obama's "massive" defense cuts and boost the Pentagon's budget. The presumptive GOP nominee says he wants to add 100,000 ground troops, increase the Navy's ship-buying budget from nine to 15 vessels a year, and maintain the current fleet of carrier battle groups, the most powerful--and most expensive--weapon in the U.S. seaborne arsenal. The Republican also wants to purchase more F-35s, a next-generation model of amazingly advanced, but staggeringly expensive, stealth warplanes.

#### Defense cuts trigger cause prolif and nuclear war

Kagan ’11 (Robert, 1-24, The Weekly Standard, Vol 16, No 18, “The Price of Power,” <http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/price-power_533696.html?page=2>, jj)

Today the international situation is also one of high risk. • The terrorists who would like to kill Americans on U.S. soil constantly search for safe havens from which to plan and carry out their attacks. American military actions in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Yemen, and elsewhere make it harder for them to strike and are a large part of the reason why for almost a decade there has been no repetition of September 11. To the degree that we limit our ability to deny them safe haven, we increase the chances they will succeed. • American forces deployed in East Asia and the Western Pacific have for decades prevented the outbreak of major war, provided stability, and kept open international trading routes, making possible an unprecedented era of growth and prosperity for Asians and Americans alike. Now the United States faces a new challenge and potential threat from a rising China which seeks eventually to push the U.S. military’s area of operations back to Hawaii and exercise hegemony over the world’s most rapidly growing economies. Meanwhile, a nuclear-armed North Korea threatens war with South Korea and fires ballistic missiles over Japan that will someday be capable of reaching the west coast of the United States. Democratic nations in the region, worried that the United States may be losing influence, turn to Washington for reassurance that the U.S. security guarantee remains firm. ***If the United States cannot provide that assurance because it is cutting back its military capabilities, they will have to choose between accepting Chinese dominance and striking out on their own, possibly by building nuclear weapons.*** • In the Middle East, Iran seeks to build its own nuclear arsenal, supports armed radical Islamic groups in Lebanon and Palestine, and has linked up with anti-American dictatorships in the Western Hemisphere. The prospects of new instability in the region grow every day as a decrepit regime in Egypt clings to power, crushes all moderate opposition, and drives the Muslim Brotherhood into the streets. A nuclear-armed Pakistan seems to be ever on the brink of collapse into anarchy and radicalism. Turkey, once an ally, now seems bent on an increasingly anti-American Islamist course. The prospect of war between Hezbollah and Israel grows, and with it the possibility of war between Israel and Syria and possibly Iran. There, too, nations in the region increasingly look to Washington for reassurance, and if they decide the United States cannot be relied upon they will have to decide whether to succumb to Iranian influence or build their own nuclear weapons to resist it. In the 1990s, after the Soviet Union had collapsed and the biggest problem in the world seemed to be ethnic conflict in the Balkans, it was at least plausible to talk about cutting back on American military capabilities. ***In the present, increasingly dangerous international environment, in which terrorism and great power rivalry vie as the greatest threat to American security and interests, cutting military capacities is simply reckless***. Would we increase the risk of strategic failure in an already risky world, despite the near irrelevance of the defense budget to American fiscal health, just so we could tell American voters that their military had suffered its “fair share” of the pain? The nature of the risk becomes plain when one considers the nature of the cuts that would have to be made to have even a marginal effect on the U.S. fiscal crisis. Many are under the illusion, for instance, that if the United States simply withdrew from Iraq and Afghanistan and didn’t intervene anywhere else for a while, this would have a significant impact on future deficits. But, in fact, projections of future massive deficits already assume the winding down of these interventions.Withdrawal from the two wars would scarcely make a dent in the fiscal crisis. Nor can meaningful reductions be achieved by cutting back on waste at the Pentagon—which Secretary of Defense Gates has already begun to do and which has also been factored into deficit projections. If the United States withdrew from Iran and Afghanistan tomorrow, cut all the waste Gates can find, and even eliminated a few weapons programs—all this together would still not produce a 10 percent decrease in overall defense spending. In fact, the only way to get significant savings from the defense budget—and by “significant,” we are still talking about a tiny fraction of the cuts needed to bring down future deficits—is to cut force structure: fewer troops on the ground; fewer airplanes in the skies; fewer ships in the water; fewer soldiers, pilots, and sailors to feed and clothe and provide benefits for. To cut the size of the force, however, requires reducing or eliminating the missions those forces have been performing. Of course, there are any number of think tank experts who insist U.S. forces can be cut by a quarter or third or even by half and still perform those missions. But this is snake oil. Over the past two decades, the force has already been cut by a third. Yet no administration has reduced the missions that the larger force structures of the past were designed to meet. To fulfill existing security commitments, to remain the “world’s power balancer of choice,” as Leslie Gelb puts it, to act as “the only regional balancer against China in Asia, Russia in eastern Europe, and Iran in the Middle East” requires at least the current force structure, and almost certainly more than current force levels. Those who recommend doing the same with less are only proposing a policy of insufficiency, where the United States makes commitments it cannot meet except at high risk of failure. The only way to find substantial savings in the defense budget, therefore, is to change American strategy fundamentally. The Simpson-Bowles commission suggests as much, by calling for a reexamination of America’s “21st century role,” although it doesn’t begin to define what that new role might be.

#### Perception of Obama win causes Israel to strike Iran

Poor ‘12

Jeff Poor covers the media for The Daily Caller. The Daily Caller, 7-8-12, Krauthammer: Israelis will attack Iran if they think Obama will win re-election, <http://dailycaller.com/2012/07/08/krauthammer-israelis-will-attack-iran-if-they-think-obama-will-win-re-election/#ixzz23dBw4BGG>, jj

On Friday’s “Special Report,” Washington Post columnist Charles Krauthammer warned that Americans should expect Israel to attack Iran if President Barack Obama’s re-election appears likely. Krauthammer explained that there could be a punitive response from the Obama administration, which would be less likely before he is re-elected. “If they think Obama will win reelection I think it’s likely they will attack before, because afterwards there is no way to tell how Obama would punish Israel and they would be vulnerable to sanctions and other measure of the United States,” he said. Krauthammer reminded viewers of the time frame advanced by Defense Secretary Leon Panetta earlier this year, and explained how that is a sign that “the clock is running.” “The window is between now — remember, the Secretary of Defense said earlier in year that Israel would have attacked by now, attack in April, May, June,” he continued. “The clock is running. They are simply waiting to make sure that the sham negotiations are declared over, rather than put on life support — to say all options have been tried and now we have to defend ourselves.”

#### The impact is great power wars and the global economy

Trabanco 09(Independent researcher of geopoltical and military affairs, “The Middle Eastern Powder Keg Can Explode at Anytime,” globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=11762)

In case of an Israeli and/or American attack against Iran, Ahmadinejad's government will certainly respond. A possible countermeasure would be to fire Persian ballistic missiles against Israel and maybe even against American military bases in the regions. Teheran will unquestionably resort to its proxies like Hamas or Hezbollah (or even some of its Shiite allies it has in Lebanon or Saudi Arabia) to carry out attacks against Israel, America and their allies, effectively setting in flames a large portion of the Middle East. The ultimate weapon at Iranian disposal is to block the Strait of Hormuz. If such chokepoint is indeed asphyxiated, that would dramatically increase the price of oil, this a very threatening retaliation because it will bring intense financial and economic havoc upon the West, which is already facing significant trouble in those respects. In short, the necessary conditions for a major war in the Middle East are given. Such conflict could rapidly spiral out of control and thus a relatively minor clash could quickly and dangerously escalate by engulfing the whole region and perhaps even beyond. There are many key players: the Israelis, the Palestinians, the Arabs, the Persians and their respective allies and some great powers could become involved in one way or another (America, Russia, Europe, China). Therefore, any miscalculation by any of the main protagonists can trigger something no one can stop. Taking into consideration that the stakes are too high, perhaps it is not wise to be playing with fire right in the middle of a powder keg.

#### Romney averts economic collapse

Weisenthal ‘12

Joe Weisenthal, Prior to joining Business Insider in October 2008, Joe was a correspondent for paidContent.org, as well as the Opening Bell editor at Dealbreaker.com. He previously was a writer and analyst for Techdirt.com, and before that worked as an analyst for money management firm Prentiss Smith & Co. He got started writing with his own infrequently updated blog TheStalwart.com. A graduate of The University of Texas at Austin, Joe's interests include Chinese food, chess and poker. He currently has the title of Deputy Editor.

May 12, 2012, Business Insider, It's More Clear Than Ever That If Romney Loses, The Economy Is Going To Implode <http://www.businessinsider.com/only-mitt-romney-can-stave-off-a-new-debt-ceiling-fiasco-2012-5>, jj

It's More Clear Than Ever That If Romney Loses, The Economy Is Going To Implode Back in April we made the argument that a Mitt Romney win would be better for the economy, based on fairly simple logic: A Mitt Romney victory would see higher government deficits, which is just what this struggling economy needs right now to regain full health. If Obama wins, there's a good chance that we'll fly off the fiscal cliff, as the political gridlock will see spending cuts kick in, and perhaps even higher taxes. If Romney wins, not only will taxes stay low, Republicans will drop their opposition to government spending and deficits. That's because parties in power always support higher deficits and spending. It's just what they do. We'd love to hear someone say with a straight face that Republicans, if given full power, would seriously stick to their principles of limiting government. Opposing deficits is strictly the purview of the opposition party. So the Keynesian choice is Romney. And as Matt Yglesias makes clear in his latest column for Slate, this choice is actually even more urgent. That's because House Republicans voted this week to renege on the debt ceiling deal made last summer. Remember as part of the deal that was made, starting in 2012 there are going to be cuts to domestic spending and military spending. But Republicans have voted to remove the military cuts, and put the entire burden on domestic spending. Those changes won't actually happen, but it's a show of extraordinarily bad faith that after that long fight that brought the country close to the brink of disaster last summer that Republicans are already trying to unwind the deal. What this means is that good faith fights over the next debt ceiling question (which will come up late this year or early next year) will be 100% impossible. As Yglesias says in the subtitle of his column: House Republicans just reneged on the debt-ceiling deal, making a default in 2013 almost inevitable. Says Yglesias: If Mitt Romney wins that may not be a problem, as he and congressional Republicans could just quickly lift the ceiling. But if Obama’s still in office, we’re looking at a potential disaster. Having won concessions by using the debt ceiling as leverage in the past, the GOP isn’t going to quietly go back to the old complain-and-agree approach. But there’s no way Democrats can bargain with a party that’s so eager to wriggle out of the terms of deals. So again, it's clear that if you want higher spending and a prevention of cataclysmic self-inflicted wounds out of Washington, Romney is the choice.

### China add-on

#### Plan prevents US China energy competition

**LeVine ‘12**

Steve LeVine writes about energy for Foreign Policy, 7-21, Herald Online, The consequences of the new era of oil abundance <http://www.heraldonline.com/2012/07/21/4127898/the-consequences-of-the-new-era.html>, jj

Cooperation: Western suspicion of China has been fueled by its aggressive acquisition of natural resources around the world, especially oil and gas fields. But “in a world of plenty,” said Ed Chow of the Center for Security and International Studies, “the zero-sum nature of the discussion could come out of the equation.” Chow thinks we are already seeing the first stages of this more relaxed future in the U.S. attitude toward billions of dollars in recent Chinese investment in U.S. shale gas and oil fields. That is far different from 2005, when public and political opinion aborted China's attempt to buy Unocal almost before it reached a serious stage. Chow likes this new atmosphere. “It was never a very healthy phobia that we had to begin with,” he said. Looking ahead, Chow wonders whether the United States might end up collaborating with China and India in patrolling the Persian Gulf.

#### This causes US-China war

**Yoshihara & Sokolsky, ‘2** Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, NDU Analyst, Winter/Spring, 26 Fletcher F. World Aff. 63

The combination of China's geopolitical ambitions, unquenchable thirst for foreign oil, and eagerness to boost arms sales has raised the worrisome specter that Beijing and Washington might be on a collision course in the Persian Gulf. In this view, as energy security in particular becomes a central component of China's national interests, Beijing will be compelled to increase its activism in the region and driven to challenge American hegemony there. The result could be a direct confrontation between China and the United States. n1

#### Global nuclear war

**Hunkovic, 09** – American Military University (Lee, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict,” <http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf>)

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it. However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

### Japan Econ

***Exports key to Japan’s economy***

**Podesta ‘12**

John Podesta is Chair and Counselor of the Center for American Progress and the Center for American Progress Action Fund. Under his leadership, American Progress has become a notable leader in the development of and advocacy for progressive policy. Prior to founding the Center in 2003, Podesta served as White House chief of staff to President William J. Clinton. He served in the president's cabinet and as a principal on the National Security Council. While in the White House, he also served as both an assistant to the president and deputy chief of staff, as well as staff secretary and a senior policy advisor on government information, privacy, telecommunications security, and regulatory policy. Most recently, Podesta served as co-chair of President Obama’s transition, where he coordinated the priorities of the incoming administration’s agenda, oversaw the development of its policies, and spearheaded its appointments of major cabinet secretaries and political appointees. Additionally, Podesta has held numerous positions on Capitol Hill, including counselor to Democratic Leader Sen. Thomas A. Daschle (1995-1996); chief counsel for the Senate Agriculture Committee (1987-1988); and chief minority counsel for the Senate Judiciary Subcommittees on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks; Security and Terrorism; and Regulatory Reform (1981-1987). A Chicago native, Podesta is a graduate of Knox College and the Georgetown University Law Center, where he is currently a visiting professor of law. He also authored The Power of Progress: How America’s Progressives Can (Once Again) Save Our Economy, Our Climate and Our Country.

4-13-12, Center for American Progress, U.S. Rebalance to Asia: Japan as the Key Partner <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/04/podesta_japan.html>, jj

Finally, **I want to say a few words about the near-term energy challenges here in Japan and how the United States can help you to meet them, while advancing both of our countries’ energy goals.** As you know, **both of our countries face serious energy challenges**. Here in Japan they are physical and immediate. **Only 1 of Japan’s 54 commercial nuclear reactors is now online**—and it is not clear if and when the other reactors will be restarted. **These reactors produced almost one third of Japan’s energy before the earthquake**. Making up for that lost capacity is daunting, and Japan has done a tremendous job responding to that crisis thus far. **But Japan had planned to get 50 percent of its total energy from nuclear power by 2030, largely in order to meet its aggressive carbon pollution reduction goals**, and the one thing that is certain is that Japan will not reopen and build the additional reactors it requires to produce that much nuclear power. At best, Japan will produce 15 to 20 percent of its energy from nuclear power within the next 20 years. **So today Japan faces a dual challenge: making up for the lost capacity of its nuclear reactors, while also staying on a low-carbon development path and meeting its future energy goals. How Japan chooses to meet that challenge will have implications far beyond the environment**. Japan is already the world’s third largest importer of oil, after the United States and China. Previously, Japan used oil as a back-up source of generation power, but today, in light of last spring’s disaster, **Japan’s reliance on oil is increasing, by about 9 percent year-on-year.** With no margin for error after the events of 3/11, ***this reliance is dangerous: the rising price of oil threatens Japan’s still-recovering economy***, and the rising tensions over Iran’s nuclear program further complicate a difficult situation. Japan is working to reduce its Iranian oil imports, but has not ended them entirely due to its significant short-term energy needs. The United States understands Japan’s position and has worked with Japan to make sure that sanctions on Iran are crippling, while accommodating Japan’s need to wean itself from Iranian oil. But we also understand that **in both our countries, our continued reliance on oil distorts our national security goals.** Fortunately, **the United States is in a strong position to help Japan reduce its growing reliance on foreign oil—and the biggest thing we can do**, in the near-term and mid-term, **is to** allow Japan to **import** some of **our vast natural gas supply. Japan**, for its part, **is already importing more natural gas to help make up for its lost nuclear capacity**: Last year Japan imported 12 percent more natural gas than it did in 2010. But most of this gas came from Asian markets, at prices that are four times higher than natural gas prices in the United States. Together with increased oil imports, these costly gas purchases have helped eliminate Japan’s trade surplus and caused energy prices to soar. **America’s natural gas can help fill that gap, and America has an interest in helping fulfill Japan’s energy needs**. **The fracking boom has caused supply in the U.S. to grow dramatically**, and natural gas prices in the U.S. are actually too low for many companies to be able to profitably extract and sell natural gas domestically. So **there is room to** give these companies the ability to **export some natural gas to other markets that are currently dependent on more expensive supplies**. Most importantly, **it is in our shared interest to reduce our reliance on energy that comes from unstable and potentially hostile regimes—and as two of the world’s largest oil importers, working to reduce our dependence on oil sends a powerful signal to the global community that we are seriously and soberly working to address those threats.**

#### Nuclear war with China

**Elliot 2** (Larry, Staff Writer – Guardian, “Defenceless Japan Awaits Typhoon”, The Guardian, 2-11, Lexis)

Even so, the west cannot afford to be complacent about what is happening in Japan, unless it intends to use the country as a test case to explore whether a full-scale depression is less painful now than it was 70 years ago. Action is needed, and quickly because this is an economy that could soak up some of the world's excess capacity if functioning properly. A strong Japan is not only essential for the long-term health of the global economy, it is also needed as a counter-weight to the growing power of China. A collapse in the Japanese economy, which looks ever more likely, would have profound ramifications; some experts believe it could even unleash a wave of extreme nationalism that would push the country into conflict with its bigger (and nuclear) neighbour.