# Rd 2 vs Wake CD

## 1nc

**1nc – Production Must Be extraction**

***Interpretation --- Production means drilling for fossil fuels or capturing renewable energy at wind and solar farms***

**Conservation Measures Partnership** [no date]

<http://www.conservationmeasures.org/initiatives/threats-actions-taxonomies/threats-taxonomy/3-energy-production-mining>, jj

3 **Energy Production** & Mining

Definition: Threats from **production of** non-biological **resources**

Exposition: Various forms of water use (for example, dams for hydro power) could also be put in this class, but these threats seemed more related to other threats that involve alterations to hydrologic regimes. As a result, they should go in 7.2 Dams & Water Management/Use.

3.1 **Oil & Gas Drilling**

**Definition: Exploring for, developing, and producing petroleum and other liquid hydrocarbons**

Exposition: Oil and gas pipelines go into 4.2 Utility & Service Lines. Oil spills that occur at the drill site should be placed here; those that come from oil tankers or pipelines should go in 4. Transportation & Service Corridors or in 9.2 Industrial & Military Effluents, depending on your perspective.

**Examples:**

**•oil wells**

**•deep sea natural gas drilling**

3.2 Mining & Quarrying

Definition: Exploring for, developing, and producing minerals and rocks

Exposition: It is a judgment call whether deforestation caused by strip mining should be in this category or in 5.3 Logging & Wood Harvesting – it depends on whether the primary motivation for the deforestation is access to the trees or to the minerals. Sediment or toxic chemical runoff from mining should be placed in 9.2 Industrial & Military Effluents if it is the major threat from a mining operation.

Examples:

•coal strip mines

•alluvial gold panning

•gold mines

•rock quarries

•sand/salt mines

•coral mining

•deep sea nodules

•guano harvesting

•dredging outside of shipping lanes

3.3 **Renewable Energy**

**Definition: Exploring, developing, and producing renewable energy**

Exposition: Hydropower should be put in 7.2 Dams & Water Management/Use.

**Examples:**

•geothermal power production

•**solar farms**

•**wind farms** (including birds flying into windmills)

•tidal farms

***Violation --- “production” is the extraction and collection process --- the plan affects the conversion phase which is distinct***

**Wilbanks et al ‘06**

Lead Author: Thomas J. Wilbanks1 Contributing Authors: Marilyn Brown,1 Ken Caldeira,2 Bill Fulkerson,3 Eric Haites,4 Steve Pacala,5 and David Fairman6 1Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2Carnegie Institution, 3University of Tennessee, 4Margaree Consultants, 9 5Princeton University, and 6Consensus Building Institute, Inc.

Chapter 6. Energy Extraction and Conversion

<http://cdiac.ornl.gov/SOCCR/pdf/SOCCR_Chapter06.pdf>, jj

Carbon **emissions from energy extraction** **(e.g.,** **mining and oil/gas production**) **and conversion** (**e.g**., 19 **electricity generation** and refining) are one of the “big three” sectors accounting for most of total 20 emissions from human systems, along with industry and transportation. The largest share of total 21 emissions from energy supply (not including energy end use) are from (a) coal and other fossil fuel use in 22 producing electricity and (b) fossil fuel conversion activities such as oil refining. Other emission sources 23 are less well-defined but generally small, such as methane from reservoirs established partly to support 24 hydropower production (Tremblay et al., 2004), or from materials production (e.g., metals production) 25 associated with other renewable or nuclear energy technologies.

***Vote negative***

***Limits---including conversion doubles the size of the topic --- causes bidirectionality by allowing the aff to affect both the supply and demand of an energy --- err neg because the terms incentives and restrictions serve no limiting function***

***Ground---all disads are based on increasing the actual supply of energy---they allow the aff to just use current reserves of energy without actually defending more energy is produced, mooting da’s like oil prices and tradeoff***

**Counterplan:**

***The United States federal government should not remove restrictions on coal production or increase incentives for coal production***

**Da**

***Absent external factors like the plan, multiple factors ensure Romney wins a tight race --- this card answers all their warrants***

**Trende 9-20** Sean Trende is Senior Elections Analyst for RealClearPolitics, 9-20-12, State of the Race, Part 2: Why Romney Wins <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/20/state_of_the_race_part_2_why_romney_wins_115513-3.html>, jj

The basic argument for why Romney is being written off far too early is pretty simple. He trails the incumbent president by 48.2 percent to 45.3 percent in the RCP Average seven weeks before the election. **There are very few races that have been this close**, this far out from Election Day, **that would be characterized as anything other than a tossup.** Of course, we can dig quite a bit deeper than that: **1) The economy is still lousy**, but as I noted yesterday, it is not so bad as to make Obama an automatic loser, as many pundits assumed. The years that have been catastrophic for presidential parties -- 1980 and 2008 -- have been years when the economy has actually been contracting during the election year. At the same time, **most years with economies similar to this one** -- 1960, 1976, 1992, 2000, 2004 -- **see party power transfer**, albeit in a reasonably close election. The one outlier here is 2004, where an incumbent president won by a healthy share in a mediocre economy. But Bush lost voters who cast their ballots based on the economy by over 60 points that year. What saved him was that 47 percent of voters either voted on moral issues (such as gay marriage) or terrorism or taxes. Those were the only issues that Bush beat Kerry on in the exit polls, but it was enough. Again, Obama probably gets graded on a curve here given the mess he inherited. Whether that is the equivalent of the War on Terror in 2004 remains to be seen. **2) Most of what we’re seeing in the polls is consistent with a close race**. Rather than cherry-picking favorite polls (“Obama is up 8 in Pew -- landslide!” “Obama is down 2 in Rasmussen -- he’s doomed!”), let’s just look at simple poll averages. Obama is up 2.9 points in the RCP Average. **His bounce peaked at 49 percent, which is just barely below the threshold he probably needs in order to win.** If we assume that the average is his “true” value -- and we should note that Gallup, Rasmussen and AP/GfK are the only national polls to include data from any of the last three days -- then we should expect to see a bunch of polls showing an Obama lead of between one and five points, a poll or two showing a slight Romney lead, and a poll or two showing a high single-digit lead for the president. That’s exactly what we see. When a Democrat is up three points, we expect to see decent Democratic leads in the two-to-four-point range in swing states like Ohio, Colorado, Iowa and Nevada, expect to see close races in places like Florida, and expect to see mid-to-high-digit Democratic leads in places like Pennsylvania and Michigan. This is what we tend to see. Since state polling is more sparse than national polling, we’re more susceptible to the outliers: Obama isn’t up 14 in Wisconsin (he wouldn’t be campaigning there if he were), but I don’t think he’s only up one in Colorado, either. Taken as a whole, the state polling is consistent with the national polls. And of course, when you have a bounce such as this one, which is driven by increased Democratic enthusiasm, you expect to see down-ticket races for House and Senate move toward the Democrats, as more Democrats push through the likely-voter screens. Which is again exactly what we are seeing -- it isn’t accidental that we’ve seen a flood of polling from Democratic House candidates in the past few days, while their Republican counterparts have been relatively silent. **3) History suggests the race will tighten further**. Yesterday I mentioned an article by Nate Cohn of The New Republic in which he observed that that “[i]f Romney can’t take a lead over the next week or so, he will be forced to do something never successfully attempted: mount an unprecedented comeback against an incumbent president.” Cohn is absolutely correct: No challenger who trailed at this point in September has ever won. But if we look at the data a different way, we realize that **Obama has to pull off some unprecedented feats of his own if he hopes to win**. The September time frame is a bit tricky for comparison purposes, because the incumbent party convention occurred in mid-August until 2004. So a challenger who trailed his opponent in September was doing so after the convention bounces had pretty much settled. So let’s instead use data that Nate Silver has helpfully compiled identifying where candidates stood a given number of weeks before and after a convention, regardless of when that convention occurred. Table 1 shows the incumbent party’s lead in the polls two weeks after its convention -- roughly where we are today -- and the ultimate result. Years with incumbents are in boldface: As you can see, **no incumbent party has ever held on to the White House while leading by fewer than four points two weeks after its convention**; **no incumbent president has ever won re-election while leading by fewer than five points** (more on the 2004 comparisons later). In other words, **winning under these circumstances would be unprecedented** (note also that Ronald Reagan was actually tied with Jimmy Carter in a simple poll average at this point in 1980). Perhaps an even better way to look at this is Table 2: This lists the races where incumbent presidents sought re-election since 1968. It then shows how those races broke between two weeks after the incumbent president’s convention and Election Day. On average, they moved 3.7 points toward the challenger (positive numbers indicate movement in that direction; negative numbers show movement toward the incumbent). If you eliminate 1976, as Cohn suggests (since Jerry Ford was a pseudo-incumbent), the average movement is six points toward the challenger. Indeed with the exception of 1992 -- a difficult race from which to draw conclusions given Ross Perot’s on-again/off-again participation in the race -- every contest with an incumbent has broken at least three points toward the challenging party from this point in the race through Election Day. And given the frequent comparisons to 2004, it’s worth bearing in mind where that race stood at this point. George Bush led by 6.8 points as opposed to Barack Obama’s current 2.9 percent. His bounce peaked at 50.4 percent, as opposed to Obama’s 49 percent. **If Obama continues to run behind Bush on either metric by similar margins through Election Day, *he loses*.** In fairness, we can’t be that precise with such a small number of observations. But it would also be foolish to ignore such a consistent trend. ***Absent some external shock, we can probably expect that the tendency will be for this race to tighten further.* 4) Romney actually has led -- you just couldn’t see it**. Much is made of the fact that Romney has never led in the RCP Average. But remember, throughout this cycle, most of the polls were using registered, rather than likely-voter, screens. There are good reasons for this, but if we’re going to do an apples-to-apples comparison, we have to take account of this fact. **Had pollsters turned on their likely-voter screens throughout, Romney and Obama probably would have been trading leads throughout the spring and summer**. After all, **Romney’s poll numbers would have been two-to-three points higher** (given the average movement we saw when pollsters activated their likely-voter screens), and Obama’s lead fluctuated between 0.2 points and 3.8 points. **5) Obama’s job approval is still low**. As I mentioned yesterday, it is significant that the president’s job approval is approaching 50 percent, as job approval and election outcomes correlate strongly. Put differently, **presidents almost never receive a higher percentage of the vote than their approval percentage with the electorate.** But remember, Obama is still on a bit of a bounce. It is significant that he was able to approach the type of approval that he needs in order to win. It just isn’t clear that this is enough. Again, the 2004 example is instructive. In early September, Bush’s average job approval was 51.4 percent, almost two points higher than Obama’s is today. And Bush’s convention was a full week earlier than Obama’s, so his bounce had already really faded by this point. Remember, **the strong tendency is that presidents run a few points behind their job approval numbers with the electorate**. Bush’s job approval in the RCP Average on Election Day was 49.8 percent, but his job approval with the actual electorate according to the exit polls was 53 percent (this is also what Bush’s internal tracking numbers were showing). Had his job approval with the electorate been 49.8 percent, he probably would have lost. Remember too that **Obama** probably **has a bit of a higher hurdle to surmount than Bush had**. While Republicans typically run ahead of polls of registered voters and adults, Democrats typically run behind them. Because job approval polling contains a mixture of these types of polls, Obama’s job approval with the actual electorate is probably a touch below his average right now. **6) Romney’s spending is just starting**. This is something that everyone mentions, but then seems to forget: **Romney and his allies will probably outspend the president heavily** in the next two months. I don’t think that matters in and of itself. After all, both candidates will have plenty of cash to make their cases, well past the point of diminishing returns. What does matter, however, is how this disparity was attained. The Obama campaign spent heavily over the summer trying to soften up Romney. It’s unclear how well this worked -- the polls were pretty steady and Romney's favorables actually improved a bit -- but a large portion of the basic case against Romney has been made. In the meantime, the Romney campaign had been very constrained in how it could spend its money; it was limited to primary funds until recently. That means the campaign has largely been outsourced to 527s and campaign committees. This explains a lot of the Romney campaign to date. During the convention, a parade of people telling tear-jerking stories about how the nominee had helped them out made their way across the stage at the RNC. Stu Rothenberg wondered on Twitter why they hadn’t appeared in ads. I suspect now that Romney can spend freely, they will appear. Quite frankly, they’ll probably be more effective in the fall, when people are paying attention. Whether this moves the dial is an unknown, but it is something of a contingency with substantial upside for Romney, which you have to figure in to any calculus about how the fall will play out. Of course, the Romney campaign may just try to dump $250 million in negative ads on the president’s head. I think that would be foolish -- and ineffective -- but we have to acknowledge the possibility there. **7) The gaffes don’t matter**. Everyone interested in elections should read this post from John Sides at The Monkey Cage. It makes an important point: Though **gaffes** set political analysts scurrying to their keyboards, they **tend not to affect the average voter.** We see this with the now-infamous “47 percent” comment. Gallup described the statement and asked how it would affect respondents’ votes. Twenty percent said it would make them more likely to vote for Romney, 36 percent said less likely, and 43 percent said it would make no difference. Drilling down to self-described Independents, 15 percent said it would make them more likely to support Romney, 29 percent less likely, and 53 percent said it would make no difference. You can try to sex that up (as Gallup did) to read that Independents say it makes them less likely to vote for Romney by a 2-1 margin, but you could just as easily say that three-quarters of independents say the gaffe makes no difference or helps Romney. **8) People haven’t made up their minds.** Finally, it is important to remember that all the claims about people’s minds being set in stone don’t jibe with what respondents tell pollsters. Table 3 shows when voters have made up their minds over the past four elections. Though the percentage of late-undecideds is diminishing, unless there is a major drop-off this cycle, we can safely say that **the decisions of a fairly wide swath of the electorate are not yet firm.** So **if the election were held today**, President **Obama would probably win comfortably**. ***But the election isn’t today***. **In the next seven weeks, the economy, the president’s tepid job approval ratings, and Romney’s spending campaign will continue to exert gravitational forces on Obama’s re-election efforts, along with the typical gravitational forces that drag down a post-convention bounce. Can these forces move things three points in seven weeks? It’s not a particularly tall order.**

***B) Link --- Plan swings blue collar voters to Obama --- they’re key to the election***

**Mead ‘12**

Walter Russell Mead, Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 6-6, the American Interest, Green Politics Hurting Obama in Swing States <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/>, jj

**Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “*brown jobs*” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery**. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and **the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election**. **Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign.** As the FT reports: “**Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio**,” he said. **Republicans**, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, **have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . .** Mr **Romney has said he will** approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and **curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work**. As we’ve mentioned before, ***energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable***. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. **This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector.** From a political perspective, **Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.**

***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.**

### K

***Energy Policy is a product of capitalism’s attempt to increase productivity and profit. This allows for exploitative working conditions and leads to extinction.***

**ICC ’11** (Nuclear Energy, Capitalism and Communism, August 16, 2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear)

The revolution in the form and quantity of energy available to humanity underpinned the industrial revolution and opened the door from the realm of want to that of plenty. But this revolution was driven by the development of capitalism whose purpose is not the satisfaction of human needs but the increase of capital based on the appropriation of surplus value produced by an exploited working class. **Energy is used to drive the development of productivity** but it is also a cost of production. It is part of the constant capital alongside raw materials, machines and factories and, as such, tends to increase in relation to the variable capital that is the source of capitalism’s profits. It is this that dictates capitalism’s attitude to energy.

Capitalism has no regard for the use of energy, for the destruction of finite resources, other than as a cost of production. Increased productivity tends to require increased energy, so the capitalists (other than those in the oil industry) are driven to try and reduce the cost of this energy. On the one hand this results in the profligate use of energy for irrational ends, such as transporting similar commodities back and forth across the world and the ceaseless multiplication of commodities that meet no real human need but serve only as a means to extract and realise surplus value. On the other, it leads to the denial of access to energy and to the products of energy for millions of humans who lack the money to be of interest to the capitalists. This is illustrated in Nigeria where Shell pumps out billions of dollars worth of oil while the local people go without or risk their lives by trying to illegally tap the oil from the pipeline. The price is also paid by those working in the energy industries in lives lost and bodies maimed or poisoned and by the environment and all that lives in it, from the polluted, toxic waters of the Thames that characterised 19th century London to the warming of the globe that threatens the future of humanity today.

***Vote neg on ethics - resisting this reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility***

**Zizek and Daly 2004**

(Slavoj, professor of philosophy at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana, and Glyn, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, Conversations with Zizek, page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

***The alternative is to withdraw from the ideology of capital. Capitalism only survives because we believe it is a truth claim.***

**Johnston ’04** (Adrian, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory, The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Žižek’s recent writings isn’t a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Žižek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance ( Žižek, 2001d, pp 22–23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Žižek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of ‘‘magic,’’ that is, the belief in money’s social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance’s powers. The ‘‘external’’ obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, ‘‘internally’’ believe in it – capitalism’s life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others’ belief in the socio-performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism’s frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic’s fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism, makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Žižek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing). Or, the more disquieting possibility to entertain is that some people today, even if one succeeds in exposing them to the underlying logic of their position, might respond in a manner resembling that of the Judas-like character Cypher in the film The Matrix (Cypher opts to embrace enslavement by illusion rather than cope with the discomfort of dwelling in the ‘‘desert of the real’’): faced with the choice between living the capitalist lie or wrestling with certain unpleasant truths, many individuals might very well deliberately decide to accept what they know full well to be a false pseudo-reality, a deceptively comforting fiction (‘‘Capitalist commodity fetishism or the truth? I choose fetishism’’).

**Oil DA**

***Oil prices will stabilize now – prices will stick above OPEC break-even levels without significant changes***

Irina **Rogovaya August 2012**; writer for Oil and Gas Eurasia, Oil Price Changes: Everyone Wants Stability <http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/-http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/>

According to the current base forecast for the Eurozone prepared by Oxford Economics, **within the next two years oil prices will continue to drift lower, but not beyond the bounds of the “green” corridor for the world economy – $80-100 per barrel**. This forecast coincides with the expectations of the World Bank (see Fig. 4). Meanwhile, S&P analysts presented three scenarios for the energy market in June. In the base scenario, **oil will remain at $100 per barrel**. S&P calculates that the likelihood of a stressful scenario in which the price of oil drops below $60 per barrel (the bottom in 2009) is 1:3. Analysts believe that **given today’s state of economic and geopolitical affairs, strong political will would be needed to force the price of oil below $70-80** (the current level of effective production). So far, **that will is nowhere to be seen**. Recent events have shown that nobody is interested in the Eurozone breaking apart. And nobody wants a war in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, nobody today intends to force the production of less valuable oil. At least that is what OPEC leaders promised during the recent summit. “Stability on the market should be at the center of our attention,” General Secretary Abdalla El-Badri said. Even Saudi Arabia, which consistently violates OPEC discipline in over-producing its quotas, announced at the beginning of July that it would review its margins to determine a higher price for Saudi supplies ordered on August contracts. Analysts noted that the average price of oil supplied to Europe and Asia had jumped (by $0.85 and $0.66 per barrel respectively), a fact which could be seen as proof that **the collective members of the cartel will not let prices fall under $100 per barrel.**

***The plan decreases global oil prices***

**Bartis and Bibber 11** (James Bartis, senior policy researcher at the RAND Corporation, and Lawrence Van Bibber, RAND Corporation, National Research Defense Institute, Prepared for the Secretary of Defense, "Alternative Fuels for Military Applications", <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2011/RAND_MG969.pdf>)

Nevertheless, despite the absence of a specific military benefit, **there are nationally important benefits to be gained from the use of alternative fuels**. If the Department of Defense were to encourage early production experience**, government decisionmakers, technology developers, and investors would obtain important information about the technical, financial, and environmental performance of various alternative fuel options**. If favorable, **that information could lead to a commercial alternative-fuels industry producing strategically significant amounts of fuel in the United States**. Once established, a large, **commercially competitive alternative fuel industry in the United States** and abroad **would weaken** the ability of the **O**rganization of the **P**etroleum **E**xporting **C**ountries to assert its cartel power. Lower world oil prices would yield economic benefits to all fuel users—civilian and military alike. **Lower prices would** also **decrease the incomes** of “rogue” oil producers, and thereby likely decrease financial support to large terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hizballah.

***Drop in oil demand causes Russian economic instability --- risks nuclear war***

**Miller 10**—assistant professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma (Gregory D., April 2010, © Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Quarterly 33:2, “The Security Costs of Energy Independence,” http://www.twq.com/10april/docs/10apr\_Miller.pdf)

**Russia is another** potential **danger spot because it is the only nuclear state**, at least for now, **that has significant revenue from the sale of oil, roughly** 8—**20 percent of its GDP**. Losing that income will have less dramatic effects on Russia than on many OPEC states more heavily reliant on oil sales, at least partly because of recent attempts to diversify the Russian economy. **Its economy**, however, **is still too fragile to handle a major drop in demand for oil**. **Given the existing tension between Russia and states such as Georgia and Ukraine, neither the United States nor Russia’s neighbors can afford the risk of a nuclear Russia suffering economic instability**.19

***Extinction***

**FILGER 2009** (Sheldon, author and blogger for the Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356)

**In Russia** historically, **economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major** industrialized **economies**. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, **Medvedev and Putin**, both intimately acquainted with their nation’s history, **are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia’s economic crisis will endanger the nation’s political stability**, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. **Should the Russian economy deteriorate** to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, **the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis**. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, **Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability** to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that **a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing** social and political **upheaval**. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama’s national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. **During the years** Boris **Yeltsin ruled** Russia, **security forces** responsible for **guarding the** nation’s **nuclear arsenal went without pay** for months at a time, **leading to fears that** desperate **personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain?** It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

**Adv 1**

***1) Military reducing reliance on fossil fuels***

ELISABETH **ROSENTHAL**, NYT, October 4th **2010**, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/05/science/earth/05fossil.html?adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1306084754-flJ2Mg6ul2Po4LpzlLT1kw&pagewanted=1(BJN)

With insurgents increasingly attacking the American fuel supply convoys that lumber across the Khyber Pass into Afghanistan, **the military is pushing aggressively to develop, test and deploy renewable energy to decrease its need to transport fossil fuels**. Last week, **a Marine company from California arrived in the rugged outback of Helmand Province bearing novel equipment: portable solar panels that fold up into boxes; energy-conserving lights; solar tent shields that provide shade and electricity; solar chargers for computers and communications equipment.** The 150 Marines of Company I, Third Battalion, Fifth Marines, will be the first to take renewable technology into a battle zone, where the new equipment will replace diesel and kerosene-based fuels that would ordinarily generate power to run their encampment. **Even as Congress has struggled unsuccessfully to pass an energy bill and many states have put renewable energy on hold because of the recession, the military this year has pushed rapidly forward. After a decade of waging wars in remote corners of the globe where fuel is not readily available, senior commanders have come to see overdependence on fossil fuel as a big liability, and renewable technologies** — which have become more reliable and less expensive over the past few years — **as providing a potential answer. These new types of renewable energy now account for only a small percentage of the power used by the armed forces, but military leaders plan to rapidly expand their use** over the next decade.

***2) Military accounting for price spikes in 2012 budget***

Jeff **Siegel** is the managing editor of Green Chip Stocks, March 4th **2011**, http://commoditiesreporter.com/alternative-energy/pentagon-oil-prediction/ (BJN)

**Based on the Pentagon’s** latest fiscal **2012 budget, this means the Navy is already gearing up to spend another $900 million** next year! You see, **the Pentagon report that was recently sent to Congress plans on the price of oil coming in at $131 a barrel**. Of course, **the military has been preparing for these price hikes for some time now. The U.S. Navy already has a plan in place to ensure that half of all the energy it uses by 2020 comes from non-fossil fuel sources.**

***3) Pentagon insulated – they get subsidized fuel***

Marcus **Weisgerber**, Defense News, April 7th **2011**, http://www.tsjonline.com/story.php?F=6030207 (BJN)

**The Defense Logistics Agency buys fuel for the military**. **The services are insulated from price swings and market volatility because they pay a standard price for the fuel**, a DLA spokeswoman said. “**The standard price is used as a cost-stabilizing tool for the Department of Defense by allowing the DoD agencies to budget for and pay the standard price rather than the market price during times of volatility in the global fuel market**,” she said. “**The standard price is reviewed and may be changed during the fiscal year to ensure that the defense working capital fund, which is used by DLA to purchase the fuel, remains solvent.”**

### Heg FL

***1) Heg high and sustainable now – overwhelming power***

**Tufts Daily 2-23-11** (Prashanth Parameswaran, master's candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, writer for the New Strait Times, Strait Times and China Post, and former CSIS intern, “America is not in decline” <http://www.tuftsdaily.com/op-ed/prashanth-parameswaran-the-asianist-1.2478466>, jj)

I don't. **Very little about "American decline" is real or new. Similar predictions of U.S. decline have surfaced every decade or so** since Washington rebuilt the international system after World War II, from the aftermath of Sputnik in the 1960s to the economic distress of the 1980s. Foreign Policy is also hardly the only peddler of the latest declinism fetish. Everyone from [Newsweek's](http://newsweek.com) Fareed Zakaria to former Singaporean diplomat Kishore Mahbubani to American intelligence agencies themselves has parroted a version of it. But every myth has a grain of truth. In this case it's the fact that — God forbid — other powers are rising. Goldman Sachs says China will overtake the U.S. economy by 2027 and that the BRIC nations (**Brazil, Russia, India and China) will emerge as major world players**. But **so what? Other powers have been rising for decades**. **Yet,** to take one statistic**, the American economy in 2004 was the same size relative to the world's total GDP as it was in 1975 — 20 percent.** The real and more useful questions about decline are therefore not who is growing and by how much, but whether emerging powers can dent American power sufficiently and whether the United States will lose the key advantages that have sustained it as the world's sole superpower. **For all the fretting, the United States,** as Mr. Rachman himself admits, **remains the leader across the board. U.S. military power is still unmatched and vastly technologically superior to any other nation. Military spending is almost as much as the rest of the world combined. The American economy dominates futuristic industries like biotechnology and nanotechnology with a potent combination of technological prowess and entrepreneurial flair.** According to China's own Jiao Tong University's rankings, **17 of the world's top 20 universities are American. Millions still flock here to pursue the American Dream, while America's melting pot of cultures bodes well for its exceptional innovative capacity**. Provided the United States continues to encourage immigration and starts controlling its debt, **there is little reason to believe that such a *resilient colossus* will see its vast advantages perish**. **There are also few signs of a "global multipolar system" emerging anytime soon.** Despite doomsday realist predictions, **no country has attempted to balance Washington's hegemony since 1991**. And while the future rise of Asian powers may boost the case for eventual American decline, the truth is that **each of the United States' potential balancers also faces significant challenges going forward. For China, it is the growing disparity between its coastal and inland areas, its physical isolation and the risk that it will get old before it gets rich. For India and the European Union, the challenge will be to painfully negotiate the divergent interests of states in a noisy democratic system. As for Iran, Russia and Venezuela, they are flexing their muscles as proud spoilers, not global powers. It is also quite unlikely that these states will soon form a coalition to confront the United States, given their own divergent interests.** Even China and Russia compete ferociously in Central Asia today. Don't get me wrong. I don't believe we've reached Francis Fukuyama's "end of history," particularly with the slowing of democracy's progress during the last decade. Nor do I think the United States will be able to dominate and dictate terms to others all the time in the future. Still, **I just don't see the irreversible decline in U.S. power and the rise of a new world order that many seem to reflexively accept.**

***5) Heg collapse doesn’t cause global nuclear war – conflicts would be small and managable***

Richard **Haas** (president of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies) April **2008** “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask\_the\_expert.html

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.

***6) Transition is smooth – decline in power causes global cooperation***

Carla **Norrlof** (an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto) **2010** “America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” p. 50

Keohane and Snidal’s predictions – that the waning of American power did not have to jeopardize cooperation – were in this context reassuring. As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, Keohane explained the persistence of cooperation in terms of states’ continued demand for regimes.40 Snidal demonstrated that collective action depends as much on the hegemon’s size, as it does on the size of other actors in the international system. By paying attention to the size of all Great Powers, not just the hegemon, Snidal opened up the possibility that a more symmetrical distribution of power might enhance the prospects for the provision of public goods, thus offering a potential explanation for the otherwise puzzling persistence of cooperation in the 1980s despite America’s relative decline. The likelihood for cooperation increases with American decline because the hegemon can no longer singlehandedly provide the good as it declines, so smaller states have to chip in for the good to be provided. If one were to use Snidal’s production function in the revised model (i.e., by plugging the numbers from his production function into the revised model), the waning hegemon continues to be taken advantage of. While Snidal was modeling a theory he did not believe in, these distributional implications haunt the literature and cast decline as inescapable and continuous

*1. No risk of US/China war---Chinese heg isn’t a threat, economic interdependence checks, miscalc won’t happen and deterrence checks escalation*

**Art ’10** (Robert J, Christian A. Herter Professor of [International Relations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Relations) at Brandeis University and Fellow at [MIT Center for International Studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT_Center_for_International_Studies) Fall, Political Science Quarterly, Volume 125, #3, “The United States and the Rise of China: Implications for the Long Haul” <http://www.psqonline.org/99_article.php3?byear=2010&bmonth=fall&a=01free>, jj)

**China does not present the type of security threat to the United States that Germany did to Britain, or Britain to Germany**. **Americaʼs nuclear forces make it secure from any Chinese attack on the homeland.** Moreover, China clearly presents a potentially different type of threat to the United States than the Soviet Union did during the Cold War, because the geopolitics of the two situations are different. The Soviet geopolitical (as opposed to the nuclear) threat was two-fold: to conquer and dominate the economic–industrial resources of western Eurasia and to control the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf. Europe and the Persian Gulf constituted two of the five power centers of the world during the Cold War—Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States being the other three. If the Soviets had succeeded in dominating Europe and the Persian Gulf through either conquest or political–military intimidation, then it would have controlled three of the five power centers of the world. That would have been a significant power transition. **Chinaʼs rise does not constitute the same type of geopolitical threat to the United States that the Soviet Union did.** **If China ends up dominating the Korean peninsula and a significant part of continental Southeast Asia, so what?** As long as Japan remains outside the Chinese sphere of influence and allied with the United States, and as long as the United States retains some naval footholds in Southeast Asia, such as in Singapore, the Philippines, or Indonesia, **Chinaʼs domination of these two areas would not present the same type of geopolitical threat that the Soviet Union did. As long as Europe, the Persian Gulf, Japan, India, and Russia** (once it reconstitutes itself as a serious great power) **remain either as independent power centers or under U.S. influence, Chinese hegemony on land in East and Southeast Asia will not tip the world balance of power**. The vast size and central position of the Soviet Union in Eurasia constituted a geopolitical threat to American influence that China cannot hope to emulate. **If judged by the standards of the last three dominant power-rising power competitions of the last 100 years, then, the U.S.–China competition appears well placed to be much safer**. Certainly, war between the two is not impossible, because either or both governments could make a serious misstep over the Taiwan issue. **War by miscalculation is always possible, but the possession of nuclear weapons by both sides has to have a restraining effect on each by dramatically raising the costs of miscalculation, thereby increasing the incentives not to miscalculate. Nuclear deterrence should work to lower dramatically the possibility of war by either miscalculation or deliberate decision** (**or if somehow such a war broke out, then nuclear deterrence should work against its escalation into a large and fearsome one)**. Apart from the Taiwan issue or some serious incident at sea, **it is hard to figure out how to start a war between the United States and China. There are no other territorial disputes of any significance between the two, and there are no foreseeable economic contingencies that could bring on a war between them. Finally, the high economic interdependence and the lack of intense ideological competition between them help to reinforce the pacific effects induced by the condition of mutual assured destruction. The workings of these three factors should make us** **cautiously optimistic about keeping Sino-American relations on the peaceful rather than the warlike track.** The peaceful track does not, by any means, imply the absence of political and economic conflicts in Sino-American relations, nor does it foreclose coercive diplomatic gambits by each against the other. What it does mean is that the **conditions are in place for war to be a low-probability event,** if policymakers are smart in both states (see below), **and that an all-out war is nearly impossible to imagine**. By the historical standards of recent dominant-rising state dyads, this is no mean feat. In sum, **there will be some security dilemma dynamics at work in the U.S.–China relationship**, both over Taiwan and over maritime supremacy in East Asia, should China decide eventually to contest Americaʼs maritime hegemony, and there will certainly be political and military conflicts, **but nuclear weapons should work to mute their severity because the security of each stateʼs homeland will never be in doubt as long as each maintains a secondstrike capability vis-à-vis the other.** If two states cannot conquer one another, then the character of their relation and their competition changes dramatically.

*2. No impact---US has a huge nuclear advantage*

**Lieber and Press, ‘7** (July/August, Keir and Daryl, “Superiority Complex,” The Atlantic Monthly, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200707/china-nukes>)

In the 1990s, with the Cold War receding, nuclear weapons appeared to be relics. Russian and Chinese leaders apparently thought so. Russia allowed its arsenal to decline precipitously, and **China showed little interest in modernizing its nuclear weapons. The small strategic force that China built and deployed in the 1970s and early 1980s is essentially the same one it has today. But meanwhile, the United States steadily improved its “counterforce” capabilities—those nuclear weapons most effective at targeting an enemy’s nuclear arsenal. Even as it reduced the number of weapons in its nuclear arsenal, the U.S. made its remaining weapons more lethal and accurate. The result today is a global nuclear imbalance unseen in 50 years. And nowhere is U.S. nuclear primacy clearer—or potentially more important—than in the Sino-U.S. relationship. China has approximately 80 operationally deployed nuclear warheads, but only a few of them—those assigned to single-warhead DF-5 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs)—can reach the continental United States**. (There is no definitive, unclassified count of China’s DF-5 ICBMs, but official U.S. statements have put the number at 18.) China **has neither modern nuclear ballistic-missile submarines nor long-range nuclear bombers. Moreover, China’s ICBMs can’t be quickly launched; the warheads are stored separately, and the missiles are kept unfueled.** (Unlike the solid fuel used in U.S. missiles, the liquid fuel used to propel Chinese ICBMs is highly corrosive.) **Finally, China lacks an advanced early-warning system that would give Beijing reliable notice of an incoming attack.**

*1. No Asian war---regional initiatives solve conflict*

**Bitzinger & Desker, 08** – senior fellow and dean of S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies respectively (Richard A. Bitzinger, Barry Desker, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December 2008, <http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328_731200556_906256449.pdf>)

**The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints** – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnationa terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); **and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories** (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) **with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect**. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. **Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit,** ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) **and the ASEAN Regional Forum. All this suggests that war in Asia** – while not inconceivable **– is unlikely.**

**Econ**

***1. Global economy resilient***

**Zakaria ‘9 -** PhD Poli Sci @ Harvard, Zakaria, Editor of Newsweek, 12/12/’9 (Fareed, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425>)

**A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets.** So consider this: **the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year**. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but **it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled**. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "**We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual**?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, **governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s,** when governments played a tiny role in national economies**. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles:** the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. **Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force.** When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.**

***2. Economic collapse doesn’t cause war***

Fareed **Zakaria** was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 20**09**, “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html>

**Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries.** At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. **One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks** (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). **Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran.** Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But **overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**.

***3. US isn’t key to the world economy***

John **Curran, 9-2-2010,** “Can World Economy Keep Growing If U.S. Doesn’t?” Time,<http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/can-world-economy-keep-growing-if-u-s-doesnt/?xid=rsstopstories&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed:+time/topstories+%28TIME:+Top+Stories%29>

A worrying economic question these days is the possibility of a return to negative GDP growth in the U.S, the dreaded double dip. If it happened it could pull much of the world back into recession, possibly triggering another round of financial crisis. Though all but a few consider this a low possibility, it's not so low as to be off the radar. Economists I follow generally put the risk of a U.S. double dip at somewhere between 20% and 35%. There's ample evidence that the U.S. economy is not out of the woods yet. U.S. consumers picked up spending slightly last month, but they are still tentative and their debt levels remain high. Businesses are watching consumers closely because managers are reluctant to commit to new hiring and investment while so many people are out of work. Consumer spending picked up slightly in July, but confidence is weak and retailers are hurting. The latest signs of this come from back-to-school shopping, where price cutting ruled, and tumbling U.S. auto sales (down 21% in August). There is talk of a second federal stimulus but nobody can count those chickens until they hatch. The chicken you can count on, though, is the economic energy coming from developing markets, specifically the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China). Though the BRICs will advance in fits and starts—for more on this, see Michael Schuman's insightful [post](http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/is-red-hot-india-too-hot/) on India and China—the fact of their increasing consumption power now feeds into the global growth calculation in a meaningful way. **The good news is that BRIC growth increasingly makes U.S. growth shortfalls in the years ahead less of a threat for the world economy**. According to work by Jim O'Neill, who heads Goldman Sachs' global economics team, the current value of consumption in the BRIC countries is roughly $4 trillion, still less than half of the $10.5 trillion that U.S. consumers spend. But **O'Neill sees a powerful lift from these countries in the years just ahead. With BRIC consumption growing by roughly 15% per year, he estimates, it should rival that of U.S. consumption by the end of the decade. The world will feel the beneficial effects sooner.**  BRIC consumption is already growing by roughly $600 billion a year and should rise to $1 trillion a year by the middle of the decade, says O'Neill. **Such demand does not all land at the U.S. doorstep but it does flow to the world, providing a nice offset to what is likely to be long-term weakness in U.S. consumption. That's good news for all.**

***1. Jobs aren’t important – productivity gains will sustain a recovery and US competitiveness***

Paul **Wiseman 2011** , U.S. productivity gains stifle job creation, The Associated Press, April 4, <http://www.usatoday.com/money/economy/2011-04-04-us-economy-jobs.htm>, KEL

**The U**nited **S**tates **is out of step with the rest of the world’s richest industrialized nations: Its economy is growing faster than theirs but creating far fewer jobs.** The reason is that **U.S. workers have become so productive that it’s harder for anyone without a job to get one. Companies are producing and profiting more than when the recession began, despite fewer workers**. They’re hiring again, but not fast enough to replace most of the 7.5 million jobs lost since the recession began. **Measured in growth, the American economy has outperformed those of Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Japan** — every Group of Seven developed nation except Canada, according to the Associated Press’ new Global Economy Tracker, a quarterly analysis of 22 countries representing more than 80% of global output. **Yet the U.S. job market remains the group’s weakest**. U.S. employment bottomed and started growing again a year ago, but there are still 5.4% fewer American jobs than in December 2007. That’s a much sharper drop than in any other G-7 country. The U.S. had the G-7’s highest unemployment rate as of December.

***2. Long time-frame and no solvency - High job growth cannot solve for a decade and too many people lack the education to fill the jobs created by plan***

James **Manyika et al 2011** (Director at McKinsey Global Institute, An economy that works: Job creation and America’s future June 2011 McKinsey Global Institute <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CD4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mckinsey.com%2F~%2Fmedia%2FMcKinsey%2Fdotcom%2FInsights%2520and%2520pubs%2FMGI%2FResearch%2FLabor%2520Markets%2FAn%2520economy%2520that%2520works%2520Job%2520creation%2520and%2520Americas%2520future%2FMGI_US_job_creation_executive_summary.ashx&ei=_qgpUIynO8WLywHO6oCoDg&usg=AFQjCNFcGlD4_zeDa-6SuPNk0nCABL-2Bw>, KEL

The results of our analysis are sobering: **only in the most optimistic scenario will the United States return to full employment1 before 2020**. Achieving this outcome will require sustained demand growth, rising US competitiveness in the global economy, and better matching of US workers to jobs. Among our key findings: ƒƒ The United States has been experiencing increasingly lengthy “jobless recoveries” from recessions in the past two decades. It took roughly 6 months for employment to recover to its prerecession level after each postwar recession through the 1980s, but it took 15 months after the 1990–91 recession and 39 months after the 2001 recession. At the recent pace of job creation, it will take more than 60 months after GDP reached its prerecession level in December 2010 for employment to recover.2 ƒƒ **The United States will need to create a total of 21 million new jobs in this decade to put unemployed Americans back to work and to employ its growing population**. We created three possible scenarios for job creation, based on sector analyses, and find that they deliver from 9.3 million to 22.5 million jobs. **Only in the high-job growth scenario will the United States return to full employment in *this decade.*** ƒƒ **Six sectors illustrate the potential for job growth in this decade: health care, business services, leisure and hospitality, construction, manufacturing, and retail.** These sectors span a wide range of job types, skills, and growth dynamics. They account for 66 percent of employment today, and we project that they will account for up to 85 percent of new jobs created through the end of the decade. ƒƒ **Under current trends, the United States will not have enough workers with the right education and training to fill the skill profiles of the jobs likely to be created**. Our analysis suggests **a shortage of up to 1.5 million workers with bachelor’s degrees or higher in 2020**. At the same time, **nearly 6 million Americans without a high school diploma are likely to be without a job.** ƒƒ **Moreover, too few Americans who attend college and vocational schools choose fields of study that will give them the specific skills that employers are seeking**. **Our interviews point to potential shortages in many occupations, such as nutritionists, welders, and nurse’s aides—in addition to the often-predicted shortfall in computer specialists and engineers.**

## 2nc

### DA

***Mid East war outweighs --- most likely and fastest impact***

**Russell, ‘09** [James, senior lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Nava Postgraduate School, Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prosepects for Nuclear War and Escalation in the Middle East, in collaboration with the Atomic Energy Commission, <http://www.nps.edu/academics/sigs/ccc/people/biolinks/russell/PP26_Russell_2009.pdf>]

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

#### C) Impact --- Obama pushes defense cuts that collapse heg --- Romney solves

Boot ‘11

Max Boot​ is the Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. He is completing a history of guerrilla warfare and terrorism. This article is adapted from testimony he delivered to the House Armed Services Committee on September 13, 2011.

Commentary Magazine, January 12, Slashing America's Defense: A Suicidal Trajectory <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/slashing-americas-defense-a-suicidal-trajectory/>, jj

The United States’ armed forces have been the greatest force for good the world has seen during the past century. They defeated Nazism and Japanese imperialism, deterred and defeated Communism, and stopped numerous lesser evils—from Slobodan Milosevic’s ethnic cleansing to the oppression perpetrated by Saddam Hussein in Iraq and the Taliban in Afghanistan. Imagine a world in which America is not the leading military power. It would be a brutal, Hobbesian place in which aggressors rule and the rule of law is trampled on. And yet Congress will be helping to usher in such a New World Disorder if it continues to slash defense spending at the currently contemplated rate—just as previous Congresses did with previous rounds of “postwar” budget cuts going back to the dawn of the Republic. But there is nothing inevitable about the outcome. The first tranche of sequestration cuts is not scheduled to take effect until the 2013 fiscal year. That means Congress has most of 2012 to find an alternative. Unfortunately, President Obama has threatened to veto any bill that tries to exempt the defense budget from sequestration. But that should not prevent pro-defense Democrats and Republicans from pushing such a bill anyway. If even one year of sequestration were to occur, major weapons systems (which will be costly and difficult to restart) might be cancelled—and great numbers of veterans (whose experience would be lost forever) might be layed off. In the long run, the question of whether or not—and to what extent—we will cut defense will be decided in the 2012 elections. Obama appears sanguine about the impact of defense cuts, but his Republican challengers are not. Mitt Romney has promised to protect the defense budget and expand naval shipbuilding. Rick Perry has called on Leon Panetta to resign rather than accept massive cuts. Even Newt Gingrich, who has been critical of wasteful Pentagon spending, has said that sequestration would be “totally destructive” and “very dangerous to the survival of the country.” It is commonly said that every election is a turning point in our history. In many cases that’s nothing more than partisan hype. In the case of the 2012 election, it’s true: The future of the U.S. armed forces, and of American power in general, could depend greatly on the outcome.

#### Romney increases coal production and slashes regs

Leber ‘12

Rebecca Leber is a Reporter/Blogger for ThinkProgress. She graduated from the University of Rochester and holds a B.A. in political science and English with a minor in economics. Previously, she interned at ThinkProgress and blogged for PolicyMic. She was managing editor of her campus newspaper and held internships with an opinion polling firm and a N.Y. Assemblymember.

4-19-12, Think Progress, CHART: How Obama And Romney Compare On Energy Issues <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/04/19/466477/chart-how-obama-and-romney-compare-on-energy-issues/?mobile=nc>, jj

Romney

•‘Aggressively” develop all our coal sources. “Coal is America’s most abundant energy source. We have reserves that—at current rates of uses—will last for the next 200 years of electricity production in an industry that directly employs perhaps 200,000 workers. [NYT, 4/3/12]

•Against new EPA regulations of harmful mercury and air pollutants from coal: “I think the EPA has gotten completely out of control for a very simple reason. It is a tool in the hands of the president to crush the private enterprise system, to crush our ability to have energy, whether it’s oil, gas, coal, nuclear.” [The Hill, 12/5/11]

#### 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.

#### Obama re-election signals weakness and invites nuclear aggression --- Romney solves

Richard Williamson served as the president's special envoy to Sudan from 2007 to 2009, assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs from 1987 to 1989, and served in the Reagan White House as an assistant to the president from 1981 to 1983.

4-26-12, Foreign Policy, Obama's Jimmy Carter Moment <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/25/obama_s_jimmy_carter_moment>, jj

North Korea's impending nuclear test is just the latest illustration of Barack Obama's weakness and naiveté abroad. In recent weeks, North Korea tested a long-range missile that could someday hold a nuclear warhead and threaten American shores. It is preparing to test a nuclear device for a third time. We are entering an exceptionally dangerous period, one that has us "within an inch of war," according to Defense Secretary Leon Panetta. It is difficult to know what kinds of calculations or miscalculations North Korea's young new leader and his entourage might make in the period ahead. But there are other reasons for worry far from the corridors of power in Pyongyang. The last weeks and months have exposed profound dysfunction in the corridors of Washington where U.S. foreign and defense policy are formulated. With President Obama's foreign policy unraveling, his reelection campaign has been quick to attack Mitt Romney as a distraction. But events abroad may be bringing us to a juncture at which the inexperience and incompetence of a presidency crystallizes in the public mind. In short, we are approaching a Jimmy Carter moment. In a perilous world, this is not the kind of leadership our country needs. The case of North Korea illustrates a foreign policy untethered from any overarching strategy. All recent administrations have wrestled with the challenges posed by the predictably unpredictable regime in Pyongyang. But few administrations have taken a sucker punch like the one delivered on April 14, when North Korea tested a long-range missile. The North Korean missile launch may have failed in its purported objective of putting a satellite into space, but it certainly succeeded in its political objective of knocking the United States off guard. It was only weeks earlier, after all, that the Obama administration decided to trust the new leader and reached an agreement with North Korea promising food aid in exchange for halting missile tests and some enrichment activities. But it was no sooner agreed to than violated. By extending an olive branch to Pyongyang only to have it snapped off at the stem, the Obama administration's singular achievement was to showcase its own naiveté and weakness. The trouble with naiveté and weakness is that they tempt aggression, which brings us to Syria. There Bashar al-Assad, another scion of a dictator, continues the carnage that has already taken some 9,000 lives and left so many others maimed by shellfire and torture. This has been going on for over a year. Here we get a clear picture of the Obama Doctrine in action: one part bluster, one part incoherence, and one part paralysis. When the carnage began, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton downplayed the Syrian regime's brutality, emphasizing that many in Washington saw Assad as a "reformer." As the carnage continued unabated, she stated that "world opinion is not going to stand idly by." But in both instances, standing idly is exactly what "world opinion" -- supposedly led by the Obama administration -- has done. Iran is the third corner in this triangle of foreign-policy failure. The basic fact is that the regime in Tehran is racing forward with its nuclear arms program. For more than three years, the Obama administration has ineptly pushed various buttons and pulled various levers, from engagement to belated sanctions and now back to engagement, without any sign that it is making progress toward its stated objective of stopping the Iranian bomb-building project. Its only accomplishment has been to give the ayatollahs time to enrich uranium, harden bunkers, and come closer to a nuclear weapons capability than ever before. President Obama's lack of resolute action and the absence of demonstrable results make hollow his declaration that a nuclear-armed Iran is "unacceptable." The path he has set us on leads to a nuclear-armed Iran. And once that occurs, the unacceptable will -- to Barack Obama -- become the accepted. Jimmy Carter's stewardship of foreign affairs came to a culmination in the twin disasters of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Iranian hostage drama. We can only hope that the final months of Barack Obama's term are not an occasion for similar disasters. But what his record underscores is the urgency of putting new and stronger leadership in the White House. Events are demonstrating on an almost daily basis that the team running the show is far out of its depth. A Mitt Romney presidency will not come a day too soon.

#### Impact is nuclear war

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.

### UQ

#### Prefer the direction of the link --- election’s too close to call

Enid News and Eagle 9-17

The heated presidential election is too close to call <http://enidnews.com/opinion/x1052803813/The-heated-presidential-election-is-too-close-to-call>, jj

ENID, Okla. — With less than two months remaining before the election, President Barack Obama and Republican nominee Mitt Romney are eyeing some pivotal swing states to win the election. Besides Colorado and New Mexico, Oklahoma virtually is surrounded by red — or red-leaning — states in most electoral projections. We’re entering the home stretch, and the heated presidential election is too close to call. The presidential debate schedules have been announced: Jim Lehrer of PBS will moderate a debate on domestic issues on Oct. 3. CNN’s Candy Crowley will coordinate a town hall debate Oct. 16 at Hofstra University. Bob Schieffer of CBS News will moderate a foreign policy-focused debate on Oct. 22 at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Fla. What will voters decide? Meena Bose, a presidential scholar at Hofstra University, told Newsday the magic number of 270 electoral votes is what really matters in the election … not the popular vote. Romney got some good news Friday when Obama announced an added travel stop to Wisconsin. That confirmed the traditionally Democratic state is in play, according to the Wall Street Journal. All of the news isn’t as favorable for Romney, however. You can blame the “liberal media,” but even the conservative Washington Times reported on NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist College polls that show Obama leads Romney in Florida, Ohio and Virginia. (Romney’s camp dismissed the post-convention bump as a “sugar high.”) Still, the Washington Post isn’t ready to move the bellwether state of Ohio in Obama’s direction for three reasons: the aforementioned bump, the Buckeye State’s ongoing political division and the fact Romney won’t give up on the Midwest’s electoral crown jewel.

#### Forecasting Model Predicts Romney Victory

Bickers 8/22 (Kenneth (in conjunction with U. Colorado Media Relations Department), Professor of Political Science at U. Colorado, “Analysis of Election Factors Point to Romney Win,” http://www.colorado.edu/news/releases/2012/08/22/analysis-election-factors-points-romney-win-university-colorado-study-says)

A University of Colorado analysis of state-by-state factors leading to the Electoral College selection of every U.S. president since 1980 forecasts that the 2012 winner will be Mitt Romney. The key is the economy, say political science professors Kenneth Bickers of CU-Boulder and Michael Berry of CU Denver. Their prediction model stresses economic data from the 50 states and the District of Columbia, including both state and national unemployment figures as well as changes in real per capita income, among other factors. “Based on our forecasting model, it becomes clear that the president is in electoral trouble,” said Bickers, also director of the CU in DC Internship Program. According to their analysis, President Barack Obama will win 218 votes in the Electoral College, short of the 270 he needs. And though they chiefly focus on the Electoral College, the political scientists predict Romney will win 52.9 percent of the popular vote to Obama’s 47.1 percent, when considering only the two major political parties.

#### Historically Reliable Hibbs Model Predicts Romney win

Mirengoff 8/2 (Paul, PowerLine Staff, “Bread and Peace Model Predicts Sizeable Defeat for Obama, “http://www.powerlineblog.com/archives/2012/08/bread-and-peace-model-predicts-sizeable-defeat-for-obama.php)

It turns out that there’s a predictive model that formulizes these intuitions. It’s called the Bread and Peace Model. Douglas Hibbs, a retired economics and politics professor, developed it. According to Hibbs, the model nicely explains nearly every post-World War II presidential elections. Only 1996 (when Clinton overperformed) and 2000 (when Gore underperformed) are problematic. For the Peace side, Hibbs basically counts American fatalities, subject to a proviso discussed below. For the Bread side, he relies on growth of per capita real disposable personal income. Under Hibbs’ model, President Obama will likely receive only 47.2 to 47.8 of the popular vote. In other words, Romney’s margin will approach the margin that Obama won by four years ago.

#### Polls are Not Predictive: Only Way to Establish Uniqueness is Models

Sabato 9/13 (Larry, Professor of Political Science U. Virginia, Forecasting the Presidential Election,” http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/forecasting-the-presidential-election-other-crystal-balls/)

Most of us spend our campaign days eagerly devouring the latest public opinion polls, and there is no shortage of them. In the six days after the conclusion of the party conventions (through Wednesday afternoon), there have been three major national polls released — not including daily tracking surveys by Gallup, Rasmussen and Reuters/Ipsos — and 13 state-level surveys; RealClearPolitics lists 57 national polls since June 1. But polls are not predictive. As the pollsters always say, each poll is just a snapshot of an object moving in time. Moreover, the further one gets away from the actual election day, the more misleading polls can be, because it is difficult to figure out who will actually show up to vote, and many events that might influence the horserace (such as debates or crises) have not yet occurred. A better way to forecast the election results — potentially, at least — is to uncover the underlying fundamentals that propel an electorate to vote the way it does, and to combine them in some rigorous, standard fashion based on America’s voting history. Quite a number of political scientists have done so, creating models that use statistical techniques such as regression analysis — seeing how one variable, like the economy, affects another, like an election outcome — to predict presidential elections. A model should ideally be simple and elegant, using relatively few variables and constants to generate a forecast.

#### Even if Obama’s winning, Romney has momentum and is narrowing the gap

Malor 9-20 GABRIEL MALOR, 9-20-12, NY Daily News, Calm down. Romney can still win this thing. <http://www.nydailynews.com/blogs/the_rumble/2012/09/calm-down-romney-can-still-win-this-thing>, jj

As a result of these recent "gaffes," freeloaders may not like Romney. Peaceniks may not like Romney. Wonks who think that ambiguity is a reasonable foreign policy strategy may not like Romney. But how many freeloaders, peaceniks or foreign policy wafflers were really going to vote for Romney, anyway? None of these groups are part of the traditional Republican constituency. None of these groups are large enough to sway the election. Unlike commentators, who spend a great deal of time fretting about Romney's recent messages, Republican voters generally agree with the governor about freeloaders, Israel and the Arab Spring. Commentators focus on gaffes like this because they have nothing else to talk about, not because gaffes are of general interest to the voting public. Indeed, if you look at the most recent polls, the race is contracting even amidst Romney's rough couple of weeks. The President's average national lead in RealClearPolitics' poll compilation has fallen from +3.6% at the height of his convention bounce to +3.1%. Sure, he's ahead of Romney right now, but he's been ahead of Romney for the entire contest, excepting two days at the height of Romney's convention bounce, when the candidates were merely tied. Moreover, Obama's convention bounce wasn't even the furthest ahead of Romney he's been during the course of the campaign. Thus, objectively, there's no reason for the recent chortles among the left or the wailing from the right. The status quo prevails. Attempting to demoralize one's opponents is a time-honored tradition, but declaring that the race is over is hyperbole that would, in cruder contexts, be simply dismissed as trash talk. In truth, neither Obama nor Romney has had his break-out moment yet.

#### Ignore their polls --- they oversample democrat voters --- Obama will lose

Holt 9-17 Mytheos Holt is an Assistant Editor at the Blaze. He has held positions at the Washington Times, National Review Online and the Competitive Enterprise Institute. He also served as a speechwriter for U.S. Senator John Barrasso (R-WY). A 2010 graduate of Wesleyan University, Mytheos hails originally from Big Sur, CA.

This Graph Shows Why Obama Is Ahead in the Polls <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/this-graph-shows-why-obama-is-ahead-in-the-polls/>, jj

Ever since the arguably skewed CNN poll of a few weeks back, conservative voters have been looking at the methodology of polling companies with an increasing amount of skepticism. The fact that most polls have used a model that tries to mimic the voter turnout in 2008, when Democrats beat Republican turnout by 7 points (as opposed to presidential elections like 2004, where turnout between the two parties was relatively even), has not improved this state of affairs. And now, the suspicion of poll bias appears to have yet one more piece of evidence to support it. Via a tweet by anonymous poll analyst NumbersCruncher comes the following graph showing the degree of oversampling of Democrats employed by the most recent polls (all of which show Obama leading Romney): Blogger keithbacker at Battleground Watch sums up the graph this way: The real take-away which I have mentioned the times I blog national polls is that many of those national polls are HORRIBLE for Obama, namely the ABC/Washington Post and CBS/New York Times polls where you have large Democrat over-samplings but rather small leads for Obama. This means if Obama doesn’t meet or beat his stellar 2008 turnout advantage he’s in for a drubbing on election day.

#### Romney win --- newest polls, Obama’s low approval rating, and enthusiasm

Chambers 9-13

Dean, Arlington Conservative Examiner, Washington Examiner, Mitt Romney possible landslide indicated by polling data released today <http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-possible-landslide-indicated-by-polling-data-released-today>, jj

The latest Rasmussen Reports Daily Presidential Tracking Poll released today shows Mitt Romney back in the lead over President Obama by a 47 percent to 46 percent margin and three percent preferring another candidate. When voters leaning to one of the candidates are included, Romney has a 49 percent to 47 percent lead over the president. The poll also finds the president having a 49 percent approval rating while being disapproved by 51 percent. This is where Barack Obama has been in this poll for months, with the exception of briefly having an approval rating at or above 50 percent for a few days earlier this month that appears to have been a “bounce” after the Democratic National Convention. The Rasmussen poll also found that 49 percent of Republican voters are following the race on a daily basis while just 42 percent are doing so. Likewise, other national surveys of the presidential race have, including the Washington Post/ABC News poll released earlier this week, found a higher “enthusiasm” factor about the race among Republican voters than that of Democratic voters.

### A2: Nate Silver

#### Silver is not a political scientist – even if his models are accurate at some times, you should not default to him.

Dickinson ‘10 – Professor of Political Science

Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt. “Nate Silver Is Not A Political Scientist”. November 1, 2010

I’ve made this point before, most recently during the 2008 presidential campaign when Silver’s forecast model, with its rapidly changing “win” probabilities, made it appear as if voters were altering their preferences on a weekly basis. This was nonsense, of course, which is why the political science forecast models issued around Labor Day proved generally accurate. But in light of Silver’s column yesterday, it bears repeating: he’s not a political scientist. He’s an economist by training, but he’s really a weathercaster when it comes to predicting political outcomes. That is, he’s very adept at doing the equivalent of climbing to the top of Mt. Worth (a local skiing area for those not familiar with God’s Green Mountains), looking west toward Lake Champlain to see what the prevailing winds are carrying toward us, and issuing a weather bulletin for tomorrow. Mind you, this isn’t necessarily a knock on Silver’s work – he’s a damn good weathercaster. In 2008, his day—before election estimate came pretty close to nailing the Electoral College vote. More generally, at his best, he digs up intriguing data or uncovers interesting political patterns. At the same time, however, when it comes to his forecast models, he’s susceptible to the “Look Ma! No Hands!” approach in which he suggests the more numerous the variables in his model, the more effective it must be. In truth, as Sam Wang demonstrated in 2008, when his much simpler forecast model proved more accurate than Silver’s, parsimony can be a virtue when it comes to predictions. Why do I bring this up now? Because, in the face of conflicting data, weathercasters can become unstrung if they are used to simply reporting the weather without possessing much of a grasp of basic meteorology. In yesterday’s column which the more cynical among us (who, moi?) might interpret as a classic CYA move, Silver raises a number of reasons why current forecasts (read: his!) might prove hopelessly wrong. Now, I applaud all efforts to specify the confidence interval surrounding a forecast. But the lack of logic underling Silver’s presentation reveals just how little theory goes into his predictions. For instance, he suggests the incumbent rule – which he has spent two years debunking – might actually come into play tomorrow. (The incumbent rule says, in effect, that in close races, almost all undecideds break for the challenger). Silver has provided data suggesting this rule didn’t apply in 2006 or 2008. You would think, therefore, that he doesn’t believe in the incumbent rule. Not so! He writes, “So, to cite the incumbent rule as a point of fact as wrong. As a theory, however — particularly one that applies to this election and not necessarily to others — perhaps it will turn out to have some legs.” Excuse me? Why, if there’s no factual basis for the incumbent rule, will it turn out to apply in this election? The rest of the column rests on equally sketchy reasoning. Silver concludes by writing, “What we know, however, is that polls can sometimes miss pretty badly in either direction. Often, this is attributed to voters having made up (or changed) their minds at the last minute — but it’s more likely that the polls were wrong all along. These are some reasons they could be wrong in a way that underestimates how well Republicans will do. There are also, of course, a lot of reasons they could be underestimating Democrats; we’ll cover these in a separate piece.” Let me get this straight: it’s possible the polls are underestimating the Republican support. Or, they might be underestimating Democrats’ support. I think this means if his forecast model proves incorrect, it’s because the polls “were wrong all along”. Really? Might it instead have something to do with his model? Come on Silver – man up! As it is, you already take the easy way out by issuing a forecast a day before the election, in contrast to the political scientists who put their reputations on the line by Labor Day. Do you believe in your model or not? The bottom line: if you want to know tomorrow’s weather, a weathercaster is good enough. If you want to know what causes the weather, you might want to look elsewhere.

### A2: econ key

#### Its not just economic performance – voter perception on economic issues swings key battleground states

Teixeira and Halpin, 11

Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin, Center for American Progress, November, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/11/pdf/path_to_270_execsumm.pdf>

Obviously, much could change between now and then but at the outset of the election campaign it is clear that two large forces will ultimately determine the outcome: the shifting demographic balance of the American electorate, and the objective reality and voter perception of the economy in key battleground states. The central questions of the election are thus fairly straightforward. Will the rising electorate of communities of color, the Millennial generation, professionals, single women, and seculars that pushed Obama to victory in 2008 be sufficient and mobilized enough to ensure his re-election in 2012? Or will the Republican Party and its presidential nominee capitalize on a struggling economy and greater mobilization from a conservative base that holds the president in deep disdain?

#### Voter economic perception can boost Obama even if economy stays weak

Lux 2-20**-12** (Mike, Co-founder & CEO – Progressive Strategies, Huffington Post, “2012 Scenarios: What if the Economy Heads Back Downhill?” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mike-lux/obama-jobs-2012_b_1289076.html>, jj)

So if the economy starts moving in the wrong direction because of either or both of these factors, are things lost for the Obama re-election effort? They sure don't help, but the answer is no. Here's what **the Obama team needs to** focus on with these dangers in mind: 1. **Keep the focus firmly on fighting for the middle class**. **Most voters** don't blame Obama for the tough times, and they are well aware that the Republicans in Congress aren't doing anything to help, but they **will blame the president if they think he is not fighting hard for them while they are suffering through these bone-crunching times for the middle class**. **The Obama team's shift in messaging toward the Teddy Roosevelt style populism he has exhibited in the last few months is working**. I am firmly convinced that this message -- in contrast to the of the rich, by the rich, for the rich campaign of Mitt Romney -- is what has driven his poll numbers in the right direction, not the modestly improving economic numbers most voters don't feel yet.

### 2nc Link Overview

#### We control link uniqueness --- Obama is losing these voters now because of a perceived war on fossil fuels --- plan shifts his position in the eyes of voters

Styles ‘11

Geoffrey Styles is Managing Director of GSW Strategy Group, LLC, an energy and environmental strategy consulting firm. Since 2002 he has served as a consultant, advisor and communicator, helping organizations and executives address systems-level policy. His industry experience includes leadership roles at Texaco Inc. in strategy development and scenario planning, alliance management, and energy trading, at both the corporate center and with business units involved in global oil refining & marketing, transportation, and alternative energy. He has an MBA and a BS in Chemical Engineering.

11-7-11, Energy Outlook, Will Energy Determine the 2012 Election? <http://energyoutlook.blogspot.com/2011/11/will-energy-determine-2012-election.html>, jj

A year from today Americans will know who will serve as President from 2013 to 2017. Even though $4 gasoline was still fresh in the minds of voters, energy played only a minor role in the outcome of the 2008 election, overshadowed by two wars and a crippling financial crisis. Will that be the case again in 2012, or will energy loom larger, propelled by its close connection with the economy? Several Republican candidates have already raised energy as a campaign issue, and the administration has repeatedly emphasized the linkages between energy, jobs and taxes. Whether any of those arguments gains traction in a race that at this point seems likely to be dominated by unemployment and deficits could depend on how deftly the administration handles decisions such as the Keystone XL Pipeline permit, as well as the degree to which voters become interested in the details of the country's shifting energy balances.

From day one, the Obama administration has taken a calculated risk on energy by focusing most of its non-crisis-response attention on promoting renewables such as biofuels and wind, solar and geothermal power. According to the latest figures from the Energy Information Agency the combined contribution to our total energy diet from these sources increased from 2.2% in 2008 to 3.2% in 2010. Rightly or wrongly, the Solyndra fiasco could leave voters questioning the wisdom of the whole suite of renewables policies that promise large future benefits but have had little tangible impact so far. Nor do the administration's efforts to claim credit for increasing US oil production look very credible when they demonstrably reflected the characteristic time lags of investments made during the Bush years, and occurred largely in spite of policies such as the Gulf of Mexico drilling moratorium and various onshore lease cancellations.

Meanwhile, the single largest energy development of recent years, the harnessing of vast shale gas resources, which last year supplied the equivalent of more than triple the combined output of US wind, solar and geothermal power, has occurred against a background of governmental ambivalence and occasional outright hostility, as in the case of New York's state moratorium on hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking". Unless the Obama administration moves to embrace shale gas, which David Brooks of the New York Times referred to in his column last week as a "wondrous gift", it might not be very hard for the President's challenger next year to portray his policies as being focused on only 3% of the energy that drives the economy, while neglecting the other 97%.

#### Obama will win traditional energy voters if he does the plan --- they’re key to swing states

Kotkin ‘12

Joel Kotkin is a presidential fellow in urban futures at Chapman University and a contributing editor to the City Journal. The Daily Beast, 7-12-12, How Fossil-Fuel Democrats Became An Endangered Species <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/07/12/the-energy-war-how-fossil-fuel-democrats-became-an-endangered-species.html>, jj

In an election pivoting on jobs, energy could be the issue that comes back to haunt Barack Obama and the Democratic Party as the cultural and ideological schism between energy-producing Republican states and energy-dependent Democratic ones widens. As the economy has sputtered since 2008, conventional energy has emerged as one of the few robust sources of high-paying work, adding roughly half a million jobs since 2007 as new technologies and changing market conditions have opened up a vast new supply of exploitable domestic reserves. This is good news for Mitt Romney: nine of the ten states that rely most heavily on the sector for jobs are solidly behind him. (Colorado, where polls show Obama with a narrow lead, is the one exception). President Obama’s heavy-handed regulation of the booming old-energy economy—the moratorium on offshore drilling following the BP spoil, the decision to block the Keystone XL Pipeline, and the prospect of a fracking ban—and his embrace of green-energy policies has played well in the solidly Democratic post-industrial coastal economies that he also depends on for fund-raising. But it’s left him with few friends in the energy belt that spans the Great Plains, the Gulf Coast, Appalachia and now some parts of the old rustbelt, despite his election-year claims of an “all-of-the-above” energy policy. It’s a far cry from Bill Clinton, whose close ties with Great Plains and Gulf Coast Democrats and energy producers there helped him twice carry Louisiana, Kentucky and West Virginia—all states that appear to be solidly behind Romney this year. Today, Democratic senators in regions that depend on fossil fuels are becoming an endangered species. Over the past two years, Virginia’s Jim Webb and Byron Dorgan and Kent Conrad, both from booming North Dakota, have announced their retirement or retired, while Montana’s Jon Tester has distanced himself from the president as he faces a difficult re-election fight. And that diminishing presence in turn means less intra-party resistance to any potential second-term plans to cut the burgeoning fossil-fuel business to size. The administration’s hostility to the dirty business of energy, and the sector’s fear of new bans or regulations in a second Obama term that would gut the industry were perhaps best captured by the then-EPA administrator who claimed Administration policy was to “crucify” fossil fuel. Yet as Obama pursues a 50-percent-plus-one re-election strategy reminiscent of President Bush in 2004, his energy approach has been embraced by his core constituents, particularly the public-sector union workers and urbanized “creative-class” members. This is particularly true in the coastal enclaves like New York and California that import much of their energy (and in California’s case in particular has declined to exploit its own considerable reserves). Sixty-percent of the electricity in Los Angeles, a key bastion of Obama support, comes from coal-fired plants in Utah and Arizona; much of the natural gas that provides nearly half of the power for California’s grid is imported. While Pennsylvania and Ohio have exploited their large shale reserves that have become vastly valuable in recent year thanks to new extraction techniques and shifting energy prices, New York State has yet to follow suit, even as New York City lacks the supply to match peak summer demand, forcing it to depend on an aging nuclear power plant at Indian Point that’s years overdue to close. If anything, the pressure from environmental activists , many of them well-heeled and living far removed from power sources and the jobs they create, is for Obama to go even further. A few rich donors from the green lobby complain the President has not been environmentally correct enough; Mother Jones actually asked if Obama has been “morphing into Dick Cheney” on energy issues. But for the most part, the coasts are on board with Obama’s energy policy. Silicon Valley and Wall Street have invested heavily in the renewable industries favored and frequently propped up by the administration, putting their money where Obama’s mouth is. Silicon Valley hegemons like venture capitalist John Doerr and Wall Street giants like Goldman Sachs regard the green energy business as a profitable, state-supported way to grow their profits. One disgusted venture investor described the investors in the heavily subsidized green game as “venture porkulists.” These investments are now critical to many powerful tech firms, who increasingly have little domestic involvement in the manufacturing businesses that was central to a prior generation of Silicon Valley titans. Google alone has invested more than a billion dollars in the green-energy sector, as the valley’s new dominant clique of venture capitalists and tech executives donate at record levels to the president’s re-election. Nowhere is the element of choice inherent in energy policy more evident than in California, home to five of the nation’s twelve largest oil fields and energy reserves equal to those of Nigeria, the world’s tenth-largest producer. As high-paying energy jobs swell payrolls in the Great Plains, the Intermountain West and parts of the Gulf, the Golden State has double-digit unemployment, a collapsed inland economy and a series of bankrupt municipalities. Amidst a great national energy boom, California’s energy production has remained stunted even as the state’s draconian “renewable” energy mandates are slated to drive up its already high electricity rates. The state’s high cost of energy has impacted industry: despite its vast human and natural resources, the Golden State, with 12 percent of the nation’s population received barely 2 percent of the country’s manufacturing expansions last year. Such inattention to California’s resources may be popular in wealthy precincts of Silicon Valley, San Francisco and west Los Angeles, but the state’s green approach has helped place traditionally manufacturing-oriented communities such as Oakland, east Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Stockton in deep distress. Despite central California’s vast deposits of oil and gas, unemployment rates in some oil-rich areas there are over 15 and sometimes even 20 percent. As economic forecaster Bill Watkins recently told an audience in hard-hit Santa Maria: “If you were in Texas, you’d be rich.” Meanwhile the fossil-fuel energy producers, related chemical manufacturers and financiers who are getting rich, from the Koch Brothers to Chesapeake Energy and Arch Coal, have been investing in Romney and the super-PACs supporting him. Much of the money they’re pouring in will likely be spent persuading voters in the four crucial energy states–long-time producers New Mexico and Colorado and emergent natural gas producers Ohio and Pennsylvania—that will be up for grabs in November. Colorado has generated more than 20,000 while new energy jobs since 2000, third highest in the nation, while Ohio and Pennsylvania combined have created 25,000 new energy jobs in that span—and that’s not counting the services those largely well-paid workers demand or the new manufacturing jobs making pipes and compressors the industry creates. What all four contested states have in common is that their energy sectors are pitted against powerful competing interests, including true-blue urban constituents, and tourism and technology sectors that employ workers and industries more concerned with the local environment than with energy-driven growth. Still, a boom is a boom, and President Obama is doing his best to claim credit for the huge surge in oil and gas production under his watch, although the increase has been almost completely on private and state lands outside his reach. Production on federal lands has actually dropped. Yet his “all of the above” rhetoric comes off as more evenhanded and substantial than the drill- baby-drill GOP set. Romney, though, can point to a series of Obama decisions and priorities—including the painfully slow resumption of Gulf Shore oil operations after the BP spill, the effective veto of the Keystone XL pipeline, and proposed EPA greenhouse gas restrictions—as mortal threats to the American energy boom. He can also contrast the economic rise of energy-friendly Texas with the troubles of hyper-green California.

#### Obama is being scapegoated for the coal industry’s decline, which will cost him Appalachian states --- plan removes a huge political liability and boosts his popularity

Bump ‘12

Philip Bump writes about the news for Gristmill, 8-9-12, Grist, As Obama runs toward the coal industry, it keeps running away <http://grist.org/news/as-obama-runs-toward-the-coal-industry-it-keeps-running-away>, jj

We’ve discussed how wind energy is playing a larger and larger role in the campaign. It goes without saying that coal is a huge policy issue, particularly in states touching the Appalachians. That’s why for months Republicans have pointed to a nonexistent Obama administration “war on coal,” trying to pin the blame for a faltering coal industry on the policies of his administration. The lens, as with all policy issues this year, is jobs. The Charleston Gazette has a report today that suggests what the “war on coal” means for coal employment. Coal-mining employment in West Virginia dropped by nearly 1,300 jobs in the second quarter of the year, according to preliminary numbers that illustrate the coal industry’s continued decline in the face of cheap natural gas, declining reserves, and competition from other coal regions. … Current statewide numbers are roughly the same as the last full quarter of George W. Bush’s presidency, according to jobs numbers mine operators report to MSHA. West Virginia mining employment is up by nearly 1,800 jobs — more than 8 percent — since the Obama administration began initiatives aimed at cracking down on mountaintop removal mining. And, the most recent quarter’s figures show the seventh-highest number of jobs over the last 40 quarters, or 10 years. … Concerns about mountaintop removal’s impacts, air pollution from coal-fired power plants, global warming, and miner safety and health continue to pressure the industry, which claims an unfair effort by President Obama to shut it down. But government and private forecasts have for years projected a decline in Southern West Virginia production, fueled by quality reserves being mined out and increasing competition from giant surface mines in Wyoming’s Powder River Basin. Emphasis added. Coal jobs are steady since Obama took office, despite the nation’s shift toward natural gas. The “war on coal” so far affects mostly plant owners, who are being forced to absorb the cost of their own pollution. But facts are never as powerful as belief. The mineworkers union, which endorsed Obama strongly in 2008, has decided to sit this election out. Said Mike Caputo, a union official: “I don’t think quite frankly that coalfield folks are crazy about either candidate.” “Our members count on coal-fired power plants and burning of coal to keep jobs,” Caputo said. “We’re a very Democratic union and we try to listen to the rank and file. They’ve sent a clear message that they’re not supportive of the environmental rules that are being put in place.” Environmental rules are tangible, unlike macroeconomic trends. It is very much the case that the Environmental Protection Agency has worked to combat pollution from coal, primarily by establishing baselines for the emissions from coal-burning facilities. It’s a short line to draw from new pollution controls to coal plant costs — especially when political opportunists spend a lot of time and energy making that line as thick and black and visible as possible. Last month, the CEO of Murray Energy, a coal-plant operator, went on CNN to argue — contrary to all presented evidence — that Obama was to blame for the drop in coal demand. The CEO, Robert Murray, has a vested financial interest in reinforcing that line between the president and the decline of coal: If Obama wins reelection, it’s more likely that Murray will be forced to reduce his plants’ pollution. It’s why Murray, as CNN noted on-air, is a major contributor to the Republican Party. Murray’s complaint and the mineworkers’ diffidence both show the coal industry’s eagerness to find a scapegoat for its decline. Coal has two options: Washington or itself. Which do you think it’s going to choose? Unfortunately for Barack Obama, the issue is coming to a head within easy sight of a key political election. So he’s forced to try to reconcile his policy moves with the inexorable politics of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia — to claim that he is a champion of a dying industry. This is perhaps the last great moment of political leverage from the coal industry. In 10, 20 years, we’ll look back at this as an anachronism. But for Barack Obama, a president who has done less than he should have to curtail carbon pollution from fossil fuels, even his meager efforts on coal are a big political liability.

### A2: Democrat Base/Greens

#### ( ) No link turn --- base enthusiasm inevitable

Cillizza 9-20

Chris Cillizza, 9-20-12, Washington Post, The enthusiasm gap (or not) — in 2 charts <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/20/the-enthusiasm-gap-or-not-in-2-charts/>, jj

Clearly Democrats have grown more enthusiastic about voting since this summer — the almost-certain result of the party’s successful national convention earlier this month. It is also true that among the likeliest of the likely voters Romney retains a slight edge over Obama due to the fact that the people trying to win something back are almost always more fired up to do it than the people who are just trying to hold on to what they have. (Sidebar: That same phenomenon is why it’s so hard to repeat as champions in a sport.) Focusing on the relative enthusiasm of the two party bases may well be something of a moot point in the end. It’s hard to imagine that in a presidential election where so much money has been spent on both sides and so much vitriol has been slung (if you can sling vitriol, that is) that the bases of both parties won’t be wildly fired up to vote.

#### 1) These voters aren’t key --- extend Mead --- swaying blue collar voters in fossil fuel states outweighs Obama’s traditional base --- more ev

Krauthammer ‘12

Charles, 8-14, Fox News, All-Star Panel: How does energy play into presidential race? <http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/special-report-bret-baier/2012/08/15/all-star-panel-how-does-energy-play-presidential-race>, jj

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER, SYNDICATED COLUMNIST: I agree. I think when you go for coal, which is where Romney is now going now. It's almost half of all the electrical production in the United States. Solar, for example, is 0.2 percent. It's minuscule. I mean, if you are going to be the green energy guy, you are going to get people on the left that Obama already has. To appeal to the country nationally, you go for coal, the restriction on oil drilling, the fracking, regulations, I think you win the argument in a very broad way. And I think Keystone is the symbol of it, but coal, I think, is the heart of it. The regulation that was passed quietly in the EPA that everybody in coal in the country knows will devastate the industry.

***2) Only a risk of our link --- no one cares about warming***

Charles K. Ebinger, Director, Energy Security Initiative, Govinda Avasarala, Senior Research Assistant, Foreign Policy, Energy Security Initiative, 6-11-12, Brookings, Five Major Energy Problems the Next President Has to Face <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/06/11-energy-climate-ebinger-avasarala>, jj

Fifth, the transition in policy discussions from “climate change” to “clean energy” or “the green economy” indicates that the importance of global warming on the national agenda is waning. However difficult, the next president must reset the conversation to focus not on the economic benefits of “green jobs” but on ensuring that the United States is on a clear path to a low-carbon future. Although bound to be controversial, this step would ensure the next president’s legacy.

#### 3) The base has made up their mind --- independents key

Angle ‘12

Jim Angle, 7-27-12, Fox News, Political parties turn to independent voters for edge in November

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/07/26/political-parties-turn-to-independent-voters-for-edge-in-november/#ixzz23YpM5gQD>, jj

Most registered Republicans and Democrats have long since made up their minds who they're going to vote for, so the presidential campaigns are poised to spend tens of millions of dollars trying to win over those who say they don't belong to either party. "Most folks in the parties have made their decision already," says Lanae Erickson Hatalsky of the centrist Democratic think tank Third Way. "And so those independents, a bigger number of them, are now going to be the real key to victory in 2012." David Winston, a Republican strategist, said such independents made up 22 percent of voters in 2002. "In 2010, they had grown to make up about 29 percent of the electorate," he said. "So clearly as the exit polls have shown, they've grown quite a bit." And a Gallup poll recently reported that independents account for 35 percent or more of voters in most recent elections. Some political analysts, however, say many voters call themselves independents but really are not -- that the true number is less than 10 percent. If so, they're just as important: "Even half of that means 3, 4, 5 percent, and in most of these battleground states the final results will be within 52 to 48 percent, so they could be and probably will be the critical voters," says Larry Sabato, a political analyst at the University of Virginia. And one Republican analyst says independents have been key in recent swings of power in Washington. "In 1994, when Republicans won the Congress, we won independents by 14 (percentage points)," Winston said. "In 2006, when we lost the Congress, we lost independent by 18. And we came back in this last election in 2010, we won independents by 19 points"

#### 4) Environmentalists will inevitably support Obama --- and undecided voters don’t care about climate change

Hurst ‘12

Steven R. Hurst, The Associated Press, 8-8-12, Calgary Herald, Climate change largely off US election radar as Obama, Romney battle over economy <http://www.calgaryherald.com/business/Climate+change+largely+election+radar+Obama+Romney+battle+over/7060719/story.html>, jj

Even without a big push on climate change, Obama has the support of environmentalists. Sierra Club executive director Michael Brune said Obama "has done a substantial amount in his three years to fight the climate crisis." Romney, he said, "is taking his lead from fossil fuel companies and does not even acknowledge there is a climate problem." Romney has been accused of changing positions on the issue to curry favour with the most conservative Republicans, many of whom deny that climate change exists. As governor of the liberal-leaning state of Massachusetts, Romney imposed restrictions on carbon dioxide emissions on power plants in the state. But as a presidential candidate, he has said the "idea of spending trillions and trillions of dollars to try to reduce CO2 emissions is not the right course for us." He acknowledges that the globe is warming, but says "we don't know what's causing climate change on this planet." Early in his administration, Obama was more bullish on tackling climate change. He pushed through tough new fuel economy standards for cars and trucks and promoted alternative energy. But the first years of Obama's presidency were dominated by the political fight over his plan to overhaul the country's health care system. Obama managed to pass health care over intense Republican objections while Democrats controlled both houses of Congress. But after Republicans — fueled by the conservative tea party movement's anti-government, small-tax message — seized control of the House of Representatives in the 2010 elections, the president's legislative agenda has been blocked. The United States is now more politically riven and gripped in partisanship than at any time in recent history. Legislation on a deeply controversial issue like curbing greenhouse gases stands no chance of passage in Congress at a time when Republicans are accusing Obama of reckless spending and burdening businesses with unnecessary regulations. Obama was bitten badly when Solyndra, a solar energy firm that received a $500 million federal loan guarantee, went bankrupt and left taxpayers with the bill. Republicans painted Obama's drive for alternative energy as a waste of time and money in an economy that was struggling to pull out of the worst downturn since the Great Depression. Obama hasn't totally ignored climate change on the campaign trail. As recently as this week he was promoting a drive to expedite seven solar and wind energy projects in the American West. His interior secretary, Ken Salazar, said Tuesday that the administration had in the past three years "approved more utility-scale renewable energy projects on public lands than in the past two decades combined." But there is little chance that the few undecided American voters who will decide the razor-close election will cast their ballots based on the candidates' position on climate change. James Riddlesperger, a political scientist who studies the juncture of science and politics at Texas Christian University, said the political lines are already drawn. "Everybody already knows where the parties, the candidates stand on global warming," he said. "What is done about it awaits the outcome of this election."

**A2: Add on**

***1) Food prices are self-correcting***

Rick **Newman**, US News and World Report, May 5th **2011**, http://www.usnews.com/mobile/blogs/flowchart/2011/5/5/why-gas-and-food-prices-are-likely-to--drop.html (BJN)

**The rise in food prices seems** even more **temporary** than the rise in gas. Energy costs have a lot to do with food costs, because it takes a lot of fuel to harvest, process, and transport food. So if oil prices stabilize or fall, the same thing will happen to food prices. **Unusually bad weather in many parts of the world has** also **led to weak harvests that have driven prices up. And unlike oil, there's a lot of excess capacity in the world for growing food**, **which is a** kind of **self-correcting mechanism: As prices rise for certain types of crops**, **farmers become more inclined to grow them, which adds to supply and helps keep prices in check**. IHS predicts that **a market correction should bring food inflation down from 6 percent now to about 1.7 percent by the end of the year.**

***2) Energy costs a small factor***

Donald **Mitchell,** Lead Economist, Development Prospects Group (DECPG), World Bank, Washington, “A Note on Rising Food Prices”, July 20**08**, http://www.wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2008/07/28/000020439\_20080728103002/Rendered/PDF/WP4682.pdf (BJN)

**High energy prices have contributed about 15**-20 **percent to higher U.S. food commodities production and transport costs**. Production costs per acre for U.S. corn10, soybeans and wheat increased 32.3, 25.6 and 31.4 percent, respectively, from 2002 to 2007, according to the USDA’s cost-of-production surveys (USDA 2008b) and forecasts (Table 1). However, **yield increases during this period reduced the per bushel cost increases** to 17.0, 24.1 and 6.7 percent, respectively. The **contribution of the energy-intensive components of production costs**—§ Marked 12:09 § fertilizer, chemicals, fuel, lubricants and electricity—**were 13**.4 **percent for corn**, 6.7 percent for soybeans **and 9**.4 **percent for wheat per bushel**. The production-weighted average increase in the cost of production due to these energy-intensive inputs for these crops was 11.5 percent between 2002 and 2007. In addition to the increase in production costs, transport costs also increased due to higher fuel costs and the margin between domestic and export prices reflect this cost (Table 2). However, these margins also include handling and other charges, such as insurance, which increase with crop prices. **The margin for corn between central Illinois cash and the Gulf Ports barge increased** from $0.36 to $0.72 per bushel for an increase of **15**.5 **percent**, while the margin between Kansas City and the Gulf Ports wheat increased only $1 per metric ton. An export weighted average of these prices suggests that transport costs could have added as much as 10.2 percent to the export prices of corn and wheat. Comparable data was not available for soybeans. Thus, **the combined increase in production costs and transport costs for the major U.S. food commodities**—corn,soybeans and wheat—**was at most 21**.7 **percent**, **and this amount likely overstates the increase, because transport costs are not estimated separately. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that higher energy and related costs increased export prices of major U.S. food commodities by about 15**-20 **percent between 2002 and 2007**.

***3) Plan can’t solve supply alt causes***

Nicholas P **Sargen**, PhD, Chief Investment Officer, May 11th **2011**, http://www.nicksargen.com/?p=640 (BJN)

Over the past decade, **the principal driver of** oil and **commodity prices has been the global economic cycle** and the emergence of China as a global economic power. Prior to the onset of the financial crisis in September 2008, commodity prices had increased nearly uninterrupted from 2003 on the back of strong global demand, with China becoming the dominant buyer of natural resources. **During the financial meltdown from mid-2008 to early 2009, commodity prices plummeted in response to the severe global recession, but they rebounded subsequently as the world economy recovered. Supply shortages have** also **played a role in the surge in food prices, owing to widespread crop damage in Russia, floods in Pakistan’s food belt, and flood damage in Australia and China**. At the same time, some observers contend the **U.S. corn-based ethanol mandate imposed in 2005 has contributed to the run-up in corn prices from $2 per bushel pre-2005 to more than $7 per bushel today.**

***4) Turn – Low food prices increases ag dumping***

Mark **Muller** et al, director of the Environment and Agriculture program at the Minneapolis-based Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, “Food vs Fuel in the United States Can Both Win in the Era of Ethanol?” Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Sept 20**07** (BJN)

**Higher commodity prices do not** necessarily **translate into higher food prices in developing countries**. In fact, **higher commodity prices could actually increase food security in developing countries by reducing agricultural dumping**. **The dumping of agricultural products—the selling of products below their cost of production—is perhaps the most damaging of all current market distortions** in world trade. **Developing country agriculture, vital for food security, rural livelihoods, poverty reduction and generating foreign exchange, is crippled by the competition from major commodities dumped onto world markets.** In 2003, U.S. corn was exported (dumped) at an average price of 10 percent below the full cost of production.16 **The structural price depression associated with selling food products below their cost of production has two major effects on developing country farmers who raise competing products. First, below-cost imports drive developing country farmers out of their local markets**. If the farmers do not have access to a safety net of tariffs or subsidies and/or credit—which in most poor countries they do not—the underpriced competition can drive them out of business. **When this happens, the local farm economy shrinks, in turn shrinking the rural economy as a whole and sending rural people into trade-related migration. Second, developing country farmers who sell their products to exporters find their global market share undermined by a depressed global price. The cascading effects of dumping are felt around the world.**

### A2: Air Power

***Air power fails---history and Libya proves***

**Ramberg, June 6th, 2011** (Bennett, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins; J.D. UCLA, foreign policy analyst in the [Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Bureau+of+Politico-Military+Affairs%22) at the [Department of State](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Department+of+State%22) during the [George H.W. Bush](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22George+H.W.+Bush%22) administration, academic appointments have included positions at Princeton, Stanford and UCLA, Seattle Post Intelligencer, “Why NATO’s air might lacks power” <http://www.seattlepi.com/default/article/Why-NATO-s-air-might-lacks-power-1411125.php>, jj)

NATO is chagrined. Yes, the bombing campaign stopped [Muammar Qadhafi](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Muammar+Qadhafi%22)'s march on Benghazi. And, yes, it staved off rebel defeats elsewhere, breaking the government's siege on Misurata. But **the alliance's hopes for a quick victory through a mini "shock and awe" failed after months of trying.** Catch me if you can, the dictator taunted NATO in his May 13 radio comment: "I am in a place you cannot reach." **Given NATO's resources, why the failure?** One answer: The colonel is not the blowhard some depicted. That should come as no surprise. Over the decades, Qadhafi proved to be a brutal but deft dictator. He beat back multiple attempts to unseat him. He survived years of isolation following the 1988 Lockerbie bombing. And in 2003, he proved nimble enough to surrender his nascent nuclear program as the quid pro quo for resumption of diplomatic relations with the United States and others. But there remains another reason: **NATO's belief in air power**. **In 1999, the alliance learned** **a** lesson - or, better put, **mislesson - that air power could win wars**. **In** the 11-week **Kosovo** campaign, **air power did** indeed **prevail. NATO hoped the strategy would repeat in North Africa. But the presumption lay on a historic anomaly - with unique caveats - rather than the broader tapestry of air power in history. The result: the Libya stalemate today**. A deeper look at history adds perspective. Air power classically seeks to bend the curve of war toward success. Tactically, it attempts to block adversary gains and provide an additive to ground forces. Strategically, it strives to incite domestic political instability within the adversary's ranks, intimidating the enemy to concede. The Kosovo war included intense NATO bombing subject to a limited objective: the expulsion of Serbian forces from the province. The three-month war included about 10,500 strike missions dropping 12,000 tons of bombs largely flown by the United States under the NATO banner. In addition to military targets, the war destroyed about 50 percent of Serbia's productive capacity. The blow squeezed a nation already reeling in the aftermath of the nearly decadelong Balkan wars. **In the aftermath, some reviewers remained mystified over NATO's air power success.** **After all, no other air campaign** - the dropping of the atomic bomb in World War II excluded - **successfully delivered a knockout blow without an effective ground war**. **The Blitz over Britain in World War II failed. Likewise, the extended bombing of Germany. The fire bombings of Tokyo also stumbled**. **After World War II, other conflicts repeatedly demonstrated the limits of air power**. **In the Cold War's hot wars, air campaigns could only help prevent defeat in Korea. It did not even achieve that in Vietnam. The Soviets found the same in Afghanistan. Israel's 1967 successful air assault on Egypt's air force still required ground forces to win the war. Air power supplemented the 1991 and 2003 wars in Iraq, the Bosnia war and the ongoing war in Afghanistan**. So why did Kosovo prove different? The answer lies less in unconvincing threats of ground intervention or Russia's displeasure with Serbia that some suggest than in the Milosevic regime's conclusion that it could afford to lose the province as long as regime change in Belgrade did not follow. That is not the case in Libya. Despite the [Security Council](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Security+Council%22)'s humanitarian resolution, the leaders of Britain, France and the United States call for Qadhafi's removal. The repeated bombardment of the Libyan leader's residential compound brings the point home. And the colonel has gotten the message and drawn the logical conclusion: Surrender is not an option. **This places NATO in a quandary. Absent a coup or lucky air strike** that takes out Qadhafi, **success requires what all other wars demanded: a competent, reasonably armed and well-led ground capacity. In the Libya case, this will require time, money, equipment and leadership with far more on-the-ground NATO assistance.** For those who think otherwise, they would do well to recall the conclusion [Johns Hopkins](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Johns+Hopkins%22) University strategist [Eliot Cohen](http://www.seattlepi.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=national%2Fpolitico&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Eliot+Cohen%22) - the director of the U.S. government's Persian Gulf War evaluation - made in Foreign Affairs in 1994: "**Air power is an unusually seductive form of military strength, in part because, like modern courtship, it appears to offer gratification without commitment." In Libya, gratification will not suffice**.

### Comp

***There are tons of alt causes to competitiveness***

***Knowledge@Wharton 3-16-11*** (“Dow Chemical's Andrew Liveris on the Future of Manufacturing -- and Making America Competitive Again” <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=2734>, jj)

Special economic zones are only part of the solution. **Liveris pointed out a range of problems that hurt America's competitiveness: crumbling infrastructure, a breakdown in K-12 education and the lack of a coherent energy policy, to name a few. The last item is a particularly sore point** for Dow, which consumes 850,000 barrels of oil a day. "I'm not saying the U.S. can solve [the problems of] oil markets, but **how about a national strategy to replace imported oil?"** Liveris asked. "Why haven't we developed this yet? **... Do you know how much of our imported oil goes into waste, between buildings, cars and consumption of all sorts? We could take off half the imports if we developed national standards in these things."**

#### 1. US economy is strong and improving---we’re leading the world

Jubak 12 3/22, \*Jim Jubak has been writing about the capital markets for more than 25 years, including 12 years at MSN Money, “US economy strong as the world falls behind,” http://money.msn.com/top-stocks/post.aspx?post=7b785c7d-3655-4577-9e9a-c346e21e4187, AJ

It seemed like the U.S. was the only strong economy in the world Thursday. Thursday morning, U.S. initial claims for unemployment fell to 348,000 for the week ended March 17 from 353,000 for the prior week. Economists surveyed by Bloomberg had projected a drop to 350,000. That number would be consistent with the U.S. economy adding another net 200,000 jobs in March for a fourth consecutive month of 200,000 new jobs or better. The data out of Europe, for example, show that the region will slip into something deeper than the mild recession the European Central Bank projected back in January for the first two quarters of 2012. And the bad news is pretty much all over Europe. In the United Kingdom, retail sales fell by 0.8% in February from January. (Expected decline was 0.4%.) Year-to-year sales were up 1% versus an expected gain of 2.6%. In Portugal, the government announced that its budget deficit almost tripled to $600 million in the first two months of the year. Higher tax rates put in place as part of the country's austerity package were offset by a 4.3% drop in government revenue as the economy slowed. In Ireland, the eurozone's austerity "success" story, the economy slipped back into recession with a drop of 0.2% in first quarter GDP. In the fourth quarter of 2011, revised figures show the economy contracted by 1.1%. In Germany, the Markit Economics flash Purchasing Managers Index for March showed a drop to 48.1 for manufacturing from 50.2 in February. That's a four-month low. Remember anything above 50 shows a sector is expanding; below 50 and a sector is contracting. Unlike manufacturing, services stayed above 50 at 51.8 but that was still a drop from 52.8 in February and also a four-month low for the index. For the European Union as a whole, the Purchasing Managers Index dropped to 48.7 in March. That was down from 49.2 in February and a projected 49.2. Not surprisingly, prices on Spanish bonds fell, pushing the yield on the country's 10-year bonds above 5.5% for the first time since January. And I hope that you're not looking for good news from China Thursday. The preliminary Purchasing Managers Index survey by HSBC came in at 48.1 in March, down from a final survey reading of 49.6 in February. The HSBC preliminary survey tends to be more bearish than the final survey, since it contains a higher proportion of smaller companies that have had a tough time raising capital recently and I expect the final reading will be higher. Still, the trend is pointing in the wrong direction. No one should be surprised that China's economy is slowing. The important question remains by how much.

#### 3. No one policy can solve for competitiveness

Porter ‘5 [Michael, “What Is Competitiveness?”, January-April, http://insight.iese.edu/doc.aspx?id=00438&ar=7&idioma=2]

Competitiveness is defined by the productivity with which a nation utilizes its human, capital and natural resources. To understand competitiveness, the starting point must be a nation's underlying sources of prosperity. A country's standard of living is determined by the productivity of its economy, which is measured by the value of goods and services produced per unit of its resources. Productivity depends both o­n the value of a nation's products and services - measured by the prices they can command in open markets - and by the efficiency with which they can be produced. Productivity is also dependent o­n the ability of an economy to mobilize its available human resources.

True competitiveness, then, is measured by productivity. Productivity allows a nation to support high wages, attractive returns to capital, a strong currency - and with them, a high standard of living. What matters most is not exports per se or whether firms are domestic or foreign-owned, but the nature and productivity of the business activities taking place in a particular country. Purely local industries also count for competitiveness, because their productivity not o­nly sets their wages but also has a major influence o­n the cost of doing business and the cost of living in the country. What Matters for Competitiveness Almost everything matters for competitiveness. The schools matter, the roads matter, the financial markets matter and customer sophistication matters. These and other aspects of a nation's circumstances are deeply rooted in a nation's institutions, people and culture. This makes improving competitiveness a special challenge, because there is no single policy or grand step that can create competitiveness, o­nly many improvements in individual areas that inevitably take time to accomplish. Improving competitiveness is a marathon, not a sprint. How to sustain momentum in improving competitiveness over time is among the greatest challenges facing countries.

## 1nr

***Biggest impact in the round***

**Bostrum**, 20**02** (Nick, PhD and Professor at Oxford, March, [www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html](http://www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html))

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. **An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal**. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time **that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization. Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation,** either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that **a smaller nuclear exchange**, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it **would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.**

**UQ – Econ High**

***Russia’s economy is growing now***

**Oprita** 6/21/20**12**, (Antonia, CNBC News Editor – “Are Oil Exports Russia's Curse as Well as Its Blessing?” http://www.cnbc.com/id/47870418)

The World Bank has upgraded slightly its economic growth estimate for Russia, forecasting growth of 3.8 percent in 2012 and 4.2 percent in 2013 in its June edition of the Global Economic Prospects. In January, the estimates were 3.5 percent for this year and 3.9 percent for next year. Russia's macroeconomic data would make many euro zone politicians go green with envy. The country's economy grew by 4.3 percent last year, its sovereign debt is around 10 percent of gross domestic product, its budget had a deficit of 0.9 percent in the first three months of this year and its current account had a surplus last year. "Actually, Russia is crediting the rest of the world," said Struchenevsky. One of the biggest risks for Russia's economy is the fact that it has become too dependent on high oil prices, said Neil Shearing, chief emerging markets economist at Capital Economics.

***Russian econ up now***

**\*\*Adomanis ‘12**

Mark Adomanis, Contributor, 7-26-12, Russia's Economy Is Not in Decline, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/07/26/russias-economy-is-not-in-decline/>, jj

**I’ve been very confused by the number of articles I’ve seen over the past few weeks that paint Russia as some sort of abysmal economic basket case, a country teetering on the edge of catastrophe**. This confuses me partially because the entire Western world is now enveloped in various kinds of slow-motion economic disaster, and partially because **when you look at the actual numbers Russia’s economy has actually done OK over the past couple of years**. Whether it was Zaiki Laidi making the inaccurate observation that Russia is “falling behind” the West or William Martel calling Russia’s economy both “totally dysfunctional” and “command” in nature, people haven’t had a whole lot of love for what has traditionally been the least popular member of the BRICS.¶ So what I thought I would do is make a simple and straightforward graph of Russia’s economic performance since its economy reached its post-Soviet nadir in 1998.\* Since my expectation is that growth is going to decelerate as the Eurozone crisis, which Russia has somehow managed to avoid sofar, begins to take a toll, I used a quite conservative estimate of 3.3% overall GDP growth for 2012. Since actual growth in the 1st quarter of 2012 was 4.9%, hitting 3.3% means that Russia would experience a pretty noticeable slowdown over the remainder of the year.¶ **Does this look to you like a country that is in long-term economic decline?¶ Now Russia was an absolute disaster area in 1998, so the fact that its economy has doubled in size since then should be taken with a very large grain of salt**. But I won’t argue with someone if they say “Russia is poor” because Russia really is poor. And if someone says “Russia could grow more quickly if it carried out liberalizing structural reforms” I would agree with that because Russia really does need to carry out liberalizing structural reforms.¶ **What I will take issue with, though, is when someone says that Russia is losing economic ground, or that its economy is in some sort of long-term decline**. As you can very easily see, **it’s simply not possible to argue that Russia’s economy is shrinking because it’s not: the clearly visible trend is of sustained, if not overwhelming, economic growth from a very low base.¶** Meanwhile, just for kicks, here’s a chart comparing the US and Russian economies have performed since 1998 (US inflation adjusted GDP data are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis here). I used the most recent IMF prediction of 2% growth in 2012. Again one should note that in 1998 Russia was a pretty nightmarish place to be, but the **next time someone tells you Russia is “falling behind” this** or that random country **it’s worth keeping this** chart **in mind**.

**A2: Resilient**

***Their evidence is inconclusive- Russia’s economy is only resilient in a world with stable oil prices.***

**Bergval 6/12/12** (Daniel, Economist at SEB (a Swedish Bank Investor), Senior administrative officer at Ministry of Finance, Sweden, Project manager at OECD “Russia: Resilient So Far”, 6/12/12, SEB Economics Insight: Macro Update, 96797299-SEB-report-Russia-resilient-so-far.pdf) ALT

Even **though Russia is not immune to the crises in the euro zone, the economy has been resilient so far**. GDP growth during Q1 2012 came in at a strong 4.9% compared to a year earlier (Chart 1) and indicators do not point to an imminent weakening (Chart 2). The consensus estimate has become more positive in the past quarter. **We are sticking to our relatively positive view, as long as oil prices stay at roughly the levels of today** (Chart 3). We expect GDP to grow by 3.8 and 4.1% in 2012 and 2013, respectively, unchanged since our previous forecast and slightly above consensus for 2013. **High oil prices will fuel government revenue – creating room for fiscal policy, exports and other parts of the economy such as capital spending and consumption**. Our forecast is that oil prices will average USD 113 per barrel in 2012 and USD 120 in 2013. **There are downside risks**, however. **A more severe than expected downturn in the euro zone could push oil prices further down, hurting exports, the current account and government finances and increasing pressures on the banking system.** Oil prices are currently below our average forecast for 2012 but are expected to rise later this year.

***1998 and 2008 crises proves that the economy is only resilient due to high oil prices***

**THE ECONOMIC TIMES 2008** (“Russia seen shrugging off market collapse,” Sep 21, Lexis)

**Buoyed by vast oil wealth, Russia is shrugging off its worst market meltdown in a decade, emerging with its booming economy almost intact**, analysts say.

The Russian stock market last week saw its sharpest falls since the catastrophic economic collapse of 1998 after suffering the toxic combination of global financial turmoil, falling commodity prices and a local credit crunch.

But **with oil prices still almost ten times higher than a decade ago, economists see Russia emerging with a relatively mild hangover**.

**The collapse was a "reality check, not a derailment, because the government had the money to fix it**," said Chris Weafer, chief strategist at Moscow investment bank Uralsib. "The Kremlin's confidence has not been shaken."

The government suspended trading on Wednesday after sharp drops of over 10 percent that left the benchmark RTS down 57 percent from an all-time high achieved in May.

After a series of ineffectual appeals for calm, the Kremlin put its money on the table, pledging over 60 billion dollars (over 40 billion euros) to prop up prices.

When the RTS reopened Friday, shares surged over 22 percent, recovering the week's losses.

**The crash has exposed flaws in the financial system**, analysts said, **but oil wealth has allowed the Kremlin to smooth over the cracks and avoid a repeat of the 1998 financial crisis**, when a sovereign debt default caused a collapse of the ruble, all but wiping out the country's middle class.

**This time around, with oil prices around 100 dollars a barrel** -- around 10 times higher than in 1998 -- **Russia's prospects could not look more different**, said Ronald Smith, chief strategist at Moscow's Alfa-Bank.

"**If you compare it to 1998, the outlook for the economy is fundamentally good**," he said. "**We will come out of this with growth that is maybe slower than we had... but relatively high**."

**2NC / 1NR Heg Backline - Ext #1-2 – Military Not Dependent**

***Military is increasing fuel efficiency***

ELISABETH **ROSENTHAL**, NYT, October 4th **2010**, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/05/science/earth/05fossil.html?adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1306084754-flJ2Mg6ul2Po4LpzlLT1kw&pagewanted=1 (BJN)

**While setting national energy policy requires Congressional debates, military leaders can simply order the adoption of renewable energy**. And **the military has the buying power to create products and markets**. That, in turn, may make renewable energy more practical and affordable for everyday uses, experts say. Last year, **the Navy introduced its first hybrid vessel**, a Wasp class amphibious assault ship called the U.S.S. Makin Island, which at speeds under 10 knots runs on electricity rather than on fossil fuel, **a shift resulting in greater efficiency that saved 900,000 gallons of fuel on its maiden voyage** from Mississippi to San Diego, compared with a conventional ship its size, the Navy said. **The Air Force will have its entire fleet certified to fly on biofuels by 2011** and has already flown test flights using a 50-50 mix of plant-based biofuel and jet fuel; **the Navy took its first delivery of fuel made from algae this summer.** **Biofuels can in theory be produced wherever the raw materials, like plants, are available, and could ultimately be made near battlefields.**

**2NC / 1NR Heg Backline - Ext #3 – Military insulated**

***Here’s more evidence – the Pentagon is insulated and if prices did get too high Congress would pass supplemental spending***

Nathan **Hodge**, WSJ, December 30th **2010**, http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2010/12/30/pentagon-keeps-eye-on-oil-prices/ (BJN)

In a statement, **Pentagon spokeswoman** Cheryl **Irwin said current prices “will not affect current operations or internal fuel prices, because the department’s working capital fund can absorb some effects of price fluctuations**.” But, Ms. Irwin added, “further market increases could become problematic.” Here’s how it could potentially be an issue: **The Pentagon forecasts fuel prices one year in advance, based on data provided by the Office of Management and Budget**. **The department then fixes a standard composite fuel price for the fiscal year based on those projections**. **The price is supposed to insulate military operations from normal market price fluctuations. If prices surge unexpectedly**, however, it could cut into operations and maintenance accounts – meaning **the Pentagon might have to ask Congress for more money.** **That kind of price squeeze happened in 2008; and in fiscal year 2010, the Pentagon sought some supplemental funding to cover higher than anticipated fuel costs**. Thus far, however, the military has been spared any impact from the current price increase. “So far **this year, the military units are shielded from the effects of minor pricing fluctuation,” said Ms. Irwin.**

### Ext #6 – No Transition Wars

***Withdrawal is smooth***

Charles A. **Kupchan**, Political Science Quarterly, 00323195, Summer **2003**, Vol. 118, Issue 2 “The Rise of Europe, America's Changing Internationalism, and the End of U.S. Primacy” Database: Academic Search Premier

As this new century progresses, unipolarity will give way to a world of multiple centers of power. As this transition proceeds, American grand strategy should focus on making both Europe and East Asia less reliant on U.S. power, while at the same time working with major states in both regions to promote collective management of the global system. The ultimate vision that should guide U.S. grand strategy is the construction of a concert-like directorate of the major powers in North America, Europe, and East Asia. These major powers would together manage developments and regulate relations both within and among their respective regions. They would also coordinate efforts in the battle against terrorism, a struggle that will require patience and steady cooperation among many different nations. Regional centers of power also have the potential to facilitate the gradual incorporation of developing nations into global flows of trade, information, and values. Strong and vibrant regional centers, for reasons of both proximity and culture, often have the strongest incentives to promote prosperity and stability in their immediate peripheries. North America might, therefore, focus on Latin America; Europe on Russia, the Middle East, and Africa; and East Asia on South Asia and Southeast Asia. Mustering the political will and the foresight to pursue this vision will be a formidable task. The United States will need to begin ceding influence and autonomy to regions that have grown all too comfortable with American primacy. Neither American leaders, long accustomed to calling the shots, nor leaders in Europe and East Asia, long accustomed to passing the buck, will find the transition an easy one. But it is far wiser and safer to get ahead of the curve and shape structural change by design than to find unipolarity giving way to a chaotic multipolarity by default. It will take a decade, if not two, for a new international system to evolve. But the decisions taken by the United States early in the twenty-first century will play a critical role in determining whether multipolarity reemerges peacefully or brings with it the competitive jockeying that has so frequently been the precursor to great power war in the past.[\*]

***2. Long time-frame and no solvency - High job growth cannot solve for a decade and too many people lack the education to fill the jobs created by plan***

James **Manyika et al 2011** (Director at McKinsey Global Institute, An economy that works: Job creation and America’s future June 2011 McKinsey Global Institute <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CD4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mckinsey.com%2F~%2Fmedia%2FMcKinsey%2Fdotcom%2FInsights%2520and%2520pubs%2FMGI%2FResearch%2FLabor%2520Markets%2FAn%2520economy%2520that%2520works%2520Job%2520creation%2520and%2520Americas%2520future%2FMGI_US_job_creation_executive_summary.ashx&ei=_qgpUIynO8WLywHO6oCoDg&usg=AFQjCNFcGlD4_zeDa-6SuPNk0nCABL-2Bw>, KEL

The results of our analysis are sobering: **only in the most optimistic scenario will the United States return to full employment1 before 2020**. Achieving this outcome will require sustained demand growth, rising US competitiveness in the global economy, and better matching of US workers to jobs. Among our key findings: ƒƒ The United States has been experiencing increasingly lengthy “jobless recoveries” from recessions in the past two decades. It took roughly 6 months for employment to recover to its prerecession level after each postwar recession through the 1980s, but it took 15 months after the 1990–91 recession and 39 months after the 2001 recession. At the recent pace of job creation, it will take more than 60 months after GDP reached its prerecession level in December 2010 for employment to recover.2 ƒƒ **The United States will need to create a total of 21 million new jobs in this decade to put unemployed Americans back to work and to employ its growing population**. We created three possible scenarios for job creation, based on sector analyses, and find that they deliver from 9.3 million to 22.5 million jobs. **Only in the high-job growth scenario will the United States return to full employment in *this decade.*** ƒƒ **Six sectors illustrate the potential for job growth in this decade: health care, business services, leisure and hospitality, construction, manufacturing, and retail.** These sectors span a wide range of job types, skills, and growth dynamics. They account for 66 percent of employment today, and we project that they will account for up to 85 percent of new jobs created through the end of the decade. ƒƒ **Under current trends, the United States will not have enough workers with the right education and training to fill the skill profiles of the jobs likely to be created**. Our analysis suggests **a shortage of up to 1.5 million workers with bachelor’s degrees or higher in 2020**. At the same time, **nearly 6 million Americans without a high school diploma are likely to be without a job.** ƒƒ **Moreover, too few Americans who attend college and vocational schools choose fields of study that will give them the specific skills that employers are seeking**. **Our interviews point to potential shortages in many occupations, such as nutritionists, welders, and nurse’s aides—in addition to the often-predicted shortfall in computer specialists and engineers.**
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***A) Interpretation-Increase is to make an addition – The plan just removes a barrier***

**Merriam-Webster Online Accessed August 20th, 2011**

© 2011 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/increase%5B2%5D>

Definition of **INCREASE**-1: **the act or process of increasing: as an addition or enlargement in size, extent, or quantity**

***Incentives are negotiated offers linked to a particular outcome – they are distinct from policies that motivate behavioral change***

**Grant, 02** - professor of political science at Duke University (Ruth, “THE ETHICS OF INCENTIVES: HISTORICAL ORIGINS AND CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDINGS,” Economics and Philosophy, 18 (2002) 111, proquest)

**We** are now in a position to **identify** **a *core understanding*** or a distinctive meaning of the concept **of incentives;** what we might call incentives `strictly speaking'. **Incentives are employed in a particular *form of negotiation*. An offer is made which is an extrinsic benefit** or a bonus, **neither the** natural or **automatic consequence of an action nor a deserved reward** or compensation. The offer is usually made in the context of an authority relationship - for example, adult/child, employer/employee, government/citizen or government/organization. **The offer is a discrete prompt expected to *elicit a particular response***. Finally and most importantly, **the offer is intentionally designed to alter the status quo by motivating a person to choose differently than he or she would in its absence**. If the desired action would result naturally or automatically, no incentive would be necessary. **An incentive is the added element *without which the desired action would not occur*.** For this reason, it makes sense to speak of `institutional incentives' when referring to arrangements designed to encourage certain sorts of responses. `Perverse incentives' is also an expression that implies that incentives are meant to direct people's behavior in particular ways. Central to the core meaning of incentives is that they are an instrument of government in the most general sense. The emergence of the term historically within discourses of social control is illustrative of this point.

***Energy production restrictions must directly limit production***

**Ludwig von Mises Institute**, no date (XXIX. RESTRICTION OF PRODUCTION

The Nature of Restriction, accessed 8/16/12, http://mises.org/humanaction/chap29sec1.asp)

We shall deal in this chapter with those **measures** which **are directly and primarily intended to divert production** (in the broadest meaning of the word, including commerce and transportation) from the ways it would take in the unhampered market economy. Each authoritarian interference with business diverts production, of course, from the lines it would take if it were only directed by the demand of the consumers as manifested on the market. ***The characteristic mark of restrictive interference with production is that the diversion of production is*** not merely an unavoidable and unintentional secondary effect, but ***precisely what the authority wants to bring about***. Like any other act of intervention, such **restrictive measures** affect consumption also. But this again, in the case of the restrictive measures we are dealing with in this chapter, is not the primary end the authority aims at. The government wants to **interfere with production**. The fact that its measure influences the ways of consumption also is, from its point of view, either altogether contrary to its intentions or at least an unwelcome consequence with which it puts up because it is unavoidable and is considered as a minor evil when compared with the consequences of nonintervention.

***“On” means directly targeted***

**World English Dictionary 2009** (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on?s=t)

— prep

1.

**in contact** or connection **with** the surface of; at the upper surface of: an apple on the ground ; a mark on the table cloth

2.

**attached** to: a puppet on a string

3.

carried with: I've no money on me

4.

in the immediate vicinity of; close to or along the side of: a house on the sea ; this verges on the ridiculous!

5.

within the time limits of a day or date: he arrived on Thursday

6.

being performed upon or relayed through the medium of: what's on the television?

***Violation --- the aff does not increase incentives for solar production or remove a restriction on it***

***We have contextual evidence – Restrictions on energy production do not include border measures like tariffs and export quotas***

**Ehring and Chinale 11 –** Lothar (Assistant to Mr. Péter Balás, Deputy Director-General at the Directorate-General for Trade of the European Commission, responsible for multilateral affairs, as well as trade defence instruments and bilateral trade relations with Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Until 2008, Lothar Ehring served in the Unit of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Trade that is responsible for Legal Aspects of Trade Policy. He was the Coordinator for legal issues of multilateral trade, handled several WTO disputes and also represented the European Community in the negotiations on the reform of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding) **and** Gian Franco **Chinale 2011** “Regulation of Energy in International Trade Law: Wto, Nafta and Energy Charter” p. 134-5

The perfect example to test and discuss this interpretation is the famous case of OPEC production quotas. These quotas as implemented at the national levels of OPEC members, are horizontal restrictions on production. They limit exportation no more than domestic sales, and yet the argument is made time and again that they fall foul of Article XI:I of the GATT 1994.” The proponents of this thesis recognize that they are on thin ice. given that production limitations are as remote from being border measures as a restriction can possibly be. Equally clear is the fact that a production limitation definition does not discriminate against exports, neither de jure nor de facto. The proponents of the OPEC GATT-illegality attempt to overcome this conclusion with the argument that for some of the oil exporting countries in question. The near totality of the production goes to export. This. however, is legally irrelevant to the question of whether there is a discrimination against or higher burden on exports. The quantitative relationship between domestic consumption and exports can be very imbalanced for reasons of production and consumption capacities, in large part for reasons of a country’s size and the foreign demand for the product concerned. Also the conceptual argument that a **restriction on production** can be decomposed into a restriction on exportation as well a restriction on domestic sales **is not plausible**. The production restriction is precisely and inseparably both at the same time and this makes a qualitative difference that is **impossible to set aside.**

***Vote neg:***

***1) Limits --- They explode limits by allowing the aff to remove minute barriers to production --- hurts predictability and preparation which undermines clash and fairness***

***2) Neg ground --- their interp does not mandate increased energy production --- mooting core neg args like oil prices and tradeoff***

**Da**

***Obama win but its close***

**AP, 9/20**/12 (Associated Press, “Obama boosted by upbeat housing reports, new polls,” http://www.bostonherald.com/news/us\_politics/view/20120920obama\_boosted\_by\_upbeat\_housing\_reports\_new\_polls/srvc=home&position=recent, bgm)

Other new surveys suggested growing support for Obama in the wake of back-to-back national political conventions and Romney’s struggle last week to explain an erroneous statement issued at a time of demonstrations â€" one of them deadly â€" at U.S. diplomatic posts in the Middle East. An NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll taken Sept. 12-16 put the president’s lead among likely voters at 50-44 percent nationwide. State surveys by Quinnipiac University, The New York Times [NYT] and CBS News showed Obama at over 50 percent support among likely voters in Virginia, with 13 electoral votes, and Wisconsin, with 10. Obama carried Wisconsin handily four years ago, but Romney recently signaled he was hoping to make it competitive. The two men were in a statistical tie in Colorado, which has 9 electoral votes, in surveys conducted between Sept. 11 and 17. A Washington Post poll also showed Obama with a lead in Virginia. All the surveys were taken before the flap erupted over Romney’s "47 percent" remarks. Taken together, they showed a **highly competitive** race as Obama and Romney pursue the 270 electoral votes needed for victory, although with the president in a stronger position than before the two political conventions and with the economy still the dominant issue.

***Plan’s unpopular with the base --- Tariffs supported by key manufacturing and union lobbies***

Ahn Jae **Wook, May 28, 2012**,“US Lobby Applauds Tax on Chinese Solar,” <http://designbuildsource.com.au/tax-on-chinese-solar-panels>, KEL

**Measures on the part of** **U**nited **S**tates authorities **to impose steep import duties on dumped solar panels from China are sensible, an American industry lobby claims.** **The Alliance for American Manufacturing** (AAM) **has applauded a recent decision** by the US Commerce Department **to impose import duties** of roughly 31 per cent **on Chinese-made solar cells**, saying that the move represents a sound response to the overproduction and dumping of product into the US market. “**The burgeoning solar panel industry is important to US manufacturing, and deserves federal support in the face of China’s mercantilism**,” the AAM says in a statement. **The decision to impose the duties followed moves on the part of several US manufacturers to file dumping charges against Chinese firms to offset alleged illegal Chinese government subsidies. It also follows previous moves by the United Steelworkers** (USW) t**o file a section 301 trade case against China for alleged dumping and subsidies in the clean energy sector** as well as moves on the part of 59 Senators and Members of Congress to urge President Barack Obama to investigate allegations of Chinese firms dumping subsidised solar panels in the US at below fair market value.

***Key to election***

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 5/31, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/buying-a-presidential-election-its-not-as-easy-as-you-think/>

The **airwaves** in the eight or 10 states that will decide the outcome of the 2012 presidential election **will soon be saturated with ads** supporting and opposing Barack Obama and Mitt Romney, all **aimed at persuading a small group of undecided voters — less than 10%**, according to most recent polls. These **undecided voters are much less interested in the presidential election than those who have already chosen sides. When the ads come on, they generally ignore them**. Moreover, undecided voters are not stupid, and they’re generally skeptical about the messages that they see on TV. As a result, **the net impact** of all of this advertising **is likely to be minimal. Research by political scientists and evidence from 2012 polls in the battleground states suggests** that the parties and **candidates would do better to focus their efforts in these states on mobilizing their supporters rather than trying to persuade uncommitted voters**. But I’ll have more to say about that in my next article.

***Republicans will strike Iran***

**Wickham** 12-19-**11** (DeWayne Wickham is a columnist for USA Today, Iraq War is over; will GOP replace it with Iran?

<http://www.statesmanjournal.com/article/20111220/OPINION/112200303/Iraq-War-over-will-GOP-replace-Iran->, jj)

On the day the Iraq War officially ended, **seven Republicans who are champing at the bit to be their party's standard bearer in next year's presidential race were** on a stage in Sioux City, Iowa, **debating the possibility of Iran joining the world's nuclear weapons club**. And **all but one of them** — in that setting, or on other recent campaign stages — **threatened to launch a new Middle East war to keep that Islamic republic from becoming a nuclear power. Only** Rep. Ron **Paul**, R-Texas, **a long shot to win the GOP nomination**, **sounds like an adult when it comes to Iran. Iran is destined to become a nuclear state**. While that's not a thought I relish, it's a reality the pragmatists in the bowels of the U.S. government surely understand. **If Iran hadn't made an irreversible decision to obtain nuclear weapons before an American-backed NATO force helped Libyan rebels topple Moammar Gadhafi, it must have done so after he was chased from power and summarily executed**. **The government in Tehran**, which has threatened the annihilation of Israel, **knows it could end up like Gadhafi's regime without the protection that a nuclear arsenal would give it**. **Indeed, even the world's most erratic states like North Korea understand the relative defensive comfort that even a few nuclear weapons assures**. Iranian leaders understand this, too. **They know their survival depends on their ability to ward off a foreign-assisted regime change attack from within, or a direct assault from an outside force, like the U.S. invasion of Iraq. And a nuclear bomb will give them that blocking power.** **To say, as** even President **Obama does, that no options have been taken off the table is one thing. To publicly proclaim a determination to make war on Iran to keep it from getting a nuclear weapon is an unequivocal commitment to a new and more costly Middle East conflict**. In nearly nine years of fighting, the Iraqi War took the lives of 4,487 American men and women, and wounded 32,226. While nothing approaches the human toll wrought by that war, **the financial cost — approximately $800 billion — has taken a big bite out of our national treasury. If one of the hawkish Republican contenders becomes president, the human and financial costs of the war they've threatened to launch against Iran will pale in comparison with the price we paid in Iraq**. **The Republican hawks**, no doubt, **will argue this is a cost we must pay to stop Iran from using a nuclear weapon against Israel — our most reliable ally in the region**. But unless Iranian leaders want to turn their entire nation into a suicide bomber, they won't risk the nuclear retaliation Israel would rain down upon them at the first sign of an Iranian nuclear-tipped missile heading toward the Jewish state.

***Iran attack will cause a global nuclear war that leads to human extinction***

**Hirsch** Professor at the University of Califorina at San Diego 20**08**

(Seymour Hirsch, Professor of physics @ the University of California @ San Diego, 4/10/2k8 http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=HIR20060422&articleId=2317)

**Iran is likely to respond to any US attack using its considerable missile arsenal against US forces in Iraq and elsewhere in the Persian Gulf**. Israel may attempt to stay out of the conflict, **it is not clear whether Iran would target Israel in a retaliatory strike but it is certainly possible. If the US attack includes nuclear weapons use against Iranian facilities,** as I believe is very likely, rather than deterring **Iran it will cause a much more violent response. Iranian military forces and militias are likely to storm into southern Iraq and the US may be forced to use nuclear weapons against them, causing large scale casualties and inflaming the Muslim world. There could be popular uprisings in other countries in the region like Pakistan, and of course a Shiite uprising in Iraq against American occupiers.** Finally I would like to discuss the grave consequences to America and the world if the US uses nuclear weapons against Iran. First, **the likelihood of terrorist attacks against Americans both on American soil and abroad will be enormously enhanced after these events. And terrorist's attempts to get hold of "loose nukes" and use them against Americans will be enormously incentivized after the US used nuclear weapons against Iran. , it will destroy America's position as the leader of the free world. The rest of the world rightly recognizes that nuclear weapons are qualitatively different from all other weapons, and that there is no sharp distinction between small and large nuclear weapons, or between nuclear weapons targeting facilities versus those targeting armies or civilians.** It will not condone the breaking of the nuclear taboo in an unprovoked war of aggression against a non-nuclear country, and the US will become a pariah state. **Third, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty will cease to exist, and many of its 182 non-nuclear-weapon-country signatories will strive to acquire nuclear weapons as a deterrent to an attack by a nuclear nation. With no longer a taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, any regional conflict may go nuclear and expand into global nuclear war. Nuclear weapons are million-fold more powerful than any other weapon, and the existing nuclear arsenals can obliterate humanity many times over. In the past, global conflicts terminated when one side prevailed. In the next global conflict we will all be gone before anybody has prevailed.**

**CP**

***The United States federal judiciary, using the next available test case, should issue a narrow ruling that: antidumping tariffs on crystalline silicon photovoltaic cells from the People’s Republic of China are unconstitutional and cannot be enforced on the grounds that it infringes on state sovereignty.***

***The Supreme Court can remove production restrictions --- solves the aff***

**Percival ‘97**

Robert V. Percival ++ Professor of Law, Robert Stanton Scholar & Director, Environmental Law Program, University of Maryland School of Law.

The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1997, 1997 U Chi Legal F 159

ARTICLE: Regulatory Evolution and the Future of Environmental Policy, Lexis, jj

These efforts are being undertaken at a time when **the federal judiciary has become less sympathetic toward environmental concerns**. Despite doctrines of deference to administrative agencies, **a judiciary more skeptical of regulation has struck down major environmental regulations by insisting that agencies provide greater and more specific evidentiary support for them**. **Important regulatory initiatives**, such as the EPA's effort to phase out all remaining uses of asbestos, **have been struck down on grounds that harken back to the common law's demand for detailed proof of particularized injury**. n59 Despite broad citizen suit provisions in the environmental laws, the courts are showing signs of reviving common-law doctrines of legal injury as a predicate for recognition of standing to sue. n60 **Judicial resuscitation of constitutional principles of state sovereignty now threatens to undermine national regulatory programs**. For the first time in more than 60 years, **the Supreme Court has struck down a federal regulatory program on the grounds that it exceeded the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce**. n61 While this decision did not occur in an environmental case, lower courts may now insist on more particularized showings of interstate impact to uphold federal environmental regulationsn62 and [\*171] **some courts have struck down such regulations for infringing on state sovereignty**. n63 By **requiring more detailed demonstrations of causal injury or effects on interstate commerce, these decisions make it more difficult to achieve the law's promise of preventative regulation**, resurrecting the very deficiencies of the commonlaw that public law sought to overcome.

### Off

***Oil prices will stabilize now – prices will stick above OPEC break-even levels without significant changes***

Irina **Rogovaya August 2012**; writer for Oil and Gas Eurasia, Oil Price Changes: Everyone Wants Stability <http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/-http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/>

According to the current base forecast for the Eurozone prepared by Oxford Economics, **within the next two years oil prices will continue to drift lower, but not beyond the bounds of the “green” corridor for the world economy – $80-100 per barrel**. This forecast coincides with the expectations of the World Bank (see Fig. 4). Meanwhile, S&P analysts presented three scenarios for the energy market in June. In the base scenario, **oil will remain at $100 per barrel**. S&P calculates that the likelihood of a stressful scenario in which the price of oil drops below $60 per barrel (the bottom in 2009) is 1:3. Analysts believe that **given today’s state of economic and geopolitical affairs, strong political will would be needed to force the price of oil below $70-80** (the current level of effective production). So far, **that will is nowhere to be seen**. Recent events have shown that nobody is interested in the Eurozone breaking apart. And nobody wants a war in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, nobody today intends to force the production of less valuable oil. At least that is what OPEC leaders promised during the recent summit. “Stability on the market should be at the center of our attention,” General Secretary Abdalla El-Badri said. Even Saudi Arabia, which consistently violates OPEC discipline in over-producing its quotas, announced at the beginning of July that it would review its margins to determine a higher price for Saudi supplies ordered on August contracts. Analysts noted that the average price of oil supplied to Europe and Asia had jumped (by $0.85 and $0.66 per barrel respectively), a fact which could be seen as proof that **the collective members of the cartel will not let prices fall under $100 per barrel.**

***Link timeframe is quick---the plan lowers the expected future demand for oil—causes oil prices to plummet***

**Feldstein, ‘8** - Martin Feldstein, 7/1/2008. Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan, is a professor at Harvard and a member of The Wall Street Journal's board of contributors. “We Can Lower Oil Prices Now,” The Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121486800837317581.html?mod=opinion\_main\_commentaries.

Unlike perishable agricultural products, oil can be stored in the ground. So **when will an owner of oil reduce production or increase inventories instead of selling his oil and converting the proceeds into investible cash?** **A simplified answer is that he will keep the oil in the ground if its price is expected to rise faster than the interest rate that could be earned on the money obtained from selling the oil.** The actual price of oil may rise faster or slower than is expected, but **the decision to sell (or hold) the oil depends on the expected price rise**. There are of course considerations of risk, and of the impact of price changes on long-term consumer behavior, that complicate the oil owner's decision – and therefore the behavior of prices. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (the OPEC cartel), with its strong pricing power, still plays a role. But **the fundamental insight is that owners of oil will adjust their production and inventories until the price of oil is expected to rise at the rate of interest, appropriately adjusted for risk.** **If the price of oil is expected to rise faster, they'll keep the oil in the ground. In contrast, if the price of oil is not expected to rise as fast as the rate of interest, the owners will extract more and invest the proceeds.** The relationship between future and current oil prices implies that **an expected change in the future price of oil will have an immediate impact on the current price of oil.** Thus, when oil producers concluded that the demand for oil in China and some other countries will grow more rapidly in future years than they had previously expected, they inferred that **the future price of oil would be higher than they had previously believed.** They responded by reducing supply and raising the spot price enough to bring the expected price rise back to its initial rate. Hence, **with no change in the current demand for oil, the expectation of a greater future demand and a higher future price caused the current price to rise.** Similarly, credible reports about the future decline of oil production in Russia and in Mexico implied a higher future global price of oil – and that also required an increase in the current oil price to maintain the initial expected rate of increase in the price of oil. Once this relation is understood, **it is easy to see how news stories, rumors and industry reports can cause substantial fluctuations in current prices – all without anything happening to current demand or supply.** Of course, **a rise in the spot price of oil triggered by a change in expectations about future prices will cause a decline in the current quantity of oil that consumers demand.** If current supply and demand were initially in balance, the OPEC countries and other oil producers would respond by reducing sales to bring supply into line with the temporary reduction in demand. **A rise in the expected future demand for oil thus causes a current decline in the amount of oil being supplied.** This is what happened as the Saudis and others cut supply in 2007. Now here is the good news. **Any policy that causes the expected future oil price to fall can cause the current price to fall**, or to rise less than it would otherwise do. In other words, **it is possible to bring down today's price of oil with policies that will have their physical impact on oil demand or supply only in the future.** For example, **increases in government subsidies to develop technology that will make future cars more efficient, or tighter standards that gradually improve the gas mileage** of the stock of cars, **would lower the future demand for oil and therefore the price of oil today**. Similarly, **increasing the expected future supply of oil would also reduce today's price. That fall in the current price would induce an immediate rise in oil consumption that would be matched by an increase in supply from the OPEC producers and others with some current excess capacity or available inventories**. **Any steps that can be taken now to increase the future supply of oil, or reduce the future demand for oil in the U.S. or elsewhere, can therefore lead both to lower prices and increased consumption today.**

***Drop in oil demand causes Russian economic instability --- risks nuclear war***

**Miller 10**—assistant professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma (Gregory D., April 2010, © Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Quarterly 33:2, “The Security Costs of Energy Independence,” http://www.twq.com/10april/docs/10apr\_Miller.pdf)

**Russia is another** potential **danger spot because it is the only nuclear state**, at least for now, **that has significant revenue from the sale of oil, roughly** 8—**20 percent of its GDP**. Losing that income will have less dramatic effects on Russia than on many OPEC states more heavily reliant on oil sales, at least partly because of recent attempts to diversify the Russian economy. **Its economy**, however, **is still too fragile to handle a major drop in demand for oil**. **Given the existing tension between Russia and states such as Georgia and Ukraine, neither the United States nor Russia’s neighbors can afford the risk of a nuclear Russia suffering economic instability**.19

***Extinction***

**FILGER 2009** (Sheldon, author and blogger for the Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356)

**In Russia** historically, **economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major** industrialized **economies**. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, **Medvedev and Putin**, both intimately acquainted with their nation’s history, **are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia’s economic crisis will endanger the nation’s political stability**, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. **Should the Russian economy deteriorate** to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, **the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis**. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, **Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability** to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that **a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing** social and political **upheaval**. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama’s national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. **During the years** Boris **Yeltsin ruled** Russia, **security forces** responsible for **guarding the** nation’s **nuclear arsenal went without pay** for months at a time, **leading to fears that** desperate **personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain?** It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

China

*US/China trade tension inevitable---but it won’t escalate*

**Feigenbaum ’10** (Evan A., *head of the Asia practice group at the Eurasia Group and adjunct senior fellow for Asia at the Council on Foreign Relations,* 10-19, Foreign Policy, “Reluctant Warriors” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/10/19/reluctant_warriors>, jj)

**A full-fledged trade war** between the United States and China would be disastrous; thankfully, **it's far from likely. Decision makers on both sides appear to have concluded that their trade disputes can be managed without undermining the entire U.S.-China relationship. Trade conflict is here to stay, but it is fast becoming a "new normal" in relations between Washington and Beijing.**

*US/China relations can survive trade disputes – assumes the plan*

**Feigenbaum ’10** (Evan A., *head of the Asia practice group at the Eurasia Group and adjunct senior fellow for Asia at the Council on Foreign Relations,* 10-19, Foreign Policy, “Reluctant Warriors” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/10/19/reluctant_warriors>, jj)

But **U.S.-China relations can probably weather a proliferation of such acrimonious trade disputes, especially if they are channeled through the WTO and other rules-based mechanisms. The bilateral relationship is extremely diverse; both sides have strong incentives not to let trade friction undermine every other form of cooperation**. And it's worth noting that **virtually no U.S. company plans to flee China -- not even those that stand to lose the most from China's indigenous innovation policies.** Meanwhile, **Beijing has two good reasons to keep the overall relationship with Washington on track. For one, China's economy is not yet "decoupled" from America's; China continues to run large trade surpluses with the United States and, because of its own stabilized exchange rate, is bound to U.S. monetary policy as its dollar reserves accumulate**. For another, Beijing has more trade and investment options with more countries than ever before; China can now weather conflict with the United States more easily -- thus Beijing need not treat trade conflict with Washington as a strategic threat. Still, to keep frictions from escalating, both sides must make sure they stick as much as possible to WTO and rules-based mechanisms for resolving their differences, avoiding purely punitive actions not linked to specific commercial grievances. **The likely course for the United States probably involves pursuing a mix of anti-dumping and countervailing duties cases -- and continuing to search for a more systemic remedy to press, persuade, and sometimes coerce China to level its playing field.**

*1. No risk of US/China war---Chinese heg isn’t a threat, economic interdependence checks, miscalc won’t happen and deterrence checks escalation*

**Art ’10** (Robert J, Christian A. Herter Professor of [International Relations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Relations) at Brandeis University and Fellow at [MIT Center for International Studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT_Center_for_International_Studies) Fall, Political Science Quarterly, Volume 125, #3, “The United States and the Rise of China: Implications for the Long Haul” <http://www.psqonline.org/99_article.php3?byear=2010&bmonth=fall&a=01free>, jj)

**China does not present the type of security threat to the United States that Germany did to Britain, or Britain to Germany**. **Americaʼs nuclear forces make it secure from any Chinese attack on the homeland.** Moreover, China clearly presents a potentially different type of threat to the United States than the Soviet Union did during the Cold War, because the geopolitics of the two situations are different. The Soviet geopolitical (as opposed to the nuclear) threat was two-fold: to conquer and dominate the economic–industrial resources of western Eurasia and to control the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf. Europe and the Persian Gulf constituted two of the five power centers of the world during the Cold War—Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States being the other three. If the Soviets had succeeded in dominating Europe and the Persian Gulf through either conquest or political–military intimidation, then it would have controlled three of the five power centers of the world. That would have been a significant power transition. **Chinaʼs rise does not constitute the same type of geopolitical threat to the United States that the Soviet Union did.** **If China ends up dominating the Korean peninsula and a significant part of continental Southeast Asia, so what?** As long as Japan remains outside the Chinese sphere of influence and allied with the United States, and as long as the United States retains some naval footholds in Southeast Asia, such as in Singapore, the Philippines, or Indonesia, **Chinaʼs domination of these two areas would not present the same type of geopolitical threat that the Soviet Union did. As long as Europe, the Persian Gulf, Japan, India, and Russia** (once it reconstitutes itself as a serious great power) **remain either as independent power centers or under U.S. influence, Chinese hegemony on land in East and Southeast Asia will not tip the world balance of power**. The vast size and central position of the Soviet Union in Eurasia constituted a geopolitical threat to American influence that China cannot hope to emulate. **If judged by the standards of the last three dominant power-rising power competitions of the last 100 years, then, the U.S.–China competition appears well placed to be much safer**. Certainly, war between the two is not impossible, because either or both governments could make a serious misstep over the Taiwan issue. **War by miscalculation is always possible, but the possession of nuclear weapons by both sides has to have a restraining effect on each by dramatically raising the costs of miscalculation, thereby increasing the incentives not to miscalculate. Nuclear deterrence should work to lower dramatically the possibility of war by either miscalculation or deliberate decision** (**or if somehow such a war broke out, then nuclear deterrence should work against its escalation into a large and fearsome one)**. Apart from the Taiwan issue or some serious incident at sea, **it is hard to figure out how to start a war between the United States and China. There are no other territorial disputes of any significance between the two, and there are no foreseeable economic contingencies that could bring on a war between them. Finally, the high economic interdependence and the lack of intense ideological competition between them help to reinforce the pacific effects induced by the condition of mutual assured destruction. The workings of these three factors should make us** **cautiously optimistic about keeping Sino-American relations on the peaceful rather than the warlike track.** The peaceful track does not, by any means, imply the absence of political and economic conflicts in Sino-American relations, nor does it foreclose coercive diplomatic gambits by each against the other. What it does mean is that the **conditions are in place for war to be a low-probability event,** if policymakers are smart in both states (see below), **and that an all-out war is nearly impossible to imagine**. By the historical standards of recent dominant-rising state dyads, this is no mean feat. In sum, **there will be some security dilemma dynamics at work in the U.S.–China relationship**, both over Taiwan and over maritime supremacy in East Asia, should China decide eventually to contest Americaʼs maritime hegemony, and there will certainly be political and military conflicts, **but nuclear weapons should work to mute their severity because the security of each stateʼs homeland will never be in doubt as long as each maintains a secondstrike capability vis-à-vis the other.** If two states cannot conquer one another, then the character of their relation and their competition changes dramatically.

***1. No warming now --- computer models are exaggerated and alarmism is used for funding***

**W**all **S**treet **J**ournal 1/19/**12** (“No Need to Panic About Global Warming” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html>, PZ)

\*The following has been signed by the 16 scientists with the following credentials: Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva.

A candidate for public office in any contemporary democracy may have to consider what, if anything, to do about "global warming." Candidates should understand that **the oft-repeated claim that nearly all scientists demand that something dramatic be done to stop global warming is not true**. In fact, **a** ***large and growing number of distinguished scientists* and engineers do not agree that drastic actions on global warming are needed. In September, Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ivar Giaever**, a supporter of President Obama in the last election, **publicly resigned from the** American Physical Society **(APS) with a letter that begins: "I did not renew [my membership] because I cannot live with the [APS policy] statement: 'The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring**. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth's physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.' In the APS it is OK to discuss whether the mass of the proton changes over time and how a multi-universe behaves, but the evidence of global warming is incontrovertible?" In spite of a multidecade international campaign to enforce the message that increasing amounts of the "pollutant" carbon dioxide will destroy civilization, **large numbers of scientists, many very prominent, share the opinions of Dr. Giaever**. And the number of scientific "heretics" is growing with each passing year. **The reason is a collection of stubborn scientific facts. Perhaps the most inconvenient fact is** ***the lack of global warming for well over 10 years now***. This is known to the warming establishment, as one can see from the 2009 "Climategate" email of climate scientist Kevin Trenberth: "The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't." But the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO2. **The lack of warming for more than a decade**—indeed, the smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) began issuing projections—**suggests that computer models have** ***greatly exaggerated* how much warming additional CO2 can cause. Faced with this embarrassment, those promoting alarm have shifted their drumbeat from warming to weather extremes, to enable anything unusual that happens in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO2. Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucracies to grow. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet**. Lysenko and his team lived very well, and they fiercely defended their dogma and the privileges it brought them. **Speaking for many scientists and engineers who have looked carefully and independently at the science of climate, we have a message to any candidate for public office: There is no compelling scientific argument for drastic action to "decarbonize" the world's economy**. Even if one accepts the inflated climate forecasts of the IPCC, aggressive greenhouse-gas control policies are not justified economically.

***2. Warming Is Not Anthropogenic – Multiple Natural Processes Subsume Human Impacts***

**Bast and Taylor 11** – \*CEO of the Heartland Institute, author of Rebuilding America’s Schools (1990), Why We Spend Too Much on Health Care (1992) Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism (1994) Education & Capitalism (2003), Climate Change Reconsidered (2009), and The Patriot’s Toolbox (2010, rev. ed. 2011), \*\* managing editor of Environment & Climate News, Senior Fellow for The Heartland Institute, bachelors degree from Dartmouth College and law degree from the Syracuse University College of Law, (Joseph and James, “Global Warming: Not a Crisis,” The Heartland Institute, 8/2/11, http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis) //PC

Natural or Man-Made? **The** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change **(IPCC),** an agency of the United Nations, **claims the warming that has occurred since the mid-twentieth century “is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations**” (IPCC, 2007). Many climate scientists disagree with the IPCC on this key issue. As Idso and Singer wrote in 2009, **The IPCC does not apply generally accepted methodologies to determine what fraction of current warming is natural, or how much is caused by the rise in** greenhouse gases (**GHG**). **A comparison of “fingerprints” from best available observations with the results of state-of-the-art GHG models leads to the conclusion that the (human-caused) GHG contribution is minor. This fingerprint evidence, though available, was ignored by the IPCC. The IPCC continues to undervalue the overwhelming evidence that**, on decadal and century-long time scales, **the Sun and associated atmospheric cloud effects are responsible for much of past climate change. It is** therefore **highly likely that the Sun is also a major cause of twentieth-century warming, with anthropogenic GHG making only a minor contribution**. In addition, the IPCC ignores, or addresses imperfectly, other science issues that call for discussion and explanation (Idso and Singer, 2009). Scientists who study the issue say it is impossible to tell if the recent small warming trend is natural, a continuation of the planet’s recovery from the more recent “Little Ice Age,” or unnatural, the result of human greenhouse gas emissions. **Thousands of peer-reviewed articles point to natural sources of climate variability that could explain some or even all of the warming in the second half of the twentieth century** (Idso and Singer, 2009). S. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery **documented natural climate cycles of approximately 1,500 years going back hundreds of thousands of years** (Singer and Avery, second edition 2008). It is clear from climate records that **the Earth was warmer than it is now in recorded human history, before man-made greenhouse gas emissions could have been the cause.** We know enough about how the Earth’s climate works to know that biological and physical processes remove CO2 from the atmosphere at a faster rate when concentration levels are higher and release more heat into space when temperatures rise. These feedback factors and radiative forcings are poorly modeled or missing from the computer models that alarmists use to make their forecasts. The arguments are complex, but the debate over natural versus man-made climate change is unquestionably still ongoing. The more we learn, the less likely it becomes that human greenhouse gas emissions can explain more than a small amount of the climate change we witness.

***3. No Impact to warming***

**Goklany 2012** [Indur, Indur M. Goklany is a science and technology policy analyst for the United States Department of the Interior, where he holds the position of Assistant Director of Programs, Science and Technology Policy. He has represented the United States at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and during the negotiations that led to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. He was a rapporteur for the Resource Use and Management Subgroup of Working Group III of the IPCC First Assessment Report in 1990, Economic Development in Developing Countries: Advancing Human Well‐Being and the Capacity to Adapt to Global Warming, <http://books.google.com/books?id=vO2ppGUrkEgC&pg=PA1&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=4#v=onepage&q=157&f=false>] Awirth

Although the IPCC notes that **sustainable development “can reduce vulnerability to climate change**, and climate change could impede nations’ abilities to achieve sustainable development pathways” (IPCC 2007: 20), **many proponents of greenhouse gas controls** on the other hand, **dwell on the** latter (**downside**) aspect **of** economic **development while** generally **ignoring the upside** (e.g., Freeman and Guzman 2009). Here I will examine whether global warming hinders sustainable development or whether sustainable development makes it easier to cope with warming, and which effect, if any, is predominant? It is possible to answer these questions using results from the previously‐discussed Britishgovernment sponsored “Fast Track Assessments” (FTAs) of the global impacts of global warming (Parry et al. 2004; Arnell et al. 2002, 2004). The FTAs provide estimates of the contribution of global warming to the total populations‐at‐risk of malaria, hunger, and coastal flooding due to sea level rise for 2085. Goklany (2009a, 2009d), while recognizing that, realistically, 2085 is beyond the period that is reasonably foreseeable, converted these estimates of populations‐at‐ risk into mortality by comparing historical mortality estimates from the World Health Organization (for 1990, the base year) against FTA estimates of populations at‐ risk for that year. **The results indicate that under the IPCC’s warmest** (A1FI) **scenario**, which gives an increase in average global temperatures of 4°C between 1990 and 2085, **global warming would contribute no more than 13% of the total mortality from malaria,2 hunger and coastal flooding in 2085** (Goklany 2009a: 71). **The remaining 87% or more is due to non‐global warming related factors**. However, **had improvements in adaptive capacity been appropriately accounted for, the 87% contribution from the latter would have been much smaller, but then so would have the 13% share attributed to global warming** (probably by a like amount). **FTA results also indicate that:  By 2085, global warming *would reduce* the global population at risk of water shortages**, although some areas would see increases (Arnell 2004; see Goklany 2009a: 72–74).3 This finding is contrary to the erroneous impression conveyed by the IPCC’s AR4’s Work Group II Summary for Policy Makers (IPCC 2007) because that summary emphasizes the number of people that may experience an increase in water shortage but neglects to provide corresponding estimates for the number that would see a reduction in water shortage (Goklany 2007, 2009). However, the finding that the net population experiencing water shortage would be reduced is consistent with other studies of the global impact of global warming on water resources (Oki and Kanae 2006). Remarkably, this result is obtained despite the fact that Arnell (2004) does not allow for any adaptation and, consequently, advances in adaptive capacity that should logically occur under the IPCC scenarios!  **Partly due to increases in net primary productivity because of CO2 fertilization, the amount of habitat devoted to cropland would be halved by global warming under** the A1FI scenario, at least through 2100 (Goklany 2007b). Since diversion of habitat to cropland is perhaps the single largest threat to species and ecosystems (Goklany 1998; MEA 2005), **this means that global warming could actually reduce pressures on biodiversity** (Goklany 1998; 2005). Thus, at least through 2085–2100, GW may relieve some of the problems that some developing countries face currently (e.g., water shortage and habitat loss), while in other instances, **the contribution of GW to the overall problem** (e.g., cumulative mortality from malaria, hunger and coastal flooding) **would be substantially smaller than that of non‐GW related factors.** Notably, economic **development**, one of the fundamental drivers of GW, **would reduce mortality problems regardless of whether they are due to GW or non‐GW related factors**. Hence, ***lack of economic development would be a greater* problem than global warming**, at least through 2085–2100. This is consistent with Figure 7, which shows that notwithstanding global warming and despite egregiously overestimating the negative consequences of global warming, future net GDP per capita will be much higher than it is today under each scenario through at least 2200. Note that Figure 7 also shows that through 2200, notwithstanding global warming, net GDP per capita will be highest under the warmest scenario, and lowest under the poorest scenario (A2). **This suggests that if humanity has a choice of which development path it takes, it ought to strive to take the scenario that has the highest economic growth, whether or not that exacerbates global warming** (Goklany 2007c). The **additional** economic **development would** more than **offset the cost of *any warming***. No less important, it is far cheaper for the world to advance economic development than mitigate climate change by a meaningful amount (Goklany 2003, 2005, 2009d). **This is consistent with** the Tol et al. (2007) **analysis of various climate‐sensitive infectious diseases**. That analysis suggests that “[D]eaths will first increase, because of population growth and climate change, but then fall, because of development … As climate can only be changed with a substantial delay, development is the preferred strategy to reduce infectious diseases even if they are exacerbated by climate change. Development can … increase the capacity to cope with projected increases in infectious diseases over the medium to long term.” Thus, **it is most unlikely that under the IPCC’s warmest scenario, global warming will overwhelm economic development in developing countries**, notwithstanding the Stern Review’s upper bound damage estimates. Second, **economic development should be given priority over reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It would enable developing countries to cope not only with any negative impacts of climate change**, but more importantly, other larger problems that they will face (Goklany 2005, 2007b).

***Turn – tariffs key to protect US solar manufacturing and innovation, which is key to the US economy***

Melanie **Hart and** Kate **Gordon May 16, 2012**, Melanie Hart is a Policy Analyst on China Energy and Climate Policy at the Center for American Progress. Kate Gordon is Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center., “5 Myths and Realities About U.S.-China Solar Trade Competition Our Nation Cannot Capitulate to China’s Solar Technology Ambitions,” Center for American Progress, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2012/05/16/11592/5-myths-and-realities-about-u-s-china-solar-trade-competition/>, KEL

Myth U.S. manufacturers should accept that they cannot compete with China Reality The United States is actually quite strong in higher-end manufacturing **One assumption underlying the cost argument is that we are not good at manufacturing—that China will always have lower costs and weaker regulations**, and therefore it does not make sense to rock the boat in an effort to protect US manufacturing. **In reality, our nation is still a global manufacturing powerhouse. In 2010 manufacturing contributed $1.7 trillion to the U.S. economy. Manufacturing accounts for 60 percent of all U.S. exports**. The United States ranks first in the world in manufacturing value added, meaning that the raw materials and processes used by the manufacturing sector result in products that add more value to the overall U.S. economy than is the case in any other country. The country was also the third-largest exporter of manufactured goods to the world in 2009. Despite drops in employment the U.S. share of global manufacturing output since 1970 has remained fairly constant at around 22 percent. **Clean energy investments are particularly good for manufacturing**. As The Brookings Institution notes, **over a quarter of all the jobs created in clean energy industries are in the *manufacturing sector.*** Between 2004 and 2009, when federal support for wind energy was stable and installed capacity grew from 6.7 megawatts to 35,000 megawatts, manufacturing in that sector grew correspondingly, to nearly 250 facilities. By 2010 the wind sector had more than 400 U.S.-based manufacturing facilities. While the solar industry has had a more turbulent time with manufacturing, perhaps in part because of unfair competition from China, **domestic production in this sector also increased dramatically in 2010. According to the Solar Energy Industry Association, this demand was due primarily to strong growth in demand for solar, both globally and domestically, as well as to increases in manufacturing capacity**. **Yet there were also some high-profile bankruptcies** in the solar manufacturing arena in 2011, including Solyndra, a California-based manufacturing company that pioneered an innovative rooftop solar system that did not use polysilicon, but which went bankrupt when polysilicon prices went from an all-time high in 2008 through the floor in 2009. **But the solar manufacturers that remain are**, in general, **those with innovative products and advanced manufacturing techniques**, such as First Solar Inc. of Tempe, Arizona, and SunPower Corp. of San Jose, California. What do all these stories and statistics tell us? Primarily, that solar manufacturing is indeed possible in the United States, and that location decisions of solar firms are driven in large part by strong market demand and access to innovative ideas and advanced manufacturing practices. The United States is a leader in advanced manufacturing and can be a leader in strong demand for clean energy. **Our country can and should be attractive to solar manufacturers so long as there is true price competition in the global marketplace**. **Moreover, we should be fighting hard to keep manufacturing in the U**nited **S**tates **precisely in order to maintain our competitive edge in innovation and advanced manufacturing.**

***Resource Wars don’t become hot wars***

**Victor ‘08** (David G., “Smoke and Mirrors”, Debating Disaster: The World Is Not Enough, <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16522>,)

MY ARGUMENT is that **classic resource wars-hot conflicts driven by a struggle to grab resources-are increasingly rare. Even where resources play a role, they are rarely the root cause of bloodshed**. Rather, **the root cause usually lies in various failures of governance.** That argument-in both its classic form and in its more nuanced incarnation-is hardly a straw man, as Thomas Homer-Dixon asserts. Setting aside hyperbole, the punditry increasingly points to resources as a cause of war. And so do social scientists and policy analysts, even with their more nuanced views. I've triggered this debate because **conventional wisdom puts too much emphasis on resources as a cause of conflict**. Getting the story right has big implications for social scientists trying to unravel cause-and-effect and often even larger implications for public policy. Michael Klare is right to underscore Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, the only classic resource conflict in recent memory. That episode highlights two of the reasons why classic **resource wars are becoming rare-they're expensive and rarely work**. (And even in Kuwait's case, many other forces also spurred the invasion. Notably, Iraq felt insecure with its only access to the sea a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Kuwait on one side and its archenemy Iran on the other.) In the end, Saddam lost resources on the order of $100 billion (plus his country and then his head) in his quest for Kuwait's 1.5 million barrels per day of combined oil and gas output. By contrast, Exxon paid $80 billion to get Mobil's 1.7 million barrels per day of oil and gas production-a merger that has held and flourished. As the bulging sovereign wealth funds are discovering, **it is easier to get resources through the stock exchange than the gun barrel.** Klare takes me to task for failing to acknowledge the role of "lootable" resources as a motive for war. My point is that looters loot what they can-not just natural resources, but also foreign aid and anything else that passes within reach. (Paul Collier's research, which Klare cites for support, finds that a sizeable share of African military budgets is, in effect, aid money that is looted and redirected from foreign aid.) I suspect that we don't differ much in our assessment of the effects of lootable resources within weak and failed states, but where we do part company is in the implication for policy. Fixing the problems in the Niger River Delta-the case he uses-requires a stronger and more accountable government. That means making it harder to loot resources, taming official corruption, lending a hand with law enforcement in places where oil is produced and stolen, and engaging reformist forces in the Nigerian government. Resource looting and misallocation are severe, but they are symptoms whose cures require focusing on governance. The realities of global resource depletion are somewhat different from Klare's story. It is true that primary resources, such as oil in the ground, are now more concentrated in "armpit" countries because more readily available resources are being depleted. That fact, though, only serves to further support my conclusion: That we must redouble our efforts to improve governance because all oil-consuming countries have a stake in the good governance of their oil producers. What really matters is not theoretical oil thousands of feet underground but actual oil produced and delivered to markets. And on that front, the armpit-country story isn't so bad because those countries tend to put themselves out of business. Witness Venezuela, where production is declining even though the country is one of the world's richest in untapped resources. High prices soon follow. And with those higher prices, a spate of "new" resources becomes viable-oil sands in Canada and shale in the western United States, for example. Moreover, many oil-rich countries actually have good governance systems (at least concerning their oil), such as Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and notably the bright new star among oil-majors, Brazil. Nonetheless, I echo a conclusion from my original article-one that Klare surely shares as well-that current patterns of oil consumption are not sustainable, and urgent efforts to tame demand are also needed.

***Failure to act against Chinese solar dumping will destroy all US trade enforcement credibility with China – tariffs now are key to maintain balance in all US-Chinese trade***

Melanie **Hart and** Kate **Gordon May 16, 2012**, Melanie Hart is a Policy Analyst on China Energy and Climate Policy at the Center for American Progress. Kate Gordon is Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center., “5 Myths and Realities About U.S.-China Solar Trade Competition Our Nation Cannot Capitulate to China’s Solar Technology Ambitions,” Center for American Progress, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2012/05/16/11592/5-myths-and-realities-about-u-s-china-solar-trade-competition/>, KEL

**Myth Imposing tariffs would trigger a trade war with China,** and that must be avoided at all costs **Reality Maintaining a mutually beneficial trade relationship requires a steady hand, and fearful capitulation is not a winning strategy** What exactly are antitariff groups implying when they warn that enforcing trade rules will trigger a “trade war” with China? The logic behind the trade war argument is that if the United States responds to illegal trade activities by the Chinese government by enforcing our mutually agreed, extensively negotiated trade rules, then the Chinese government will then retaliate against U.S. companies by accusing the United States of its own trade misconduct and levying tariffs against U.S. products, or by simply shutting down relationships with U.S. companies. **This trade war argument basically assumes that facing Chinese retaliation would be worse than putting up with the initial misbehavior and that we are therefore better off putting our heads in the sand, ignoring Chinese government violations of our trade policies, and continuing on as usual.** These retaliatory fears are certainly valid. We can already see this coming in the current solar trade case. The Chinese companies targeted in the SolarWorld petition have already filed retaliatory trade complaints in China. China’s Ministry of Commerce is investigating Chinese trade complaints against six U.S. state-level renewable energy incentive programs, and it is slated to announce its findings on May 25, right after the U.S. antidumping announcement. U.S. upstream suppliers selling silicon and manufacturing equipment to China claim that in addition to the formal Chinese government investigation, some of their Chinese customers have threatened to terminate purchasing contracts if the SolarWorld case results in significant tariffs. If China does take retaliatory action by levying tariffs on U.S. imports or switching to non-U.S. suppliers, U.S. companies could feel a big impact. But **wouldn’t allowing China to violate international trade agreements ultimately have an even bigger, and more disastrous, impact on the U.S. economy**? **Would it not signal that the U**nited **S**tates **has now reached the point where we are too dependent on and afraid of China to enforce trade rules that Chinese leaders have explicitly agreed to**? **If so, that is a dangerous position to be in, and it likely would not have a good outcome for the U.S. economy. It is important to remember that the U.S.-China trade relationship is mutual**—China is also dependent on and strongly affected by the United States. **The fact that Chinese companies and officials are up in arms about the SolarWorld case demonstrates that U.S. trade enforcement actions impose real costs**, which is exactly what they were designed to do. **If the U**nited **S**tates **can consistently demonstrate that it is willing and able to impose those costs, then those actions will increase Beijing’s estimates of the risks involved in targeting U.S. markets with WTO-illegal trade policies.** And perhaps, **consistency in trade enforcement on our side will help convince China to start playing by the rules across all its industries, not just solar manufacturing.**

**Domestic**

***No threat to power grids- their studies don’t take into account the laws of physics***

**Toor 10** (Amar Toor, “Don't Worry, Terrorists Won't Bring Down the U.S. Power Grid, Researchers Say”, http://www.switched.com/2010/10/14/dont-worry-terrorists-wont-bring-down-the-u-s-power-grid-re/, 10/14/10)

Over the past few months, many politicians and national security experts have grown increasingly worried about what might happen if the U.S. power grid were ever to fall prey to a terrorist attack. Concerns first arose last March, when a scientific study published in the journal Safety Science suggested that even an attack on a small corner of the electrical network could unleash a domino effect across the country, effectively shutting down the entire grid. A subsequent paper published in the journal Nature legitimized these concerns, demonstrating that a similar cascade took down the Italian national power grid in 2003. Now, however, a new study has soundly refuted these claims, which the authors dismiss as "a bunch of hooey." Authored by University of Vermont power grid expert Paul Hines and Penn State's Seth Blumsack, this latest study questions the mathematical model underpinning the apocalyptic scenarios outlined in both the Safety Science and Nature articles. These so-called topological models, Science Daily explains, are essentially graphs of interconnected networks, which are often used to map the flow of river networks, highway traffic and supply chains. According to this model, whenever one node in the network fails or changes, the next will fail, as well -- hence the aforementioned domino effect that many fear. Hines and Blumsack, though, argue that these topological models don't account for the unique laws of physics that govern the flow of electricity. In their article, which was published in the journal Chaos, the researchers point out that the most susceptible parts of the grid are only those which see the most electricity flow, like major connectors or power generating stations. Given the complexity of the U.S. power grid, moreover, it's a bit simplistic, Hines argues, to conceive of the network as a series of dominoes. "Some modelers have gotten so fascinated with these abstract networks that they've ignored the physics of how things actually work -- like electricity infrastructure," Hines says, "and this can lead you grossly astray." The ultimate takeaway, then, is that our power grid is probably more secure than we think, and perhaps too complex for terrorists to bring down in a single blow. And, if lawmakers buy Hines's and Blumsack's approach, they may end up saving a lot of money. "If the government takes these topological models seriously," Hines says, "and changes their investment strategy to put walls around the substations that have the least amount of flow -- it would be a massive waste of resources."

***Nearly impossible to black out the power grid- hurricanes, physics prove***

**Brown 10** )Joshua E. Brown, staff writer at the University of Vermont, “Study: It's Hard to Bring Down the Electric Grid”, http://www.uvm.edu/~uvmpr/?Page=News&storyID=17119, 10/8/10,)

An important implication of Hines's work, funded by the National Science Foundation, is that electric grid is probably more secure than many people realize -- because it is so unpredictable. This, of course, makes it hard to improve its reliability (in another line of research, Hines has explored why the rate of blackouts in the United States hasn't improved in decades), but the up-side of this fact is that it would be hard for a terrorist to bring large parts of the grid down by attacking just one small part.

"Our system is quite robust to small things failing -- which is very good," he says, "Even hurricanes have trouble taking out power systems. Hurricanes do cause power system failures, but they don't often take out the whole system." Blumsack agrees. "Our paper confirms that it would be possible for somebody who wanted to do something disruptive to the power grid to do so," he says. "A lot of the infrastructure is out in the open," which does create vulnerability to planned attack. "But if you wanted to black out half of the U.S., it will be much more difficult than some of these earlier models imply," he says. "If you were a bad guy, there is no obvious thing to do to take out the power system," Hines says. "What we learned from doing the simulations is that if you take out the biggest substation, with the most flow, you get the biggest failure on average. But there were also a number of cases where, even if you took out the biggest one, you don't get much of a blackout." "It takes an incredible amount of information," he says, "to really figure out how to make the grid fail."

***Problems with the grid are being solved in the status quo***

**Fox News, 7** (Allison Barrie, “Project Hydra: Keeping Power Out of the Hands of Terrorists,” 6-6-2008, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,364104,00.html) // SM

The closer the grid gets to hitting capacity and buckling from consumer demand, the more and more vulnerable it becomes to natural disasters and terrorist attacks causing blackouts, rolling outages and cascading failures.

**The Department of Energy has taken the lead on countering this threat and has come up with a plan to be rolled out in 2020**. But will terrorists conveniently wait for the next 12 years to exploit this vulnerability?

Fortunately, some groups are stepping in to fill the gap. **ConEdison, American Superconductor and the Department of Homeland Security are determined to keep the lights on in New York no matter what terrorists throw at the grid.**In less than two years, **the three organizations plan to launch a program they’re calling the Resilient Electric Grid, which provides a new superconductor cable that can link up stations and ensure the steady flow of juice to all parts of the city.**

Right now, if an area like the financial district is targeted and goes down, the grid will not allow any other stations to assist by donating electricity to keep the lights on in that area.  
But **when this superconducting cable is integrated with the existing electrical grid, it will link up substations and allow them to share excess capacity in case of an emergency**.

**In the event of a deliberate attempt to cause a cascading failure similar to the blackout of 2003, it also will be able to limit the current flow between substations during fault conditions**.

The effort was dubbed "Project Hydra" after the mythical beast that grew a new head each time any was chopped off.

**Once the capability for multi-path electrical resilience goes live in the New York City electric grid in 2010, the plan is to roll out Hydra to protect other national critical infrastructure.**

Project Hydra also has plans to install micro wind and water turbine generators on rooftops to ensure ongoing power generation for neighborhoods in the event of a crisis.

Guarding every power line from a terrorist attack is an impossibility for forces that already lack resources, but Project Hydra will allow our guns, guards and badges to be focused on nuclear plants and other places where they are critical to stopping terrorist attacks.

***No extinction impact to disease***

**Posner 5** – Court of Appeals Judge; Professor, Chicago School of Law (Richard, Catastrophe, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html, AG)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease.

***Terrorists can’t get bioweapons***

**The Economist 1-8-11** (“A bug’s life; Bioterror; Africa and security,” lexis, jj)

Sceptics say Mr **Lugar is scaremongering abroad for political gain** at home. **He may be right**, as he complained in Kenya, **that pathogens are easier to package than nuclear materials. But "weaponising" them is still difficult. Many organisms mooted as terror agents are tricky to handle and hard to make into weapons. It is** **unlikely that Somalia's al-Shabab, the most threatening terrorist group in east Africa, or organised criminals, have the technical ability to do that**.

***Bioterror is extremely unlikely – no weapons programs – and current biodefense solves***

**Orent 09** – Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Michigan, leading freelance science writer, and author of Plague: The Mysterious Past and Terrifying Future of the World's Most Dangerous Disease (Wendy, 7/17. “America’s bioterror bugaboo.” Los Angeles Times. Lexis.)

After the anthrax letter attacks of October 2001, the Bush administration pledged US$57 billion to keep the nation safe from bioterror. Since then, the government has created a vast network of laboratories and institutions to track down and block every remotely conceivable form of bioterror threat. The Obama administration seems committed to continuing the biodefense push, having just appointed a zealous bioterror researcher as undersecretary of science and technology in the Department of Homeland Security. But is the threat as great as we've been led to believe? Last summer, the FBI concluded that the anthrax letters that killed five Americans came not from abroad but from an American laboratory, the United States Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases. Meanwhile, the Russian bioweapons program was officially shut down in 1992, and it's unlikely that anything remaining of it could pose much of a threat. Iraq, it has turned out, had no active program. And al-Qaida's rudimentary explorations were interrupted, according to an Army War College report, by the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan.

***Food prices are self-correcting***

Rick **Newman**, US News and World Report, May 5th **2011**, http://www.usnews.com/mobile/blogs/flowchart/2011/5/5/why-gas-and-food-prices-are-likely-to--drop.html (BJN)

**The rise in food prices seems** even more **temporary** than the rise in gas. Energy costs have a lot to do with food costs, because it takes a lot of fuel to harvest, process, and transport food. So if oil prices stabilize or fall, the same thing will happen to food prices. **Unusually bad weather in many parts of the world has** also **led to weak harvests that have driven prices up. And unlike oil, there's a lot of excess capacity in the world for growing food**, **which is a** kind of **self-correcting mechanism: As prices rise for certain types of crops**, **farmers become more inclined to grow them, which adds to supply and helps keep prices in check**. IHS predicts that **a market correction should bring food inflation down from 6 percent now to about 1.7 percent by the end of the year.**

***Plan can’t solve supply alt causes***

Nicholas P **Sargen**, PhD, Chief Investment Officer, May 11th **2011**, http://www.nicksargen.com/?p=640 (BJN)

Over the past decade, **the principal driver of** oil and **commodity prices has been the global economic cycle** and the emergence of China as a global economic power. Prior to the onset of the financial crisis in September 2008, commodity prices had increased nearly uninterrupted from 2003 on the back of strong global demand, with China becoming the dominant buyer of natural resources. **During the financial meltdown from mid-2008 to early 2009, commodity prices plummeted in response to the severe global recession, but they rebounded subsequently as the world economy recovered. Supply shortages have** also **played a role in the surge in food prices, owing to widespread crop damage in Russia, floods in Pakistan’s food belt, and flood damage in Australia and China**. At the same time, some observers contend the **U.S. corn-based ethanol mandate imposed in 2005 has contributed to the run-up in corn prices from $2 per bushel pre-2005 to more than $7 per bushel today.**

***Turn – Low food prices increases ag dumping***

Mark **Muller** et al, director of the Environment and Agriculture program at the Minneapolis-based Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, “Food vs Fuel in the United States Can Both Win in the Era of Ethanol?” Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Sept 20**07** (BJN)

**Higher commodity prices do not** necessarily **translate into higher food prices in developing countries**. In fact, **higher commodity prices could actually increase food security in developing countries by reducing agricultural dumping**. **The dumping of agricultural products—the selling of products below their cost of production—is perhaps the most damaging of all current market distortions** in world trade. **Developing country agriculture, vital for food security, rural livelihoods, poverty reduction and generating foreign exchange, is crippled by the competition from major commodities dumped onto world markets.** In 2003, U.S. corn was exported (dumped) at an average price of 10 percent below the full cost of production.16 **The structural price depression associated with selling food products below their cost of production has two major effects on developing country farmers who raise competing products. First, below-cost imports drive developing country farmers out of their local markets**. If the farmers do not have access to a safety net of tariffs or subsidies and/or credit—which in most poor countries they do not—the underpriced competition can drive them out of business. **When this happens, the local farm economy shrinks, in turn shrinking the rural economy as a whole and sending rural people into trade-related migration. Second, developing country farmers who sell their products to exporters find their global market share undermined by a depressed global price. The cascading effects of dumping are felt around the world.**

***Turn – removing tariffs will destroy renewable innovation, which is key to sustainable renewable market penetration***

James **Holloway, June 24 2012**, Renewable trade wars: green mercantilism and the threat to innovation Other countries undercutting the US on PV sales complicates a renewable future. <http://arstechnica.com/science/2012/06/renewable-trade-wars-green-mercantilism-and-the-threat-to-innovation/>, KEL

If it's a case of a chasm between CASM and CASE, then the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation stands firmly on CASM's side. The report does acknowledge the merits of the argument that **in undercutting US manufacturers, China is effectively subsidizing the US with cheap renewable technology** (and therefore the associated services and jobs). **This will spur renewable energy proliferation which will in turn lead to lower energy prices.** The report argues, however, that **this consumer-oriented view is short-termist. The bigger picture is the stifling of innovation which spells a grim long-term prognosis for the *entire renewable industry.*** The report's logic is that **a renewable sector in which low cost is king has little to no incentive to innovate.** **And further innovation is crucial if renewable technologies are to surpass fossil fuels on a dollar per watt basis**. **The report cites MIT research into the cost effectiveness of PV, which must achieve a cost of $0.50 per peak watt without subsidies in order to compete with coal–a target requiring "advanced concepts not currently in industry roadmaps**," according to the MIT study. "**If the goal is to create a global energy system that is largely carbon free, continual dependence on subsidies, whether domestic and legitimate or foreign and mercantilist, is not the way. Driving innovation is**," the report finds.

## 2nc

**Shell**

#### Turns case --- Romney kills domestic solar

**Tracy ‘12**

Tennille Tracy, 7-11-12, Wall Street Journal, Obama, Romney Surrogates Debate Energy Policy <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2012/07/11/obama-romney-surrogates-debate-energy-policy/>, jj

If elected president, Mr. Romney would almost certainly remove support for the billions of dollars set aside for alternative energy. Mr. Romney believes the free market should determine which types of technologies succeed and which ones fail, Ms. Stuntz said. Holding the opposite view, Mr. Obama believes the federal government should play a role in promoting clean energy technologies that wean the U.S. off fossil fuels, Mr. Reicher said.

***GOP president ramps up China bashing and containment, destroying relations***

James **Traub** is a journalist specializing in foreign affairs. He writes a "Terms of Engagement," a weekly column in ForeignPolicy.com. He is also writing a biography of John Quincy Adams. Washington Monthly, Foreign Affairs The “more enemies, fewer friends” doctrine. Jan/Feb **12** <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/foreign_affairs034475.php>, jj)

The Republicans tend to paint themselves as hardheaded realists as against Obama’s universalist idealism; but a true realist would regard such an option as a bad bargain. **The Republican candidates see China as another power seeking to assert itself at America’s expense. Romney has said that Obama has let China “run all over us,” stealing American jobs and waging a “trade war” against the U.S.** Rick Perry, harking back to hoary Cold War rhetoric—in fact, to Marxist rhetoric—has proclaimed that “the communist Chinese government will end up on the ash heap of history.” Candidates of both parties tend to accuse an incumbent president of the opposite party of coddling China and neglecting human rights, but China’s rising power means that the issues on the other side of the balance are now not chiefly moral, but strategic and, of course, economic. **Romney has said that he would haul China before the World Trade Organization on charges that it was manipulating its currency,** the renminbi, in order to assure a steady flow of cheap exports. But as with Iran, it’s not clear how much space actually lies on the more aggressive side of the Obama administration’s own policies. Obama has responded to China’s rapidly increasing military budget, its growing presence in the South China Sea, and its assertive claims over disputed territory in the region by offering pointed reassurance to American allies like Japan and South Korea. On a recent swing through Asia, Obama announced that the U.S. would be stationing 2,500 Marines at a base in Australia, and declared, with uncharacteristic brassiness, “The United States is a Pacific power, and we are here to stay.” Even while making these shots across China’s bow, the president has tried to send other, perhaps contradictory, messages. **On international finance, administration officials** have said that the cheap renminbi is hurting the U.S. economy, but they **have not threatened retaliation or action before the WTO. On the military front, the White House has not explicitly said that China is trying to exclude the U.S. from the region, though that is what they fear. A Republican president would, at the very least,** shift this delicate balance. **The U.S. would more bluntly describe China as a rival and demand changes in Chinese policy more harshly. Conservatives speak of creating a much stronger Asian alliance beefed up by more, and more advanced, American weaponry and a more open acknowledgment of China’s drive for regional hegemony**. Indeed, **Romney and other conservatives cite the imperative of responding to Chinese militarism as the most powerful argument for increasing the Pentagon budget, rather than cutting it by $450 billion over a decade, as Obama and Congress have agreed to do. Romney would increase defense spending by at least $50 billion a year, and engage in a massive program of shipbuilding aimed in part at deterring Chinese designs**. Of course, this would make reducing the budget deficit that much more difficult; Romney has not explained what domestic programs he would cut even more deeply than is currently planned in order to finance such an expansion. China really does seem to have moved away from its doctrine of “peaceful rise” to one more threatening to the neighborhood, which is why Obama has adopted a tougher tone. But ***toughness carries dangers of its own. China’s cooperation is indispensable on a vast range of issues, including the global economy, energy supplies, and climate change; provoking Chinese nationalism is a sure path to a scratchy relationship***. This is why presidents of both parties have tended to accommodate China more than they said they would as candidates. Moreover, it’s not clear that even those allies who fear China’s bullying tactics would welcome a chestier American presence; they, even more than the U.S., have to balance their security concerns with the wish to benefit from China’s locomotive economy. **It is an article of faith among Republicans that the twenty-first century, like the twentieth, will be an American century— which is to say, not a Chinese one**. But “communist China” is an absurd archaism, and China is not likely to wind up on the ash heap of history. **Treating the world’s premier rising power like the Soviet Union in the 1960s would be a mistake of historic proportions.**

***Romney will label china a currency manipulator – not a bluff***

**Palmer, 12**

Doug, Trade Journalist @ Reuters, 3/12, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/28/us-usa-romney-china-idUSBRE82Q0ZS20120328

**Romney would squeeze China on currency manipulation**-adviser¶ Republican presidential candidate Mitt **Romney is looking** at ways **to increase pressure on China over** what he sees as **currency manipulation** and unfair subsidy practices, a Romney campaign adviser said on Tuesday.¶ "I think **he wants to maximize the pressure**," Grant Aldonas, a former undersecretary of commerce for international trade, said at a symposium on the future of U.S. manufacturing. Aldonas served at the Commerce Department under Republican President George W. Bush.¶ **Romney,** the front-runner in the Republican race to challenge President Barack Obama for the White House in November, **has promised** if elected **he would quickly label China a currency manipulator, something** the **Obama** administration **has** six times **declined to do**.¶ **That would set the stage**, under Romney's plan, **for the U**nited **S**tates **to impose countervailing duties** on Chinese goods **to offset the advantage** of what many consider to be China's undervalued currency.¶ Last year, the Democratic-controlled Senate passed legislation to do essentially the same thing.¶ However, the measure has stalled in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, where leaders say they fear it could start a trade war, and the Obama administration has not pushed for a House vote on the currency bill.¶ The U.S. Treasury Department on April 15 faces a semi-annual deadline to declare whether any country is manipulating its currency for an unfair trade advantage. The department, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has not cited any country since 1994, when China was last named.¶ **Asked if Romney was serious about declaring China a currency manipulator**, **Aldonas answered: "He is."**

***Impact – Republicans will destroy the economy***

**Dorner 1-2-12** (Josh, is the Communications Director for the ThinkProgress war room. He brings four years of experience heading up communications strategy and media for all of the Sierra Club’s energy and global warming work, as well as its other federal legislative campaigns and political work. He also served as deputy communications director at the Clean Energy Works campaign. Prior to Sierra Club, Josh worked as an account executive at a PR firm that primarily served nonprofits, independent film distributors, and other arts projects. Josh graduated from Grinnell College with honors degrees in political science and French. He also holds a master of science in European politics and governance from the London School of Economics.

Think Progress, REPORT: The Republican Candidates’ Economic Agenda For The 1 Percent

<http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/02/395363/gop-economic-agenda-for-the-one-percent/>, jj)

**Each and every Republican candidate has called for trillions of dollars in new tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans and corporations — all while calling for ending Medicare as we know it and dramatic cuts to Social Security, Medicaid, and countless other programs and services** that Americans depend on each day. **All of the candidates would take us back to the Bush-era policies that** increased income inequality, **resulted in the worst job growth in decades, exploded the deficit and national debt, and ultimately** crashed the economy. Indeed, **the policies proposed by the candidates would not only embrace this failed economic agenda, they would take it even further.**

***( ) Romney strikes Syria – causes great power war***

**Pangburn, 9/4**/12 (DJ, editor at Death and Taxes, “6 countries Mitt Romney could antagonize if elected,” http://www.deathandtaxesmag.com/188055/6-countries-mitt-romney-could-antagonize-if-elected/, bgm)

Last but certainly not least: Syria. **Romney** has openly stated that he **would send US troops to Syria to aid in the revolution.**¶ **“I think we have to also be ready to take whatever action is necessary to ensure that we do not have any kind of weapon of mass destruction falling into the hands of terrorists and whether that requires troops, or whether that requires other actions by our friends and allies,” Romney said** in an interview with CBS News.¶ **What’s particularly troublesome about an open commitment to US troops in Syria is that there are so many economic, religious and state alliances at play.** In the early 20th century, **this vortex of alliances would be enough to trigger a world war. Indeed, what we have right now is in effect a proxy world war.**¶ **If Romney backed his Syria rhetoric with actual military deployment, Americans would have to hope that the China-Russia alliance wouldn’t militarily push back, thereby triggering a world war. Diplomacy is the only sane route here, but after Bush and the GOP’s irrational invasion of Iraq, don’t expect the world to just sit by as Romney and his party continue subduing the Middle East. There is too much oil and Islamic blood at stake for everyone to simply remain neutral.**

### A2: base inev

***Public perception of Obamas economic policy can still swing***

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 3/26, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12306>)

**A far more important factor in determining whether voters decide to renew Obama’s contract** for another four years **is whether they see his stewardship of the economy as a success**. Has he done as well as anyone could realistically have done? Or did he have other priorities—like health care—that seemed to merit more attention than dealing with a worsening economic downturn and dramatically escalating unemployment? With each passing week we will get a new crop of statistics that will provide clues as to how the economy is faring. Will the narrative be a continuation of the improvement seen since last fall? Or, will this spurt have been more temporary, bumping against headwinds—in the form of high energy prices, a global economic downturn, and recession in Europe—preventing that pattern from continuing through the November election? How will the economy perform over the seven months between now and the election? Upcoming economic reports are likely to answer the question about whether Obama’s presidency will be judged as a success. The Conference Board on Tuesday will release its latest survey of consumer confidence. On Friday, the Thomson/Reuters/University of Michigan Index of Consumer Sentiment will be released. These are the two most closely watched measures of how Americans see the economy now, and what their expectations are for the coming months. A week from Friday, the March unemployment figures will be reported. Analysts will look to see whether the improvement in the jobless picture seen over the winter will continue or whether it has leveled off. Some speculate that rapidly rising gasoline prices may ease sooner, rather than skyrocketing through the spring and summer, as many have forecasted. Which forecasts turn out to be right will be hugely important both politically and for the economy. Up until now, much of the spike in gas prices has been offset by unusually low heating bills paid during the fourth-warmest winter on record, and the warmest since 1990. The Wall Street research firm ISI Group, as of Oct. 3, had charted 16 out of 20 weeks as having more negative economic news and developments than positive ones. Since October 10, it has marked 25 weeks in a row of more positive than negative news and developments. But it has noted that the positive mix last week was not particularly convincing—a possible sign that the recent upbeat pattern may be breaking up. **Right now, a fair number of voters *sit on the fence* when it comes to assessing Obama’s performance on the economy**. **They are disappointed that he didn’t do better, but they are unwilling to pass final judgment.** How the economy fares in **the coming months will determine which side** of that fence these **voters decide** to come down on.

**Extension – Iran**

***All critical advisors for Romney are pro attack***

Ben **Armbruster** on **Oct 7**, 2011, <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2011/10/07/338979/romney-advisers-war-iran/>

Yesterday, GOP presidential front runner Mitt **Romney announced his campaign’s foreign policy team**. While ThinkProgress pointed out that many of **Romney’s advisers helped push the United States into war with Iraq, it might also be interesting to know what the** former Massachusetts **governor will be hearing from his top aides regarding Iran**. Prominent neoconservative Robert **Kagan, who is among Romney’s foreign policy advisers, has actually spoken out in favor of talking to Iran**. However, that view is by far an outlier among Romney’s team. While some of them have tried to push the claim that Iran is working with al Qaeda, **others have said** or written that the U**.S. should take a more militaristic approach toward the Islamic Republic**: ELIOT COHEN: Soon after the 9/11 attacks, **Cohen**, now director of the strategic studies program and Johns Hopkins University, **called for the overthrow of the Iranian government. And that thinking doesn’t appear to have changed**. In 2009, Cohen again called for the overthrow of the Iranian regime and said either attack Iran or it gets nukes. “The choices are now what they ever were: an American or an Israeli strike, which would probably cause a substantial war, or living in a world with Iranian nuclear weapons, which may also result in war, perhaps nuclear, over a longer period of time.” **MICHAEL HAYDEN: On CNN** last year, former CIA director (and prominent torture advocate) Michael Hayden **said attacking Iran over its nuclear program might not be a bad idea.** “In my personal thinking — I need to emphasize that — I have begun to consider that that may not be the worst of all possible outcomes,” he said. ERIC EDELMAN: **Edelman** was a career diplomat and former aid to Vice President Dick Cheney. Earlier this year **in an article in Foreign Affairs**, Edelman, along with two other co-authors, **said that the U.S. will** either **have to attack Iran** or contain its nuclear weapons capability. “The military option should not be dismissed because of the appealing but flawed notion that containment is a relatively easy or low-risk solution to a very difficult problem,” they wrote. NORM COLEMAN: Coleman, the former Republican senator from Minnesota, said in 2007 that if Israel ever attacks Iran, the United States should join in. “If something is taken,” Coleman said, “the United States is going to be part of that. We have to understand that. There is no saying, ‘Israel did it.’” KIM **HOLMES**: In 2005, the Heritage Foundation’s Kim Holmes **worried that the Europeans, by negotiating with Iran** over its nuclear program, **might be preventing the U.S. from using military force to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. Holmes called it a “serious mistake” to allow Iran to obtain the bomb** because “Iran itself is simply too untrustworthy to be trusted with nuclear weapons.” Holmes is referring to the hackneyed right-wing fearmongering talking point which CAP’s Matt Duss has labeled, “The martyr state myth.” The myth is that Iran is hell bent on using nuclear weapons, against Israel, the U.S., etc, should it acquire them and that Iran’s leaders are “uniquely immune to the cost-benefit calculations that underpin a conventional theory of deterrence.” Today in his foreign policy speech at the Citadel military college in South Carolina, which happened to also be “full of ridiculous fear mongering,” **Romney echoed this sentiment.** “In the hands of the ayatollahs, a nuclear Iran is nothing less than an existential threat to Israel,” he said. “Iran’s suicidal fanatics could blackmail the world.” **Romney also said** in his speech today that “**Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon is unacceptable.**” **Now that we know how he will be advised on how to prevent that,** it looks like **Romney’s new American Century** that he called for today, **should he become president, is likely to turn out just like the last new American Century the neocons tried to create under the previous Republican president.**

**Rhetoric Trick**

***Even if they won’t directly attack – The republicans will rhetorically bash Iran***

Paul R. **Pillar**, The National Interest, September 19, **2011**, <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/the-consequences-campaign-rhetoric-5905>

Probably more **dangerous is the rhetoric coming out of the Republican campaign about Iran**—more **dangerous because it propels a vicious circle of mutual hostility and threat perception that already has seen many rounds of escalation**. **Republican extremists and Iranian hardline extremists feed off each other's militant rhetoric**. This is a rhetorical line that is likely to get only worse during the general election campaign. As Trita Parsi notes, “Whatever hawkish line Obama adopts, the Republicans will find a way to 'outhawk' him. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.”

***This increases the risk of miscalc***

Heather **Hurlburt**, The Guardian, **November 3rd** 2011, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/nov/03/iran-overheated-rhetoric-us-policy?utm\_source=twitterfeed&utm\_medium=twitter

These developments suggest that **the path of diplomacy is far from exhausted**. At the same time, Ahmadinejad complains that the UN sanctions are biting, and Iran finds itself utterly isolated in front of the UN Human Rights Council – without even the regional support that North Korea and Burma enjoy. But **the overheated political climates** in the Middle East and the nasty politicisation **of security policy in the US make the risk of miscalculation unnervingly high** – **as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen reflected** when he proposed a US-Iran hotline last month. Mullen also called the prospect of a military strike "incredibly destabilising"; the International Campaign for Human Rights in Iran interviewed leading human rights voices inside the country and found them overwhelmingly opposed to a western strike. **This is a mix of spin and substance that really should worry military planners and civilian leaders alike.**

### 2nc UQ

***Base enthusiasm high***

**Silver 9-6**

NATE SILVER, bamf, 9-6-12, New York Times, Obama Would Be Big Favorite With ‘Fired Up’ Base <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/06/obama-would-be-big-favorite-with-fired-up-base/>, jj

**There’s one advantage** that President **Obama has that** Mitt **Romney** probably **doesn’t. If he can get a good turnout from his base, he’ll be the heavy favorite to win** in November — **even if Mr. Romney gets a strong turnout as well.** On average over the last five public surveys, **35 percent of registered voters identify themselves as Democrats and 30 percent as Republicans.** That advantage is down somewhat for Democrats since 2008, but it is an advantage nevertheless.

***Obama win – the important polls are in his favor***

**Silver, 9/20**/12 (Nate, political forecaster and analyst, “Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead,” http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead, bgm)

By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys.

***Prefer Nate Silver – he’s a statistical mastermind.***

**Leigh Bureau**, the world’s preeminent lecture bureau, “Nate Silver,” **2010**, http://www.leighbureau.com/speaker.asp?id=498

**Nate Silver has been called a "spreadsheet psychic" and "number-crunching prodigy"** by New York Magazine.

Nate comes out of the world of baseball statistics, but **during the 2008 presidential election primaries, he turned his sights and his amazing predictive abilities and forecasting models to the game of politics and current events — with incredible results.**

**He began by predicting 2008 primary election results with stunning accuracy — and often in opposition to the better-known political pollsters.** **He then moved on to the general election, where he correctly predicted the presidential winner in 49 states and the District of Columbia**.

***Obama winning – swing states***

**Bookman, 9/20**/12 (Jay, columnist at The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, specializing in foreign relations, environmental and technology-related issues and state and local politics. He has won two national awards for outstanding editorial writing, the National Headliner Award and the Scripps-Howard National Journalism Award, “GOP strategists cannot like what they’re seeing,” http://blogs.ajc.com/jay-bookman-blog/2012/09/20/gop-strategists-cannot-like-what-theyre-seeing/, bgm)

But Romney’s real problems show up at the state level. In the swing states that he has to have — Ohio, Virginia, Florida — poll after poll shows his situation deteriorating significantly. At a point in the campaign where he has to be shrinking the margin, the margin is growing. Fox puts Romney down seven in Ohio, down five in Florida and down seven in Virginia.

***Electoral college***

**Rivers, 9/19**/12 (Doug, Professor of Political Science at Stanford University, Chief Innovations Officer at YouGov and a CBS News Consultant, “In electoral vote simulation, signs point to Obama,” http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57515796/in-electoral-vote-simulation-signs-point-to-obama/, bgm)

The new CBS News/YouGov Electoral Vote Tracker - a computer simulation model of the Presidential race - shows that if President Obama were to win the national popular vote by three points (which is his current edge today in national polls) that would translate into 332 electoral votes for Mr. Obama and 206 for Mitt Romney on election night. The model shows how the votes would most likely be distributed across all fifty states, if Mr. Obama's three-point lead held up on November 6th and that reveals which states would ultimately tilt to Mr. Obama, and which go to Romney. The president would pick up enough swing voters from across the battleground states to take almost all of them. He'd win Pennsylvania, Ohio, Nevada, New Hampshire, Iowa, Colorado, Virginia; he'd win a close race in Florida, and win a squeaker in Wisconsin, while North Carolina would go to Romney.

***Prefer the direction of the link --- election’s too close to call***

**Enid News and Eagle 9-17**

The heated presidential election is too close to call <http://enidnews.com/opinion/x1052803813/The-heated-presidential-election-is-too-close-to-call>, jj

ENID, Okla. — **With less than two months** remaining before the election, President Barack **Obama** **and** Republican nominee Mitt **Romney are eyeing** some **pivotal swing states** to win the election. Besides Colorado and New Mexico, Oklahoma virtually is surrounded by red — or red-leaning — states in most electoral projections. We’re entering the home stretch, and **the heated presidential election is too close to call.** The presidential debate schedules have been announced: Jim Lehrer of PBS will moderate a debate on domestic issues on Oct. 3. CNN’s Candy Crowley will coordinate a town hall debate Oct. 16 at Hofstra University. Bob Schieffer of CBS News will moderate a foreign policy-focused debate on Oct. 22 at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Fla. What will voters decide? Meena Bose, a presidential scholar at Hofstra University, told Newsday the magic number of 270 electoral votes is what really matters in the election … not the popular vote. **Romney got some good news Friday when Obama announced an added travel stop to Wisconsin. That confirmed the traditionally Democratic state is in play**, according to the Wall Street Journal. All of the news isn’t as favorable for Romney, however. You can blame the “liberal media,” but even the conservative Washington Times reported on NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist College polls that show Obama leads Romney in Florida, Ohio and Virginia. (Romney’s camp dismissed the post-convention bump as a “sugar high.”) Still, **the Washington Post isn’t ready to move the bellwether state of Ohio in Obama’s direction for three reasons: the aforementioned bump, the Buckeye State’s ongoing political division and the fact Romney won’t give up on the Midwest’s electoral crown jewel.**

### Too soon

***No major surprises coming now – econ and foreign policy are static***

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/30, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/30/economically-obama-is-no-jimmy-carter/)

**The forward-looking data** was bad as well. The stock market declined in the six months leading up to May 1980 (even without adjusting for inflation), and the consensus of economic forecasters at the time was that conditions would remain recessionary for the six months ahead. By contrast, the data this year **is mediocre, but nowhere near** that **terrible.** Industrial production has picked up quite a bit and is an economic bright spot, which could help Mr. Obama in the manufacturing-intensive economies of the Midwest. Inflation has not been a major problem throughout the economy as a whole, although energy prices have been a periodic threat. However, income growth is very slow, as is the growth in consumption as indicated by the broadest measure of it, personal consumption expenditures. (Growth in retail sales has been more robust, but that is a less comprehensive statistic.) Jobs growth has been decent recently, but many economists expect it to slow some in the subsequent months. Gross domestic product in the final six months of the year, likewise, is expected to grow at a below-average rate. Still, there is really no comparison between Mr. Obama and Mr. Carter, who faced an economy that was still bottoming out into a severe and broad-based recession. Mr. **Obama**, by contrast, **faces numbers that are improving but perhaps too slowly.** It would probably require an economic shock, instead, to put Mr. Obama in Mr. Carter’s shoes. This could happen, of course – for instance, if there were a meltdown in Europe. Economists differ greatly on whether this would have relatively mild or more catastrophic effects on the American economy. But most versions of it would be enough to leave Mr. Obama as a clear underdog for re-election. Even if that were to occur, however, Mr. Obama’s situation might still not be as bad as Mr. Carter’s. For instance, **he does not face an acute foreign policy crisis**, at the moment at least, as Mr. Carter did in Iran, **and a European-driven recession would probably not be associated with high inflation** (although one set off by oil-price instability in the Middle East might). In some ways, in fact, it’s remarkable that Mr. Carter lost his election to Mr. Reagan by only 10 points. Some of this was because the recession of 1980 was extremely unusual: it was severe but also brief, ultimately persisting for only six months. Mr. Carter’s recession technically ended in August 1980, although not in a way that would have been highly visible to consumers and voters at the time. All of this produced some incredibly volatile polling in 1980. Mr. Carter led Mr. Reagan by a wide margin in polls in January and February 1980. The numbers drew closer together in the spring. By the summer, Mr. Reagan had a clear lead, peaking around 25 points in polls conducted immediately after the Republican convention in Detroit. Then, Mr. Carter rebounded, with polls conducted in late October showing him behind Mr. Reagan by only a point or two on average. Mr. Reagan considerably beat his polls on Election Day, however, and won in a landslide. Once we release the election model, we will be a little bit more in “sweat the small stuff” mode, analyzing the trends in the polling and the economic numbers on an almost-daily basis. So far, however, **the 2012 election cycle has been *extremely stable*** as **compared with** some **other years** like 1980.

### 2nc link

#### Hardline stance on China key to Obama election --- plan opens him up to a new round of GOP attacks --- the public hates China

Dawson and Mason, 12

Stella and Jeff, Columnists @ Reuters, 2/13, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/13/us-usa-campaign-obama-china-idUSTRE81C0DG20120213

**Tough calculus for Obama in** Chinese leader's **election-year** visit¶ Even as he greets China's vice president in the Oval Office on Tuesday, President **Barack Obama is quietly overhauling U.S. economic policy toward Beijing**, looking for new ways **to extract results on** issues such as market access and **currency manipulation** that have bedeviled him and his predecessors.¶ **Obama's need to boost U.S. exports and show he can be firm with China, and** his **simultaneous hopes for a smooth start with** Vice President Xi Jinping, who is due to become **China's leader** in 13 months, **illustrate** the **conflicting tugs on Washington's China policy**.¶ **Making the calculus** even **more complicated, Xi arrives in the middle of a U.S. election year**, in which **Obama's dealings with Beijing are a popular punching bag for Republican** presidential **candidates** aiming to challenge the Democratic incumbent.¶ Xi is getting the full Washington tour: visits to the State Department, Pentagon and Capitol Hill, as well as meetings with U.S. and Chinese business leaders.¶ But he won't be offered the complete red-carpet treatment. For all his power within the Chinese system, Xi is still for now No. 2, leader-in-waiting behind outgoing President Hu Jintao.¶ Obama's aides say the visit will produce few, if any, formal agreements. Rather they expect the president and Xi to size one another up. There will be firm talk from Obama on U.S. gripes, and perhaps from Xi as well.¶ While there has been progress in increasing U.S. exports to China, "we've also raised very directly instances where we believe that China is not living up to the rules of the road that all nations need to with regard to business practices," deputy national security adviser Ben Rhodes told reporters.¶ POLICY AND POLITICS¶ **China is not beloved by the American electorate. Its** trade and **currency policies are blamed for job losses** in the U.S. manufacturing sector **that hit important election battleground states** such as Ohio especially hard. **Beating up on Beijing is an easy way for candidates** from both parties **to score political points.**¶ **Obama knows that,** and he set the stage for tough talk at the Asia-Pacific summit in Hawaii in November, telling China to act like a "grown-up" by reforming trade and currency practices viewed as detrimental to the U.S. economy.¶ U.S. leverage over Beijing is limited, since China holds hundreds of billions of dollars of U.S. debt.¶ Still, the policy review, described by an official who recently left the Obama administration, is aimed at finding new ways of getting results on limits to U.S. market access, China's use of state-owned corporations, the valuation of its yuan currency, which U.S. officials see as artificially low, and related issues.¶ In his State of the Union address last month, Obama announced a new enforcement unit that will investigate unfair trade practices. China will likely be a major target.¶ Republicans do not see a lot that is working. Mitt **Romney,** the apparent front-runner in the race for the Republican presidential nomination, has **said Obama is not being tough enough. He *promised to label China a currency manipulator*** - something the Obama administration has declined to do.¶ In a speech to technology executives on Friday, Romney slammed China's "autocratic model" of capitalism, and said that China's rise could ultimately threaten U.S. freedom.¶ Such criticism has gained traction on the campaign trail.¶ "China is just a drop in the bucket in terms of things the Obama administration is doing wrong," said Chrystalline Lauryl, 35, who was attending a conservative conference in Washington where the Republican candidates were speaking.¶ "There's friendly and there's buttering up," she said with regard to China policy. Obama, she said, was doing the latter.¶ The president's political advisers are aware that Xi's visit could trigger more attacks on the president's record, and they are ready with a string of comebacks about Romney's own record on the subject.¶ They point out, for example, that in his book "No Apology" Romney criticized Obama for being protectionist after putting tariffs on Chinese tires, while as a presidential candidate Romney said he would apply tariffs to goods after declaring the country a currency manipulator.¶ "That just gives us another opportunity to talk about a flip flop," a senior Obama campaign official said.¶ CALCULUS¶ Obama may not address Romney's critiques directly while Xi is in Washington, but the pressure of the election will influence his positioning.¶ "The way that China's been broached in the Republican primaries has been one of the things that has contributed to Obama having to take a tougher public stance on some of the China economic issues in particular," said Andrew Small, a China expert at the German Marshall Fund, who said U.S. officials would still be cognizant of China's sensitivity to protocol.¶ "For this trip itself, the calculus will probably net out in favor of laying on a good show for him," he said.¶ One senior administration official said the protocol would be appropriate to Xi's current position as vice president.¶ Making Xi's visit smooth is also important to Obama, who has an interest in establishing good relations with the man expected to lead the world's second-largest economy and most populous nation for the next 10 years.¶ "The hope of this administration is that (Obama is) going to be returned to power for another four years, and they want to establish a rapport between these two individuals," said Bonnie Glaser, a China expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.¶ Pomp and circumstance aside, the White House has signaled in advance it will not shy away from touchy subjects, many of which are important to U.S. voters.¶ Biden, who traveled to China to meet with Xi in August, called the country's one-child policy "God-awful" earlier this week and later met with a group of human rights advocates.¶ "We consider it an important visit - make no mistake -- because the relationship is important and his role as the future leader is important, so we're not going to in any way seek to diminish that importance because it's an election year," White House spokesman Jay Carney said.¶ "But we're also going to be pretty candid, as we have been in the past, about where we have differences."

#### Obama strongly supporting US solar manufacturing industry now – tariffs key election issue.

Bloomberg, September 5, 2012, China Speeding U.S. Solar-dumping Case as Election Nears, <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/09/china-speeding-u-s-solar-dumping-case-as-election-nears>, KEL

China’s potential penalties on imported polysilicon, the most costly material in making solar cells, comes after the Obama administration announced plans to impose punitive duties of as much as 250 percent on U.S. imports of Chinese solar cells. The trade dispute is heating up as Obama seeks re-election in November. The Chinese government hasn’t said its move is a retaliatory measure. The struggle between the world’s biggest energy-consuming nations centers on state support for the solar industry, a business both Obama and Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao have said is a priority. Global investment in solar projects rose 61 percent to $137.8 billion last year.

#### Obama had to apply the tariffs to protect US industries – crackdown on China important in the election

Investor's Business Daily May 21, 2012 (“China And The Solyndra Syndrome,” pp. LN, KEL)

Also, many manufacturing jobs are not in businesses hurt by Chinese imports. America happens to be the world's biggest producer of polycrystalline silicon, which China imports from us to make its solar cells. A tit-for-tat tariff from China could hurt this business just as badly as China's alleged dumping harms the few remaining U.S. solar cell makers. Given the facts of the case, you could naively say the Obama administration had no choice but to act as it did. But trade rulings never happen in a political vacuum. An election year is never a bad time to look tough on China.

#### Pro-domestic industry support key to Obama’s employment message

Sun & Wind Energy Feb 2012, “The Solar Jobs Message,” <http://www.foley.com/files/News/b9594b12-9b6f-4b8f-8949-09c7604c8181/Presentation/NewsAttachment/0b510b64-c460-4e2f-8bff-0d3354593461/TheSolarJobsMessage.pdf>, KEL

Highlighting solar job growth will be critical for Obama in the upcoming election because unemployment rates are likely to be one of the biggest issues for voters. The US currently has an unemployment rate around 9 % and predictions by Goldman Sachs put the unemployment rate at 8.75 % by the end of 2012. This is bad news for Obama. Since World War II, no president has been re-elected with a jobless rate higher than 7.2 %, with the exception of the 1984 election when Ronald Reagan won. But in the 40 years before that, no president had been re-elected with an unemployment rate of more than 5.3 %. People care about jobs and they often hold the president responsible. Therefore it is vitally important that the solar industry unify its message and clear up some of the misconceptions about it, Resch points out.

#### Failure to protect US solar manufacturing hurts Obama’s image on job promotion

Ed Crooks, May 18, 2012, rade war fears over US solar duties, Financial Times,<http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/eeda5714-a051-11e1-88e6-00144feabdc0.html#axzz27DKnxPxi>, KEL

The pressure on US solar manufacturing has been politically difficult for Barack Obama’s administration, which has repeatedly stressed the opportunities for job creation in renewable energy. SolarWorld’s shares have fallen 84 per cent in the past year, while Chinese companies such as Trina and Yingli are down 74 per cent and 73 per cent respectively. The announcement of the duties lifted shares in First Solar, which manufactures panels in the US: it closed up 7 per cent, although still down 88 per cent over the past year.

#### Voter economic perception can boost Obama even if economy stays weak

Lux 2-20**-12** (Mike, Co-founder & CEO – Progressive Strategies, Huffington Post, “2012 Scenarios: What if the Economy Heads Back Downhill?” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mike-lux/obama-jobs-2012_b_1289076.html>, jj)

So if the economy starts moving in the wrong direction because of either or both of these factors, are things lost for the Obama re-election effort? They sure don't help, but the answer is no. Here's what **the Obama team needs to** focus on with these dangers in mind: 1. **Keep the focus firmly on fighting for the middle class**. **Most voters** don't blame Obama for the tough times, and they are well aware that the Republicans in Congress aren't doing anything to help, but they **will blame the president if they think he is not fighting hard for them while they are suffering through these bone-crunching times for the middle class**. **The Obama team's shift in messaging toward the Teddy Roosevelt style populism he has exhibited in the last few months is working**. I am firmly convinced that this message -- in contrast to the of the rich, by the rich, for the rich campaign of Mitt Romney -- is what has driven his poll numbers in the right direction, not the modestly improving economic numbers most voters don't feel yet.

### Oil

#### No impact, even in the worst case scenario

**Butt ‘10** (Yousaf M, staff scientist @ Center for Astrophysics @ Harvard, Phd in astrophysics – Yale, 1-25, The Space Review, “The EMP Threat: fact, fiction, and response (part 1)” <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1549/1>, jj)

**Serious long-lasting consequences of a one-kiloton EMP strike would likely be limited to a state-sized region of the country.** Although grid outages in this region may have cascading knock-on effects in more distant parts of the country, **the electronic devices in those further regions would not have suffered direct damage, and the associated power systems far from the EMP exposed region could be re-started.**

#### Terrorists won’t use EMP strikes

**Butt ’10** (Yousaf M., **staff scientist @ Center for Astrophysics @ Harvard, Phd in astrophysics – Yale**, 2-1, The Space Review, “The EMP Threat: fact, fiction and response (part 2)” <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1553/1>, jj)

**If a terrorist cell miraculously built such a weapon, they are likely to explode their “crown jewel” in a simple spectacular ground-burst that will destroy a large part of a city, and not risk the** complications—and **likely failure—of a lofted EMP strike that will,** if all goes according to their plan, **cause casualties via unpredictable secondary effects upon a limited part of some of the nation’s infrastructure. The risk versus reward calculation for both terrorists cells and so-called “rogue” states would almost certainly force their hand to a spectacular and direct ground burst in preference to a unreliable and uncertain EMP strike. A weapon of mass destruction is preferable to a weapon of mass disruption**.

#### Water wars will not escalate – countries resort to cooperation.

**Hecker ’05** (Jurgen, World Leader in Quality Parts for 101 Scouts, Terra Daily, “Will Future Wars Be About Water? Not Likely, Experts Say”, August 29, 2005, http://www.terradaily.com/news/water- earth-05u.html)

Regional tensions over water resources will multiply as the world becomes a drier place, but fears of water wars have faded as countries adopt a cooperative approach rather than violence, experts gathered at a Stockholm water symposium said. War over water goes back to biblical times, and conflict over freshwater access has been a major factor in countless standoffs since.

"When 60 percent of the world population suffers from water shortages, it is easy to imagine the potential for conflict," Patricia Wouters, director of the International Water Law Research Institute at Dundee University, Scotland, told AFP at the World Water Week, which ended at the weekend. As recently as 1988 then-foreign minister of Egypt and future UN chief Boutros Boutros Ghali said that "the next war in our region will be over the waters of the Nile, not politics". But although UN estimates have confirmed that large parts of the world, including China and most Arab countries, face severe shortages within a decade, governments have shown that they are willing to knock heads together rather than resort to armed force.

***Water war claims are over-exaggerated most countries settle diplomatically***

**Watkins and Anders, ’06** (Kevin, director of the Human Development Report Office at the UN Development Program, and Berntell, executive director of the Stockholm International Water Institute, International Herald Tribune, 8/23/06, “A global problem: How to avoid war over water” http://www.iht.com/articles/2006/08/23/opinion/edwatkins.php)

The threats posed by competition for water are real enough - but for every threat there is an opportunity. Cooperation tends to attract less news than violent conflict. Perhaps that is why "water wars" get such exaggerated coverage. The agreement under which Lesotho provides water to the greater Johannesburg area in South Africa in return for watershed management finance does not make front page news. Nor does the Nile Basin Initiative, through which Egypt, Ethiopia and other countries are exchanging the benefits of cooperation on the Nile. And cooperation in West Africa between Senegal, Mali and Mauritania to share the Senegal River is not likely to make prime- time new slots in Europe. Yet cooperation over water is far more widespread than conflict.

#### Chemical industry decline inevitable

**Amos, 4/1/2011** (C. Kenna, Automation World Contributing Editor, Automation World, “Chemical Industry Grows, But Faces Energy, Regulatory, Workforce Issues,” <http://www.automationworld.com/operations/chemical-industry-grows-faces-energy-regulatory-workforce-issues>, ts)

Drill, drill, drill Natural gas from the Marcellus Shale in the Appalachian Basin helped the current surge, Swift suggests**. But restrictions on, and the shortage of, crude-oil feedstock didn’t help. “Gulf [of Mexico] permits are trickling out, but exploration and production is nowhere near what it used to be. Energy-intensive manufacturers need access to a reliable and affordable energy supply,”** declares Owen Kean, ACC senior director for energy policy. “**We need normal production to resume in the Gulf, and we need policies to open access to other areas of the Outer Continental Shelf, which [President Barack] Obama plans to keep off-limits through 2017.” The U.S. federal government policies and implementation of its regulatory process also frustrates the industry**. In March 9, 2011, Congressional testimony, Michael P. Walls, ACC vice president for regulatory and technical affairs, said, “The process of Federal regulatory impact analysis can be improved significantly by regularly and comprehensively assessing cumulative regulatory impacts and employment impacts. Unfortunately, current practice relegates both of these elements to minor roles in impact analyses, if they are even acknowledged.” Further, he noted, “the type and quality of the jobs created or affected by a proposed regulatory action need to be identified.” **Workforce attrition remains an issue**. To tackle this, last year, the International Society of Automation (ISA), Research Triangle Park, N.C., launched a new committee—ISA106: Procedural Automation for Continuous Process Automation. “**It’s happening because of the brain-drain from people with 20 to 30 years experience leaving,**” comments Larry O’Brien, former research director with ARC Advisory Group Inc. ([www.arcweb.com](http://www.arcweb.com/)), Dedham, Mass. O’Brien, who recently left ARC to accept another position, believes a draft technical report may be coming in June. **“Everybody is facing an aging workforce,”** echoes Tobias Scheele, Lake Forest, Calif.-based vice president for advanced applications for automation supplier Invensys Operations Management (iom.invensys.com). **This issue spans the entire plant, he emphasizes**. “Operators today should be empowered to make decisions having a business impact—all within a reliable safety envelope.” Modeling will provide capabilities to facilitate informed decision-making, he suggests. “We have a couple of prototypes. One is the look-ahead model. One is the decision-support model, which can be part of the workflow**.” Companies also face aging infrastructures**. In its 2010 year-end report, the ACC forecasts that industry global capital spending will increase in 2011 by 13.5 percent to $280 billion. And domestic capital spending will grow by about 10 percent from 2010 levels to approximately $27 billion.

### Case

**1NC Energy Prices Frontline**

***1) Energy transition from fossil fuel energy to renewables will take decades and will be incredibly difficult***

**Bryce ‘10** Robert Bryce, has been writing about energy for nearly two decades. His articles have appeared in dozens of publications ranging from The Atlantic Monthly to The Guardian, and The Nation to The American Conservative. He is the author of Pipe Dreams: Greed, Ego, and the Death of Enron, and Cronies: Oil, the Bushes, and the Rise of Texas, America’s Superstate. Bryce is a fellow at the Institute for Energy Research, as well as the managing editor of Energy Tribune and a contributing writer for The Texas Observer. “Power Hungry: The Myths of "Green" Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future” pg 18-20, jj

Gore may be right. It’s also possible that he’s wrong. In many ways, Gore’s opinion doesn’t matter; because **no matter how much the U**nited **S**tates **may want to lead the effort to reduce carbon emissions, it cannot, and will not, be able to substantially slow the increasing global use of coal, oil, and natural gas.** Why? **There are simply too many people living in dire energy poverty for them to forgo the relatively low-cost power that can be derived From hydrocarbons**. (1 will discuss carbon dioxide emissions at length in Part 2) For proof of that, consider the per-capita carbon dioxide emissions in the world’s most populous coun tries, From 1990 to 2007, the per-capita emissions of carbon dioxide in the United States fell by 1.8 percent. But during that same time period, per-capita emissions soared in Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, and Pak istan. Those five countries contain more than 3 billion people, and their energy-consumption patterns are being replicated in nearly every major developing country on the planet. That reality was reflected in Copenhagen in December 2009 when leaders from 192 countries met for what the Associated Press called “the largest and most important UN climate change conference in history. After two weeks of wrangling and lofty rhetoric, the meeting ended with an eminently predictable result: no legally binding agreement on any re ductions in carbon emissions, only a promise to reduce emissions indi vidually or jointly,” and an agreement to meet again a year later in Mexico City to discuss all of the same contentious issues one more time.22 In short, all of these concerns, from worries that we have reached (or will soon reach) a peak in oil production and are (or will soon be) enter ing a period of inevitable decline, to the **alarmist cries over impending global warming and the supposed solutions to them----hinge on the be lief that the transition away from hydrocarbons to renewable resources can be done quickly, cheaply, and easily. That. Is. Not. True.** Tomorrow’s energy sources will look a lot like today’s, because **energy transitions are always difficult and lengthy. “There is one thing all en ergy transitions have in common: they are prolonged affairs that take decades to accomplish**,” wrote Vaclav Smil in November 2008. “**And the greater the scale of prevailing uses and conversions, the longer the subs stitutions will take**.”23 Smil, the polymath, prolific author on energy issues, and distinguished professor at the University of Manitoba, wrote that while a “world without fossil fuel combustion is highly desirable… getting there will demand not only high cost but also considerable pa tience: **coming energy transitions will unfold across decades, not years**.”24

***5) Even with rapid expansion, wind and solar will never supplant fossil fuel energy***

Jeffrey **Ball 2012** Scholar in Residence at Stanford University's Steyer- Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance, Tough Love for Renewable Energy: Making Wind and Solar Power Affordable, Foreign Affairs 91. 3 (May/Jun 2012), KEL

**Wind and solar power will not replace fossil fuels anytime soon -- not by a long shot. The I**nternational **E**nergy **A**gency **projects that by 2035, wind and solar could be producing ten percent of global electricity**, up from 1.5 percent now, **and that renewables of all sorts could be generating 31 percent of the world's electricity, up from about 19 percent now**. **But even that expansion would require an increase in subsidies** -- "support that in some cases," the IEA notes, "cannot be taken for granted in this age of fiscal austerity." **Some countries with particularly generous subsidies and high electricity prices have made wind and solar power big enough to matter**. Denmark gets 18 percent of its electricity from wind, and Spain gets two percent from the sun -- the world's leaders by share, according to the IEA's latest figures. **But even that renewable electricity is backed up by fossil-fuel power plants**. **Last year, fully one-third of the new electricity-generating capacity brought on line in the United States came from wind and solar projects. Even so, given the vastness of the conventional energy system, wind and solar power remained relatively tiny, accounting for just three percent of the electricity the country actually produced**. For the foreseeable future, renewable power is likely to supplement, not supplant, conventional energy.

***Food insecurity doesn’t cause conflict***

**Salehyan, ‘7**[Idean Salehyan, assistant professor of political science at the University of North Texas and coauthor of “Climate Change and Conflict: The Migration Link,” The New Myth About Climate Change, Foreign Policy, August 2007, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3922&print=1>]

**Dire scenarios** like these may sound convincing, but they **are misleading**. Even worse, they are irresponsible, for they shift liability for wars and human rights abuses away from oppressive, corrupt governments. Additionally, focusing on climate change as a security threat that requires a military response diverts attention away from prudent adaptation mechanisms and new technologies that can prevent the worst catastrophes. First, aside from a few anecdotes, **there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically.** Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world**. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere?** For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But **famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters. Second, arguing that climate change is a root cause of conflict lets tyrannical governments off the hook. If the environment drives conflict, then governments bear little responsibility for bad outcomes. Thats why Ban Ki-moons case about Darfur was music to Khartoums ears. The Sudanese government would love to blame the West for creating the climate change problem in the first place**. True, desertification is a serious concern, but its preposterous to suggest that poor rainfall rather than deliberate actions taken by the Sudanese government and the various combatant factions ultimately caused the genocidal violence in Sudan. Yet **by Moons perverse logic, consumers in Chicago and Paris are at least as culpable for Darfur as the regime in Khartoum**. To be sure, resource scarcity and environmental degradation can lead to social frictions. Responsible, accountable governments, however, can prevent local squabbles from spiraling into broader violence, while mitigating the risk of some severe environmental calamities. As Nobel laureate Amartya Sen has observed, no democracy has ever experienced a famine. Politicians who fear the wrath of voters usually do their utmost to prevent foreseeable disasters and food shortages. Accountable leaders are also better at providing public goods such as clean air and water to their citizens.

## 1nr

**No impact to ocean - - their evidence is alarmist non-sense- and studies prove acidification actually helps marine biodiversity grow. And even if they win a corals impact- destruction is inevitable from non-emissions causes**

* This card is actually fantastic

**Ridley 12** (Matt Ridley has been a scientist, journalist and businessman. With BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman. He was founding chairman of the International Centre for Life in Newcastle, January 7 2012, “Taking Fears of Acid Oceans With a Grain of Salt”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203550304577138561444464028.html)//JM

**Coral reefs around the world are suffering badly from overfishing and various forms of pollution. Yet many experts argue that the greatest threat to them is the acidification of the oceans from the dissolving of man-made carbon dioxide emissions. The effect of acidification, according to J.E.N. Veron,** an Australian coral scientist, **will be "nothing less than catastrophic**.... What were once thriving coral gardens that supported the greatest biodiversity of the marine realm will become red-black bacterial slime, and they will stay that way." **This is a common view**. The Natural Resources Defense Council has called ocean acidification "the scariest environmental problem you've never heard of." Sigourney Weaver, who narrated a film about the issue, said that "the scientists are freaked out." The head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration calls it global warming's "equally evil twin." **But do the scientific data support such alarm? Last month scientists** at San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography and other authors **published a study showing how much the pH level** (measuring alkalinity versus acidity) **varies naturally between parts of the ocean and at different times of the day, month and year. "On both a monthly and annual scale, even the most stable open ocean sites see pH changes many times larger than the annual rate of acidification**," say the authors of the study, adding that because good instruments to measure ocean pH have only recently been deployed, "**this variation has been under-appreciated." Over coral reefs, the pH decline between dusk and dawn is almost half as much as the decrease in average pH expected over the next 100 years. *The noise is greater than the signal.* Another recent study**, by scientists from the U.K., Hawaii and Massachusetts, **concluded that "marine and freshwater assemblages have always experienced variable pH conditions," and that "in many freshwater lakes, pH changes that are orders of magnitude greater than those projected for the 22nd-century oceans can occur over periods of hours." This adds to other hints that the ocean-acidification problem may have been exaggerated. For a start, the ocean is alkaline and in no danger of becoming acid** (despite headlines like that from Reuters in 2009: "Climate Change Turning Seas Acid"). **If the average pH of the ocean drops to 7.8 from 8.1 by 2100 as predicted, it will still be well above seven, the neutral point where alkalinity becomes acidity. The central concern is that lower pH will make it harder for corals, clams and other "calcifier" creatures to make calcium carbonate skeletons and shells. Yet this concern also may be overstated. Off Papua New Guinea** and the Italian island of Ischia, where natural carbon-dioxide bubbles from volcanic vents make the sea less alkaline, and off the Yucatan, **where underwater springs make seawater actually acidic, studies have shown that at least some kinds of calcifiers still thrive—at least as far down as pH 7.8.** In a recent experiment in the Mediterranean, reported in Nature Climate Change, **corals and mollusks were transplanted to lower pH sites, where they proved "able to calcify and grow at even faster than normal rates when exposed to the high [carbon-dioxide] levels** projected for the next 300 years." In any case, freshwater mussels thrive in Scottish rivers, where the pH is as low as five. **Laboratory experiments find that more marine creatures thrive than suffer when carbon dioxide lowers the pH level to 7.8. This is because the carbon dioxide dissolves mainly as bicarbonate, which many calcifiers use as raw material for carbonate. Human beings have indeed placed marine ecosystems under terrible pressure, but the chief culprits are overfishing and pollution.** By comparison, **a very slow reduction in the alkalinity of the oceans, well within the range of natural variation, is a modest threat, and it certainly does not merit apocalyptic headlines.**

#### Chemical industry decline inevitable

**Amos, 4/1/2011** (C. Kenna, Automation World Contributing Editor, Automation World, “Chemical Industry Grows, But Faces Energy, Regulatory, Workforce Issues,” <http://www.automationworld.com/operations/chemical-industry-grows-faces-energy-regulatory-workforce-issues>, ts)

Drill, drill, drill Natural gas from the Marcellus Shale in the Appalachian Basin helped the current surge, Swift suggests**. But restrictions on, and the shortage of, crude-oil feedstock didn’t help. “Gulf [of Mexico] permits are trickling out, but exploration and production is nowhere near what it used to be. Energy-intensive manufacturers need access to a reliable and affordable energy supply,”** declares Owen Kean, ACC senior director for energy policy. “**We need normal production to resume in the Gulf, and we need policies to open access to other areas of the Outer Continental Shelf, which [President Barack] Obama plans to keep off-limits through 2017.” The U.S. federal government policies and implementation of its regulatory process also frustrates the industry**. In March 9, 2011, Congressional testimony, Michael P. Walls, ACC vice president for regulatory and technical affairs, said, “The process of Federal regulatory impact analysis can be improved significantly by regularly and comprehensively assessing cumulative regulatory impacts and employment impacts. Unfortunately, current practice relegates both of these elements to minor roles in impact analyses, if they are even acknowledged.” Further, he noted, “the type and quality of the jobs created or affected by a proposed regulatory action need to be identified.” **Workforce attrition remains an issue**. To tackle this, last year, the International Society of Automation (ISA), Research Triangle Park, N.C., launched a new committee—ISA106: Procedural Automation for Continuous Process Automation. “**It’s happening because of the brain-drain from people with 20 to 30 years experience leaving,**” comments Larry O’Brien, former research director with ARC Advisory Group Inc. ([www.arcweb.com](http://www.arcweb.com/)), Dedham, Mass. O’Brien, who recently left ARC to accept another position, believes a draft technical report may be coming in June. **“Everybody is facing an aging workforce,”** echoes Tobias Scheele, Lake Forest, Calif.-based vice president for advanced applications for automation supplier Invensys Operations Management (iom.invensys.com). **This issue spans the entire plant, he emphasizes**. “Operators today should be empowered to make decisions having a business impact—all within a reliable safety envelope.” Modeling will provide capabilities to facilitate informed decision-making, he suggests. “We have a couple of prototypes. One is the look-ahead model. One is the decision-support model, which can be part of the workflow**.” Companies also face aging infrastructures**. In its 2010 year-end report, the ACC forecasts that industry global capital spending will increase in 2011 by 13.5 percent to $280 billion. And domestic capital spending will grow by about 10 percent from 2010 levels to approximately $27 billion.
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***A) Interpretation-***

***Energy production restrictions must directly limit production***

**Ludwig von Mises Institute**, no date (XXIX. RESTRICTION OF PRODUCTION

The Nature of Restriction, accessed 8/16/12, http://mises.org/humanaction/chap29sec1.asp)

We shall deal in this chapter with those **measures** which **are directly and primarily intended to divert production** (in the broadest meaning of the word, including commerce and transportation) from the ways it would take in the unhampered market economy. Each authoritarian interference with business diverts production, of course, from the lines it would take if it were only directed by the demand of the consumers as manifested on the market. ***The characteristic mark of restrictive interference with production is that the diversion of production is*** not merely an unavoidable and unintentional secondary effect, but ***precisely what the authority wants to bring about***. Like any other act of intervention, such **restrictive measures** affect consumption also. But this again, in the case of the restrictive measures we are dealing with in this chapter, is not the primary end the authority aims at. The government wants to **interfere with production**. The fact that its measure influences the ways of consumption also is, from its point of view, either altogether contrary to its intentions or at least an unwelcome consequence with which it puts up because it is unavoidable and is considered as a minor evil when compared with the consequences of nonintervention.

***“On” means directly targeted***

**World English Dictionary 2009** (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on?s=t)

— prep

1.

**in contact** or connection **with** the surface of; at the upper surface of: an apple on the ground ; a mark on the table cloth

2.

**attached** to: a puppet on a string

3.

carried with: I've no money on me

4.

in the immediate vicinity of; close to or along the side of: a house on the sea ; this verges on the ridiculous!

5.

within the time limits of a day or date: he arrived on Thursday

6.

being performed upon or relayed through the medium of: what's on the television?

***Violation --- the aff does not remove a direction restrict***

***We have contextual evidence – Restrictions on energy production do not include border measures like investment and trade restrictions***

**Ehring and Chinale 11 –** Lothar (Assistant to Mr. Péter Balás, Deputy Director-General at the Directorate-General for Trade of the European Commission, responsible for multilateral affairs, as well as trade defence instruments and bilateral trade relations with Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Until 2008, Lothar Ehring served in the Unit of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Trade that is responsible for Legal Aspects of Trade Policy. He was the Coordinator for legal issues of multilateral trade, handled several WTO disputes and also represented the European Community in the negotiations on the reform of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding) **and** Gian Franco **Chinale 2011** “Regulation of Energy in International Trade Law: Wto, Nafta and Energy Charter” p. 134-5

The perfect example to test and discuss this interpretation is the famous case of OPEC production quotas. These quotas as implemented at the national levels of OPEC members, are horizontal restrictions on production. They limit exportation no more than domestic sales, and yet the argument is made time and again that they fall foul of Article XI:I of the GATT 1994.” The proponents of this thesis recognize that they are on thin ice. given that production limitations are as remote from being border measures as a restriction can possibly be. Equally clear is the fact that a production limitation definition does not discriminate against exports, neither de jure nor de facto. The proponents of the OPEC GATT-illegality attempt to overcome this conclusion with the argument that for some of the oil exporting countries in question. The near totality of the production goes to export. This. however, is legally irrelevant to the question of whether there is a discrimination against or higher burden on exports. The quantitative relationship between domestic consumption and exports can be very imbalanced for reasons of production and consumption capacities, in large part for reasons of a country’s size and the foreign demand for the product concerned. Also the conceptual argument that a **restriction on production** can be decomposed into a restriction on exportation as well a restriction on domestic sales **is not plausible**. The production restriction is precisely and inseparably both at the same time and this makes a qualitative difference that is **impossible to set aside.**

***Vote neg:***

***1) Limits --- They explode limits by allowing the aff to remove minute barriers to production --- hurts predictability and preparation which undermines clash and fairness***

***2) Neg ground --- their interp does not mandate increased energy production --- mooting core neg args like oil prices and tradeoff***

**DA1**

***Absent external factors like the plan, multiple factors ensure Romney wins a tight race --- this card answers all their warrants***

**Trende 9-20** Sean Trende is Senior Elections Analyst for RealClearPolitics, 9-20-12, State of the Race, Part 2: Why Romney Wins <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/20/state_of_the_race_part_2_why_romney_wins_115513-3.html>, jj

The basic argument for why Romney is being written off far too early is pretty simple. He trails the incumbent president by 48.2 percent to 45.3 percent in the RCP Average seven weeks before the election. **There are very few races that have been this close**, this far out from Election Day, **that would be characterized as anything other than a tossup.** Of course, we can dig quite a bit deeper than that: **1) The economy is still lousy**, but as I noted yesterday, it is not so bad as to make Obama an automatic loser, as many pundits assumed. The years that have been catastrophic for presidential parties -- 1980 and 2008 -- have been years when the economy has actually been contracting during the election year. At the same time, **most years with economies similar to this one** -- 1960, 1976, 1992, 2000, 2004 -- **see party power transfer**, albeit in a reasonably close election. The one outlier here is 2004, where an incumbent president won by a healthy share in a mediocre economy. But Bush lost voters who cast their ballots based on the economy by over 60 points that year. What saved him was that 47 percent of voters either voted on moral issues (such as gay marriage) or terrorism or taxes. Those were the only issues that Bush beat Kerry on in the exit polls, but it was enough. Again, Obama probably gets graded on a curve here given the mess he inherited. Whether that is the equivalent of the War on Terror in 2004 remains to be seen. **2) Most of what we’re seeing in the polls is consistent with a close race**. Rather than cherry-picking favorite polls (“Obama is up 8 in Pew -- landslide!” “Obama is down 2 in Rasmussen -- he’s doomed!”), let’s just look at simple poll averages. Obama is up 2.9 points in the RCP Average. **His bounce peaked at 49 percent, which is just barely below the threshold he probably needs in order to win.** If we assume that the average is his “true” value -- and we should note that Gallup, Rasmussen and AP/GfK are the only national polls to include data from any of the last three days -- then we should expect to see a bunch of polls showing an Obama lead of between one and five points, a poll or two showing a slight Romney lead, and a poll or two showing a high single-digit lead for the president. That’s exactly what we see. When a Democrat is up three points, we expect to see decent Democratic leads in the two-to-four-point range in swing states like Ohio, Colorado, Iowa and Nevada, expect to see close races in places like Florida, and expect to see mid-to-high-digit Democratic leads in places like Pennsylvania and Michigan. This is what we tend to see. Since state polling is more sparse than national polling, we’re more susceptible to the outliers: Obama isn’t up 14 in Wisconsin (he wouldn’t be campaigning there if he were), but I don’t think he’s only up one in Colorado, either. Taken as a whole, the state polling is consistent with the national polls. And of course, when you have a bounce such as this one, which is driven by increased Democratic enthusiasm, you expect to see down-ticket races for House and Senate move toward the Democrats, as more Democrats push through the likely-voter screens. Which is again exactly what we are seeing -- it isn’t accidental that we’ve seen a flood of polling from Democratic House candidates in the past few days, while their Republican counterparts have been relatively silent. **3) History suggests the race will tighten further**. Yesterday I mentioned an article by Nate Cohn of The New Republic in which he observed that that “[i]f Romney can’t take a lead over the next week or so, he will be forced to do something never successfully attempted: mount an unprecedented comeback against an incumbent president.” Cohn is absolutely correct: No challenger who trailed at this point in September has ever won. But if we look at the data a different way, we realize that **Obama has to pull off some unprecedented feats of his own if he hopes to win**. The September time frame is a bit tricky for comparison purposes, because the incumbent party convention occurred in mid-August until 2004. So a challenger who trailed his opponent in September was doing so after the convention bounces had pretty much settled. So let’s instead use data that Nate Silver has helpfully compiled identifying where candidates stood a given number of weeks before and after a convention, regardless of when that convention occurred. Table 1 shows the incumbent party’s lead in the polls two weeks after its convention -- roughly where we are today -- and the ultimate result. Years with incumbents are in boldface: As you can see, **no incumbent party has ever held on to the White House while leading by fewer than four points two weeks after its convention**; **no incumbent president has ever won re-election while leading by fewer than five points** (more on the 2004 comparisons later). In other words, **winning under these circumstances would be unprecedented** (note also that Ronald Reagan was actually tied with Jimmy Carter in a simple poll average at this point in 1980). Perhaps an even better way to look at this is Table 2: This lists the races where incumbent presidents sought re-election since 1968. It then shows how those races broke between two weeks after the incumbent president’s convention and Election Day. On average, they moved 3.7 points toward the challenger (positive numbers indicate movement in that direction; negative numbers show movement toward the incumbent). If you eliminate 1976, as Cohn suggests (since Jerry Ford was a pseudo-incumbent), the average movement is six points toward the challenger. Indeed with the exception of 1992 -- a difficult race from which to draw conclusions given Ross Perot’s on-again/off-again participation in the race -- every contest with an incumbent has broken at least three points toward the challenging party from this point in the race through Election Day. And given the frequent comparisons to 2004, it’s worth bearing in mind where that race stood at this point. George Bush led by 6.8 points as opposed to Barack Obama’s current 2.9 percent. His bounce peaked at 50.4 percent, as opposed to Obama’s 49 percent. **If Obama continues to run behind Bush on either metric by similar margins through Election Day, *he loses*.** In fairness, we can’t be that precise with such a small number of observations. But it would also be foolish to ignore such a consistent trend. ***Absent some external shock, we can probably expect that the tendency will be for this race to tighten further.* 4) Romney actually has led -- you just couldn’t see it**. Much is made of the fact that Romney has never led in the RCP Average. But remember, throughout this cycle, most of the polls were using registered, rather than likely-voter, screens. There are good reasons for this, but if we’re going to do an apples-to-apples comparison, we have to take account of this fact. **Had pollsters turned on their likely-voter screens throughout, Romney and Obama probably would have been trading leads throughout the spring and summer**. After all, **Romney’s poll numbers would have been two-to-three points higher** (given the average movement we saw when pollsters activated their likely-voter screens), and Obama’s lead fluctuated between 0.2 points and 3.8 points. **5) Obama’s job approval is still low**. As I mentioned yesterday, it is significant that the president’s job approval is approaching 50 percent, as job approval and election outcomes correlate strongly. Put differently, **presidents almost never receive a higher percentage of the vote than their approval percentage with the electorate.** But remember, Obama is still on a bit of a bounce. It is significant that he was able to approach the type of approval that he needs in order to win. It just isn’t clear that this is enough. Again, the 2004 example is instructive. In early September, Bush’s average job approval was 51.4 percent, almost two points higher than Obama’s is today. And Bush’s convention was a full week earlier than Obama’s, so his bounce had already really faded by this point. Remember, **the strong tendency is that presidents run a few points behind their job approval numbers with the electorate**. Bush’s job approval in the RCP Average on Election Day was 49.8 percent, but his job approval with the actual electorate according to the exit polls was 53 percent (this is also what Bush’s internal tracking numbers were showing). Had his job approval with the electorate been 49.8 percent, he probably would have lost. Remember too that **Obama** probably **has a bit of a higher hurdle to surmount than Bush had**. While Republicans typically run ahead of polls of registered voters and adults, Democrats typically run behind them. Because job approval polling contains a mixture of these types of polls, Obama’s job approval with the actual electorate is probably a touch below his average right now. **6) Romney’s spending is just starting**. This is something that everyone mentions, but then seems to forget: **Romney and his allies will probably outspend the president heavily** in the next two months. I don’t think that matters in and of itself. After all, both candidates will have plenty of cash to make their cases, well past the point of diminishing returns. What does matter, however, is how this disparity was attained. The Obama campaign spent heavily over the summer trying to soften up Romney. It’s unclear how well this worked -- the polls were pretty steady and Romney's favorables actually improved a bit -- but a large portion of the basic case against Romney has been made. In the meantime, the Romney campaign had been very constrained in how it could spend its money; it was limited to primary funds until recently. That means the campaign has largely been outsourced to 527s and campaign committees. This explains a lot of the Romney campaign to date. During the convention, a parade of people telling tear-jerking stories about how the nominee had helped them out made their way across the stage at the RNC. Stu Rothenberg wondered on Twitter why they hadn’t appeared in ads. I suspect now that Romney can spend freely, they will appear. Quite frankly, they’ll probably be more effective in the fall, when people are paying attention. Whether this moves the dial is an unknown, but it is something of a contingency with substantial upside for Romney, which you have to figure in to any calculus about how the fall will play out. Of course, the Romney campaign may just try to dump $250 million in negative ads on the president’s head. I think that would be foolish -- and ineffective -- but we have to acknowledge the possibility there. **7) The gaffes don’t matter**. Everyone interested in elections should read this post from John Sides at The Monkey Cage. It makes an important point: Though **gaffes** set political analysts scurrying to their keyboards, they **tend not to affect the average voter.** We see this with the now-infamous “47 percent” comment. Gallup described the statement and asked how it would affect respondents’ votes. Twenty percent said it would make them more likely to vote for Romney, 36 percent said less likely, and 43 percent said it would make no difference. Drilling down to self-described Independents, 15 percent said it would make them more likely to support Romney, 29 percent less likely, and 53 percent said it would make no difference. You can try to sex that up (as Gallup did) to read that Independents say it makes them less likely to vote for Romney by a 2-1 margin, but you could just as easily say that three-quarters of independents say the gaffe makes no difference or helps Romney. **8) People haven’t made up their minds.** Finally, it is important to remember that all the claims about people’s minds being set in stone don’t jibe with what respondents tell pollsters. Table 3 shows when voters have made up their minds over the past four elections. Though the percentage of late-undecideds is diminishing, unless there is a major drop-off this cycle, we can safely say that **the decisions of a fairly wide swath of the electorate are not yet firm.** So **if the election were held today**, President **Obama would probably win comfortably**. ***But the election isn’t today***. **In the next seven weeks, the economy, the president’s tepid job approval ratings, and Romney’s spending campaign will continue to exert gravitational forces on Obama’s re-election efforts, along with the typical gravitational forces that drag down a post-convention bounce. Can these forces move things three points in seven weeks? It’s not a particularly tall order.**

***B) Link --- Plan swings blue collar voters to Obama --- they’re key to the election***

**Mead ‘12**

Walter Russell Mead, Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 6-6, the American Interest, Green Politics Hurting Obama in Swing States <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/>, jj

**Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “*brown jobs*” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery**. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and **the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election**. **Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign.** As the FT reports: “**Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio**,” he said. **Republicans**, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, **have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . .** Mr **Romney has said he will** approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and **curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work**. As we’ve mentioned before, ***energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable***. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. **This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector.** From a political perspective, **Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.**

***C) Impact --- Obama pushes defense cuts that collapse heg --- Romney solves***

**Boot ‘11**

Max Boot​ is the Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. He is completing a history of guerrilla warfare and terrorism. This article is adapted from testimony he delivered to the House Armed Services Committee on September 13, 2011.

Commentary Magazine, January 12, Slashing America's Defense: A Suicidal Trajectory <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/slashing-americas-defense-a-suicidal-trajectory/>, jj

**The United States’ armed forces have been the greatest force for good the world has seen during the past century.** They defeated Nazism and Japanese imperialism, deterred and defeated Communism, and stopped numerous lesser evils—from Slobodan Milosevic’s ethnic cleansing to the oppression perpetrated by Saddam Hussein in Iraq and the Taliban in Afghanistan. **Imagine a world in which America is not the leading military power. It would be a brutal, Hobbesian place in which aggressors rule and the rule of law is trampled on**. And yet **Congress will be helping to usher in such a New World Disorder if it continues to slash defense spending at the currently contemplated rate**—just as previous Congresses did with previous rounds of “postwar” budget cuts going back to the dawn of the Republic. **But there is nothing inevitable about the outcome**. The first tranche of sequestration cuts is not scheduled to take effect until the 2013 fiscal year. That means Congress has most of 2012 to find an alternative. **Unfortunately**, President **Obama has threatened to veto any bill that tries to exempt the defense budget from sequestration**. But that should not prevent pro-defense Democrats and Republicans from pushing such a bill anyway. If even one year of sequestration were to occur, major weapons systems (which will be costly and difficult to restart) might be cancelled—and great numbers of veterans (whose experience would be lost forever) might be layed off. **In the long run, the question of whether or not**—and to what extent—**we will cut defense will be decided in the 2012 elections**. Obama appears sanguine about the impact of defense cuts, but his Republican challengers are not. Mitt **Romney has promised to protect the defense budget and expand naval shipbuilding**. Rick Perry has called on Leon Panetta to resign rather than accept massive cuts. Even Newt Gingrich, who has been critical of wasteful Pentagon spending, has said that **sequestration would be “totally destructive” and “very dangerous to the survival of the country.” It is commonly said that every election is a turning point in our history. In many cases that’s nothing more than partisan hype. In the case of the 2012 election, it’s true: The future of the U.S. armed forces, and of American power in general, could depend greatly on the outcome.**

***Heg solves extinction***

**Barnett**, Professor, Warfare Analysis and Research Dept – U.S. Naval War College, 3/7/’**11**

(Thomas, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” )

Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended.** Indeed, **it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace.** We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.

**Da2**

***Transition to renewables coming now***

**Bowen ‘12**

Currently a businessman, Robert Bowen served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980s as a moderate Democrat. He was also appointed by three different governors to serve on various boards and commissions. He has followed political news, national news headlines and international news closely for almost five decades.

8-22-12, Examiner, US carbon emissions are declining due to clean energy <http://www.examiner.com/article/us-carbon-emissions-are-declining-due-to-clean-energy>, jj

US carbon emissions are declining due to clean energy

A new report that studied 2,500 electrical power plants owned by 100 utilities in the United States was released this week and it shows that **harmful carbon pollution is on the decline. This is due to a transition to clean energy**. The report is out just before the science-deniers open their national convention in Tampa next Monday. The 2012 Benchmarking Air Emissions report looked at 2010-2011 data from the US Energy Information Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency to determine trends in four power plant pollutants: carbon dioxide (CO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen oxide (NOx) and mercury (Hg). The report looked at 100 utilities operating 2,500 power plants. These plants account for 86% of electricity generation and 88% of all emissions in the nation. The good news is that three of the pollutants studied have declined significantly. **The primary reason** is that coal power plants have been closing and are replaced by natural gas. Another factor **is the increase of electrical generation from wind and solar.** These **utilities have doubled their use of renewable energy since 2004. Renewables now account for 5% of the US electricity supply according to the report.** Natural gas now supplies 32% of all US electrical generation which is about the same as coal. Natural gas consumption by the electric power sector has risen an average of 4% annually for the past 10 years Power plants in 2010 were responsible for about 65% of SO2 emissions overall, 16% of NOx emissions, 68% of mercury air emissions and 40% of CO2 emissions. Because of this transition to gas and renewables, SO2 emissions are down 40% and NOx emissions are down 35% since 2008. More coal power plants are slated to close this year. These moth-balled plants produce about 40 gigawatts (GW) of electricity representing 12% of the US coal-fired capacity. Even though this trend began in earnest under the Bush administration, Mitt Romney is running ads accusing President Obama for waging a “war on coal.” If such a war exists, the result seems to be cleaner, healthier air and fewer greenhouse gas emissions. Maybe it is a good thing. **Southern Company**, a utility in the Southwest with more than 4.4 million customers and 43,000 MWs of generating capacity is one of the nation's most coal-intensive power producers. Southern, will use more natural gas than coal in 2012 for the first time in its 100-year history. The utility **owns a 30 MW solar PV plant** with Ted Turner **in New Mexico - the partnership just made a second solar acquisition. Its subsidiary**, Alabama Power, **buys wind energy from a farm in Oklahoma, and another unit, Georgia Power, is working on its first utility-scale project. Colorado’s Xcel Energy brought 68MW of new solar on line so far this year.** CO2 emissions from power plants are down 9% in the United States since 2008, more than any country or region. This decline occurred despite a global rise in emissions to record levels in 2011, largely due to a 9.3% leap in greenhouse gas emissions in China. The authors of the report were optimistic. "**This is an historic transition for the electric power industry**," says Mindy Lubber, president of Ceres, which prepared the report with M.J. Bradley & Associates, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Entergy, Exelon, Tenaska and Bank of America. "**More and more power producers are shifting away from coal-fired generation in favor of lower-emitting** natural gas-fired plants, **renewable power and energy efficiency**. **The economic case for cleaner energy is better than it's ever been, and this report shows that the industry is adapting to stronger Clean Air Act emissions standards, state-driven efficiency and renewable energy incentives** and the dynamics of the current natural gas market." The data shows that an **energy policy that shifts to** cleaner gas and **renewables does in fact make a difference**. The problem is, Congress wants to put an end to renewable energy, and Mitt Romney seems to be a big fan of coal. Should he win, no one but the Almighty knows what his energy agenda will be, but odds are that he will slow if not reverse the trend to clean energy that is showing results in our air quality.

***Increased oil production saps investment from clean energy***

**Cunningham ‘12**

Nicholas Cunningham on July 5, 2012, American Security Project, Why We Shouldn’t Feel Secure From an Oil Boom <http://americansecurityproject.org/blog/2012/the-dangers-of-increased-oil-production/>, jj

But, **perhaps the most pernicious conclusion from the “abundant oil supply” crowd is that we no longer need to worry about finding alternatives to oil. Higher production** (and lower prices) **allows us to become complacent. Investment in biofuels, electric vehicles, energy efficiency and other forms of clean energy will suffer.**

***Continued investment key to renewable energy***

**Kauffman ‘12**

Richard Kauffman, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of Energy, 8-9-12, Seizing a Clean Energy Opportunity <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-kauffman/a-clean-energy-opportunity_b_1761543.html?utm_hp_ref=green>, jj

**Over the past four years, we have seen tremendous progress in the development and deployment of renewable energy technologies** that should give us all hope that America can lead in the global clean energy economy. **These technologies are helping to create new jobs and new industries domestically, while reducing carbon pollution and helping to address the challenges of climate change.** Want more reasons to be optimistic about driving progress in the development and deployment of renewable energy? **Just look at some of the most significant challenges we face -- and how easy it could be to overcome them**. While the technological advances are exciting, there is also important work to do in the other aspects of clean energy, particularly as it relates to financing. For a variety of reasons, including provisions in the tax code, it can cost over 10 percent more to finance a renewable energy project than it does a traditional energy project. **But with a few small changes in how we finance renewable energy projects, we can help to make it easier and more affordable to bring clean energy to families and businesses nationwide.** A few things to keep in mind: 1. **Renewable energy is reliable, the technologies work, and costs are dropping dramatically**. **Deploying the technologies globally and at scale has helped costs to decline far faster than almost anyone could have anticipated**. **Solar costs**, for example, **are down more than 75 percent over the last four year**s. As Neil Auerbach of Hudson Clean Energy put it, "**renewable energy is the only energy source that gets cheaper the more it is deployed."** 2. As the industry gets to scale, the importance of reducing non-hardware (or so called "soft costs") becomes increasingly important. In the case of solar, equipment costs now account for just 46 percent of the total costs of an installed system, with 54 percent of the total coming from everything else, including installation, financing, insurance and permits. **There are ways to bring** these **soft costs down that don't require major technology breakthroughs**. That's why the Energy Department is partnering with industry to look at everything from standardizing building permits to construction techniques to new insurance products to do just that. 3. Helping to expand access to and reduce the cost of financing projects is a critical step in significantly reducing overall project costs. Renewable energy projects in the U.S. rely upon an old-fashioned, antiquated form of financing that's different from how other parts of the U.S. economy are financed. Rather than using bond or stock markets, projects depend on non-capital markets sources of investment, like banks, where the cost of capital can approach typical private equity rates of return of 12-15 percent. The Energy Department has been pursuing multiple avenues to help expand capital markets financing for renewable energy that could potentially halve the cost of accessing equity capital and drive down other costs of financing as well. Again, these reductions in costs don't require going to the lab; they involve applying financing techniques that are widely used in other parts of the economy, but have not yet been applied to this sector. 4. In addition to deploying cleaner sources of energy, **we can achieve dramatic reductions in carbon pollution by investing in** cost-effective energy efficiency **improvements. Financing is a key constraint here** as well, since lenders are not certain that investments in efficiency will either work as advertised, whether the borrower will save or spend the savings, or whether the building will be worth more after the investments have been made. Additionally, a lack of standardized contracts makes it difficult to bundle small projects into securities that would attract the interest of institutional investors. Despite these difficulties, we are working with industry and other stakeholders to find solutions to these contracting and data challenges. And like **with renewable energy**, we can be optimistic because **technology isn't the binding constraint - it's about finding ways to mobilize proven financing instruments that already exist elsewhere and applying it to this growing global sector.** 5. If we begin thinking about energy projects as financial assets, as well as energy assets, **we can help to encourage additional, smart investments in these industries. Currently, renewable energy and energy efficiency projects offer investors something that, between a volatile stock market and low interest rates, is very difficult to find: current yields.** Basically, we have an asset-liability mismatch. The banks and non-capital markets that are currently the primary financiers in the renewable energy sector are generally looking for short-term yields. Renewable energy projects, however, are typically longer-term investments that provide stable returns over long periods of times (15 or 20 years, for example). Longer-term investments like these are very appealing to pension funds or insurance companies that need long-term yields to match their long-dated liabilities. However, because renewable energy projects currently aren't able to seek investment in capital markets, new classes of investors who want to invest in renewable energy projects can't. Fixing this mix-match would reduce financing costs for projects, further reducing the overall cost of clean energy. That's good for investors, good for project developers, and good for American consumers. 6. We can be optimistic because most Americans support investments in clean energy. This includes strong bipartisan support for clean, renewable energy at the state level, with over a dozen states currently developing their own clean energy finance entities. But while reasons remain to be hopeful about the progress of the industry, **there are serious headwinds that could have a significant impact on America's clean energy industry**, and we cannot be complacent. We are making gains globally in the clean energy race, but much of that progress is due to government programs and support that are coming to an end. In fact, 75 percent of U.S. government support programs -- including the 1705 loan guarantee program, the 1603 program to provide tax grants in lieu of tax credits and the Production Tax Credit -- have expired or are set to expire soon. Throughout our country's history -- from aviation to agriculture, from biotechnologies to computer technologies -- the federal government has supported the private sector to keep the United States at the technological forefront of important industries. To seize the clean energy opportunity, we must do so again - and we must act now. Around the world, countries recognize that renewable energy represents one of the biggest economic opportunities for the global economy. There are some in Washington, however, who think we can't compete with other countries, who think that we have already lost the clean energy race. I can tell you firsthand, the clean energy industry in the U.S. is able and prepared to produce real energy for American consumers. **By combining America's historic leadership in technological and manufacturing innovation with improvements in how we finance renewable energy and energy efficiency projects across the country, we can once again lead the world in this critical sector.**

***Green energy key to prevent extinction***

**Jagger ‘08** (Bianca, Chair, World Future Council, CQ Congressional Testimony, "RENEWABLE ENERGY," 3/6, lexis)

**“If we go beyond the point where human intervention can no longer stabilise the system, then we precipitate unstoppable runaway climate change. That will set in motion a major extinction event** comparable to the five other extinction crises that the earth has previously experienced.” As climate change kicks in, the tropical and subtropical countries of Africa, South Asia and Latin America will heat up more and more, with temperatures becoming increasingly intolerable. **Droughts will affect large parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Melting glaciers will flood river valleys and then, when they have disappeared, unprecedented droughts will occur. Poor, low-lying countries** such as Bangladesh **will find it** much **harder to cope with sea level rise** than Holland or Florida. If current trends are allowed to continue, **hundreds of millions of people in the poorer countries will lose their homes, as well as the land on which they grow their crops. And then there is the threat of diseases**: By the end of the century **182 million people in sub-Saharan Africa alone could die of diseases directly attributable to climate change**, according to Christian Aid. **Given the scale of this impending disaster, we have no choice but to embark upon a global renewable energy revolution, by replacing our carbon-driven economy with a renewable energy economy**. **The challenge we are facing now is how to switch to a more secure, lower-carbon energy system that** does not undermine economic and social development, and **addresses the threats of climate change** and global inequality.

**CP**

***The United States federal judiciary, using the next available test case, should issue a narrow ruling that:***

***Exon-Florio reviews on crude oil and natural gas violate international trade rules and cannot be enforced.***

***The Supreme Court can remove production restrictions --- solves the aff***

**Percival ‘97**

Robert V. Percival ++ Professor of Law, Robert Stanton Scholar & Director, Environmental Law Program, University of Maryland School of Law.

The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1997, 1997 U Chi Legal F 159

ARTICLE: Regulatory Evolution and the Future of Environmental Policy, Lexis, jj

These efforts are being undertaken at a time when **the federal judiciary has become less sympathetic toward environmental concerns**. Despite doctrines of deference to administrative agencies, **a judiciary more skeptical of regulation has struck down major environmental regulations by insisting that agencies provide greater and more specific evidentiary support for them**. **Important regulatory initiatives**, such as the EPA's effort to phase out all remaining uses of asbestos, **have been struck down on grounds that harken back to the common law's demand for detailed proof of particularized injury**. n59 Despite broad citizen suit provisions in the environmental laws, the courts are showing signs of reviving common-law doctrines of legal injury as a predicate for recognition of standing to sue. n60 **Judicial resuscitation of constitutional principles of state sovereignty now threatens to undermine national regulatory programs**. For the first time in more than 60 years, **the Supreme Court has struck down a federal regulatory program on the grounds that it exceeded the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce**. n61 While this decision did not occur in an environmental case, lower courts may now insist on more particularized showings of interstate impact to uphold federal environmental regulationsn62 and [\*171] **some courts have struck down such regulations for infringing on state sovereignty**. n63 By **requiring more detailed demonstrations of causal injury or effects on interstate commerce, these decisions make it more difficult to achieve the law's promise of preventative regulation**, resurrecting the very deficiencies of the commonlaw that public law sought to overcome.

**Cp2**

***The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce***

***its agricultural support, at least eliminating nearly all of the***

***domestic subsidies, for cotton***

***US failure to comply with WTO ruling in cotton subsidies case undermines the legitimacy of the WTO DSB mechanisms***

Karen **Halverson** Cross, Professor of Law John Marshall Law School, 1-3-**06** King Cotton, Developing Countries and the ‘Peace Clause’: The WTO’s US Cotton Subsidies Decision. Journal of International Economic Law 2006. http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149

At the same time, the widespread perception that the WTO advancesthe agenda of its most powerful members[6](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN6#FN6) threatens to underminethe legitimacy of the institution. Developing countries viewthemselves as ‘losers’ of the Uruguay Round.[7](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN7#FN7) Theobligation of WTO members to adhere to all of the Uruguay Roundagreements as a ‘single undertaking’ is particularlyburdensome to developing countries,[8](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN8#FN8) especially as the scopeof matters addressed by the Uruguay Round agreements expandedto include trade in services and protection of intellectualproperty, two areas of particular export interest to developedcountry WTO members such as the US. The Uruguay Round also resultedin the creation of a dispute settlement mechanism that, whilemore predictable and equitable than that of the GATT system,has been criticized as disadvantaging developing countries inits implementation.[9](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN9#FN9) And yet with respect to trade in agriculture,an issue of paramount importance to developing countries, theUruguay Round yielded very limited concessions, which were madeonly after a ‘peace clause’ was added to the WTOAgreement on Agriculture that effectively shielded most domesticagricultural subsidy practices from WTO challenge.[10](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN10#FN10) Doha Roundefforts to liberalize trade in agriculture stalled at the September2003 Cancún Ministerial meeting when the G20 group ofdeveloping countries coalesced to oppose a US–EC[11](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN11#FN11) jointproposal that made inadequate concessions to liberalize tradein agriculture.[12](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN12#FN12) The Agreement on Agriculture has not preventeddeveloped counties – in particular the US, the EC, andJapan[13](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN13#FN13) – from providing producers nearly $1 billion perday in agricultural subsidies.[14](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN14#FN14) These subsidies shield recipientsfrom market fluctuations and depress world prices for agriculturalproducts. Since the world’s poor live primarily in ruralareas, agricultural subsidies (along with tariffs on agriculturalproducts) tend to injure the poor.[15](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN15#FN15)

It was in this context that the government of Brazil filed acomplaint with the WTO’s Dispute Settlement Body (DSB),complaining that subsidies paid by the US government to producersof upland cotton[16](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN16#FN16) violate WTO rules. In September 2004, a panelof the DSB issued a report that for the most part found in favorof Brazil.[17](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN17#FN17) The decision represents a victory not only forBrazil, but also for all developing countries in the WTO disputesettlement system. It involves agricultural subsidies, an issuethat has been the focus of critique by observers of the worldtrading system. Moreover, it is fitting that the measures complainedof by Brazil involved cotton, a commodity that fueled the economicgrowth of the southern US during the nineteenth century andplayed a central role in US history.[18](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN18#FN18) The *US Cotton Subsidies*decision is also significant as legal precedent, as it addressesseveral legal issues of first impression to WTO dispute settlement.On a practical level, the decision affects many billions ofdollars in US agricultural subsidy programs. Finally, the timingof the *US Cotton Subsidies* decision, coinciding with agriculturenegotiations that are at the heart of the Doha Round,[19](http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/9/1/149" \l "FN19#FN19) ensuresthat it will influence any outcome that may be reached in theDoha Round talks.

**Econ**

***1. Global economy resilient***

**Zakaria ‘9 -** PhD Poli Sci @ Harvard, Zakaria, Editor of Newsweek, 12/12/’9 (Fareed, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425>)

**A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets.** So consider this: **the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year**. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but **it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled**. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "**We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual**?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, **governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s,** when governments played a tiny role in national economies**. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles:** the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. **Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force.** When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.**

***2. Economic collapse doesn’t cause war***

Fareed **Zakaria** was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 20**09**, “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html>

**Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries.** At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. **One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks** (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). **Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran.** Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But **overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**.

***3. US isn’t key to the world economy***

John **Curran, 9-2-2010,** “Can World Economy Keep Growing If U.S. Doesn’t?” Time,<http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/can-world-economy-keep-growing-if-u-s-doesnt/?xid=rsstopstories&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed:+time/topstories+%28TIME:+Top+Stories%29>

A worrying economic question these days is the possibility of a return to negative GDP growth in the U.S, the dreaded double dip. If it happened it could pull much of the world back into recession, possibly triggering another round of financial crisis. Though all but a few consider this a low possibility, it's not so low as to be off the radar. Economists I follow generally put the risk of a U.S. double dip at somewhere between 20% and 35%. There's ample evidence that the U.S. economy is not out of the woods yet. U.S. consumers picked up spending slightly last month, but they are still tentative and their debt levels remain high. Businesses are watching consumers closely because managers are reluctant to commit to new hiring and investment while so many people are out of work. Consumer spending picked up slightly in July, but confidence is weak and retailers are hurting. The latest signs of this come from back-to-school shopping, where price cutting ruled, and tumbling U.S. auto sales (down 21% in August). There is talk of a second federal stimulus but nobody can count those chickens until they hatch. The chicken you can count on, though, is the economic energy coming from developing markets, specifically the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China). Though the BRICs will advance in fits and starts—for more on this, see Michael Schuman's insightful [post](http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/is-red-hot-india-too-hot/) on India and China—the fact of their increasing consumption power now feeds into the global growth calculation in a meaningful way. **The good news is that BRIC growth increasingly makes U.S. growth shortfalls in the years ahead less of a threat for the world economy**. According to work by Jim O'Neill, who heads Goldman Sachs' global economics team, the current value of consumption in the BRIC countries is roughly $4 trillion, still less than half of the $10.5 trillion that U.S. consumers spend. But **O'Neill sees a powerful lift from these countries in the years just ahead. With BRIC consumption growing by roughly 15% per year, he estimates, it should rival that of U.S. consumption by the end of the decade. The world will feel the beneficial effects sooner.**  BRIC consumption is already growing by roughly $600 billion a year and should rise to $1 trillion a year by the middle of the decade, says O'Neill. **Such demand does not all land at the U.S. doorstep but it does flow to the world, providing a nice offset to what is likely to be long-term weakness in U.S. consumption. That's good news for all.**

**Prolif**

***Sanctions fail***

**Majidyar ‘12**

Ahmad K. Majidyar, Senior Research Associate, interview with News.Az, 8-7-12, American Enterprise Institute, Iran has only accelerated its nuclear activity <http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/middle-east-and-north-africa/iran-has-only-accelerated-its-nuclear-activity/>, jj

I don’t know whether or not the news story is accurate. But I think an Israeli attack against Iran’s nuclear facilities is now more likely than any time in the past, and the Iranian leaders understand this. This is because **all diplomatic efforts to persuade Iran to halt its controversial nuclear program have produced no results**. The **recent talks** between Iran and the 5+1 Group in Baghdad and Moscow largely **failed**. While **economic sanctions** have had a real impact on Iran’s economy, they **have** so far **failed to force Iran to stop its nuclear activity**. Moreover, **there is no sign of strong internal opposition inside Iran that could topple the current regime. Thus, with no alternative solution in sight and Iran’s nuclear enrichment continuing apace,** Israeli leaders may any time opt for a military strike as the only option to delay the Iranian race toward a nuclear bomb. Israel sees a nuclear Iran as an existential threat, and it may launch an attack to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power with or without Washington’s approval. Do you believe in possible peaceful solution to the problem connected with the Iranian nuclear programme? In the past twenty years, **diplomacy with Iran has failed to produce any positive results**. In the 1990s, Germany and France tried to use diplomacy and offered economic incentives to persuade the regime in Tehran to stop its nuclear program. They failed. **In the past three and half years, the Obama administration has tried to use a combined policy of diplomacy, sabotage and sanctions to deter Tehran from continuing its march towards a nuclear bomb. But Iran has only accelerated its nuclear activity.** Indeed, both **the Ahmadinejad government and the reformists before him have used diplomacy as a tool to advance Iran’s nuclear program without direct confrontation with the West**. Hassan Rowhani, former Iranian nuclear negotiators, and Abdollah Ramezandzadeh, former spokesperson of the President Mohammed Khatami’s government (1997-2005), have articulated that **Tehran’s diplomatic engagements with the West were aimed at buying time to advance Iran’s nuclear activities rather than to find a peaceful resolution to the issue. Now that Iran is on the threshold of becoming a nuclear power, diplomacy alone is unlikely to persuade it to halt its nuclear program.** How effective are the resolutions of the UN Security Council and economic sanctions against Iran for the peaceful resolution of the ‘Iranian problem’? The U.N. Security Council resolutions and unilateral sanctions by the United States and the European Union have had a significant effect on the Iranian economy. Iran is facing rising inflation, major depreciation of its currency, and increasing unemployment rates. Figures issued by Iran’s Central Bank show inflation above 20%. The actual number could be much higher. The price of food, especially bread and chicken, has skyrocketed in the recent months, triggering protests in some regions. While these **economic woes** will definitely have political cost for the regime in future, they **are currently not at a level that would force Iran to abandon its nuclear program. Iran’s defiant stance in the Baghdad and Moscow negotiations showed the current sanctions regime has not been effective enough to force Tehran to make a compromise.**

***1. No impact---Iran prolif won’t cause a chain reaction and nuclear Iran would be rational---deterrence solves***

**Zakaria ’10** (Fareed, editor of Newsweek, 3-1, Newsweek, Vol. 155, Iss. 9, “Don’t Scramble the Jets; Why Iran’s dictators can be deterred” proquest, jj)

**An Iran with nuclear weapons** would be dangerous and destabilizing, though **I am not as convinced as some that it would automatically force Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey to go nuclear as well. If Israel's large nuclear arsenal has not made Egypt seek its own nukes-despite the fact that the country has fought and lost three wars with Israel-it is unclear to me why an Iranian bomb would.** The United States should use the latest IAEA report to bolster a robust containment strategy against Iran, bringing together the moderate Arab states and Israel in a tacit alliance, asking European states to go further in their actions, and pushing Russia and China to endorse sanctions. Former secretary of state James Baker suggested to me on CNN that the United States could extend its nuclear umbrella to Israel, Egypt, and the Gulf states-something that current Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has hinted at as well. At the same time, Washington should back the Green Movement, which ultimately holds out the greatest hope for a change in the basic orientation of Iran's foreign policy. It remains unclear how broad or well organized this movement is, but as a matter of long-term strategy, we should support groups that want a more modern and open Iran. **Can we live with a nuclear Iran? Well, we're living with a nuclear North Korea** (boxed in and contained by its neighbors). **And we lived with a nuclear Soviet Union and communist China. Iran, we're told, is different. The country cannot be deterred by America's vast arsenal of nukes because it is run by a bunch of mystic mullahs who aren't rational, embrace death, and have millenarian fantasies. This was never an accurate description of Iran's canny (and ruthlessly pragmatic) clerical elite. But it's even less so now**. **The most significant development in Iran has been the displacement of the clerical elite by the Revolutionary Guards, a military organization that is now the center of power.** Clinton confirmed what many of us have been pointing out over the last year and warned of an emerging "military dictatorship" there. I'm not sure which is worse for the Iranian people: rule by nasty mullahs or by thuggish soldiers. But **one thing we know about military regimes is that they are calculating. They act in ways that keep themselves alive and in power. That instinct for self-preservation is what will make a containment strategy work.**

***2. Nuclear Iran won’t cause conflict***

**Crist & Ward ’09** Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and senior CIA intelligence analyst [David& Steven “Deterring Iran: Lessons from History” (<http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=3078>) 6/24]

Although it will be challenging, **Iran can be deterred**. The Iranians have proven to be incredibly opportunistic -- primarily through the use of asymmetric threats and proxies -- in exploiting U.S. weaknesses in the region. Nevertheless, **Iran is capable of rationally balancing its interests and determining when it is necessary to back off in order to avoid a full-blown conflict. Iranian leaders are primarily concerned with survival, and their decisions rest on remaining in power for the long term.**

***Israel won’t attack – relations with the US***

**Cook**, senior fellow, Mid East studies – CFR, 6/9/**’9**

(Steven A, “Why Israel Won’t Attack Iran,” Foreign Affairs)

**Given Israel's perception of an acute Iranian threat and** its demonstrated **ability to act alone, there must be some** other **factor holding the Israelis back.** Most likely, **that factor is politics, and** more specifically, the **importance that close relations with Washington has on** the **domestic political calculations** of Israeli leaders. Unlike 1981, when the United States had barely a toe-hold in the Middle East, **Washington occupies two countries in** or adjacent to **the region, maintains** military facilities throughout the Persian Gulf, and relies on Arab governments for logistical support. **In the event of an Israeli attack, Washington would** surely **be accused of colluding with Jerusalem**, severely **damaging the U**nited **S**tates' **position in the region while provoking** a ferocious **Iranian response in Iraq, Afghanistan, Gaza, and** southern **Lebanon**. **The** resulting **breach between Israel and the** **U**nited **S**tates **would be unprecedented**, creating a crisis far more serious than President Dwight Eisenhower's demand that Israel stand down after its invasion of Sinai in 1956 and Gerald Ford's "reassessment" of 1975 (which suspended all military and economic agreements between the two countries for three months when Israel proved uncooperative in negotiating a second Sinai agreement). **This is a scenario with which** many **Israelis**, including Netanyahu, **are unlikely to be comfortable.**

The Israelis have always claimed that they did not want a formal defense treaty with the United States for fear that such a pact would limit their freedom of maneuver. David Ben Gurion sought close relations with Washington, but not at the expense of Israel's "independence or its existence." Yet, the historical record does not track consistently with Ben Gurion's bravado. The **1956 and 1975** episodes **are instructive because the Israelis backed down, establishing an informal pattern for future relations in which Israeli prime ministers** tend to **tread cautiously when it comes to the** **U**nited **S**tates.

***Empirics are conclusive***

**Cook**, senior fellow, Mid East studies – CFR, 6/9/**’9**

(Steven A, “Why Israel Won’t Attack Iran,” Foreign Affairs)

Yet, despite my best efforts to walk a few financial analysts off the ledge, a mystery remains: **Why haven't the Israelis attacked Iran's nuclear facilities?** After all, Israel is a country borne of the blood-soaked history of Jews in Europe, and **Iran's leaders seem to be promising a new Holocaust. One would think there is already justification enough to dispatch** every plane in **Israel's arsenal to attack Iran's nuclear infrastructure.** Also, between 2001 and 2009, **the Israelis enjoyed** the support of what was indisputably **the most pro-Israel American administration in history**. President George W. **Bush** and his advisors **helped enable the Lebanon war** in 2006 in the hopes that the vaunted Israel Defense Forces would deal Hizballah a fatal blow, **so why not take out the Iranian mother ship, which poses a far greater threat to Israel and U.S. interests** in the region than Hizballah's guerrilla army?

The standard wonk answers to these questions are that Israel does not have the capacity to fly its F-15s to Iran and back, that there is uncertainty about the actual targets, that there is too much risk of an inadvertent clash with possibly Turkish or even American air crews, and that the Israelis are in fact giving diplomacy a chance -- despite all evidence that Jerusalem is profoundly skeptical that anything Washington can offer Tehran will bring its nuclear ambitions to heel.

The *New York Times* caused quite a stir in Januarywhen it reported that Israel's defense and political leaders repeatedly sought permission from the Bush administration "to go," but were denied U.S. approval. Still, why didn't Israel attack anyway? **Would Bush have ordered U.S forces to shoot down Israeli F-15s** as they streaked across the Baghdad sky **on their way to Iran? Unlikely.** Confronted with a fait accompli, the **Bush** White House -- even if it were so inclined -- **would not have been in a position to condemn an Israeli attack.** Given his axis of evil and "with us or against us" rhetoric, it would have been decidedly awkward for Bush to come down on the Israelis for striking a blow against Iran. Moreover, the Israelis set a precedent for not informing the U.S. of dramatic military operations when on June 7,1981, the Sunday morning routines of Reagan administration officials were disrupted with reports ofthe smoldering ruins of what was Iraq's Osirak nuclear facility.

***1) No impact - Deterrence solves***

**Waltz ’10** (Kenneth N, adjunct professor of political science @ Columbia, senior research scholar in the Institute of War and Peace , the National Interest, “Is Nuclear Zero the Best Option?” Sep/Oct, Iss. 109; pg. 88, proquest, jj)

War may not pay, as British economist Norman Angeli repeatedly claimed, but the lesson proved a hard one for states to learn. **Even with the horrors of World War I fresh in their minds, European countries went into World War II just twenty-one years later**. **Until August of 1945, violent conflict punctuated the history of states, especially of those major and great. When in short order the Soviet Union followed the United States into the nuclear business with "man of steel" Stalin and in due course "we will bury you" Khrushchev at the helm, many in the Western world thought that all hell would break loose.** Robert Maynard Hutchins, boy president of the University of Chicago (he was thirty when he took over), and Bertrand Russell, eminent in mathematics and rhetoric, proclaimed that in the nuclear age, world government was the only alternative to world war. **With nuclear weapons, war presumably meant that civilization would perish and we along with it. Instead, the alternative to world government proved to be nuclear deterrence, which banished war among the world's major nations through the long years of the Cold War and ever since**. Certainly, **violent conflict** still exists, but it **has been relegated to taking its course in the periphery of international politics. The United States, in particular, has been fond of beating up poor and weak states.** In the twenty years dating from 1983, we invaded six of them, beginning and ending with Iraq. **Yet since the end of World War II, states with nuclear weapons have never fought one another.** Testing propositions against historical events has become a favorite indoor sport of social scientists. **This is the only proposition that has passed every test. One might think that the best, in fact the only, peacekeeping weapon that the world has ever known would gain many fans. It does not seem to have done so.**

***3) Will be slow***

**Yusuf 2009** (Fellow, Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Longer-Range Future Boston University)

http://www.pugwash.org/01\_nuclear\_proliferation\_yusuf.pdf

First, it reveals consistent misjudgments regarding the extent of nuclear proliferation. **Overall, projections were far more pessimistic than actual developments**; those emanating from independent experts more so than intelligence estimates. In the early years of the Cold War, the overly pessimistic projections stemmed, in part, from an incorrect emphasis on technology as the driving factor in horizontal proliferation, rather than intent, a misjudgment, which came to light with the advent of a Chinese bomb in 1964. The parallel shift from developed-world proliferation to developing-world proliferation was accompanied by greater alarm regarding the impact of proliferation. It was felt that developing countries were more dangerous and irresponsible nuclear statesvthan developed countries. Second, while all the countries that did eventually develop nuclear weapons were on the lists of suspect states, **the estimations misjudged when these countries would go nuclear.** The Soviet Union went nuclear much earlier than had been initially predicted, intelligence estimates completely missed China’s nuclear progress, and India initially tested much later than U.S. intelligence projections had anticipated and subsequently declared nuclear weapon status in 1998 when virtually no one expected it to do so. Third, **the pace of proliferation has been consistently slower than has been** **anticipated by most experts due to a combination of overwhelming alarmism, the intent of threshold states, and many incentives to abstain from weapons development. In the post-Cold War period, the number of suspected threshold states has gradually decreased and the geographical focus has shifted solely to North-East Asia, South Asia, and the** **Middle East.**

**Protectionism**

***Alt cause – solar tariff***

**Rex-Kiss 8/17**-12, Endre, green technology advocate and freelance copywriter in topics of sustainability and social media, “Are solar panels about to start a new trade war between China and the West?”, <http://www.earthtimes.org/green-blogs/green-living/solar-panel-trade-war-china-west-17-Aug-12/>

**Tensions are always running high between Chinese and western manufacturers, but it seems those tensions have finally spilled over into the solar industry.** The business world has been alight in recent days discussing the anti-dumping complaint that a group of 25 European solar panel manufactures filled in Brussels this week, asking if it means a trade 'war' between the West and China. We answer your questions below¶ How did the 'trade war' begin?¶ **Earlier this year the USA placed a 31% and higher tariff on Chinese-made solar panels, claiming that the Chinese were overproducing and flooding the American market with their solar panels**. By selling at what the US has deemed 'below fair value', Chinese solar panel makers have pushed prices down and therefore pushed many American solar panel makers out of business.¶ Overproduction can be normal fare in trade, but what has angered US panel makers most are the questions over whether the Chinese government is illegally subsiding solar panel makers to **help them undercut their prices.** This is a claim that the Chinese have vigorously denied. **There are now fears that the Chinese will also raise tariffs against countries who have placed tariffs on their products, *starting a trade war* and damaging the entire industry.¶** How has the crisis spread to the EU?¶ A German solar panel manufacturer backed by 24 others from around the EU has now filed a complaint in Brussels, asking the EU to investigate if China is also selling solar cells in the EU at below-production prices. If the Commission takes up the case and decides to take measures similar to that of the US, it could be devastating for the Chinese solar industry. EU countries make up over 60% of the market for Chinese solar panels, with Germany being the country with the largest number of total installations of solar panels. US tariffs have wounded, but EU tariffs could be fatal.¶ How has China responded?¶ **The Chinese are contending** that US and European panel makers are incorrect in the dumping claims, and therefore **the tariff is unfair and protectionist. They also feel the moves are *highly hypocritical* given all the pushing the West has given for China to embrace clean energy.¶** **China have *hit back* by opening their own anti-dumping investigation**, accusing the US and South Korea of dumping polysilicon, a key ingredient in solar panels, in the Chinese market. The Chinese have also condemned the EU investigation, but it is yet to be seen if they will find a way to hit back at the EU through trade legislation. If they do, it would only deepen the crisis.¶ What does it mean for consumers?¶ The tariffs are aimed at raising the prices of solar panels, which some have contented is bad for consumers and bad for the market. Although the companies pushing for tariffs have argued that they are simply trying to protect their jobs and workers from unfair trade practices, there are those who disagree that tariffs are the way forward. Many in the industry have argued that tariffs are not the answer as they will simply cause demand to dry up, hurting solar panel companies even further. Even **worse, problems with the solar industry would stall the progress that the world is making in turning away from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources. Solar panels are seen as the future by many, so if the market turns volatile it will be bad for the environment as well as business.**

***protectionism won’t lead to wars***

**Matthews ’10** (Jessica Tuchman, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace + former employee in the executive and legislation branches of the USFG, 12-29, Carnegie, “The World in 2011” <http://carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=42207#china>, jj)

Will it be a tough year for the global economy? **Is there a danger that a currency or trade war could break out? People felt that the threat in 2010 was enormous and that we would see tit for tat trade sanctions and barriers—but we didn’t. This is** **partially because the world remembers how devastating that was during the period between the two world wars.**

***A) Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace***

**MARTIN, MAYER, AND THOENIG 2008 (**Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

***B) Doha proves even sudden collapse of free trade will not cause war***

**THE SEATTLE TIMES 7-31-2008**

Economists disagree on the Doha round's potential benefits; estimates of economic gain that could have been reaped through additional trade range from $4 billion to $100 billion. Set against the rapid expansion of global trade to $13.6 trillion last year from $7.6 trillion five years ago, however, the bottom-line loss from Doha's failure is "not a market issue," said Julian Callow, an economist at Barclays Capital in London. Nor is the world on the edge of the kind of protectionist wave that ended the last period of globalization in the early 20th century and contributed to two world wars, analysts say. Countries are likely to go on negotiating bilateral trade deals with each other, such as the U.S.-South Korea free-trade deal earlier this year.

***C) Trade only pacifies some constituencies—it can’t solve in the countries with the biggest impacts***

**GOLDSTONE 2007** (P.R., PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science and a member of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a non-resident research fellow at the Center for Peace and Security Studies, Georgetown University, AlterNet, September 25, http://www.alternet.org/audits/62848/?page=entire)

American policymakers should beware claims of globalization's axiomatic pacifying effects. Trade creates vested interests in peace, but these interests affect policy only to the extent they wield political clout. In many of the states whose behavior we most wish to alter, such sectors -- internationalist, export-oriented, reliant on global markets -- lack a privileged place at the political table. Until and unless these groups gain a greater voice within their own political system, attempts to rely on the presumed constraining effects of global trade carry substantially greater risk than commonly thought. A few examples tell much. Quasi-democratic Russia is a state whose principal exposure to global markets lies in oil, a commodity whose considerable strategic coercive power the Putin regime freely invokes. The oil sector has effectively merged with the state, making Russia's deepening ties to the global economy a would-be weapon rather than an avenue of restraint. Russian economic liberalization without political liberalization is unlikely to pay the strong cooperative dividends many expect. China will prove perhaps the ultimate test of the Pax Mercatoria. The increasing international Chinese presence in the oil and raw materials extraction sectors would seem to bode ill, given such sectors' consistent history elsewhere of urging state use of threats and force to secure these interests. Much will come down to the relative political influence of export-oriented sectors heavily reliant on foreign direct investment and easy access to the vast Western market versus the political power of their sectoral opposites: uncompetitive state-owned enterprises, energy and mineral complexes with important holdings in the global periphery, and a Chinese military that increasingly has become a de facto multi-sectoral economic-industrial conglomerate. Actions to bolster the former groups at the expense of the latter would be effort well spent. At home, as even advanced sectors feel the competitive pressures of globalization, public support for internationalism and global engagement will face severe challenges. As more sectors undergo structural transformation, the natural coalitional constituency for committed global activist policy will erode; containing the gathering backlash will require considerable leadership. Trade can indeed be a palliative; too often, however, we seem to think of economic interdependence as a panacea; the danger is that in particular instances it may prove no more than a placebo.

***Trade is resilient – no collapse possible***

**Perroni and Whally 96** (Carlo, University of Warwick and John, University of Western Ontario, American Economic Review, 86(2), May, p. 60, EBSCOHost)

Furthermore, trade performance in the period since the late 1940’s also clearly stands in sharp contrast to the events of the 1930’s. The largest players, **the United States and the EU have consistently displayed a determination to mediate their trade disputes in the 1980’s**, triggered by EU enlargement**. And today’s global economy is much more interdependent than it was in the 1930’s. Firms and industries have become more reliant on export markets, and there is more interindustry trade. There is also the major difference of the presence of the GATT/WTO, accompanied by bindings on tariffs achieved in eight rounds of negotiations; and, despite its weaknesses, a GATT/WTO dispute-settlement procedure has continued to function**.

***Trade leadership is permanently damaged and they can’t overcome alt causes***

**Kim 2010** – Policy Analyst in Heritage's Center for International Trade and Economics, master's degree in international trade and investment policy from the Elliott School of International Affairs at the George Washington University (4/12, Anthony, Heritage Foundation, “A trade war averted for now”, http://blog.heritage.org/2010/04/12/a-trade-war-averted-for-now/, WEA)

So, a trade war was avoided. More precisely, it has been delayed. Considerable murkiness lingers on the trade horizon, and not just with Brazil. As Friday’s WSJ editorial points out: \* WTO-approved retaliation to counteract U.S. trade violations is spreading. More than $3.4 billion [in] U.S. exports now face punishing retaliation tariffs. \* The U.S.’s most economically damaging trade war is with Mexico. As part of the North American Free Trade Agreement ([NAFTA]), the U.S. is supposed to give Mexican trucking companies access to the U.S. But 17 years into [NAFTA], Mexican trucks still don’t cross the border, because the Teamsters union won’t accept the competition. A [NAFTA] dispute panel [has] authorized Mexico to retaliate. Last year it imposed duties on $2.4 billion of U.S. exports. \* The [European] Union and Japan have also asked the WTO for authorization to retaliate because the U.S. Commerce Department insists on deciding antidumping cases with an arcane calculation that the WTO ruled against in 2007. As a result, according to the trade publication “Inside U.S. Trade”, both Japan and the European Union are eyeing retaliation. The total value of U.S. exports affected could top $500 million. The fallout from U.S. protectionism will hurt our ongoing economic recovery efforts. The protectionism itself is doing irrevocable damage to America’s leadership in international economic discussions. Free trade and its expansion through multilateral, regional, and bilateral agreements have been vital to world economic strength and prosperity. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner commented during his recent two-day visit to India that President Obama “was ‘deeply committed’ to trying to build a consensus among Americans for more open trade and to support the [economic] recovery,” as noted in the Financial Times. While the Obama Administration has repeatedly said that the U.S. will not abandon its legacy of supporting open and free commerce, the fact is that it has done little to nothing to demonstrate that commitment in more substantive terms. One sign of inaction: three pending free trade agreements with Panama, Colombia, and South Korea remain on ice. Talking about “strengthening” America’s trade relations around the world, boosting exports, and even enforcing trade rules are only empty gestures without tangible action to re-establish America’s leadership in advancing free trade.

***Global free trade increase risk of war; Less trade would DECREASE the likelihood and intensity of wars***

**Blainey**, Professor of Economic History, Melbourne, **'88**

[Geoffrey, *The Causes of War*, Third Edition, pages 91-96 7/7/08]

Alec Lawrence Macfie fought with the Gordon Highlanders on the Somme in the First World War and then, at the onset of the world depression, became a lecturer in economics

at Glasgow University. His experience of the two most shattering events of his generation came together in an odd way, for about 1937 he detected a thread that seemed to connect the outbreak of the war with certain economic conditions. In February 1938 he issued a short article with an ominous warning. Entitled 'The Outbreak of War and the Trade Cycle', it occupied nine pages of a learned journal at the very time when newspapers were mesmerised by the revival of Germany and the danger of another world war. Macfie argued that international wars were most likely to begin when an economic recovery was well under way or had mounted the slopes and reached a prosperous tableland. A quick study of the outbreak of twelve international wars in the period from 1850 to 1914

suggested this pattern, but what did the pattern signify? Macfie thought that wars tended to break out at those times when the economic mood was bumptious and when 'hope is alight and obstacles are impatiently confronted'. That mood, he suggested, provides the heat to 'germinate the seeds of war no matter when they are sown'. Macfie's knowledge of economic fluctuations persuaded him that in Europe the danger point would appear again in about two years. 'If these considerations are accepted', he argued, 'we may well pray that statesmen may be granted an access of wisdom between now and 1941. The prayer was not answered. The tendency for economic activity to move regularly from slackness to boom and from boom to slackness – the depressed years being marked by a scarcity of jobs and falling profits – was first experienced by England and the advanced industrial countries. Variously called the trade cycle or the business cycle, it reflected the spread of an intricate web of interdependence between nations and between producers within each nation; economic specialization was turning much of the world into a 'global village' long before aircraft, radio and television made the web conspicuous. Thus a fall in the demand for Manchester-made textiles was felt in the cotton fields of the Carolinas, the terraces of Liverpool, and in many corners of the globe. In glimpsing a link between the business cycle and war, Macfie pointed to something that could not neatly be applied to wars before 1800. He did not comment on this dilemma; he humbly disowned any intention of setting up his plate as a historian and merely passed on his observations in the hope that they might 'prove grist to some historian's mill'. Although the eighteenth century had ups and downs in economic activity, and although the famous Swedish historian Eli Heckschser thought his homeland had a weak semblance of the business cycle as early as 1763, those oscillations presumably did not move with the regularity and the capitalist clockwork that merit the name of 'business cycles'. Wind, ice and rain – and their effects on the harvests – were probably the main pendulum of these earlier fluctuations. The ups and downs of economic activity were probably more influential on war decisions after the Napoleonic wars, partly because the prevailing economic mood was more likely to be shared by many nations, and partly because the oscillations between economic pessimism and optimism tended to become sharper. Macfie's link is, at first sight, open to some doubt even in his chosen period of 1850-1914. He realised that economists could argue that he had mistaken the causes of war with the preparations for war. It could be argued that the rising prosperity which preceded wars was merely the effect of re-arming and preparing for war. This may have been partly true of the

prosperity that preceded some wars but seems untrue of the majority. It is therefore difficult to reject Professor Macfie's observation that economic conditions affected the outbreak of wars. Changes in economic moods and conditions affect not only bankers, shopkeepers, manufacturers and shipowners, farmers and all they employ: they also affect monarchs, first ministers and chiefs of staff of the armed forces. They affect the revenue and expenditure of governments and they affect the problems which they have to face. They affect social unrest or

cohesion. And perhaps most important they subtly affect expectations of what the coming months will be like and whether they can be shaped with ease.' When trade is deteriorating and when unemployment is increasing the mood of governments tends to be cautious or apprehensive. Dwindling revenue and soaring claims for the state's adi

aggravate the mood. On the other hand, when prosperity is high – and this is the time most dangerous to peace – there comes a sense of mastery of the environment. Indeed the economic moods closely parallel those mental moods which psychiatrists study. Such words as 'depression' and 'mania' are common to the vocabulary of those who chart fluctuations in the market places as well as mental asylums. When a contemporary psychiatrist, David Stafford-Clark, describes the emotional conditions of elation, which virtually everyone experiences at times, he is describing a mood which all economists have observed: when the sense of well-being and confidence not only exceeds all degree of appropriateness to the patient's life, but begins to colour and cloud judgement and responsibility to a point at which the capacity to adjust to reality and manage affairs becomes impaired, then it consistutes a condition of illness no matter how little the patient may complain. More than a trace of this illness is visible in business booms and even in the recurring moods of nations. The eve of the Crimean, Franco-Prussian, Boer and many other wars was tinged with this mania. One cannot say that economic events alone shape these oscillating moods. Admittedly economic events - partly because they are easily measurable - have been studied so intensely that they can for practical purposes be explained mainly in terms of other economic happenings. But economic behaviour cannot be isolated from the totality of behaviour. Economists have built a deep reservoir of knowledge of how man behaves in economic affairs, but the mental conditions which influence that behaviour are not known so well

***( ). Environment***

***A. Free trade risks environmental extinction***

George, Dalit-Adivasi activist, 2004 (Goldy M., Countercurrents, "Free Trade – A war against Dalits & Adivasis", November 10, 2004, [http://www.countercurrents.org/dalit-george101104.htm](http://www.countercurrents.org/dalit-george101104.htm#_blank), accessed on July 8, 2008)

War because the indigenous people are thrown out of their resource zones and livelihoods. Forceful change in life style, culture and eco-friendly ethos is reversed through this process. Land and forests turned to be a commodity of consumption, with concentration on private and individual (corporate) capital; it is not meant for the welfare of all. War because their right to land, water and forests are yet to be defined by the nation state. Although there are sufficient facts to realise the symbiotic relationship of Adivasis and Dalits with forest environment and the eco-system at large – they are systematically and strategically bypassed, excluded and isolated. They are not recognised as the original inhabitants and owners of land. Many so-called development projects resulted in mass displacement and migration creating an army of domestic refugees. And let us not forget free trade is also considered to be a part of economic growth and development. Hence the historical omission of the already betrayed and battered continues in higher degree and magnitude. War because their skills and knowledge are patented under the newly coined phenomenon of IPRs. The wealth of Indian natural zones and skills and knowledge of indigenous communities are immense. Once this is transferred it could easily brought under the IPRs. War because everything is now in the market. But the Dalits and Adivasis are nowhere in the market. Other production-based communities have a minimum right to enter the market, but the indigenous people have no right to market. Is it not really silly that the inherited ones are out of livelihood, profession, trade and even market? Rank of Dalits & Adivasis in Trade process is nothing more than a big cipher. War because the exploitation of non-renewable resources is diametrically opposite to the man-resource relationship. This at large disturbs eco-system and erupts major ecological problems, which threatens the life of the mother earth to unpredictable magnitude. In other words life on earth is and will be at stake if the present process continues. This is particularly related to the question of mining. In fact the communities have no right to mining on their own. The mining and mineral policy has contributed a lot to this process in tune with the principles of market and trade for the MNCs. War because the jargons like ecological democracy and ecological equity won't go hand in hand with globalisation and market. Both are wholly opposite to each other. War because the corporate house needs resources whereas people need their livelihood. It is a war between surplus vs. survival. Thus the subsistent economy is transferred into market economy. War because in an age of free trade and market the life values sustained through the community life and love are constantly diffusing and substituted with competition.

## 2nc

### 2nc Impact Overview

#### Heg turns and solves every aff impact

Robert **Kagan** is a senior fellow in Foreign Policy at Brookings. His most recent book is "The World America Made." 3-14-**12**, America has made the world freer, safer and wealthier, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/03/14/opinion/kagan-world-america-made/index.html?hpt=hp_c2>, jj

(CNN) -- **We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today** -- the widespread **freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity** (even despite the current economic crisis), ***and the absence of war among great powers.* In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are more than 100. For four centuries prior to 1950, global GDP rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the 20th century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past 60 years no great powers have gone to war. This is the world America made when it assumed global leadership** after World War II. Would this world order survive if America declined as a great power? **Some American intellectuals insist that a "Post-American" world need not look very different from the American world and that all we need to do is "manage" American decline**. ***But that is wishful thinking*. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other powers, the world order will inevitably change to suit their interests and preferences. Take the issue of democracy**. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. **In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great power autocracies. Both China and Russia already protect dictators like** Syria's Bashar al-**Assad**. **If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. What about the free market, free trade economic order?** **People assume China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it**. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. **But China's form of capitalism is heavily dominated by the state, with the ultimate goal being preservation of the ruling party. Although the Chinese have been beneficiaries of an open international economic order, they could end up undermining it simply because, as an autocratic society, their priority is to preserve the state's control of wealth and the power it brings**. They might kill the goose because they can't figure out how to keep both it and themselves alive. **Finally, what about the long peace that has held among the great powers** for the better part of six decades? Many people imagine that American predominance will be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But **multipolar systems have historically been neither stable nor peaceful. War among the great powers was a** common, if not **constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. The 19th century was notable for** two stretches of great-power peace of roughly four decades each, punctuated, however, by **major wars among great powers** and **culminating in World War I, the most destructive and deadly war mankind had known** up to that point. ***The era of American predominance has shown that there is no better recipe for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand.*** **Many people view the present international order as the inevitable result of human progress**, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government -- forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But **there was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. International order is not an evolution; it is an imposition. It is the domination of one vision over others -- in America's case, the domination of liberal free market principles of economics, democratic principles of politics, and a peaceful international system that supports these, over other visions that other nations and peoples may have. The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it. If and when American power declines, the institutions and norms American power has supported** will decline, too. Or they **may collapse** altogether **as we transition into** another kind of world order, or into **disorder**. **We may discover then that the United States was essential to keeping the present world order together and that the alternative to American power was not peace and harmony but chaos and catastrophe -- which was what the world looked like right before the American order came into being.**

### 2nc Impact Wall

#### 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.”

#### 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.

#### Impact is nuclear war

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.

### 2nc UQ

#### Even if Obama’s winning, Romney has momentum and is narrowing the gap

Malor 9-20 GABRIEL MALOR, 9-20-12, NY Daily News, Calm down. Romney can still win this thing. <http://www.nydailynews.com/blogs/the_rumble/2012/09/calm-down-romney-can-still-win-this-thing>, jj

As a result of these recent "gaffes," freeloaders may not like Romney. Peaceniks may not like Romney. Wonks who think that ambiguity is a reasonable foreign policy strategy may not like Romney. But how many freeloaders, peaceniks or foreign policy wafflers were really going to vote for Romney, anyway? None of these groups are part of the traditional Republican constituency. None of these groups are large enough to sway the election. Unlike commentators, who spend a great deal of time fretting about Romney's recent messages, Republican voters generally agree with the governor about freeloaders, Israel and the Arab Spring. Commentators focus on gaffes like this because they have nothing else to talk about, not because gaffes are of general interest to the voting public. Indeed, if you look at the most recent polls, the race is contracting even amidst Romney's rough couple of weeks. The President's average national lead in RealClearPolitics' poll compilation has fallen from +3.6% at the height of his convention bounce to +3.1%. Sure, he's ahead of Romney right now, but he's been ahead of Romney for the entire contest, excepting two days at the height of Romney's convention bounce, when the candidates were merely tied. Moreover, Obama's convention bounce wasn't even the furthest ahead of Romney he's been during the course of the campaign. Thus, objectively, there's no reason for the recent chortles among the left or the wailing from the right. The status quo prevails. Attempting to demoralize one's opponents is a time-honored tradition, but declaring that the race is over is hyperbole that would, in cruder contexts, be simply dismissed as trash talk. In truth, neither Obama nor Romney has had his break-out moment yet.

#### Forecasting Model Predicts Romney Victory

Bickers 8/22 (Kenneth (in conjunction with U. Colorado Media Relations Department), Professor of Political Science at U. Colorado, “Analysis of Election Factors Point to Romney Win,” http://www.colorado.edu/news/releases/2012/08/22/analysis-election-factors-points-romney-win-university-colorado-study-says)

A University of Colorado analysis of state-by-state factors leading to the Electoral College selection of every U.S. president since 1980 forecasts that the 2012 winner will be Mitt Romney. The key is the economy, say political science professors Kenneth Bickers of CU-Boulder and Michael Berry of CU Denver. Their prediction model stresses economic data from the 50 states and the District of Columbia, including both state and national unemployment figures as well as changes in real per capita income, among other factors. “Based on our forecasting model, it becomes clear that the president is in electoral trouble,” said Bickers, also director of the CU in DC Internship Program. According to their analysis, President Barack Obama will win 218 votes in the Electoral College, short of the 270 he needs. And though they chiefly focus on the Electoral College, the political scientists predict Romney will win 52.9 percent of the popular vote to Obama’s 47.1 percent, when considering only the two major political parties.

#### Polls are Not Predictive: Only Way to Establish Uniqueness is Models

Sabato 9/13 (Larry, Professor of Political Science U. Virginia, Forecasting the Presidential Election,” http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/forecasting-the-presidential-election-other-crystal-balls/)

Most of us spend our campaign days eagerly devouring the latest public opinion polls, and there is no shortage of them. In the six days after the conclusion of the party conventions (through Wednesday afternoon), there have been three major national polls released — not including daily tracking surveys by Gallup, Rasmussen and Reuters/Ipsos — and 13 state-level surveys; RealClearPolitics lists 57 national polls since June 1. But polls are not predictive. As the pollsters always say, each poll is just a snapshot of an object moving in time. Moreover, the further one gets away from the actual election day, the more misleading polls can be, because it is difficult to figure out who will actually show up to vote, and many events that might influence the horserace (such as debates or crises) have not yet occurred. A better way to forecast the election results — potentially, at least — is to uncover the underlying fundamentals that propel an electorate to vote the way it does, and to combine them in some rigorous, standard fashion based on America’s voting history. Quite a number of political scientists have done so, creating models that use statistical techniques such as regression analysis — seeing how one variable, like the economy, affects another, like an election outcome — to predict presidential elections. A model should ideally be simple and elegant, using relatively few variables and constants to generate a forecast.

#### Despite polling data, the race is still close and Romney will win. Recent media spin does not make Obama the winner and Obama won’t get the turnout polling models assume.

Rick Wilson Sept 23, 2012, Mitt's not over yet; Romney could still win in November, <http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/mitt-article-1.1165152?localLinksEnabled=false>, KEL

If voters went to the polls this minute, President Obama would win. Tomorrow? Perhaps. Six weeks from now? Not so much. Despite the hyperventilating over each and every poll and dramatic pronouncement from the Obama campaign, Mitt Romney enters the home stretch in much better shape politically than they or the media believe. It won’t be easy and it won’t be pretty, but the objective reality of the campaign is fundamentally different than the political landscape seen through the filter of cable news and online coverage. If you read the usual horse race coverage of the last few weeks, you’d be convinced that Romney’s campaign had entirely collapsed and that Obama would be safe staying home for the next 45 days and playing a few dozen rounds of golf in the crisp fall air of Washington, D.C. From the “47%” fund-raiser video to the Libya announcement to Clint Eastwood to Paul Ryan, it seems that every week, the press declares Romney has made a fateful slip that has nailed his campaign in the coffin, once and for all. After all, the Beltway media “Gang of 500” said so, right? But these stories from the hermetic world of political media reporters are never quite as deadly as their breathless prose would suggest. Instead, Romney has kept grinding it out, pushing through tough coverage and Team Obama’s increasingly shrill and desperate attacks. He’s a better candidate than the anonymous critics on his own side would suggest, mainly because he has a key attribute many lack: guts. National polling on the race is a distorted mirror, and even that shows a tie game. Romney and Obama are close to tied in the swing states, and with swing voters. Plus, there’s this little-noticed problem: Far too many of the public and media polls have set their likely voter screens and models to something looking more optimistic than the 2008 turnout model, which even Obama’s most dedicated partisans think is highly unlikely. Considering that Obama won a crushing, decisive electoral and popular vote victory in 2008, it’s not surprising he’s kept the Democratic base intact. But the rest of America figured something out about him: He’s a charming communicator, but a mediocre President. That’s why his job approval, the right-track wrong-track numbers and his ratings on the economy match up with his failed economic record. Presidents’ final ballot percentages typically run behind their job approval numbers. With his hovering below 50%, Obama has almost no room for error, and the economy is not his ally. He is not, contrary to the belief of some in the press, immune from the laws of political physics.

#### Obama will lose due to economy – his spin doesn’t resolve fundamental problems with growth

Rick Wilson Sept 23, 2012, Mitt's not over yet; Romney could still win in November, <http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/mitt-article-1.1165152?localLinksEnabled=false>, KEL

Add it up: 1% growth, 8% unemployment, $4-per-gallon gas. Record numbers of Americans who have abandoned even looking for work. Record declines in household incomes. Home values still wheezing. The stories of “funemployment” are long passed, and the picture isn’t improving in the minds of most Americans. Yes, it’s true: In the past few days, there have been a handful of polls showing increased economic optimism. Obama’s team suggests — rather strenuously, and rather disingenuously — that 8% unemployment is the “new normal,” insisting that Americans give him credit for inheriting an economy beset with headwinds from President George W. Bush. It’s an argument that has worn thin with the electorate. And with two more jobs reports to come, Obama can pretend that the new normal is just fine, but that doesn’t make the life of a trucker in Racine, Wisc., paying close to $5 a gallon for diesel, feel better. It doesn’t cushion the shock to a mom in Toledo, when she’s paying much more than she paid two years ago for groceries. It doesn’t help the middle-manager in the Orlando suburbs accept the fact that his mortgage is underwater and his current job pays 25% less than his last. These kinds of stories don’t make the daily coverage, but they make up a large, restless and deeply unhappy fraction of the American electorate. Friday’s unemployment numbers, showing jobless rates rising in most of the swing states and frozen in others, adds to Romney’s argument that America needs a new approach to economic growth. Spin cannot cover the deep, ingrained sense of pessimism that the economy — and the nation — is fundamentally off track. Swing state voters are more typically affected by this than the national surveys reflect, and the “new normal” isn’t cutting it.

#### Prefer the direction of the link --- election’s too close to call

Enid News and Eagle 9-17

The heated presidential election is too close to call <http://enidnews.com/opinion/x1052803813/The-heated-presidential-election-is-too-close-to-call>, jj

ENID, Okla. — With less than two months remaining before the election, President Barack Obama and Republican nominee Mitt Romney are eyeing some pivotal swing states to win the election. Besides Colorado and New Mexico, Oklahoma virtually is surrounded by red — or red-leaning — states in most electoral projections. We’re entering the home stretch, and the heated presidential election is too close to call. The presidential debate schedules have been announced: Jim Lehrer of PBS will moderate a debate on domestic issues on Oct. 3. CNN’s Candy Crowley will coordinate a town hall debate Oct. 16 at Hofstra University. Bob Schieffer of CBS News will moderate a foreign policy-focused debate on Oct. 22 at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Fla. What will voters decide? Meena Bose, a presidential scholar at Hofstra University, told Newsday the magic number of 270 electoral votes is what really matters in the election … not the popular vote. Romney got some good news Friday when Obama announced an added travel stop to Wisconsin. That confirmed the traditionally Democratic state is in play, according to the Wall Street Journal. All of the news isn’t as favorable for Romney, however. You can blame the “liberal media,” but even the conservative Washington Times reported on NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist College polls that show Obama leads Romney in Florida, Ohio and Virginia. (Romney’s camp dismissed the post-convention bump as a “sugar high.”) Still, the Washington Post isn’t ready to move the bellwether state of Ohio in Obama’s direction for three reasons: the aforementioned bump, the Buckeye State’s ongoing political division and the fact Romney won’t give up on the Midwest’s electoral crown jewel.

### China

#### Foreign policy irrelevant – voters don’t care, its already priced in and Romney can’t exploit

Cook, 12

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/7, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12467)

A second piece of advice for Romney: Shut up about foreign policy. It’s clearly not your forte. You sound shrill at best and, at worst, uninformed. Romney isn’t going to beat Obama on foreign policy. It will be on the economy. Polls show that Obama gets considerably better job-approval ratings on handling foreign policy than on anything else. For Romney, the bad news is that Obama is rated reasonably well on foreign policy. The good news is that voters don’t seem to be voting on foreign policy.

#### Foreign Policy Irrelevant – economic issues key

Cook, 12(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/12, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12364>)

Romney must quickly reverse directions, probably grinding some gears in the process, but Obama’s fate is less in his own hands than in the economy’s. As of now, foreign policy is a good news/bad news proposition. The good news for the president is that the public generally approves of his handling of foreign policy. Indeed, if judged on that performance alone, he would win the election quite comfortably today. The bad news for him is that foreign policy doesn’t seem to be a driver for many voters; their focus is the economy.

### Israel

#### Iran Strikes won’t be October surprise – several reasons

Cook, 12(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/7, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12454)

According to The New York Times, top Israeli and U.S. intelligence and military officials agree that Iran has suspended its nuclear-weapons program. They believe that Iran unquestionably had an active program but some time ago stopped short of taking advanced steps to create weapons. Some well-placed foreign-policy officials of close U.S. allies also share this view. In the past two weeks, current and very recent Israel intelligence and military officials have publicly made these points. These officials’ statements contrast starkly with those of Israel’s political leaders, notably Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Defense Minister Ehud Barak, who see Iran’s nuclear capability as an immediate and existential threat to their country. The growing consensus that Iran is no longer actively developing nuclear weapons and that the Persian nation is facing increased economic hardship—with an embargo slated to begin on July 1—has lessened fears of an imminent attack on Iran. This is one reason, along with rising Saudi and domestic U.S. oil production and diminished demand, for the recent drop in oil prices. The American Automobile Association’s latest Daily Fuel Gauge Report indicates that the national average for regular-grade gasoline is $3.81 a gallon, 12 cents below the $3.93 of a month ago. It is also 13 cents below the average of a year ago. The perceived threat of war is lower, helping to bring gas prices down some. We don’t know, though, whether prices will continue to drop in the coming months or stay relatively high until Election Day. The combination of the fourth-warmest winter on record and historically low natural-gas prices has significantly diminished home-heating costs for many Americans this year, and that has worked to offset spiking gasoline prices during the winter months. So, for now, the threat of major military action in the Middle East before November 6 is less likely than it was just a few months ago. It’s just unclear whether the odds have declined enough to create a peace dividend in the form of lower oil and gasoline prices in the next six months. Foreign-policy insiders don’t think that Obama will participate in, or support, a unilateral attack on Iran unless he is convinced that Iran is on the cusp of developing a nuclear-weapons capability. But they are equally certain that he would act if intelligence showed that capability is drawing near. The insiders say that a knee-jerk reaction to protect Israel wouldn’t motivate Obama. The president, they believe, is worried that if Iran developed a nuclear-weapons capability, other countries in the region would immediately go on the market to acquire their own nuclear capabilities from Pakistan or elsewhere, triggering an arms race on his watch that he would consider abhorrent and unacceptable.

#### No Strikes before the election

National Journal Subscriber, 3-4-2012 <http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-plays-hawk-in-chief-on-iran-20120304>

But after delivering those more martial pledges, Obama then tried to tamp down what he called “loose talk of war. Over the last few weeks, such talk has only benefited the Iranian government, by driving up the price of oil, which they depend upon to fund their nuclear program. For the sake of Israel’s security, America’s security, and the peace and security of the world, now is not the time for bluster; now is the time to let our increased pressure sink in, and to sustain the broad international coalition that we have built.” Obama laid out a timetable for obtaining a diplomatic commitment from Iran to negotiate away its nuclear program that seemed to take him well beyond November. “Sanctions are continuing to increase, and this July – thanks to our diplomatic coordination – a European ban on Iranian oil imports will take hold,” he said.

### A2: Agent CP’s Bad

#### 1) Agent CP’s are a pre-req to energy policy education --- effective political action is not possible without understanding process

Laurance Geri & David McNabb 2011, Laurance (Larry) Geri is a member of the faculty of The Evergreen State College, where he teaches in the Masters Program in Public Administration; David E. McNabb is business administration professor emeritus at Pacific Lutheran University and currently a member of the adjunct faculty of Olympic College; Energy Policy in the U.S.: Politics, Challenges, and Prospects for Change, electronic copy of book, KEL)

Producing an energy policy that meets security and environmental criteria begins with answering these questions: Who has decision-making power in this system of government? How does the political system acknowledge needs and concerns, and respond to them? To whom is the government more likely to respond? These questions are broader than the narrower workings of the policy process, but are also essential to it. The huge scale of the United States and its states and limited role of the citizen in a representative democracy leaves the individual citizen capable, in most cases, of little impact on important policy processes at either the state or national levels. Beginning in the 1950s, political scientist Robert Dahl and others argued for a pluralistic or group model of political decision making. That model emphasized the competition between groups of relatively equal power in the political arena, and the policy outcomes that result from the bargaining between these groups. The pluralist model largely ignores the differences in resources and power between groups and the reality that large economic entities, especially corporations, have a considerable advantage in the policy bargaining process. Their ability to control investment and employment gives their requests more weight in Washington and the state capitals, although it may not be enough when voters feel betrayed by the corporate sector, as they have in the aftermath of the financial crash of 2008.

### 2nc Solvency Frontline

#### Court decisions immediately solve business & investor confidence which helps the industry & increases production --- coal ruling proves

Yates ‘12

Jonathan Yates – member of the Motley Fool Blogging Network.

Founded in 1993 in Alexandria, Va., by brothers David and Tom Gardner, The Motley Fool is a multimedia financial-services company dedicated to building the world's greatest investment community. Reaching millions of people each month through its website, books, newspaper column, television appearances, and subscription newsletter services, The Motley Fool champions shareholder values and advocates tirelessly for the individual investor.

8-23, The Motley Fool, Court Decision has King Coal Coming Back <http://beta.fool.com/jonathanyates13/2012/08/23/court-decision-has-king-coal-coming-back/10399/>, jj

A recent federal appeals court ruling that rejected the latest effort of the Environmental Protection Agency to limit soot and smog that blows from utility plants across state lines has led to a rally in the coal sector. Peabody Energy (NYSE: BTU), the largest coal company in the United States, is up more than 20% for the last month of trading. Alpha Natural Resources (NYSE: ANR) has risen more than 10% for the same period. The share price of Arch Coal (NYSE: ACI) is higher by more than one-quarter for the last four weeks of market action. The exchange traded fund for coal, Market Vectors Coal (NYSEMKT: KOL), also increased in double digits for the same time segment. Coal companies certainly need a great deal of assistance in the present market environment. Due to the plunging price of natural gas, many electric plants have replaced coal power with it. The exchange traded fund for natural gas, United States Natural Gas (NYSEMKT: UNG), is down more than 50% for the last 52 weeks of market action. While it has risen in recent trading due to an unusually hot summer resulting in a greater demand for electricity to run air conditioning units, United States Natural Gas is expected to plunge again with another mild winter predicted. At present, the short float for United States Natural Gas is 40.61%, reflecting that expectation among investors. A short float of 5% is considered to be troubling for a security. Slumping economic growth in China, Japan, India, Russia, Brazil, South Africa and Korea, among other nations, has also pounded away like the legendary John Henry's hammers at the earnings of coal companies. China, Japan, South Korea and India, in that order, are the biggest coal importers in the world. Imports from abroad do not look to be increasing anytime soon. China, far and away the largest consumer of coal, looks to be settling into a "hard landing" for its economy. That is revealed by its record stockpiles of iron ore in the People's Republic, for which massive quantities of coal are needed to produce. Japan is well into the 21st year of its "Lost Decade" of economic growth for the island nation. As a result of these factors, the federal appeals court ruling is welcome relief for the coal sector. It is having an immediate impact, too. Luminant, a unit of Energy Future Holdings Corp, the largest power generator in Texas, announced that it would now continue operating two coal-fired power plants. Before the court decision, it had planned to idle the two utility facilities situated east of Dallas.

#### CP means the reg can’t be enforced

Star Telegram ‘12

Aug. 21, 2012 Federal appeals court overturns EPA's cross-state pollution rule

<http://www.star-telegram.com/2012/08/21/4195351/federal-appeals-court-overturns.html#storylink=cpy>, jj

A new Environmental Protection Agency rule on interstate air pollution, which was challenged by Dallas-based Energy Future Holdings, the state of Texas and other energy companies, is unlawful and cannot be enforced, a federal appeals court in Washington ruled. A three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington today sided with more than three dozen challengers to the EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, which imposes caps on emissions for 27 states. The rule was put on hold in December by the court while it considered the legality of the regulation. The court ordered the agency to instead enforce a 2005 rule known as the Clear Air Interstate Rule until a viable replacement to the cross-state pollution rule is made. The new rules, issued in July and revised in October, apply to emissions that cross state lines.

### A2: Perm Do CP

#### 2) They sever USFG

#### A) The means whole

Merriam Websters [http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/the]

4—used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### B) That means all 3 branches have to act

Blacks Law ’90 (p. 695)

In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.
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**Rewewables**

***Flaring inevitable***

Other countries flare, its produced during oil production, and flaring happens for many reasons besides low prices – safety concerns, lack of infrastructure, financial barriers and lack of incentives

**Buzcu-Guven et. al ‘10**

Birnur Buzcu-Guven, Ph.D., Robert Harriss, Ph.D., and Donald Hertzmark, Ph.D.

SEPTEMBER 2010, JAMES A. BAKER III INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY RICE UNIVERSITY, GAS FLARING AND VENTING: EXTENT, IMPACTS, AND REMEDIES, online, jj

1.4 Reasons for high flaring and venting volumes Associated **gas** **co-produced during oil production is often flared due to safety concerns, financial barriers to implementing flare reduction projects**, low domestic gas prices, **lack of incentives** and efficient regulations on flaring activities**, or market barriers** (GGFR, 2002). Safety is an issue during process malfunctions and emergency shutdowns due to the risk of the release of high pressure in the well. Also, the associated **gas** composition **might pose a safety hazard to the facility and to the workers**. For example, the **gas from Shell’s Shearwater oil field in Britain contains a large percentage of highly toxic hydrogen sulfide, and therefore burning the gas is the only safe option to get rid of the acidic component** (Broere, 2008). **Associated gas is also flared because it is economically not feasible to remove sulfur and other contaminants, and to pressurize and transport the commercial product to the customer**. Trans), again at some cost. Use by industry, households, or utilities requires a distribution system. **The remote locations of oil fields and offshore platforms from energy consumption points also make it impractical to build pipelines or electricity transmission lines to utilize associated gas**. In some cases, although the oil field is close to a local market, the markets are too small or nonexistent, or the amount of associated gas is insufficient to allow for viable energy infrastructure development. The geophysical nature of the oil fields can be inappropriate for the re-injection of associated gas into the subsurface. In some cases, re-injection adversely impacts oil recovery rather than increasing oil production efficiency and is not an economically valid process (IEA, 2006a). In some countries, Nigeria for example, unanticipated interruptions due to economic and social instabilities discourage secondary recovery projects that produce relatively minor economic returns. In other cases, associated gas **is flared due to the structure of markets that limit new investments or the right to use existing infrastructure, as in the case of** Gazprom’s monopoly on gas pipeline and exports in **Russia** (see Section 4.4) (IEA, 2006a). Another and rather important factor hindering gas flaring reduction efforts, especially in developing countries, is the absence of an efficient and effective regulatory framework and powerful authorities to enforce the regulations. Gas flaring reduction efforts have been proven successful in countries that have a strong cooperation between the governments and the oil and gas companies, and where technologies are complemented by supportive government policies. The regulatory institutions in developed countries, such as **Norway**, the United States, **the U**nited **K**ingdom, and Canada, **have** the authority to monitor **flaring** levels; enforce emission permits; and monitor the health, safety, and environmental impact of flaring and venting activities. However, without strongly enforced regulations, oil companies may neglect activities that in any way diminish attention to oil production and project profitability. In some developing countries, oil producers are given permission to use associated gas to increase oil production efficiency by re-injecting back to the well, or to utilize the gas for operational activities in the facility; however, they are often limited by preemptive rights imposed by the host governments to sell associated gas to third parties. Since local governments do not have the economic and technical means and necessary infrastructure to transport and sell the associated gas by themselves, oil producers do not have options other than flaring or venting the associated gas. In countries where preemptive rights are not common, oil producers sell associated gas only if it is financially advantageous (Gerner et al., 2004). As one of the highest flaring nations, **Nigeria faces significant challenges in reducing flaring volumes**. **The most important barriers are: the lack of local gas and gas product markets**; low gas prices; **a lack of gas pipelines and electricity transmission lines; the amount of investment needed mission of any appreciable distance also requires removal of the liquid fractions** (the LPGs for flaring reduction projects; public unrest and security issues; lack of regulatory, fiscal, and legal frameworks; and capacity to attract investment and to enforce regulations and gas flaring policies (ICF, 2006). The structure of the oil and gas sector in Russia, specifically the monopoly of Gazprom, is a major barrier to utilizing associated gas. Gazprom has a monopoly over the gas transmission network, hindering transparent and reliable third-party access to pipelines by other oil companies. Gazprom only allows associated gas that meets certain criteria to flow through its pipelines; therefore, most oil producers cannot sell their gas to Gazprom without further processing, and there is no other entity that can purchase their gas. Their only option is to send the associated gas to one of the Gazprom-owned gas processing plants or build their own gas processing plants. Gazprom also has a monopoly on Russia’s exports of natural gas to European markets. It sells West Siberian gas to European markets at high prices of around $140-280 per million cubic meter (mmcm); however, other producers are not allowed to do so. Other producers are free to sell their gas to domestic markets using Gazprom’s pipelines but at much lower prices (around $45/mmcm). A Gazprom-owned company called Sibur Holding controls all independent gas processing operations in West Siberia. **Other factors limiting the options to reduce the flaring of associated gas in Russia are low domestic gas prices; low associated gas flow rates in some fields; insufficient capacity of the existing pipelines; and the high cost of gas infrastructure and transmission lines from remote locations to consumption points** (IEA, 2006a; PFC Energy, 2007).

**Iran**

#### 1) Wikileaks proves

**AFP 4-10-11** (“Israel ruled out Iran strike in 2005: Wikileaks” <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5jDchPChm3jDRZNAs0IctBSiXX_iQ?docId=CNG.4eb79e0b90682dda27e5e8f688957945.321>, jj)

JERUSALEM — **Israeli defence officials ruled out a strike on Iran's nuclear facilities as early as 2005, US diplomatic cables leaked to whistleblower site WikiLeaks show**, an Israeli newspaper said Sunday. **The documents** given to the Haaretz newspaper by WikiLeaks **detail conversations between US diplomats and Israeli defence officials, which suggested the Jewish state did not plan to target Iran's controversial nuclear programme**. One December 2005 cable said **Israeli officials** had **indicated there was "no chance of a military attack being carried out on Iran**," Haaretz reported. Another telegram a month later, detailing talks between a US congressman and the then deputy chief of Israel's Atomic Energy Commission, Ariel Levite, offered a stronger suggestion that **Israel considered a strike on Iran's facilities unfeasible**. Levite "said that **most Israeli officials do not believe a military solution is possible**," Haaretz quoted the telegram as saying. "**They believe Iran has learned from Israel's attack on Iraq's** **Osirak reactor (in 1981) and has dispersed the components of its nuclear programme throughout Iran, with some elements in places that Israel does not know about."**

#### 2) America would veto

**Avnery ’10** (Uri, Apr 17-Apr 30, the Arab American News, “Why Israel would never attack Iran” Vol. 26, Iss. 1262; pg. 8, proquest, jj)

It is dangerous to prophesy in such matters, especially when we are dealing with people not all of whom are wise and not all of whom are sane. Yet I am ready to maintain: **there is no possibility whatsoever that the government of Israel .will send the air force to attack Iran**. I am not going to enter into military matters. Is our air force really capable of executing such an operation? Are circumstances similar to those that prevailed 28 years ago, when the Iraqi reactor was successfully destroyed? Is it at all possible for us to eliminate the Iranian nuclear effort, whose installations are dispersed throughout the large country and buried far below the surface? I want to focus on another aspect: is it politically feasible? What would be the consequences? First of all, **a basic rule of Israeli reality: the State of Israel cannot start any large-scale military operation without American consent. Israel depends on the U. S. in almost every respect, but in no sphere is it more dependent than in the military one. The aircraft that must execute the mission were .supplied to us by the U. S. Their efficacy depends on a steady flow of American spare parts. At that range, refueling from U .S .-built tanker aircraft would be necessary. The same is true for almost all other war materiel of our army, as well as for die money needed for their acquisition. Everything comes from America**. In 1956, Israel went to war without American consent. Ben-Gurion thought that his collusion with the UK and France was enough. He was vastly mistaken. One hundred hours after telling us that the "Third Kingdom of Israel" had come into being, he announced with a broken voice that he was going to evacuate all the territories just conquered. President Dwight Eisenhower, together with his Soviet colleague, had submitted an ultimatum, and that was the end of the adventure. Since then, **Israel has not started a single war without securing the agreement of Washington. On the eve of the Six Day War, a special emissary was sent to the U.S. to make sure that there was indeed American agreement. When he returned with an affirmative answer, the order for the attack was issued**. **On the eve of Lebanon War I**, Defense Minister Ariel **Sharon rushed to Washington to obtain American consent**. He met with Secretary of State Alexander Haig, who agreed - but only on condition that there would be a clear provocation. A few days later there just happened to be an attempt on the life of the Israeli ambassador in London, and the war was on. The Israeli army's offensives against Hizbullah ("Lebanon War ?") and Hamas ("Cast Lead") were possible because they were cast as part of the American campaign against "Radical Islam." Ostensibly, that is also true for an attack on Iran. But no. Because **an Israeli attack on Iran would cause a military, political and economic disaster for the United States of America.**

#### 3) No impact

**Brookes ’04** (Peter, heritage foundation senior fellow, 9-29, Military.com, “Iran-Israel Confrontation Brewing?” <http://www.military.com/Opinions/0,,Brookes_092904,00.html>, jj)

So **what would happen if Israel decided to conduct a pre-emptive surgical strike on Iran's nuclear facilities? Some say that an Israeli attack on a Muslim country would set the Middle East ablaze in an anti-Jewish frenzy**. Possible, but **not likely.** Sure, all **Muslim governments** would vociferously condemn the Israeli strike. But most **would breathe a quiet sigh of relief. No one in the Middle East** (except maybe Syria) **wants to see fundamentalist, hegemonic Iran go nuclear. This is especially true for Iran's cross-Gulf rival, Saudi Arabia.**
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**Cp**

***Through all necessary means the Chinese government will provide all necessary resources to the Institute of Plasma Physics for the research and development of fusion power. China should offer to share this technology with the United States.***

***China can effectively develop fusion***

**Dillow 2010 (Clay, Popular Science, Dec 6)**

<http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2010-12/wikileaked-cables-beijing-reveal-chinas-pursuit-fusion-power-teleportation>

One confidential diplomatic cable sent from the Beijing Embassy to Washington in February suggests **China is doing big things** at the small scale. For one, **China is aggressively expanding its nuclear energy resources**, with plans to open at least 70 nuclear plants in the next decade. More interestingly, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (**CAS) is pouring research funding into** its Institute of Plasma Physics (IPP) to conduct ongoing research into **nuclear fusion**. Apparently China has been hard at work on its Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak (EAST) reactor, which is designed to sustain a controlled fusion reaction that can go on indefinitely at high temperatures. In 2009, **researchers a**pparently **sustained** a 18-million-degree **reaction** for 400 seconds, and a 180-million-degree reaction for 60 seconds. Their goal for 2010 was to sustain a 180-million-degree reaction for more than 400 seconds, though it’s unclear if they achieved that. Moreover, **IPP is** apparently **conducting research on hybrid fission-fusion reactors**, though details are slim.

**Cp**

***Text: the United States federal government should offer to host the Gulf Cooperation Council’s multinational consortium to provide enriched uranium to states looking to build their own nuclear power program.***

***Only an international fuel bank solves virtual proliferation – Countries will say yes***

Harold **Feiveson**, Senior Research Policy Analyst, Program on Science and Global Security, “Can Future Nuclear Power Be Made Proliferation Resistant?”, Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, July 20**08**, http://www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/files/future\_nuclear\_power.pdf

It is treacherous to imagine the institutional framework that would be relevant in fifty to one hundred years. But as an initial cut, **let us consider** three sorts of situations: • a world where there has been a significant proliferation of nuclear weapons, to say 20 to 30 states, and where there no longer is an effective Nonproliferation Treaty constraining other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons; • a world where there has been substantial nuclear disarmament, with most or all of the nuclear weapons under the authority of an international agency, possibly under the UN Security Council; • **a world more or less like the present, in which a few countries still have nuclear weapons** **and where most of the non-nuclear countries do not aspire to acquire them.** In the first case, the spread of nuclear power would have significance mainly if it led to proliferation to countries that the international community considered unfit to manage nuclear power or unfit to manage nuclear weapons. For countries such as those, states or combinations of states might try to prevent the proliferation of nuclear technology on an ad-hoc basis. In this situation, the dangers associated with nuclear power would flow from the great difficulty of assuring that nuclear power programs remain safe, and that terrorist groups are not able to get fissile material. Since some of the countries with nuclear weapons and nuclear power program could have shoddy safety and security systems, and could conceivably have ties to terrorist groups, these dangers would be evident. It is difficult to see how nuclear power could prosper in this kind of world and could be adequately safeguarded. The second case would provide the best basis for a flourishing of nuclear power. Without question, if we wished to construct a future most compatible with a robust expansion of nuclear power worldwide, it would be one marked by very substantial nuclear disarmament. In such a world, the incentives for a few rogue countries to acquire nuclear weapons would be lessened, as would the myriad of discriminatory features that now dominate non-proliferation institutions. International authorities could oversee the safety and security of nuclear facilities, and, as explained further below, any move by a country to acquire nuclear material for weapons would be confronted by strong international measures to secure compliance with international agreements. **The** third **case is probably the most likely**, and in any event the one requiring the most analysis. Much of what is discussed below would be relevant to the second case as well. Even if we focus only on the third case, a large range of alternative futures is still possible, and there is great difficulty in latching on to any one of these. Nevertheless, it is necessary to start somewhere. And so we assume the following as a first order approximation: • That **the world will not be free of nuclear weapons,** and that something like the fundamental structure of the current nonproliferation regime as defined by **the NonProliferation Treaty** (NPT), **will remain in place**. In other words, **there will remain two classes of states—declared nuclear weapon states** allowed to keep nuclear weapon **and non-nuclear weapon states that have forsworn them**. The declared nuclear weapon states under the NPT are the U.S., Russia, China, France, and the UK. India, Pakistan, and Israel also have nuclear weapons and stand outside the treaty. North Korea also at present has nuclear weapons, but may be in the process of giving them up and rejoining the NPT. The nuclear states may be different and possibly more numerous in fifty years – but let’s assume that the number of nuclear states will stay limited to on the order of ten say, and more important that most countries will not be seeking a nuclear weapons capability. • That **all, or almost all, civilian nuclear facilities will be under international safeguards, such as those now implemented by the International Atomic Energy Agency** (IAEA). **Such safeguards will include inspections at declared nuclear facilities and the universal implementation** of the so-called Additional Protocol, which authorizes the IAEA to look for undeclared, clandestine nuclear facilities. Given the flows of material in a robust nuclear future, we would add the following stipulations for an international institutional framework necessary (though not necessarily sufficient) to safeguard nuclear energy. • **The nuclear power system is non-discriminatory. Any reactor or fuel cycle facility allowed in any country must be allowed in all**. **• All enrichment and reprocessing will be under international authority; and that an international authority will guarantee fuel supply to all reactors**. At present, the NPT is supplemented by agreements among suppliers not to export certain specified materials or technologies to non-nuclear countries, and to ensure that whatever nuclear material or equipment that is exported is under safeguards. This is a discriminatory arrangement and is not likely to be sustainable. • All uranium mining and milling and possibly also all spent fuel will also be under international authority. • Countries will not be able to withdraw from the NPT (or its functional follow-on), at least in the sense that they could withdraw and appropriate fissile material and facilities that they enjoyed while in the treaty; and that there will be clear provisions for enforcing compliance with all nuclear undertakings. • **Physical security standards for all nuclear facilities will be set and imposed by international authority**. This is essential since a lapse of security anywhere will endanger every country. • No research reactors will use nuclear-explosive materials. At present, many research reactors and some reactors producing medical isotopes are using highly enriched uranium (HEU) as fuel. But scores of reactors once running on HEU have already been converted to low enriched uranium, and it seems straightforward for the international community to work toward agreements that no reactors use HEU. We elaborate briefly on the first two points. The issues here that most need clarification are: the character and scope of an international authority; the reasons for insistence on non-discrimination; and the emphasis on enforcement and compliance**. In this context, there has been renewed interest in restricting national access to enrichment and reprocessing via multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle**. At present all enrichment and reprocessing are located in “safe” states — either countries that are already nuclear weapon states or industrialized countries that have forsworn nuclear weapons. While much of the envisioned expansion of nuclear power to midcentury would probably occur in states that already have reactors, some of the new growth and sustained growth after that would necessarily involve states that do not now have such facilities. **It is conceivable that these states would be willing to rely upon existing market mechanisms supplemented by additional assurances of fresh fuel supply on favorable terms and** (especially) **by the willingness of other countries to accept spent fuel– that is, to rely on fuel cycle services done elsewhere**. To the extent that this strategy is viewed by non-nuclear weapons states as adding an additional layer of discrimination to that inherent in the NPT’s division of the world into weapons and non-weapons states, though, it will certainly encounter significant opposition despite its practical advantages. Considerable skepticism already exists about the commitment of the NPT weapons states to fulfill their commitments under the NPT, and a discriminatory market-oriented strategy to make the world safe for nuclear power could be viewed as another attempt by the nuclear weapon states and their friends to maintain a nuclear status quo that largely favors the existing weapons states, their closest allies, and their nuclear industries. The prospect that non-nuclear weapon states will willingly forgo a right that is inherent in Article IV while nuclear weapon states continue to retain, and in some cases enhance their arsenals with weapons seen to be developed for use rather than deterrence, is remote. **The only way to persuade non-nuclear weapon states to accept tighter restrictions on their peaceful nuclear programs is through some kind of multilateralization of the fuel cycle** — **an arrangement that somehow levels the playing field with respect to tightening controls over the nuclear fuel cycle, but does so in a way that is non-discriminatory, placing the same obligations and constraints on all parties while assuring all of equitable and timely access to required nuclear fuel for a civil nuclear program**. If the objective is to have states give up a right in a treaty, the result should not be further distinction between classes of states and discrimination, but rather the opposite. For this reason, we think that **the only way that nuclear power can achieve the level of political acceptability needed to permit its expansion on a significant scale for the long-term is to implement a non-discriminatory institutional framework involving multilateral ownership and operation of all enrichment, reprocessing,** a**nd possibly other fuel cycle facilities, especially for spent fuel or high-level disposal.** The way to get this strategy off the ground is for the nuclear weapon states, especially the U.S., to commit to implementing a non-discriminatory, multilateral framework for nuclear power. 19 No doubt, many in the U.S. and elsewhere in the nuclear industry take it for granted that a future nuclear system will in fact be discriminatory. For example, in a recent overview of the long-term future of nuclear power emanating from the U.S. Department of Energy, one of the authors of GNEP, Victor Reiss, notes that “the level of engagement [with nuclear power] must be dependent upon the relative national trustworthiness” of countries. Thus he envisions South Korea with a full fuel cycle and full control of the fuel cycle, Iran with reactors only and leasing fuel made elsewhere, North Korea limited to leasing and nuclear batteries, and Sudan with no nuclear power at all. 20 This understanding that certain technologies will be out of bounds for some countries, but not others is a widely shared assumption in the U.S. As already remarked, this paper assumes that the nuclear weapon regime will remain discriminatory, at least for the foreseeable future. But we believe that hoping to add another dimension involving nuclear power to this discrimination is illusory. **In a future nuclear system, technical barriers alone cannot prevent countries from obtaining nuclear-explosive materials and eventually nuclear weapons**. 21 **Therefore, the critical safeguard to country proliferation will be the certainty of enforcement and the likelihood of enforcement will depend upon the strength of international consensus in support of the regime.** If many countries view a nuclear power regime as discriminatory and illegitimate, it is difficult to imagine a sufficient consensus on enforcement being achieved. Still more telling, **even if one adopted the thinking of those who do not wish to trust advanced and sensitive nuclear technologies to certain countries, one must realize that countries that might at one point be considered “safe” may not be considered safe at later times**. **Since ready access to fissile materials could for some countries constitute a real threat, we should not allow national control over sensitive nuclear facilities.** At various times in the past, the IAEA considered regional and other alternatives to national control of sensitive nuclear facilities. For example, in the 1970s, the IAEA endorsed the idea of regional nuclear fuel cycle centers, primarily with reprocessing in mind. This concept soon faded in the wake of a slowdown in the growth of nuclear power, a sharp drop in uranium prices, and the emergence of strong U.S. resistance to reprocessing the plutonium recycling. Similarly, in the late 1970s, countries considered for a time the idea of an International Plutonium Storage, a concept that also fell out of favor. The idea of the IPS is based on Article XII.A.5 of the IAEA statute that specifies circumstances in which the Agency can require that excess special fissionable materials from peaceful uses be deposited with the Agency to prevent stockpiling by states. In addition to the the same kinds of arguments that worked against the regional nuclear fuel cycle centers, the IPS foundered on the inability of countries to define the exact conditions under which contributing countries could withdraw fissionable material deposited with the Agency. 22 Regional and **multinational arrangements appear achievable and would represent a significant improvement over a multiplicity of national enrichment and reprocessing facilities, offering economies of scale and reduced risk of proliferation**. In the longer term, to achieve a nuclear power system that is seen as truly non-discriminatory and even more supportive of nonproliferation, the establishment of an international authority to oversee and manage all sensitive nuclear fuel cycle facilities for all countries would be preferable. The initial attempt to sketch a framework for safeguarding nuclear power, the Acheson-Lilienthal Report, included these activities among the “dangerous” activities that an international authority would have to control. The Report also included uranium mining and milling as dangerous activities. Although the extent of uranium deposits are far wider spread than the authors of the Acheson-Lilienthal Report imagined, we believe it worth considering including these under the activities controlled by an international authority. We also would include spent fuel as part of the auspices of an international authority. See Appendix B for an overview assessment of several regional and international arrangements that have been suggested. We do not here analyze the details of how an international authority would operate – how exactly it would control or manage enrichment, reprocessing, uranium mining, and spent fuel. Researchers have recently forwarded some ideas ranging from reliance on existing market mechanisms supplemented by additional assurances of fresh fuel supply and spent fuel return provided by governments and the IAEA, to coownership and operation of both existing and new fuel cycle facilities. 23 Whatever the institutional arrangements, **civilian nuclear power will provide a country the basis eventually for a dedicated weapons program – by allowing a country to train scientists and engineers, to build research facilities, and to learn techniques of reprocessing and enrichment that could later be turned to weapons uses. A civilian program could, in this manner, impel a country along a path of “latent proliferation,” in which the country moves closer to nuclear weapons without having to make an explicit decision actually to take the final step to weapons, or at least to make transparent its intention to take such a step**. **Latent proliferation is particularly germane to consideration of the spread of civilian nuclear power to countries that do not now have any, and which, therefore, would not today have a ready infrastructure to support a dedicated route to nuclear weapons.** In our view, this situation cannot be helped. **Civilian nuclear power will always present some degree of latent proliferation**. For many countries today, this does not represent a serious concern, since the countries can always undertake a dedicated route to nuclear weapons, with no need to rely upon the civilian fuel cycle. **In the future, with many new countries entering into nuclear power, we cannot so easily wave away the latent proliferation inherent in nuclear power programs**. But, as we have also emphasized, **in a world where most countries simply do not want nuclear weapons and where nuclear power is not constructed on a discriminatory basis, a complex of safeguards, international control of key fuel cycle elements, and well accepted compliance provisions could provide a reasonable degree of proliferation resistance.**

***US nuclear leadership causes prolif of civilian nuclear tech --- spurs arms race***

**Fuhrmann, ’9**

~[Matthew, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, Summer, "Spreading Temptation: Proliferation and Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation," International Security Vol. 34, No. 1. MIT Press Journals~]

**This article examines the relationship between peaceful nuclear cooperation and nuclear weapons proliferation**. Specifically, it explores whether **countries receiving civilian nuclear aid over time are more likely to initiate weapons programs and build the bomb**. The conventional wisdom is that civilian nuclear cooperation does not lead to proliferation. Most scholars argue that nuclear weapons spread when states have a demand for the bomb—not when they have the technical capacity to proliferate.4 Those who recognize the im-portance of the supply side of proliferation argue that certain types of nuclear assistance enable countries to build nuclear weapons but that others are innocuous or even positive from a nonproliferation standpoint. Nuclear suppliers, for instance, generally restrict the sale of uranium enrichment or plutonium reprocessing facilities because these can be used directly to produce fissile material for a bomb, but suppliers routinely build research or power reactors in other countries and train foreign scientists.5 A recent study finds that countries receiving enrichment and reprocessing facilities, bomb designs, or significant quantities of weapons-grade fissile material are more likely to acquire the bomb.6 The implication of this research is that other forms of atomic assistance do not lead to the spread of nuclear weapons. **This article argues that the conventional wisdom is wrong—and dangerous. All types of civilian nuclear assistance raise the risks of proliferation. Peaceful nuclear cooperation and proliferation are causally connected because of the dual-use nature of nuclear technology and know-how**.7 **Civilian cooperation provides technology and materials necessary for a nuclear weapons program and helps to establish expertise in matters relevant to building the bomb**. I develop four hypotheses based on this general insight. First, **receiving civilian nuclear assistance over time increases the likelihood that states will begin nuclear weapons programs because it reduces the expected costs of such a campaign and inspires greater confidence among leaders that the bomb could be successfully developed**. Second, militarized disputes with other countries condition the effect of civilian nuclear assistance on program initiation. **The likelihood that nuclear assistance causes countries to begin weapons programs increases as their security environments worsen.** Third, **peaceful aid increases the probability that countries will successfully build nuclear weapons.** Fourth, **this is especially true when a country’s security environment deteriorates**. To test these hypotheses, I produced a data set on civilian nuclear assistance based on the coding of all NCAs signed from 1945 to 2000.8 **A combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis yields support for my arguments, even when controlling for the other variables thought to influence proliferation**. The results from my statistical analysis indicate that other factors, such as industrial capacity and membership in the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), also have significant effects on proliferation. But **peaceful cooperation is among the few variables that is *consistently salient* in explaining both nuclear weapons program onset and weapons acquisition.**

***Nuclear power plants encourage a virtual arms race – leads to nuclear war***

Joseph **Cirincione**, Senior Fellow and Director for Nuclear Policy at the Center for American Progress, and Andrew Grotto, Senior National Security Analysts at the Center for American Progress, “Contain and Engage”, CAP, March **2007**, http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2007/02/pdf/iran\_report.pdf

Regardless of how Iran behaves with a nuclear- or near nuclear-weapons capability, the leaders of predominantly Sunni Arab countries in the region, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, will feel varying degrees of pressure to develop nuclear programs of their own. Like Iran, they would not necessarily need to build and test a weapon in order to match Iran’s perceived capabilities; a nuclear energy industry and its supporting infrastructure—specifically fuel cycle technology—could be enough. This is already happening. In September 2006, Gamal Mubarak, son of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak and the presumed successor for Egypt’s presidency, suggested that Egypt develop nuclear power. He also wryly noted that Egypt “is not the only country that is thinking about this alternative to save on energy sources.” Indeed, Turkey has also indicated renewed interest in nuclear power, and the IAEA has reported that up to a dozen Arab countries have expressed similar interest. Most recently the states of the Gulf Cooperation Council announced plans for developing nuclear power for a water desalinization project. And Jordan’s King Abdullah has suggested that his country, too, should explore nuclear energy. Iran could even share nuclear technology with other countries, as Pakistan’s A.Q. Khan did. Iran’s leaders have already suggested they would be prepared to share nuclear technology with other Muslim countries as energy development aid. While this is a far cry from sharing nuclear fissile materials or weapons with Hezbollah, these statements could be interpreted as a commitment to export uranium enrichment technology and thereby enable other countries to move to the brink of having nuclear weapons. Iran might do this in an attempt to broaden its sphere of influence, drive a wedge between the United States and Muslim countries, or reassure Saudi Arabia and other Sunni nations that the rise of predominantly Shia Iran as a regional power with a “near nuclear” capability does not threaten them. Whether from cooperation or competition, though, Iran’s regional rivals are likely to pursue their own nuclear options. All these nations will insist their programs are purely peaceful, and yet all of them would be laying the basis for future nuclear weapons development. This “virtual” arms race in the Middle East, where countries have the ability to build a weapon on relatively short notice, could quickly lead to a Middle East with not one nuclear weapon state (Israel), but four or five such states. With so many existing territorial, political and ethnic conflicts unresolved, this is a recipe for nuclear war.

**1nc Shell – Iran Impact**

***A) Obama win but its close***

**AP, 9/20**/12 (Associated Press, “Obama boosted by upbeat housing reports, new polls,” http://www.bostonherald.com/news/us\_politics/view/20120920obama\_boosted\_by\_upbeat\_housing\_reports\_new\_polls/srvc=home&position=recent, bgm)

Other new surveys suggested growing support for Obama in the wake of back-to-back national political conventions and Romney’s struggle last week to explain an erroneous statement issued at a time of demonstrations â€" one of them deadly â€" at U.S. diplomatic posts in the Middle East. An NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll taken Sept. 12-16 put the president’s lead among likely voters at 50-44 percent nationwide. State surveys by Quinnipiac University, The New York Times [NYT] and CBS News showed Obama at over 50 percent support among likely voters in Virginia, with 13 electoral votes, and Wisconsin, with 10. Obama carried Wisconsin handily four years ago, but Romney recently signaled he was hoping to make it competitive. The two men were in a statistical tie in Colorado, which has 9 electoral votes, in surveys conducted between Sept. 11 and 17. A Washington Post poll also showed Obama with a lead in Virginia. All the surveys were taken before the flap erupted over Romney’s "47 percent" remarks. Taken together, they showed a **highly competitive** race as Obama and Romney pursue the 270 electoral votes needed for victory, although with the president in a stronger position than before the two political conventions and with the economy still the dominant issue.

***B) Link --- plan drives a wedge into Obama’s base --- they’re key to re-election***

**Mick ‘10**

Jason Mick, 6-19-10, Daily Tech, Obama Fights For Nuclear, Environmentalists Label Him a Shill <http://www.dailytech.com/Obama+Fights+For+Nuclear+Environmentalists+Label+Him+a+Shill/article18781.htm>, jj

Despite these small victories, President **Obama's nuclear vision faces many impending obstacles**. Despite the fact that you could tear down one of the nation's old reactors, replace it with a dozen modern clean reactor designs and still have less net waste, some **environmentalist groups remain adamantly opposed to new plant construction.** **They have vowed to bury the bid for clean nuclear power under a flood of lawsuits. If the suits succeed, they will raise the cost of nuclear so high, that it can't even compete with the most expensive forms of nuclear energy, like solar power.** And perhaps **the biggest obstacle to Obama's nuclear vision will come in 2012**. That is the year when he will face reelection. **That may prove challenging given that** one of **his** former **key constituent groups -- the environmental lobby -- has become one of his staunchest critics**. Regardless, the U.S. is making its first true nuclear progress in 30 years, and that is among the many factors that will already make President Obama's presidency noteworthy.

***Obama’s margin for error is small --- plan deflates democrat enthusiasm***

**TNF ‘12**

1-3, The New Fuelist, Obama’s tall environmental task in 2012 <http://www.newfuelist.com/blog/obama-coal-regulations-keystone-pipeline>, jj

In case you can’t see it, **that’s a treacherous tightrope Barack Obama is walking on these days whenever he steps into the circus-like national energy and environmental policy debate. And his margin for political error on environmental issues will shrink even more during this election year. To avoid alienating environmentalists who supported him in 2008, he must not forget to occasionally—and substantially—lean to the left.** But if he wants to hold on to coveted independent voters who are more worried about the slumping economy than they are about pollution, he must also periodically shift back to the middle and right.The proposed Keystone XL pipeline embodies the President’s conundrum. From the right, calls for increased “energy security” and for the creation of (a disputed number) of pipeline-related jobs make it hard for him to say no. On the left, a large and organized anti-pipeline contingent has taken pains to turn the decision on the pipeline—which will carry crude made from Canadian oil sands, the extraction and production of which makes the fuel much more greenhouse gas-intense than conventional oil—into a political make-or-break for Obama on climate change. The administration spent 2011 establishing what it must view as a politically necessary middle ground on the environment. It engineered a drastic ratcheting up of fuel efficiency standards for automakers, and sold it as a way to both reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the burden on the consumer. It also introduced landmark regulations on air pollution from power plants, while placating utilities—and outraging many supporters—by delaying the EPA’s proposed tightening of the nation’s standards for smog. And it earned at least temporary relief from pressure to decide on the Keystone XL by punting the issue past the election, to 2013. But **it’s going to be tougher to maintain balance on the tightrope this year.** Congressional Republicans, by demanding a much-earlier Obama decision on the Keystone XL in exchange for their support of the recent payroll tax extension, have hinted at their party’s desire to force the President’s hand on environmental issues. **The GOP’s presidential nominee will undoubtedly attempt to paint Obama as an over-regulator and irrational environmentalist—an attack line which will warrant a defense. And therein lies Obama’s tall task:** to defend his administration’s substantial forays into environmental regulation in terms that resonate with independents whose main concern is the economy—all while simultaneously **ensuring that his frustrated environmentalist supporters don’t completely lose their patience**.

***C) Republicans will strike Iran***

**Wickham** 12-19-**11** (DeWayne Wickham is a columnist for USA Today, Iraq War is over; will GOP replace it with Iran?

<http://www.statesmanjournal.com/article/20111220/OPINION/112200303/Iraq-War-over-will-GOP-replace-Iran->, jj)

On the day the Iraq War officially ended, **seven Republicans who are champing at the bit to be their party's standard bearer in next year's presidential race were** on a stage in Sioux City, Iowa, **debating the possibility of Iran joining the world's nuclear weapons club**. And **all but one of them** — in that setting, or on other recent campaign stages — **threatened to launch a new Middle East war to keep that Islamic republic from becoming a nuclear power. Only** Rep. Ron **Paul**, R-Texas, **a long shot to win the GOP nomination**, **sounds like an adult when it comes to Iran. Iran is destined to become a nuclear state**. While that's not a thought I relish, it's a reality the pragmatists in the bowels of the U.S. government surely understand. **If Iran hadn't made an irreversible decision to obtain nuclear weapons before an American-backed NATO force helped Libyan rebels topple Moammar Gadhafi, it must have done so after he was chased from power and summarily executed**. **The government in Tehran**, which has threatened the annihilation of Israel, **knows it could end up like Gadhafi's regime without the protection that a nuclear arsenal would give it**. **Indeed, even the world's most erratic states like North Korea understand the relative defensive comfort that even a few nuclear weapons assures**. Iranian leaders understand this, too. **They know their survival depends on their ability to ward off a foreign-assisted regime change attack from within, or a direct assault from an outside force, like the U.S. invasion of Iraq. And a nuclear bomb will give them that blocking power.** **To say, as** even President **Obama does, that no options have been taken off the table is one thing. To publicly proclaim a determination to make war on Iran to keep it from getting a nuclear weapon is an unequivocal commitment to a new and more costly Middle East conflict**. In nearly nine years of fighting, the Iraqi War took the lives of 4,487 American men and women, and wounded 32,226. While nothing approaches the human toll wrought by that war, **the financial cost — approximately $800 billion — has taken a big bite out of our national treasury. If one of the hawkish Republican contenders becomes president, the human and financial costs of the war they've threatened to launch against Iran will pale in comparison with the price we paid in Iraq**. **The Republican hawks**, no doubt, **will argue this is a cost we must pay to stop Iran from using a nuclear weapon against Israel — our most reliable ally in the region**. But unless Iranian leaders want to turn their entire nation into a suicide bomber, they won't risk the nuclear retaliation Israel would rain down upon them at the first sign of an Iranian nuclear-tipped missile heading toward the Jewish state.

***Iran attack will cause a global nuclear war that leads to human extinction***

**Hirsch** Professor at the University of Califorina at San Diego 20**08**

(Seymour Hirsch, Professor of physics @ the University of California @ San Diego, 4/10/2k8 http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=HIR20060422&articleId=2317)

**Iran is likely to respond to any US attack using its considerable missile arsenal against US forces in Iraq and elsewhere in the Persian Gulf**. Israel may attempt to stay out of the conflict, **it is not clear whether Iran would target Israel in a retaliatory strike but it is certainly possible. If the US attack includes nuclear weapons use against Iranian facilities,** as I believe is very likely, rather than deterring **Iran it will cause a much more violent response. Iranian military forces and militias are likely to storm into southern Iraq and the US may be forced to use nuclear weapons against them, causing large scale casualties and inflaming the Muslim world. There could be popular uprisings in other countries in the region like Pakistan, and of course a Shiite uprising in Iraq against American occupiers.** Finally I would like to discuss the grave consequences to America and the world if the US uses nuclear weapons against Iran. First, **the likelihood of terrorist attacks against Americans both on American soil and abroad will be enormously enhanced after these events. And terrorist's attempts to get hold of "loose nukes" and use them against Americans will be enormously incentivized after the US used nuclear weapons against Iran. , it will destroy America's position as the leader of the free world. The rest of the world rightly recognizes that nuclear weapons are qualitatively different from all other weapons, and that there is no sharp distinction between small and large nuclear weapons, or between nuclear weapons targeting facilities versus those targeting armies or civilians.** It will not condone the breaking of the nuclear taboo in an unprovoked war of aggression against a non-nuclear country, and the US will become a pariah state. **Third, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty will cease to exist, and many of its 182 non-nuclear-weapon-country signatories will strive to acquire nuclear weapons as a deterrent to an attack by a nuclear nation. With no longer a taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, any regional conflict may go nuclear and expand into global nuclear war. Nuclear weapons are million-fold more powerful than any other weapon, and the existing nuclear arsenals can obliterate humanity many times over. In the past, global conflicts terminated when one side prevailed. In the next global conflict we will all be gone before anybody has prevailed.**

**1nc**

***Transition to renewables coming now***

**Bowen ‘12**

Currently a businessman, Robert Bowen served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980s as a moderate Democrat. He was also appointed by three different governors to serve on various boards and commissions. He has followed political news, national news headlines and international news closely for almost five decades.

8-22-12, Examiner, US carbon emissions are declining due to clean energy <http://www.examiner.com/article/us-carbon-emissions-are-declining-due-to-clean-energy>, jj

US carbon emissions are declining due to clean energy

A new report that studied 2,500 electrical power plants owned by 100 utilities in the United States was released this week and it shows that **harmful carbon pollution is on the decline. This is due to a transition to clean energy**. The report is out just before the science-deniers open their national convention in Tampa next Monday. The 2012 Benchmarking Air Emissions report looked at 2010-2011 data from the US Energy Information Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency to determine trends in four power plant pollutants: carbon dioxide (CO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen oxide (NOx) and mercury (Hg). The report looked at 100 utilities operating 2,500 power plants. These plants account for 86% of electricity generation and 88% of all emissions in the nation. The good news is that three of the pollutants studied have declined significantly. **The primary reason** is that coal power plants have been closing and are replaced by natural gas. Another factor **is the increase of electrical generation from wind and solar.** These **utilities have doubled their use of renewable energy since 2004. Renewables now account for 5% of the US electricity supply according to the report.** Natural gas now supplies 32% of all US electrical generation which is about the same as coal. Natural gas consumption by the electric power sector has risen an average of 4% annually for the past 10 years Power plants in 2010 were responsible for about 65% of SO2 emissions overall, 16% of NOx emissions, 68% of mercury air emissions and 40% of CO2 emissions. Because of this transition to gas and renewables, SO2 emissions are down 40% and NOx emissions are down 35% since 2008. More coal power plants are slated to close this year. These moth-balled plants produce about 40 gigawatts (GW) of electricity representing 12% of the US coal-fired capacity. Even though this trend began in earnest under the Bush administration, Mitt Romney is running ads accusing President Obama for waging a “war on coal.” If such a war exists, the result seems to be cleaner, healthier air and fewer greenhouse gas emissions. Maybe it is a good thing. **Southern Company**, a utility in the Southwest with more than 4.4 million customers and 43,000 MWs of generating capacity is one of the nation's most coal-intensive power producers. Southern, will use more natural gas than coal in 2012 for the first time in its 100-year history. The utility **owns a 30 MW solar PV plant** with Ted Turner **in New Mexico - the partnership just made a second solar acquisition. Its subsidiary**, Alabama Power, **buys wind energy from a farm in Oklahoma, and another unit, Georgia Power, is working on its first utility-scale project. Colorado’s Xcel Energy brought 68MW of new solar on line so far this year.** CO2 emissions from power plants are down 9% in the United States since 2008, more than any country or region. This decline occurred despite a global rise in emissions to record levels in 2011, largely due to a 9.3% leap in greenhouse gas emissions in China. The authors of the report were optimistic. "**This is an historic transition for the electric power industry**," says Mindy Lubber, president of Ceres, which prepared the report with M.J. Bradley & Associates, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Entergy, Exelon, Tenaska and Bank of America. "**More and more power producers are shifting away from coal-fired generation in favor of lower-emitting** natural gas-fired plants, **renewable power and energy efficiency**. **The economic case for cleaner energy is better than it's ever been, and this report shows that the industry is adapting to stronger Clean Air Act emissions standards, state-driven efficiency and renewable energy incentives** and the dynamics of the current natural gas market." The data shows that an **energy policy that shifts to** cleaner gas and **renewables does in fact make a difference**. The problem is, Congress wants to put an end to renewable energy, and Mitt Romney seems to be a big fan of coal. Should he win, no one but the Almighty knows what his energy agenda will be, but odds are that he will slow if not reverse the trend to clean energy that is showing results in our air quality.

***Nuclear dries up renewable investment***

**Charman, 6** – Karen, environmental journalist and managing editor at the Capitalism Nature Socialism journal (“Brave Nuclear World?/Commentary: Nuclear revival? Don’t bet on it!”, July/august, Vol. 19, pg. 12, Proquest)

**Governments and markets are beginning to recognize the potential of renewable energy and its use is growing rapidly**. According to Worldwatch Institute's Renewables 2005, global investment in renewable energy in 2004 was about US$30 billion. **The report points out that renewable sources generated 20 percent of the amount of electricity produced by the world's 443 operating nuclear reactors in 2004**. Renewables now account for 20-25 percent of global power sector investment, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development predicts that over the next 30 years one-third of the investment in new power sources in OECD countries will be for renewable energy.

**Alternative energy guru Amory Lovins says the investment in alternatives is currently "an order of magnitude" greater than that now being spent on building new nuclear plants**. Lovins has been preaching lower-cost alternatives, including energy conservation, for more than three decades, and the realization of his vision of sustainable, renewable energy is perhaps closer than ever. He **argues that the current moves to re-embrace nuclear power are a huge step backwards, and that contrary to claims that we need to consider all options to deal with global warming, nuclear power would actually hinder the effort because of the high cost and the long time it would take to get enough carbon-displacing nuclear plants up and running**. "In practice, **keeping nuclear power alive means *diverting private and public investment* from the cheaper market winners-cogeneration, renewables, and efficiency-to the costly market loser**. Its higher cost than competitors, per unit of net CO2 displaced, means that **every dollar invested in nuclear expansion will worsen climate change**," he writes in his 2005 paper "Nuclear Power: Economics and Climate-Protection Potential."

***Continued investment key to renewable energy***

**Kauffman ‘12**

Richard Kauffman, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of Energy, 8-9-12, Seizing a Clean Energy Opportunity <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-kauffman/a-clean-energy-opportunity_b_1761543.html?utm_hp_ref=green>, jj

**Over the past four years, we have seen tremendous progress in the development and deployment of renewable energy technologies** that should give us all hope that America can lead in the global clean energy economy. **These technologies are helping to create new jobs and new industries domestically, while reducing carbon pollution and helping to address the challenges of climate change.** Want more reasons to be optimistic about driving progress in the development and deployment of renewable energy? **Just look at some of the most significant challenges we face -- and how easy it could be to overcome them**. While the technological advances are exciting, there is also important work to do in the other aspects of clean energy, particularly as it relates to financing. For a variety of reasons, including provisions in the tax code, it can cost over 10 percent more to finance a renewable energy project than it does a traditional energy project. **But with a few small changes in how we finance renewable energy projects, we can help to make it easier and more affordable to bring clean energy to families and businesses nationwide.** A few things to keep in mind: 1. **Renewable energy is reliable, the technologies work, and costs are dropping dramatically**. **Deploying the technologies globally and at scale has helped costs to decline far faster than almost anyone could have anticipated**. **Solar costs**, for example, **are down more than 75 percent over the last four year**s. As Neil Auerbach of Hudson Clean Energy put it, "**renewable energy is the only energy source that gets cheaper the more it is deployed."** 2. As the industry gets to scale, the importance of reducing non-hardware (or so called "soft costs") becomes increasingly important. In the case of solar, equipment costs now account for just 46 percent of the total costs of an installed system, with 54 percent of the total coming from everything else, including installation, financing, insurance and permits. **There are ways to bring** these **soft costs down that don't require major technology breakthroughs**. That's why the Energy Department is partnering with industry to look at everything from standardizing building permits to construction techniques to new insurance products to do just that. 3. Helping to expand access to and reduce the cost of financing projects is a critical step in significantly reducing overall project costs. Renewable energy projects in the U.S. rely upon an old-fashioned, antiquated form of financing that's different from how other parts of the U.S. economy are financed. Rather than using bond or stock markets, projects depend on non-capital markets sources of investment, like banks, where the cost of capital can approach typical private equity rates of return of 12-15 percent. The Energy Department has been pursuing multiple avenues to help expand capital markets financing for renewable energy that could potentially halve the cost of accessing equity capital and drive down other costs of financing as well. Again, these reductions in costs don't require going to the lab; they involve applying financing techniques that are widely used in other parts of the economy, but have not yet been applied to this sector. 4. In addition to deploying cleaner sources of energy, **we can achieve dramatic reductions in carbon pollution by investing in** cost-effective energy efficiency **improvements. Financing is a key constraint here** as well, since lenders are not certain that investments in efficiency will either work as advertised, whether the borrower will save or spend the savings, or whether the building will be worth more after the investments have been made. Additionally, a lack of standardized contracts makes it difficult to bundle small projects into securities that would attract the interest of institutional investors. Despite these difficulties, we are working with industry and other stakeholders to find solutions to these contracting and data challenges. And like **with renewable energy**, we can be optimistic because **technology isn't the binding constraint - it's about finding ways to mobilize proven financing instruments that already exist elsewhere and applying it to this growing global sector.** 5. If we begin thinking about energy projects as financial assets, as well as energy assets, **we can help to encourage additional, smart investments in these industries. Currently, renewable energy and energy efficiency projects offer investors something that, between a volatile stock market and low interest rates, is very difficult to find: current yields.** Basically, we have an asset-liability mismatch. The banks and non-capital markets that are currently the primary financiers in the renewable energy sector are generally looking for short-term yields. Renewable energy projects, however, are typically longer-term investments that provide stable returns over long periods of times (15 or 20 years, for example). Longer-term investments like these are very appealing to pension funds or insurance companies that need long-term yields to match their long-dated liabilities. However, because renewable energy projects currently aren't able to seek investment in capital markets, new classes of investors who want to invest in renewable energy projects can't. Fixing this mix-match would reduce financing costs for projects, further reducing the overall cost of clean energy. That's good for investors, good for project developers, and good for American consumers. 6. We can be optimistic because most Americans support investments in clean energy. This includes strong bipartisan support for clean, renewable energy at the state level, with over a dozen states currently developing their own clean energy finance entities. But while reasons remain to be hopeful about the progress of the industry, **there are serious headwinds that could have a significant impact on America's clean energy industry**, and we cannot be complacent. We are making gains globally in the clean energy race, but much of that progress is due to government programs and support that are coming to an end. In fact, 75 percent of U.S. government support programs -- including the 1705 loan guarantee program, the 1603 program to provide tax grants in lieu of tax credits and the Production Tax Credit -- have expired or are set to expire soon. Throughout our country's history -- from aviation to agriculture, from biotechnologies to computer technologies -- the federal government has supported the private sector to keep the United States at the technological forefront of important industries. To seize the clean energy opportunity, we must do so again - and we must act now. Around the world, countries recognize that renewable energy represents one of the biggest economic opportunities for the global economy. There are some in Washington, however, who think we can't compete with other countries, who think that we have already lost the clean energy race. I can tell you firsthand, the clean energy industry in the U.S. is able and prepared to produce real energy for American consumers. **By combining America's historic leadership in technological and manufacturing innovation with improvements in how we finance renewable energy and energy efficiency projects across the country, we can once again lead the world in this critical sector.**

***Green energy key to prevent extinction***

**Jagger ‘08** (Bianca, Chair, World Future Council, CQ Congressional Testimony, "RENEWABLE ENERGY," 3/6, lexis)

**“If we go beyond the point where human intervention can no longer stabilise the system, then we precipitate unstoppable runaway climate change. That will set in motion a major extinction event** comparable to the five other extinction crises that the earth has previously experienced.” As climate change kicks in, the tropical and subtropical countries of Africa, South Asia and Latin America will heat up more and more, with temperatures becoming increasingly intolerable. **Droughts will affect large parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Melting glaciers will flood river valleys and then, when they have disappeared, unprecedented droughts will occur. Poor, low-lying countries** such as Bangladesh **will find it** much **harder to cope with sea level rise** than Holland or Florida. If current trends are allowed to continue, **hundreds of millions of people in the poorer countries will lose their homes, as well as the land on which they grow their crops. And then there is the threat of diseases**: By the end of the century **182 million people in sub-Saharan Africa alone could die of diseases directly attributable to climate change**, according to Christian Aid. **Given the scale of this impending disaster, we have no choice but to embark upon a global renewable energy revolution, by replacing our carbon-driven economy with a renewable energy economy**. **The challenge we are facing now is how to switch to a more secure, lower-carbon energy system that** does not undermine economic and social development, and **addresses the threats of climate change** and global inequality.

**Science diplomacy**

***They don’t access science diplomacy – must engage in a comprehensive strategy, not just foster new tech   
Zewail ‘10 (Ahmed, Obama’s science envoy to the Middle East and prof of physics @ Cal Institute of Technology. Christian Science Monitor, “Science, not Hollywood or Starbucks, is America's best soft power” Jun 28 2010.*** [***http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Global-Viewpoint/2010/0628/Science-not-Hollywood-or-Starbucks-is-America-s-best-soft-power***](http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Global-Viewpoint/2010/0628/Science-not-Hollywood-or-Starbucks-is-America-s-best-soft-power)***)***

First, **the US needs to define a coherent and comprehensive policy for pursuing science diplomacy with Muslim-majority countries**. Despite many efforts by both public and private organizations, **their initiatives remain fragmented**. Second, the focus of a better-integrated effort should be on improving education and fostering the scientific and technological infrastructure that will bring about genuine economic gains and social and political progress. **One way to build human capital in science, for example, would be for the US to encourage and support the creation of relatively simple earth science labs in elementary schools, along with the teacher training necessary to stimulate curiosity about workings of nature.** For older students, I propose a new program, “Reformation of Education and Development,” whose acronym, READ, would have special significance for Muslims, as it is the first word of the Quran. **Through the READ program, the US would support the establishment of centers of excellence in science and technology that can serve as educational hubs for talented high school and university students throughout the region. Third, these efforts must complement, not replace, US efforts to promote human rights and democratic governance in the Muslim world. The United States must also continue to pursue a just and secure two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and work toward freeing the Middle East from nuclear proliferation.**

***SQ solves - Clinton is aggressively pursuing science diplomacy  
Turekian ‘10 (Vaughan C., Chief international officer, AAAS, Washington, DC. Medical News Today, 21 July.*** [***http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/195393.php***](http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/195393.php)***)***

"**Innovation, science [and] technology must again become fundamental components of how we conduct development work**," Secretary of State Hillary Rodham **Clinton told a "high-level meeting of international development and science experts**" last week, [SciDev.net](http://www.scidev.net/en/news/clinton-puts-science-at-heart-of-us-development-strategy.html) reports**. The meeting**, Transforming Development Through Science Technology and Innovation, "**was originally billed as a consultation to help map out a 'bold new' science strategy for [USAID]. But observers say it went beyond that, putting science and innovation firmly at the heart of USAID's work and the administration's development policy**." The article notes that the meeting "follows the recent appointment of a science and technology adviser and repeated calls for USAID to consider more focused approach to its support of science and technology in developing countries," the news service writes. Specifically, **Clinton "emphasised the need to collaborate with the private sector, non-governmental organizations and, particularly, local groups." She also said the administration is encouraging science diplomacy and exploring ways to promote innovation by including competitions "that encourage more people to put their own intellectual capital to work."**

***Science diplomacy can’t solve the impacts  
David*** *Dickson****, 6/4/****09****, SciDev, "the limits of science diplomacy,"*** [***http://www.scidev.net/en/editorials/the-limits-of-science-diplomacy.html***](http://www.scidev.net/en/editorials/the-limits-of-science-diplomacy.html)

Recently, the Obama administration has given this field a new push, in its desire to pursue "soft diplomacy" in regions such as the Middle East. Scientific agreements have been at the forefront of the administration's activities in countries such as Iraq and Pakistan. But — as emerged from a meeting entitled New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy, held in London this week (1–2 June) — **using science for diplomatic purposes is not as straightforward as it seems**. Some scientific collaboration clearly demonstrates what countries can achieve by working together. For example, a new synchrotron under construction in Jordan is rapidly becoming a symbol of the potential for teamwork in the Middle East. But **whether scientific cooperation can become a precursor for political collaboration is less evident**. For example, **despite hopes that the Middle East synchrotron would help bring peace to the region, several countries have been reluctant to support it until the Palestine problem is resolved**. Indeed, one speaker at the London meeting (organised by the UK's Royal Society and the American Association for the Advancement of Science) even suggested **that the changes scientific innovations bring inevitably lead to turbulence and upheaval. In such a context, viewing science as a driver for peace may be wishful thinking.**

**Heg**

***1) Heg high and sustainable now – overwhelming power***

**Tufts Daily 2-23-11** (Prashanth Parameswaran, master's candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, writer for the New Strait Times, Strait Times and China Post, and former CSIS intern, “America is not in decline” <http://www.tuftsdaily.com/op-ed/prashanth-parameswaran-the-asianist-1.2478466>, jj)

I don't. **Very little about "American decline" is real or new. Similar predictions of U.S. decline have surfaced every decade or so** since Washington rebuilt the international system after World War II, from the aftermath of Sputnik in the 1960s to the economic distress of the 1980s. Foreign Policy is also hardly the only peddler of the latest declinism fetish. Everyone from [Newsweek's](http://newsweek.com) Fareed Zakaria to former Singaporean diplomat Kishore Mahbubani to American intelligence agencies themselves has parroted a version of it. But every myth has a grain of truth. In this case it's the fact that — God forbid — other powers are rising. Goldman Sachs says China will overtake the U.S. economy by 2027 and that the BRIC nations (**Brazil, Russia, India and China) will emerge as major world players**. But **so what? Other powers have been rising for decades**. **Yet,** to take one statistic**, the American economy in 2004 was the same size relative to the world's total GDP as it was in 1975 — 20 percent.** The real and more useful questions about decline are therefore not who is growing and by how much, but whether emerging powers can dent American power sufficiently and whether the United States will lose the key advantages that have sustained it as the world's sole superpower. **For all the fretting, the United States,** as Mr. Rachman himself admits, **remains the leader across the board. U.S. military power is still unmatched and vastly technologically superior to any other nation. Military spending is almost as much as the rest of the world combined. The American economy dominates futuristic industries like biotechnology and nanotechnology with a potent combination of technological prowess and entrepreneurial flair.** According to China's own Jiao Tong University's rankings, **17 of the world's top 20 universities are American. Millions still flock here to pursue the American Dream, while America's melting pot of cultures bodes well for its exceptional innovative capacity**. Provided the United States continues to encourage immigration and starts controlling its debt, **there is little reason to believe that such a *resilient colossus* will see its vast advantages perish**. **There are also few signs of a "global multipolar system" emerging anytime soon.** Despite doomsday realist predictions, **no country has attempted to balance Washington's hegemony since 1991**. And while the future rise of Asian powers may boost the case for eventual American decline, the truth is that **each of the United States' potential balancers also faces significant challenges going forward. For China, it is the growing disparity between its coastal and inland areas, its physical isolation and the risk that it will get old before it gets rich. For India and the European Union, the challenge will be to painfully negotiate the divergent interests of states in a noisy democratic system. As for Iran, Russia and Venezuela, they are flexing their muscles as proud spoilers, not global powers. It is also quite unlikely that these states will soon form a coalition to confront the United States, given their own divergent interests.** Even China and Russia compete ferociously in Central Asia today. Don't get me wrong. I don't believe we've reached Francis Fukuyama's "end of history," particularly with the slowing of democracy's progress during the last decade. Nor do I think the United States will be able to dominate and dictate terms to others all the time in the future. Still, **I just don't see the irreversible decline in U.S. power and the rise of a new world order that many seem to reflexively accept.**

***Energy independence causes retrenchment --- decimates heg***

Steve **LeVine** is the author of The Oil and the Glory and a longtime foreign correspondent. 3-23-12, Foreign Policy, The Weekly Wrap -- March 23, 20**12** [,](http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/03/23/the_weekly_wrap_march_23_2012m) <http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/03/23/the_weekly_wrap_march_23_2012>, jj

**A coming U.S. renaissance -- and an oil price crash**: Citibank's Ed Morse unloads a monster, 92-page report forecasting no less than a new American Industrial Revolution. This economic resurgence is carried on the back of low natural gas prices as far as the eye can see (pictured above, hydraulic fracturing in Pennsylvania), in addition to a shale-oil, oil-sands, deepwater-oil boom that makes the U.S. "the new Middle East." In line with other top analysts, notably Deutsche Bank, Morse forecasts a tight global market in the next few years, notwithstanding the U.S. abundance, with the suggestion that prices will be high as well. But nirvana will arrive by the end of the decade with the convergence of U.S. oil abundance and a burst of production from west and east Africa, the Gulf of Mexico, India and the Caspian Sea. By the 2020s, we will see maximum oil prices of $85 a barrel, Morse writes in a teaser at the Wall Street Journal. **There are** of course **potential geopolitical consequences**, Morse writes: It is unclear what **the** political **consequences** of this might be **in terms of American attitudes to continuing to play the various roles adopted since World War II -- guarantor of supply lanes globally, protector of main producer countries in the Middle East and elsewhere.** **A U.S. economy that is less vulnerable to oil disruptions, less dependent on oil imports and supportive of a stronger currency will inevitably play a central role globally.** **But with such a turnaround in its energy dependence,** it is questionable how arduously the U.S. government might want to play those traditional roles.

***Energy independence kills leverage***

Max **Fisher** is an associate editor at The Atlantic, where he edits the International channel. Apr 2 20**10**, the Atlantic, The Upside of Depending on Foreign Oil <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2010/04/the-upside-of-depending-on-foreign-oil/38380/>, jj

When President Obama opened the coastline to offshore oil drilling, nearly every aspect of the plan came under heated debate. The only thing everyone agrees on, it seems, is the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Statements from the Environmental Protection Agency to automakers to T. Boone Pickens to Obama himself, whether supporting or condemning offshore drilling, all cite the dangers of relying on foreign energy. It's not hard to see why. Shipping oil from halfway around the world is environmentally costly, economically inefficient, and lands us in bed with some of the world's least democratic regimes. But **our ties to these states might not be categorically terrible things for us, as they're often assumed to be. Hidden unexamined among the many downsides of our dependence on foreign oil is an upside: It gives us leverage over the countries that sell us oil.** The top ten oil exporters to the U.S., which account for half of all U.S. consumption, read like a State Department tourism warning list: Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Nigeria, Iraq, Angola, Russia, Colombia, and Brazil. (To be fair, Canada has long been our number one oil source, and Mexico alternates with Saudi Arabia for the number two spot.) But **keep in mind that most of these countries need our money a lot more then we need their oil. If Saudi Arabia and the U.S. suddenly ended our trade tomorrow, for example, the U.S. and global economies would not suffer nearly as much as Saudi Arabia's. The Saudis understand this and so want to keep U.S. and Saudi interests aligned.** As a result, **buying Saudi oil gets us a lot more than just energy. It gets us a dedicated ally that wields unparalleled influence in a part of the world where we desperately need it: the Middle East. The Saudi royal family has put their wily intelligence service at our disposal and allowed sprawling U.S. military bases onto their soil**. In 1992, the Saudis even exiled one of their own on America's behalf: A prominent, wealthy, and popular humanitarian and freedom fighter named Osama bin Laden. **Saudi royalty risked a violent backlash by expelling bin Laden to Sudan, but U.S. officials had demanded his ouster. That's no small favor**. It would be almost as if the United States deported Google CEO Eric Schmidt to Honduras at the request of angry Chinese officials. The Saudis came to our aid again in 1996 when they convinced the Sudanese regime to themselves deport bin Laden. Bin Laden's anti-American terrorism did not begin until he fled to Afghanistan, where the United States then had little influence. In the decade since, he has moved between there and Pakistan, two countries with which the U.S. has no meaningful economic ties save foreign aid. Unlike with Saudi Arabia, our pleas to those governments to help us rout bin Laden went largely ignored. **If our oil-greased relationships with other top producing states are half as close as the U.S.-Saudi partnership, it will give us much-needed leverage over some of this century's biggest emerging threats**. In Nigeria, we can pressure the government to peacefully contain the state's alarming increase in terrorism. For Iraq, the economic ties with America would be an important counterbalance to Iran's religious and political influence. As for Venezuela, no matter how antagonistic President Hugo Chavez gets, he would be a lot worse if we didn't take close to a million barrels off his hands every day. The point isn't that dependence on foreign oil is a good thing. The political, economic, and environmental costs are severe, unsustainable, and require long-term alternatives. But **as we seek to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, it's important to remember that our influence with certain key states will reduce as well.**

***5) Heg collapse doesn’t cause global nuclear war – conflicts would be small and managable***

Richard **Haas** (president of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies) April **2008** “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask\_the\_expert.html

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.

***6) Transition is smooth – decline in power causes global cooperation***

Carla **Norrlof** (an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto) **2010** “America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” p. 50

Keohane and Snidal’s predictions – that the waning of American power did not have to jeopardize cooperation – were in this context reassuring. As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, Keohane explained the persistence of cooperation in terms of states’ continued demand for regimes.40 Snidal demonstrated that collective action depends as much on the hegemon’s size, as it does on the size of other actors in the international system. By paying attention to the size of all Great Powers, not just the hegemon, Snidal opened up the possibility that a more symmetrical distribution of power might enhance the prospects for the provision of public goods, thus offering a potential explanation for the otherwise puzzling persistence of cooperation in the 1980s despite America’s relative decline. The likelihood for cooperation increases with American decline because the hegemon can no longer singlehandedly provide the good as it declines, so smaller states have to chip in for the good to be provided. If one were to use Snidal’s production function in the revised model (i.e., by plugging the numbers from his production function into the revised model), the waning hegemon continues to be taken advantage of. While Snidal was modeling a theory he did not believe in, these distributional implications haunt the literature and cast decline as inescapable and continuous

***Nuclear expansion is structurally impossible:***

***1) NG prices will be low for decades – makes nuclear impossible***

**Crawford, 7/24/2012** (Jonathan, SNL Generation Markets Week: “Former Senator, DOE Official Urge Continued Federal Support for Nuke Support,” LexisNexis, ts)

Beyond these recommendations, the report called for federal support to assist a nuclear energy industry besieged by low natural gas prices. **Together with depressed electricity demand and heightened safety and security requirements, low natural gas prices have led to the suspension in the past few years of up to 20, or more, proposed reactors.** **The report said the ability to tap vast shale gas reserves through hydraulic fracturing is likely to keep natural gas prices low for decades**. **This, in turn, is expected to make financing for new reactors "very difficult for at least the next decade, if not longer**," it said. "Market signals alone are unlikely to result in a diverse fuel mix, so helping to maintain and improve a range of electricity supply options remains a role for federal policy. In particular, U.S. policy should be aimed at helping to preserve nuclear energy as an important technology option for near or longer-term deployment," the report said**. The hurdles presented by low natural gas prices and tepid growth in electricity demand are compounded by an aging nuclear fleet**. According to the report, 73 reactors, representing well over half of the nation's reactor fleet, have received a 20-year extension on top of their original 40-year operating license, while 13 additional license-extension applications are under review. The report estimates that in 2029 and thereafter, about one-third of the fleet will reach its 60-year operation limit, with a "significant fraction" likely to retire and be replaced by newer-generation resources.

***Economics solves resource scarcity***

Tim **Worstall** 7-6-20**12**; ¶ Tim Worstall is a Senior Fellow at the Adam Smith Institute in London, and one of the global experts on the metal scandium, one of the rare earths. His book, Chasing Rainbows, on the economics of climate change, is available at Amazon.¶ We are nowhere near hitting 'peak oil', because we keep inventing new ways of extracting the stuff http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/finance/timworstall/100018350/so-thats-the-end-of-peak-oil-then/

Any economist could have told him that. **Resource constraints *are always an economic problem*: solved by the price mechanism.¶** **It was never true that we would run out of oil – it just gets more expensive**. **At a higher price, people use less and go and hunt for more**. **Both have happened: the amount of oil** (or energy of any kind) **used to produce one dollar of GDP has been falling for decades now. Techniques to extract more have been developed as those prices rise**. And I'm afraid that **people don't seem to understand the implications of those new techniques.¶** Take the Macondo field drilled by BP. Yes, a disaster in the Gulf: but also the deepest well ever drilled. **Having developed the technology to drill so deeply we have not only discovered one new oil field – we've also discovered a whole new Earth that we can explore for oil**. That part of the entire globe that between 4,000 and 5,000 feet below the surface.¶ **Inventing fracking does not mean just extracting gas from Pennsylvania or oil from the Bakken. It means prospecting the whole planet again for such deposits**. **New technologies mean we have invented *whole new planets* to explore for resources.¶** This does not apply only to peak oil or peak gas. There are those out there who worry about peak copper, peak indium and even peak tellurium (an odd one when we use 125 tonnes a year and there's 120 million tonnes in the crust). None of these are **geological problems**, they **are all plain and simple economic ones.**

***Resource Wars don’t become hot wars***

**Victor ‘08** (David G., “Smoke and Mirrors”, Debating Disaster: The World Is Not Enough, <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16522>,)

MY ARGUMENT is that **classic resource wars-hot conflicts driven by a struggle to grab resources-are increasingly rare. Even where resources play a role, they are rarely the root cause of bloodshed**. Rather, **the root cause usually lies in various failures of governance.** That argument-in both its classic form and in its more nuanced incarnation-is hardly a straw man, as Thomas Homer-Dixon asserts. Setting aside hyperbole, the punditry increasingly points to resources as a cause of war. And so do social scientists and policy analysts, even with their more nuanced views. I've triggered this debate because **conventional wisdom puts too much emphasis on resources as a cause of conflict**. Getting the story right has big implications for social scientists trying to unravel cause-and-effect and often even larger implications for public policy. Michael Klare is right to underscore Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, the only classic resource conflict in recent memory. That episode highlights two of the reasons why classic **resource wars are becoming rare-they're expensive and rarely work**. (And even in Kuwait's case, many other forces also spurred the invasion. Notably, Iraq felt insecure with its only access to the sea a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Kuwait on one side and its archenemy Iran on the other.) In the end, Saddam lost resources on the order of $100 billion (plus his country and then his head) in his quest for Kuwait's 1.5 million barrels per day of combined oil and gas output. By contrast, Exxon paid $80 billion to get Mobil's 1.7 million barrels per day of oil and gas production-a merger that has held and flourished. As the bulging sovereign wealth funds are discovering, **it is easier to get resources through the stock exchange than the gun barrel.** Klare takes me to task for failing to acknowledge the role of "lootable" resources as a motive for war. My point is that looters loot what they can-not just natural resources, but also foreign aid and anything else that passes within reach. (Paul Collier's research, which Klare cites for support, finds that a sizeable share of African military budgets is, in effect, aid money that is looted and redirected from foreign aid.) I suspect that we don't differ much in our assessment of the effects of lootable resources within weak and failed states, but where we do part company is in the implication for policy. Fixing the problems in the Niger River Delta-the case he uses-requires a stronger and more accountable government. That means making it harder to loot resources, taming official corruption, lending a hand with law enforcement in places where oil is produced and stolen, and engaging reformist forces in the Nigerian government. Resource looting and misallocation are severe, but they are symptoms whose cures require focusing on governance. The realities of global resource depletion are somewhat different from Klare's story. It is true that primary resources, such as oil in the ground, are now more concentrated in "armpit" countries because more readily available resources are being depleted. That fact, though, only serves to further support my conclusion: That we must redouble our efforts to improve governance because all oil-consuming countries have a stake in the good governance of their oil producers. What really matters is not theoretical oil thousands of feet underground but actual oil produced and delivered to markets. And on that front, the armpit-country story isn't so bad because those countries tend to put themselves out of business. Witness Venezuela, where production is declining even though the country is one of the world's richest in untapped resources. High prices soon follow. And with those higher prices, a spate of "new" resources becomes viable-oil sands in Canada and shale in the western United States, for example. Moreover, many oil-rich countries actually have good governance systems (at least concerning their oil), such as Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and notably the bright new star among oil-majors, Brazil. Nonetheless, I echo a conclusion from my original article-one that Klare surely shares as well-that current patterns of oil consumption are not sustainable, and urgent efforts to tame demand are also needed.

***Fusion fails – costs, tech, and time***

William Reville is an emeritus professor of biochemistry and public awareness of science officer at UCC. The Irish Times - Thursday, June 7, 2012 Fusion energy still a pipe dream <http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/sciencetoday/2012/0607/1224317432816.html>

NUCLEAR FUSION is the holy grail of power generation, promising the safe, clean generation of boundless energy from essentially limitless, cheap fuel – if we can ever get it to work. The timeline for the development of nuclear fusion has been lengthened several times, costs have ballooned and it seems unlikely that nuclear-fusion power will be available before the end of this century. The current situation is summarised by Geoff Brumfiel in the June edition of Scientific American. Massive energy is released in nuclear fusion because some of the matter in the atomic nucleus is converted into energy, as in Einstein’s famous equation E=mc2, where E is energy, M is mass and C is the speed of light. Even the tiniest amount of matter is equivalent to an enormous amount of energy, because C2 is such a huge number. The nuclear fusion of 1g of fuel releases the same energy as burning 11 tonnes of coal. The sun’s enormous energy is generated by nuclear fusion when hydrogen atoms fuse together to form helium. The plan for earthly nuclear fusion requires us to simulate the sun on Earth – an enormously difficult task. Fusion on Earth requires a temperature of 100,000,000 degrees Kelvin, 10 times hotter than the sun, whose huge gravitational field allows fusion to occur more easily. Two forms of hydrogen, deuterium and tritium, will fuel nuclear-fusion power plants. Deuterium is easily extracted from sea water and tritium, a mildly radioactive form of hydrogen, can be made from lithium, a fairly common metal. Hydrogen atoms exist as a “plasma” of positively charged atomic nuclei at fusion temperatures. Fusion temperature is reached by heating the hydrogen with a mixture of microwaves, electricity and bombardment with particles. A viable fusion plant must generate much more energy from fusion than the input energy necessary to heat the fuel to fusion temperature. The energy released will heat water, raising high-pressure steam to turn a turbogenerator that generates electricity. The principle of deriving fusion energy in this way was first demonstrated in the Joint European Torus (Jet) device at Culham, UK, which has been in operation since 1983. In 1997, a fusion power of 10 megawatts was sustained for 0.5 seconds and 65 per cent of the power expended to ignite the plasma was recovered through fusion. The 80 cubic metre Jet plasma is too small to produce a net energy gain. This will be the role of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (Iter) under construction in Cadarache, France, with a plasma volume of about 830 cubic metres. The Iter is designed to generate fusion power of 500 megawatts, 10 times the power needed to ignite the plasma. Iter is a collaboration of seven partners – EU, US, Japan, Russia, China, India and South Korea. The EU provides 45.5 per cent of the funding and each other partner provides 9.1 per cent. Each partner constructs different components for Iter in its own country and ships them to France for incorporation into Iter. This arrangement is intrinsically awkward and dogs the project with delays and budgetary over-runs. Original construction costs were estimated at $5 billion (€3.9bn). This doubled in the mid-1990s and costs have now doubled again to $20 billion (€15.6bn). Iter fusion will operate intermittently, up to 30 minutes at a time, because materials that can withstand continuous fusion conditions are not yet available. A programme to develop these materials, essential for commercial reactors, is also under way, but it will have to overcome formidable technical difficulties. Iter will test the feasibility of a sustained fusion reaction and will then become a test nuclear fusion power plant. Following several delays it is hoped to build Iter by 2020, after which about 1,000 scientists and engineers will work on the device for 20 years. If Iter works, a demonstration reactor with all the functions of a power plant will be built by 2050 and tested for 10 to 20 years. Finally, it may be possible to start up full-scale nuclear fusion worldwide by 2100, but many things could lengthen this timeline. Fusion technology emits no warming CO2 gas but nuclear fusion will not be available to mitigate the effects of global warming this century. Bringing the sun to Earth was never going to be easy, but work will continue because the dream of cheap, clean and virtually unlimited power is irresistible.

***Fusion fuel reactors only have a 50/50 chance of being successful- each plant takes 10 years to build***

**MSNBC 5** ([http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/8385911/] $13 billion nuclear fusion site gets green light/ June 28, 2005)

Some scientists have warned that Cadarache could be prone to earth tremors, a view discounted by France's government**. And opponents note that the project, which will take 10 years to build, is only experimental and that it would be at least 50 years before a commercially viable reactor is built.** Greenpeace, for one, stated that “at a time when it is universally recognized that we must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, Greenpeace considers it ridiculous to use resources and billions of euros on this project.”  **Some also contend that fusion fuel is neither clean nor safe,** although they acknowledge it would be a safer energy source than nuclear fission. T**he project also faces challenges like trying to build a reactor that can sustain temperatures of about 180 million degrees Fahrenheit for long enough to generate power. “I give it a 50:50 chance of success but the engineering is very difficult,”** said Ian Fells of Britain’s Royal Academy of Engineering. “If we can really make this work there will be enough electricity to last the world for the next 1,000 to 2,000 years.”

***Fusion reactors won’t be commercially viable for 40 years***

**BBC 6** (BBC News [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/4627237.stm] Q&A: Nuclear fusion reactor/ February 6, 2006)

**When will the first commercial fusion reactor be built? Not for a long time. Experimental fusion reactors** like the Joint European Torus (Jet) at Culham in the UK **currently use more energy than they release**. **There are** therefore many major **scientific and engineering hurdles to overcome before the technology becomes commercially viable. A commercial reactor is not expected before 2045 or 2050 - if at all**. Indeed, there is no guarantee that Iter will succeed. **The running joke is that fusion has been "just decades away" for several decades.** And many commentators, particularly those greens who have fought long campaigns against nuclear fission, are deeply suspicious of fusion. **They doubt Iter will deliver and believe the money earmarked for the project would be better spent on renewables, such as wind, wave and solar, for which technical solutions already exist.**

## 2nc

**Iran 2nc Overview**

***The impact is extinction—high probability of escalation***

**Russell, ‘09** [James, senior lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Nava Postgraduate School, Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prosepects for Nuclear War and Escalation in the Middle East, in collaboration with the Atomic Energy Commission, <http://www.nps.edu/academics/sigs/ccc/people/biolinks/russell/PP26_Russell_2009.pdf>]

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

**Obama Solves Nuclear**

***Obama re-election key to nuclear power***

**Holl ‘12**

Nathan Holl, February 15th, 2012, Energy & Capital, Obama Has Big Plans for Nuclear Energy in 2013 <http://www.energyandcapital.com/articles/obama-has-big-plans-for-nuclear-energy-in-2013/2065>, jj

President **Obama has unveiled his fiscal budget for 2013 and it looks like the administration has a clear focus on** investing in alternative energy, **ramping up nuclear energy**, and ending tax subsidies for big oil. **The administration proposed allocating $27.2 billion to the Department of Energy, a 3.2 percent increase of what congress allotted to the department last year.** $2.3 billion of which is to be put towards research and development for increased energy and efficiency, advanced vehicles and biofuels. In a cover letter justifying the push for research and development in alternative energy, federal energy secretary Steven Chu wrote: “The United States is competing in a competing in a global race for the clean energy jobs of the future” Chu went on to write that it would not be prudent of America to allow those jobs to land in the laps of its competitors. Primarily, **Obama intends to reinvigorate the nation's fervor over alternative energy** and revive its perception after the Solyndra debacle, which occurred last year. Obama’s budget will extend key tax credits for renewable-energy production and clean-energy manufacturing. The remaining **$25 billion is to be distributed amongst America’s various nuclear divisions**. ■$**150 million is will go into *r*esearch and *d*evelopment of a new processing facility being constructed by the U.S Enrichment Corp.** ■**The Office of Nuclear Energy would receive $770 million; the money is to promote the research and development of small modular reactors.** ■$**60 million to perform essential research on developing more viable and sustainable battery storage systems.** ■ $11.5 billion to protect Americans by maintaining U.S. nuclear deterrence capabilities, designed to reduce nuclear dangers in an increasingly volatile and unpredictable world. **$8.33 billion is to be allocated to support the Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s issuing of Combined Construction and Operating license to Southern Co**. (NYSE: SO) **to build the nation’s first nuclear reactors in 30 years.**

**2nc impacts**

***Obama is the best choice when it comes to foreign policy – most experience***

**Burns ‘11**

Nicholas Burns is a professor of the practice of diplomacy and international politics at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government. His column appears regularly in the Globe.

Boston Globe, December 09, 2011, Our best foreign policy president

<http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2011/12/09/our-best-foreign-policy-president/099kgmi9VkgJIVntKH9j9M/story.html>, jj

What lessons can we draw from Bush’s masterful work in ending the Cold War on our terms? First, that creative and purposeful presidential diplomacy exercised at key moments continues to be a vital national requirement. We lost sight of that at times in the decade after 9/11 when we turned too frequently to the military to respond to fires burning overseas. Second, that **we need a president with a deep and unerring knowledge of the world and the self-confidence to act boldly on the biggest stage imaginable. *As we look to November, we cannot afford to elect a president who requires on-the-job training***. **With a rising China, nuclear challenges from Iran and North Korea, the Arab revolutions, a European financial crisis, and climate change all on the agenda, our nation’s chief diplomat must possess a clear and steady strategic compass**. While **the election** should clearly focus on the economy, it **must** also **be about who best can lead us through the thickets of the most complex strategic landscape we have ever encountered. That is why Republican voters will need to judge which candidate can match President Obama’s impressive international record**. **This just may be a rare election when the Democratic candidate can claim legitimately that he is best prepared to defend the country, given Obama’s string of foreign policy accomplishments.**

***Reset is working – Obama can constrain Russia-bashing – GOP win kills cooperation***

Fred **Weir**, staff writer, **10-26-2011,** “Putin and the 'Russian Empire': Can U.S.-Russian relations survive?” CSM, http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/putin-and-russian-empire-can-us-russian-relations-survive?page=0,1

**Russia's foreign policy community is watching** with growing **nervousness as** leading **Republicans** in the US, including at least one top contender for the party's presidential nomination, **turn their ire against** Barack **Obama's** already troubled "**reset**" in US-Russian relations, **which the Kremlin sees as vital to its future plans for repairing Russian influence** in the world. Republicans have been critical all along of Mr. Obama's policy of building strong, practical relations with Moscow while soft-peddling US disapproval of Kremlin power abuses and human rights violations. But as recently as last December, more than a dozen Republican senators joined Democrats to win the needed two-thirds Senate ratification of the START nuclear arms reduction accord, which was understood in Moscow as a sign that pragmatism would always prevail in Washington. Now, Russian experts do not seem so sure. Since former president Vladimir Putin decided to shoulder aside his hand-picked successor, Dmitry Medvedev, and seek a fresh term as Russia's supreme leader, the tone of discussion about Russia in the US has grown much harsher, many note. Mr. Putin's recently publicized plan to establish a "Eurasian Union" – a strong economic, and potentially political, alliance of former Soviet states – has rekindled fears among many in the West that Russia's strategic goal is to bring back the USSR and return to its historic rivalry with the US. "We had hoped that the reset with the US might help Russia move into a friendlier, closer relationship with the West, but that seems to be fading fast," says Viktor Kremeniuk, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Now it seems the general opinion in the US is that Russia is fast becoming an authoritarian state with the scarecrow figure of Putin as its next president. It's all starting to feel a bit hopeless." In a Washington Post interview earlier this month, Republican presidential contender Mitt **Romney**, often seen as moderate, **is quoted as saying** that Putin "dreams of rebuilding the Russian empire." **Obama's reset** of relations "**has to end** ... we have to show strength," Mr. Romney added. Reining in Russian ambitions? At a Washington conference Tuesday, Republican House Speaker John Boehner slammed Russia's "use of old tools and old thinking" as an attempt "to restore Soviet-style power and influence," and called for tougher measures to rein in Russian ambitions. At the same meeting, Garry Kasparov, a leader of the banned Other Russia opposition movement, urged Americans to heed Ronald Reagan's advice and treat Putin's Russia as an "evil empire" beyond the pale of civilized nations. The current cold war-style spat between Moscow and Washington over the suspicious death of Sergei Magnitsky, an anticorruption lawyer who died after being denied medical treatment in a Russian remand prison two years ago, clearly illustrates the reasons **Moscow prefers Obama to any Republican** who might come into the White House. A bill currently before the US Senate, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011, and heavily supported by Republicans, would impose tough visa restrictions and financial penalties on a list of Russian officials deemed to be implicated in his fate. But the US State Department has moved to preempt the bill by issuing its own "secret" list of proscribed officials, without imposing any financial sanctions, and connecting it with global human rights policies rather than a measure specifically targeted at Russia. Last weekend Moscow announced its own list of US citizens allegedly implicated in human rights abuses, who would be denied entry to Russia. "On the surface it looks like a bad dispute, but actually **we see the actions of the** Obama **administration as proof that it is committed to the reset**," says Dmitry Suslov, an expert with the Council on Foreign and Defense Policies, an influential Moscow think tank. "**The Senate bill is purely anti-Russian**, and for the time being at least, **Obama has managed to blunt this.** It's greatly appreciated in Moscow.... We know that **if any of the current Republican presidential nominees makes it to the White House, *things will go very badly for the*** **US-Russian relationship."** Apprehensions that Putin is an anti-Western hardliner who will reverse the more liberal foreign policies of Mr. Medvedev are greatly exaggerated, he adds. "Putin was involved with the reset from the very beginning. In fact, it would be weird to think that any major policy could have been developed in Moscow over the past four years without his leadership," Mr. Suslov says. "And Putin is not, by nature, an anti-Western ideologue. He understands the benefits of maintaining good relations with the US. Whatever happens in Washington, what you will see on the Russian side in the coming years under Putin is mostly continuity," he adds. The reset has delivered Russian analysts argue that **the reset has so far delivered** quite a few benefits, and **if the next US president abandons it the world will become a more dangerous place**. **Besides** the **START** deal, which slashed nuclear arsenals on both sides and installed a system for mutual verification, **they point to greatly improved Russian cooperation in pressuring Iran to give up its alleged nuclear weapons program. A Russian-approved "northern corridor**" through former Soviet territory **is now used to deliver almost half of all supplies reaching embattled NATO forces in Afghanistan, and stepped up anti-drug collaboration** between Moscow and the US **may** finally **be making a dent in the flow of narcotics from Afghanistan** to the West via pipelines through former Soviet territory, experts say.

***Nuclear war***

**Allison 10-31** (Graham, Director – Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, and Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, and Robert D. Blackwill, Senior Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations, “10 Reasons Why Russia Still Matters”, Politico, 2011, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

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

Uq

***Obama win – the important polls are in his favor***

**Silver, 9/20**/12 (Nate, political forecaster and analyst, “Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead,” http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead, bgm)

By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys.

***Obama winning – swing states***

**Bookman, 9/20**/12 (Jay, columnist at The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, specializing in foreign relations, environmental and technology-related issues and state and local politics. He has won two national awards for outstanding editorial writing, the National Headliner Award and the Scripps-Howard National Journalism Award, “GOP strategists cannot like what they’re seeing,” http://blogs.ajc.com/jay-bookman-blog/2012/09/20/gop-strategists-cannot-like-what-theyre-seeing/, bgm)

But Romney’s real problems show up at the state level. In the swing states that he has to have — Ohio, Virginia, Florida — poll after poll shows his situation deteriorating significantly. At a point in the campaign where he has to be shrinking the margin, the margin is growing. Fox puts Romney down seven in Ohio, down five in Florida and down seven in Virginia.

***Obama win – electoral college models***

**Witt, 9/19**/12 (Ryan, “New polls reinforce Obama's lead on the Electoral College map,” http://www.examiner.com/article/new-polls-reinforce-obama-s-lead-on-the-electoral-college-map, bgm)

Over the last few days a slew of new polls have been released from the states of Colorado, Virginia, Wisconsin, Florida, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Oregon, Massachusetts, and Kentucky. As seen above, and in the polls listed below, the numbers currently paint a picture of Electoral College victory for President Obama. Obama currently leads with 303 projected electoral votes compared to 235 for Mitt Romney, and that projection includes giving Mitt Romney Florida even though Romney is trailing the Real Clear Politics average of polls from that state.

***Prefer the direction of the link --- election’s too close to call***

**Enid News and Eagle 9-17**

The heated presidential election is too close to call <http://enidnews.com/opinion/x1052803813/The-heated-presidential-election-is-too-close-to-call>, jj

ENID, Okla. — **With less than two months** remaining before the election, President Barack **Obama** **and** Republican nominee Mitt **Romney are eyeing** some **pivotal swing states** to win the election. Besides Colorado and New Mexico, Oklahoma virtually is surrounded by red — or red-leaning — states in most electoral projections. We’re entering the home stretch, and **the heated presidential election is too close to call.** The presidential debate schedules have been announced: Jim Lehrer of PBS will moderate a debate on domestic issues on Oct. 3. CNN’s Candy Crowley will coordinate a town hall debate Oct. 16 at Hofstra University. Bob Schieffer of CBS News will moderate a foreign policy-focused debate on Oct. 22 at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Fla. What will voters decide? Meena Bose, a presidential scholar at Hofstra University, told Newsday the magic number of 270 electoral votes is what really matters in the election … not the popular vote. **Romney got some good news Friday when Obama announced an added travel stop to Wisconsin. That confirmed the traditionally Democratic state is in play**, according to the Wall Street Journal. All of the news isn’t as favorable for Romney, however. You can blame the “liberal media,” but even the conservative Washington Times reported on NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist College polls that show Obama leads Romney in Florida, Ohio and Virginia. (Romney’s camp dismissed the post-convention bump as a “sugar high.”) Still, **the Washington Post isn’t ready to move the bellwether state of Ohio in Obama’s direction for three reasons: the aforementioned bump, the Buckeye State’s ongoing political division and the fact Romney won’t give up on the Midwest’s electoral crown jewel.**

**Syria intervention**

***No Syria intervention***

**DeYoung, 9/2/12** (Karen, associate editor and senior national security correspondent for the Washington Post, she has served as bureau chief in Latin America and London and correspondent covering the the White House, U.S. foreign policy and the intelligence community, as well as assistant managing editor for national news, national editor and foreign editor. She has won numerous awards for national and international reporting, The Washington Post: “US Intervention in Syria Appears Unlikely Say Officials,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-intervention-in-syria-appears-unlikely-say-officials/2012/09/02/c1cd4e9a-f2bb-11e1-a612-3cfc842a6d89_story.html>, ts)

Yet, as bad as the Syrian fighting looks, with an estimated 20,000 dead and hundreds of thousands of refugees in neighboring countries, intervention by the United States or international authorities appears remote. Even a limited expansion of the minimal U.S. role is unlikely for the next several months and perhaps beyond, according to American and foreign officials.

**2nc Link Overview**

***Independents are irrelevant it’s a question of base turnout***

**MacAskill ‘12**

Ewen MacAskill, 8-16-12, Democrats' nerves start to show as Ryan fires up conservative voters, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/aug/16/romney-gamble-paul-ryan-vicepresident?newsfeed=true>, jj

But that strategy was not working. **The US is so polarised that there are**, according to the polls, **few undecided voters left.** Compared with 2008, when about 25% of the electorate had still to make up their minds at this stage in the election, **only about 5% are undecided**. Both the Democratic and Republican strategists have concluded that **the winner on 6 November will be the campaign that fires up its own supporters, that gets its base out, rather than the one that wins over the independent swing voters**. Larry Sabato, professor of politics at the University of Virginia, said: "**It is base v base**. **There are hardly any independents**." At the cost of winning over a percentage of that small group in the centre, the campaigns risked alienating their core support, he said.

***Specifically true of young greens --- Obama needs strong turnout and their energetic support --- they wouldn’t vote for Romney but they’d stay home or devote resources to congressional races***

**Hill ‘11**

Ben Geman - 08/20/11, The Hill, Obama faces big green tests in 2012 <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/177607-obama-faces-big-green-tests-heading-into-2012>, jj

“**He still has the opportunity to regain some footing with young people**,” said Hight, the Obama campaign’s Florida youth vote director in 2008. “By all means, **everybody is hungry for leadership**.” According to the Pew Research Center, **Obama** scored a whopping 66 percent of the vote among voters under 30 in 2008. Next year, he **needs young voters to turn out in large numbers again in what is expected to be a tighter election.** Polls show other issues – notably the economy – are a bigger priority than the environment, but **the president** still **can’t afford widespread political disenchantment in the green movement that could suppress turnout.** “**The risk he has in turnout is environmental issues tend to play the strongest among voters under 30**,” said political analyst Ron Faucheux, who is president of the Clarus Research Group and teaches at George Washington University. **While environmentalists won’t throw their weight behind a GOP White House hopeful, Obama’s choices could affect the work of green groups with political field organizations**, notably the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters (LCV). Navin Nayak, LCV’s senior vice president for campaigns, pointed to Obama’s decision to significantly boost auto mileage requirements, and create first-time efficiency standards for heavy trucks, in arguing that Obama’s standing with environmentalists remains generally good. But Nayak also took a shot across Obama’s bow: he notes that **the White House can’t “coast” given the “magnitude of decisions they have in front of them.”** “**We are certainly going to be watching closely how these decisions play out in terms of our resources and investment in the presidential race,” said Nayak, whose group is also active in congressional races. “It is all a matter of prioritizing resources.”**

**A2: not perceived**

***Even if they win all their link turns --- the plan’s mechanism is seen as wasteful spending, which muddles Obama’s message***

**Mariotte ‘12**

Michael Mariotte, June 5, 2012, Daily Kos, Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the polls say <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say>, jj

Conclusion 1: ***The public does NOT want to pay for new nuclear power***. It IS willing to pay for renewable energy.

**This one is a slam dunk.** New nuclear reactors are simply too expensive for utilities to build with their own assets. Nor are banks willing to lend money for most nuclear projects; they’re considered too risky given the long history of cost overruns, defaults, cancellations and other problems. Thus, **the only** two **means of financing a new reactor are to either get money from taxpayers, through direct federal loans or taxpayer-backed loan guarantees**, or from ratepayers in a few, mostly Southern states, which allow utilities to collect money from ratepayers before reactors are built—a concept known either as “early cost recovery” or Construction Work in Progress (CWIP). **ORC International (which polls for CNN, among others) has asked a straightforward question** for the past two years (March 2011 and February 2012) in polls commissioned by the Civil Society Institute: “**Should U.S. Taxpayers Take on the Risk of Backing New Nuclear Reactors?” The answer? Basically identical both years: 73% opposed in 2011, 72% opposed in 2012.** Maybe using the work “risk” skews the poll, you think? So ORC also asked, “**Do you favor or oppose shifting federal loan guarantees from nuclear energy to clean renewables?” The answer was basically the same: 74% said yes in 2011, 77% in 2012 with 47% “strongly” holding that opinion both years.** A third poll conducted by ORC for Civil Society Institute in March 2012 asked this question: “Utilities in some states are allowed to charge electricity ratepayers for “Construction Work in Progress” for new power plants. This means that ratepayers – instead of the companies – pay for construction of new nuclear reactors and other major power plants before any electricity ever reaches customers, thereby lowering the financial risks to shareholders. Knowing this, which of the following statements about “Construction Work in Progress” most closely reflects your view?” The answer: fully 80% opposed CWIP. Most pollsters have not asked similar questions; interestingly though, Rasmussen did in May 2012 for an undisclosed client. Their question: “The government is providing billions in loan guarantees to help the development of new nuclear plants. Would that money be better spent on the development of alternative new energy sources?” Unfortunately, Rasmussen did not publicize the results and hid them behind a paywall, which we were not inclined to pursue. But if anyone has access to that, we’d love to know what Rasmussen found.

Conclusion 2: **Americans do not think nuclear power is “clean” energy, and still don’t want to pay for it.**

Jumping back to ORC International, their March 2012 poll found this: About **two out of three Americans** (66 percent) – **including 58 percent of Republicans, 65 percent of Independents, and 75 percent of Democrats -- agree that the term “‘clean energy standard’ should not be used to describe any energy plan that involves nuclear energy**, coal-fired power, and natural gas that comes from hydraulic fracturing, also known as ‘fracking.’” and this: About **three out of four Americans** (73 percent) **agree that “federal spending on energy should focus on developing the energy sources of tomorrow, such as wind and solar, and not the energy sources of yesterday, such as nuclear power.”** Fewer than one in four (22 percent) say that “federal spending on energy should focus on existing energy sources, such as nuclear, and not emerging energy sources, such as wind and solar.” Meanwhile, the New York Times in May reported on **a Harvard/Yale poll** (also behind a paywall), conducted in 2011 but released in May 2012, that **found that Americans are willing to pay an average of $162/year more for clean energy than they are paying now—an average 13% increase in electric bills. But when clean energy was defined as including nuclear power** or natural gas, **that support plummeted.**  This is consistent with findings over the past decade, which have shown that **nuclear power has typically ranked well below renewable energy sources, especially solar and wind, in public opinion, at times *battling with coal for least-favorite U.S. energy source*.**  A March 2012 Gallup poll found **that 69% of Americans support spending more government money on solar and wind power—with majorities among Democrats (84%) and Republicans (51%) alike. But support for “expanding the use of nuclear power” barely received a majority (52%) and then only due to Republican support: 64% of Republicans supported that idea, only 41% of Democrats.**

***This isn’t offense for them --- Romney co-opts popularity of nuke power with no spending baggage***

**NEI ‘12**

Nuclear Energy Insight, Summer 2012, Nuclear Energy Institute, Obama, Romney Support Nuclear Energy, Offer Views on Financing, Regulation <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/publicationsandmedia/insight/insightsummer2012/obama-romney-support-nuclear-energy-offer-views-on-financing-regulation/>, jj

**Romney** also wants to spur nuclear power plant development. His 2011 energy plan **calls for reform of the “cumbersome and restrictive” U.S. *N*uclear *R*egulatory *C*ommission**. **Romney wants the agency to review several new reactor designs and ensure that licensing decisions based on pre-approved designs are issued within two years. Romney** in 2011 **said he prefers streamlining the federal permitting process for the use of loan guarantees through the Department of Energy**. **If permits are not issued for approved sites and designs within a specified time period, the government should “refund the money to [nuclear energy utilities] that have invested to build the facility.”**

**Funding now**

***Link controls the direction of uniqueness --- Obama’s focusing like a laser on base turnout now --- plan is controversial and interrupts***

**Lippman ‘12**

Daniel Lippman, 8-10-12, Wall Street Journal, Political Wisdom: Turning Out the Base <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2012/08/10/political-wisdom-turning-out-the-base/>, jj

“**Focused on talking to the converted**, President Barack **Obama and** his Republican challenger Mitt **Romney are going the extra mile to identify, target, and turn out every likely supporter, while almost ignoring people still on the fence**. That is a change from the 2008 election, when Mr. Obama won on a wave of enthusiasm, capturing large groups of new and swing voters, becoming along the way the first Democrat since 1964 to snag Virginia.”

***Obama will win --- base enthusiasm***

**Silver 9-6**

NATE SILVER, bamf, 9-6-12, New York Times, Obama Would Be Big Favorite With ‘Fired Up’ Base <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/06/obama-would-be-big-favorite-with-fired-up-base/>, jj

**There’s one advantage** that President **Obama has that** Mitt **Romney** probably **doesn’t. If he can get a good turnout from his base, he’ll be the heavy favorite to win** in November — **even if Mr. Romney gets a strong turnout as well.** On average over the last five public surveys, **35 percent of registered voters identify themselves as Democrats and 30 percent as Republicans.** That advantage is down somewhat for Democrats since 2008, but it is an advantage nevertheless.

***Nuclear power not a campaign issue now --- the issue is playing out at the bureaucratic level now***

**Newsday ‘12**

Newsday, 3-11-12, No nuclear overreaction, Lexis, jj

**In the American presidential race**, in contrast, **the nuclear issue is almost invisible**. **Republicans have** traditionally **supported nuclear power - but so does** President Barack **Obama**, who continues to back billions of dollars in federal loan guarantees for nuclear plants. But **the issue is playing out at the dry technical level of NRC rule-making**. **Soon after Fukushima, the agency set up a task force** to look at what happened and figure out how the industry should react here. Last summer, it came out with a series of recommendations. **The agency and the industry are now doing the slow bureaucratic dance of turning those recommendations into actual changes at plants.**

***Yucca proves Obama is conceding to environmentalists interests now***

**Bookman ‘12**

Jay Bookman is a columnist and blogger at The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, specializing in foreign relations, environmental and technology-related issues and state and local politics. He has won two national awards for outstanding editorial writing, the National Headliner Award and the Scripps-Howard National Journalism Award. In addition, his work on environmental issues has been recognized with the Aldo Leopold Award, granted by the Wilderness Society, and the American Conservation Award, by the National Wildlife Federation. He is an eight-time winner of the Best of Cox Newspapers Awards for columns and editorials. In 2008, he became the only two-time winner of the $75,000 Eugene Pulliam Fellowship for editorial writing, sponsored by the Society of Professional Journalists. He is using the fellowship to study the role of media in modern information warfare. Bookman is also the author of “Caught in the Current,” published by St. Martin’s Press, about the social impact of technology. Bookman is a graduate of Pennsylvania State University with degrees in history and journalism. He has lived in Atlanta since 1990, and previously worked for newspapers in Washington state, Nevada and Massachusetts. He is married with two daughters. His first book, “Caught in the Current,” was published by St. Martin’s Press in July, 2004.

8-9-12, Atlanta Journal Constitution, Obama, Reid block solution to nuke-waste issue <http://blogs.ajc.com/jay-bookman-blog/2012/08/09/obama-reid-block-solution-to-nuke-waste-issue/>, jj

Here’s an area in which President **Obama and his fellow Democrats, led by** Senate Majority Leader Harry **Reid, have allowed local partisan politics to override the clear national interest.** Unfortunately, **it’s** also **an issue on which Mitt Romney has tried to avoid taking any position whatsoever**. **The debate is over** the use of **Yucca Mountain**, a vast piece of federal property deep in the Nevada desert, as a repository for the nation’s growing stockpiles of high-level nuclear waste generated by power plants. Since the early ’80s, the ***D***epartment ***o***f ***E***nergy **has spent** almost **$15 billion** studying and **preparing** the **Yucca** Mountain site **to store** such **waste, but because of opposition from** the **Obama** administration and Reid, Nevada’s senior senator, **those efforts have been abandoned.** Yucca Mountain may not be a perfectly safe solution to handling nuclear waste for the thousands of years necessary. Given the immense time frames involved, a perfectly safe solution probably does not exist. But Yucca is clearly the best and safest option that we have available. Wisely or not, we are creating more and more such waste all the time, and we have an obligation not just to our species but to the planet to handle it as responsibly as we can. However, 30 years ago, as editorial page editor of the Las Vegas Review-Journal, I learned firsthand how deep the opposition in Nevada runs to serving as the nation’s nuclear-waste dump. That opposition was compounded by the state’s experience serving as the site of above-ground nuclear tests during the ’50s and early ’60s, when federal officials repeatedly lied to local residents about the amount of radiation being released and its potential health effects. Maybe **it’s opportunistic politics** for Reid. Maybe his opposition is sincere, a product of growing up in Nevada during the above-ground testing era. Whatever the cause, **Reid has bitterly opposed** the **Yucca** Mountain repository throughout his career. In the 2008 election, **Obama echoed that opposition, helping him to carry the state**.

***Obama perceived as anti-nuclear now***

**Pearce ‘12**

Fred Pearce is a freelance author and journalist based in the UK. 8-8-12, Nuclear Fast Reactor: The Saviour of Nuclear Power? <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Nuclear-Fast-Reactor-The-Saviour-of-Nuclear-Power.html>, jj

Fast reactors could do the same for the U.S. **Under the presidency of George W. Bush, the U.S. launched a Global Nuclear Energy Partnership aimed at developing technologies to consume plutonium in spent fuel. But President Obama drastically cut the partnership's funding, while also halting work on the planned Yucca Mountain geological repository**. "We are left with a million-year problem," says Loewen. "**Right now there isn't a policy framework in the U.S. for solving this issue."**

**Fusion popular**

***Public doesn’t support nuke power subsidies***

**Cart ‘12**

Julie Cart, LA Times staff, Standard-Examiner, 4-26-12, Support for more nuke plants in U.S. decreasing, poll finds, <http://www.standard.net/stories/2012/04/26/support-more-nuke-plants-us-decreasing-poll-finds>, jj

**The American public is divided about whether to eliminate** federal **subsidies** for any form of energy **and is giving less support to nuclear power** and U.S. funding of renewable energy, **a new poll has found**.

**Fifty-four percent of respondents opposed doing away with subsidies for** oil, gas, coal, **nuclear** or renewable energy, **while 47 percent favored the idea**. **Support for building more nuclear power plants has fallen dramatically, to 42 percent from 61 percent in 2008.**

**DOE**

***3) Obama will get the blame***

**Nicholas and Hook 10**(Peter and Janet, Tribune Washington Bureau, July 30, "Obama the Velcro president", http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730)jn

Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC’s “The View,” drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. “Stylistically, he creates some of those problems,” Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. “His favorite pronoun is ‘I.’ When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn’t get fixed or things happen.” A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable – such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Il.) said: “The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It’s naïve to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office.”

**Rhetoric Trick**

***Even if they won’t directly attack – The republicans will rhetorically bash Iran***

Paul R. **Pillar**, The National Interest, September 19, **2011**, <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/the-consequences-campaign-rhetoric-5905>

Probably more **dangerous is the rhetoric coming out of the Republican campaign about Iran**—more **dangerous because it propels a vicious circle of mutual hostility and threat perception that already has seen many rounds of escalation**. **Republican extremists and Iranian hardline extremists feed off each other's militant rhetoric**. This is a rhetorical line that is likely to get only worse during the general election campaign. As Trita Parsi notes, “Whatever hawkish line Obama adopts, the Republicans will find a way to 'outhawk' him. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.”

***This increases the risk of miscalc***

Heather **Hurlburt**, The Guardian, **November 3rd** 2011, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/nov/03/iran-overheated-rhetoric-us-policy?utm\_source=twitterfeed&utm\_medium=twitter

These developments suggest that **the path of diplomacy is far from exhausted**. At the same time, Ahmadinejad complains that the UN sanctions are biting, and Iran finds itself utterly isolated in front of the UN Human Rights Council – without even the regional support that North Korea and Burma enjoy. But **the overheated political climates** in the Middle East and the nasty politicisation **of security policy in the US make the risk of miscalculation unnervingly high** – **as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen reflected** when he proposed a US-Iran hotline last month. Mullen also called the prospect of a military strike "incredibly destabilising"; the International Campaign for Human Rights in Iran interviewed leading human rights voices inside the country and found them overwhelmingly opposed to a western strike. **This is a mix of spin and substance that really should worry military planners and civilian leaders alike.**

**Extension – Iran**

***All critical advisors for Romney are pro attack***

Ben **Armbruster** on **Oct 7**, 2011, <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2011/10/07/338979/romney-advisers-war-iran/>

Yesterday, GOP presidential front runner Mitt **Romney announced his campaign’s foreign policy team**. While ThinkProgress pointed out that many of **Romney’s advisers helped push the United States into war with Iraq, it might also be interesting to know what the** former Massachusetts **governor will be hearing from his top aides regarding Iran**. Prominent neoconservative Robert **Kagan, who is among Romney’s foreign policy advisers, has actually spoken out in favor of talking to Iran**. However, that view is by far an outlier among Romney’s team. While some of them have tried to push the claim that Iran is working with al Qaeda, **others have said** or written that the U**.S. should take a more militaristic approach toward the Islamic Republic**: ELIOT COHEN: Soon after the 9/11 attacks, **Cohen**, now director of the strategic studies program and Johns Hopkins University, **called for the overthrow of the Iranian government. And that thinking doesn’t appear to have changed**. In 2009, Cohen again called for the overthrow of the Iranian regime and said either attack Iran or it gets nukes. “The choices are now what they ever were: an American or an Israeli strike, which would probably cause a substantial war, or living in a world with Iranian nuclear weapons, which may also result in war, perhaps nuclear, over a longer period of time.” **MICHAEL HAYDEN: On CNN** last year, former CIA director (and prominent torture advocate) Michael Hayden **said attacking Iran over its nuclear program might not be a bad idea.** “In my personal thinking — I need to emphasize that — I have begun to consider that that may not be the worst of all possible outcomes,” he said. ERIC EDELMAN: **Edelman** was a career diplomat and former aid to Vice President Dick Cheney. Earlier this year **in an article in Foreign Affairs**, Edelman, along with two other co-authors, **said that the U.S. will** either **have to attack Iran** or contain its nuclear weapons capability. “The military option should not be dismissed because of the appealing but flawed notion that containment is a relatively easy or low-risk solution to a very difficult problem,” they wrote. NORM COLEMAN: Coleman, the former Republican senator from Minnesota, said in 2007 that if Israel ever attacks Iran, the United States should join in. “If something is taken,” Coleman said, “the United States is going to be part of that. We have to understand that. There is no saying, ‘Israel did it.’” KIM **HOLMES**: In 2005, the Heritage Foundation’s Kim Holmes **worried that the Europeans, by negotiating with Iran** over its nuclear program, **might be preventing the U.S. from using military force to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. Holmes called it a “serious mistake” to allow Iran to obtain the bomb** because “Iran itself is simply too untrustworthy to be trusted with nuclear weapons.” Holmes is referring to the hackneyed right-wing fearmongering talking point which CAP’s Matt Duss has labeled, “The martyr state myth.” The myth is that Iran is hell bent on using nuclear weapons, against Israel, the U.S., etc, should it acquire them and that Iran’s leaders are “uniquely immune to the cost-benefit calculations that underpin a conventional theory of deterrence.” Today in his foreign policy speech at the Citadel military college in South Carolina, which happened to also be “full of ridiculous fear mongering,” **Romney echoed this sentiment.** “In the hands of the ayatollahs, a nuclear Iran is nothing less than an existential threat to Israel,” he said. “Iran’s suicidal fanatics could blackmail the world.” **Romney also said** in his speech today that “**Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon is unacceptable.**” **Now that we know how he will be advised on how to prevent that,** it looks like **Romney’s new American Century** that he called for today, **should he become president, is likely to turn out just like the last new American Century the neocons tried to create under the previous Republican president.**

**A2: Obama Attacks Too**

***Romney causes Iran Strikes –Obama doesn't***

**AP 7/29** Kasie Hunt. "Adviser: Romney would back strike against Iran," 2012, http://news.yahoo.com/adviser-romney-back-strike-against-iran-072640314.html

JERUSALEM (AP) — Mitt **Romney would back an Israeli military strike against Iran** aimed at preventing Tehran from obtaining nuclear capability, **a top foreign policy adviser said** Sunday, **outlining the aggressive posture the Republican presidential candidate will take toward Iran** in a speech in Israel later in the day.¶ **Romney has said he has a "zero tolerance" policy toward Iran obtaining the capability to build a nuclear weapon.¶** "If Israel has to take action on its own, in order to stop Iran from developing the capability, the governor would respect that decision," foreign policy adviser Dan Senor told reporters ahead of the speech, planned for late Sunday near Jerusalem's Old City.¶ Romney believes the option of a U.S. attack should also be "on the table." He has said **he will do "the opposite" of what** U.S. President Barack **Obama would d**o in his approach to Israel.¶ The Obama administration hasn't ruled out the military option, but **Obama has so far been relying on sanctions and diplomatic negotiations to discourage Iran from building a nuclear bomb.**

**A2: Thumper – Econ/FoPo Surprises**

***No major surprises coming now – econ and foreign policy are static***

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/30, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/30/economically-obama-is-no-jimmy-carter/)

**The forward-looking data** was bad as well. The stock market declined in the six months leading up to May 1980 (even without adjusting for inflation), and the consensus of economic forecasters at the time was that conditions would remain recessionary for the six months ahead. By contrast, the data this year **is mediocre, but nowhere near** that **terrible.** Industrial production has picked up quite a bit and is an economic bright spot, which could help Mr. Obama in the manufacturing-intensive economies of the Midwest. Inflation has not been a major problem throughout the economy as a whole, although energy prices have been a periodic threat. However, income growth is very slow, as is the growth in consumption as indicated by the broadest measure of it, personal consumption expenditures. (Growth in retail sales has been more robust, but that is a less comprehensive statistic.) Jobs growth has been decent recently, but many economists expect it to slow some in the subsequent months. Gross domestic product in the final six months of the year, likewise, is expected to grow at a below-average rate. Still, there is really no comparison between Mr. Obama and Mr. Carter, who faced an economy that was still bottoming out into a severe and broad-based recession. Mr. **Obama**, by contrast, **faces numbers that are improving but perhaps too slowly.** It would probably require an economic shock, instead, to put Mr. Obama in Mr. Carter’s shoes. This could happen, of course – for instance, if there were a meltdown in Europe. Economists differ greatly on whether this would have relatively mild or more catastrophic effects on the American economy. But most versions of it would be enough to leave Mr. Obama as a clear underdog for re-election. Even if that were to occur, however, Mr. Obama’s situation might still not be as bad as Mr. Carter’s. For instance, **he does not face an acute foreign policy crisis**, at the moment at least, as Mr. Carter did in Iran, **and a European-driven recession would probably not be associated with high inflation** (although one set off by oil-price instability in the Middle East might). In some ways, in fact, it’s remarkable that Mr. Carter lost his election to Mr. Reagan by only 10 points. Some of this was because the recession of 1980 was extremely unusual: it was severe but also brief, ultimately persisting for only six months. Mr. Carter’s recession technically ended in August 1980, although not in a way that would have been highly visible to consumers and voters at the time. All of this produced some incredibly volatile polling in 1980. Mr. Carter led Mr. Reagan by a wide margin in polls in January and February 1980. The numbers drew closer together in the spring. By the summer, Mr. Reagan had a clear lead, peaking around 25 points in polls conducted immediately after the Republican convention in Detroit. Then, Mr. Carter rebounded, with polls conducted in late October showing him behind Mr. Reagan by only a point or two on average. Mr. Reagan considerably beat his polls on Election Day, however, and won in a landslide. Once we release the election model, we will be a little bit more in “sweat the small stuff” mode, analyzing the trends in the polling and the economic numbers on an almost-daily basis. So far, however, **the 2012 election cycle has been *extremely stable*** as **compared with** some **other years** like 1980.

### CP

#### China is ahead of the US in fusion development

**Dillow 2010 (Clay, Popular Science, Dec 6)**

<http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2010-12/wikileaked-cables-beijing-reveal-chinas-pursuit-fusion-power-teleportation>

Perhaps most interesting: China doubled the IPP budget in 2009 over 2008, and the diplomatic chatter suggests 2010’s budget saw a significant boost as well. Amid choppy economic waters, such funding bumps indicate a real commitment on China’s part to figure out the fusion energy puzzle. China’s sci-tech ambitions don’t stop there. While the evidence is anecdotal, the embassy seems to think the Chinese are pulling ahead in fields like quantum communications and even teleportation. To quote one diplomat’s description of a trip to the University of Science and Technology of China (USTC) in Hefei: “A cursory walk through their labs seemed to indicate they had already succeeded in single-particle quantum teleportation and are now trying to conduct dual-particle quantum teleportation.”

#### China can develop fusion in the next decade

**Stanway 2011 (Sydney Morning Herald, May 4)**

<http://www.smh.com.au/environment/energy-smart/chinas-bid-for-manmade-sun-20110504-1e7h4.html>

China by most calculations is already the world's biggest energy consumer, and demand for power is set to soar in the next decade. But its dependence on fossil fuels have also turned it into the world's biggest source of greenhouse gas. Professor Duan's fusion reactor could be the answer to China's energy conundrum. It does not require hectares of space or tonnes of scarce fuel or water resources. It produces no carbon dioxide emissions or waste, and is completely safe, even if struck by an earthquake. A large part of China's fusion research is now focused on the tokamak, a Russian acronym meaning "toroidal magnetic chamber". It is a doughnut-shaped vacuum vessel wrapped in superconducting magnetic coils that confine and control the ultra-high temperature soup of ions and electrons known as plasma. But tokamaks can only run a few seconds in experiments conducted every five months or so, creating a brief 500-megawatt burst of energy before fizzling out. Unlike the tokamak, new conventional technologies are on the cusp of being commercialised, including "third-generation" designs imported from US-based Westinghouse, owned by Toshiba, and France's Areva.

#### China will cooperate on the development of technology

**Stanway 2011 (Sydney Morning Herald, May 4)**

<http://www.smh.com.au/environment/energy-smart/chinas-bid-for-manmade-sun-20110504-1e7h4.html>

Back at his lab in Chengdu, Professor Duan remains optimistic about the long-term prospects for fusion, particularly when the pressures of climate change begin to intensify. Professor Duan heads a team of 200 people, up from just a few dozen in the 1980s when fusion researchers were struggling to convince their paymasters the technology was feasible. In recent years, Beijing has offer more funds, partly to meet its commitments to a fusion project known as the international thermonuclear experimental reactor, or ITER. "Now it is much better than before," Professor Duan said. "One reason is energy security. Another is political: we joined the ITER project." China joined the European Union, Russia, Japan and the United States in ITER in 2003. With India and South Korea also on board, the project aims to produce a working fusion reactor by 2019. The countries will share the project's costs, expected to run to €10 billion. Fusion is far behind fission in terms of development and far more reliant on international cooperation, at least while the technology is in its infancy. China, which has shown it can leverage its nuclear might to get know-how from Westinghouse and Areva, could be equally hard-headed if fusion looks like is paying off.

### 2nc

*No Caucasus war---the region always avoids large scale conflict*

**de Waal ’10** (Thomas, Senior Associate for the Caucasus at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, 11-4, Johnson’s Russia List, “The lightness of history in the Caucasus” <http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/russia-caucasus-history-georgia-abkhazia-nov-276.cfm>, jj)

**If the first historical lesson is that the region's conflicts are not predestined, the second is that the Caucasus is not as bloody as it looks. The locals** fight when they have to, but also **have sophisticated ways of not fighting**. I am not of course saying that the Caucasus is a non-violent, vegetarian kind of place. Denmark it is not. There is a strong culture of violence and weapons here, but I would argue that this is often an expressive substitute for real killing. **The conflicts of the south Caucasus in the 1990s**, great tragedies as they were, **exemplify the point. Their most striking feature was the vast number of displaced people - a total of almost 1.5 million in three years - rather than numbers killed** (the body-count was far smaller than in the contemporaneous war in Bosnia, for example). This was a grave regional humanitarian catastrophe. But it also points to the fact that in both Karabakh and Abkhazia, advancing soldiers generally preferred to terrify civilians into flight rather than to kill them. The exceptions, such as the massacre at Khojali in February 1992 and some of the atrocities in Abkhazia, were as a rule committed by more ruthless incomers not locals. Again, as well as the people who did not die, **there were the conflicts that did not happen. To the Adzharia example could be added the mixed Armenian-Georgian region of Javakheti** (which saw a brief war in 1918) **and the case of the Lezghins who live on either side of the Dagestan-Azerbaijan border, but who have chosen not to agitate for reunification. Likewise, Georgians and Ossetians on the ground in South Ossetia twice** (after the fighting of 1991-92 and 2004) **managed to carry on living and trading together despite political conflict, before their interaction was tragically cut short by the war of August 2008. All this underlines a deep history of pragmatism in the south Caucasus which is there, just below the surface, if you care to look for it.**

*2008 Georgia-Russia war proves no escalation*

**Shafee ‘10** (Fareed, holds master's degrees from the School of History, and the School of Law of Baku State University, Azerbaijan, and Kennedy School of Government of the Harvard University, Caucasian Review of International Affairs, Spring, Vol. 4, Iss. 2; pg. 184, “NEW GEOPOLITICS OF THE SOUTH CAUCASUS” proquest, jj)

The Georgian-Russian War had adverse effects on the image of the West in the region. **The verbal support from the US, EU and NATO was not enough to counter the Russian offensive**. Russia showed assertively that it would resort to force rather than yield its influence **in the South Caucasus**. Accordingly, attempting to secure NATO membership by regional countries has posed a direct threat to their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Post-Soviet countries realized that **Russia is still a mighty power, and the West is not willing to confront her for the sake of small post-Soviet states.**

## 1nr

**En independence**

**Ext #5 – No Impact – Collapse Doesn’t Cause War**

***Prefer our evidence --- their authors overestimate the US’s ability to shape the international system***

Christopher **Layne** (Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University) **2006** “The Peace of Illusions” p 176-7

A second contention advanced by proponents of American hegemony is that the United States cannot withdraw from Eurasia because a great power war there could shape the post conflict international system in ways harmful to U.S. interests. Hence, the United States "could suffer few economic losses during a war, or even benefit somewhat, and still find the postwar environment quite costly to its own trade and investment."sa This really is not an economic argument but rather an argument about the consequences of Eurasia's political and ideological, as well as economic, closure. Proponents of hegemony fear that if great power wars in Eurasia occur, they could bring to power militaristic or totalitarian regimes. Mere, several points need to be made. First, proponents of American hegemony overestimate the amount of influence that the United States has on the international system. There are numerous possible geopolitical rivalries in Eurasia. Most of these will not culminate in war, but it's a good bet that some will. But regardless of whether Eurasian great powers remain at peace, the outcomes are going to be caused more by those states' calculations of their interests than by the presence of U.S. forces in Eurasia. The United States has only limited power to affect the amount of war and peace in the international system, and whatever influence it does have is being eroded by the creeping multipolarization under way in Eurasia. Second, the possible benefits of "environment shaping" have to be weighed against the possible costs of U.S. involvement in a big Eurasian war. Finally, distilled to its essence, this argument is a restatement of the fear that U.S. security and interests inevitably will be jeopardized by a Eurasian hegemon. This threat is easily exaggerated, and manipulated, to disguise ulterior motives for U.S. military intervention in Eurasia.

**Ext #6 – No Transition Wars**

***Withdrawal is smooth***

Charles A. **Kupchan**, Political Science Quarterly, 00323195, Summer **2003**, Vol. 118, Issue 2 “The Rise of Europe, America's Changing Internationalism, and the End of U.S. Primacy” Database: Academic Search Premier

As this new century progresses, unipolarity will give way to a world of multiple centers of power. As this transition proceeds, American grand strategy should focus on making both Europe and East Asia less reliant on U.S. power, while at the same time working with major states in both regions to promote collective management of the global system. The ultimate vision that should guide U.S. grand strategy is the construction of a concert-like directorate of the major powers in North America, Europe, and East Asia. These major powers would together manage developments and regulate relations both within and among their respective regions. They would also coordinate efforts in the battle against terrorism, a struggle that will require patience and steady cooperation among many different nations. Regional centers of power also have the potential to facilitate the gradual incorporation of developing nations into global flows of trade, information, and values. Strong and vibrant regional centers, for reasons of both proximity and culture, often have the strongest incentives to promote prosperity and stability in their immediate peripheries. North America might, therefore, focus on Latin America; Europe on Russia, the Middle East, and Africa; and East Asia on South Asia and Southeast Asia. Mustering the political will and the foresight to pursue this vision will be a formidable task. The United States will need to begin ceding influence and autonomy to regions that have grown all too comfortable with American primacy. Neither American leaders, long accustomed to calling the shots, nor leaders in Europe and East Asia, long accustomed to passing the buck, will find the transition an easy one. But it is far wiser and safer to get ahead of the curve and shape structural change by design than to find unipolarity giving way to a chaotic multipolarity by default. It will take a decade, if not two, for a new international system to evolve. But the decisions taken by the United States early in the twenty-first century will play a critical role in determining whether multipolarity reemerges peacefully or brings with it the competitive jockeying that has so frequently been the precursor to great power war in the past.[\*]

***Fusion reactors won’t be commercially viable for 40 years***

**BBC 6** (BBC News [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/4627237.stm] Q&A: Nuclear fusion reactor/ February 6, 2006)

**When will the first commercial fusion reactor be built? Not for a long time. Experimental fusion reactors** like the Joint European Torus (Jet) at Culham in the UK **currently use more energy than they release**. § Marked 19:41 § **There are** therefore many major **scientific and engineering hurdles to overcome before the technology becomes commercially viable. A commercial reactor is not expected before 2045 or 2050 - if at all**. Indeed, there is no guarantee that Iter will succeed. **The running joke is that fusion has been "just decades away" for several decades.** And many commentators, particularly those greens who have fought long campaigns against nuclear fission, are deeply suspicious of fusion. **They doubt Iter will deliver and believe the money earmarked for the project would be better spent on renewables, such as wind, wave and solar, for which technical solutions already exist.**

### Prolif Cp

***They can’t build them without the plan***

**McGoldrik ’11** Fred McGoldrick has extensive experience in nuclear non-proliferation and international nuclear policy fields. He held senior positions in the U.S. Department of Energy and the U.S. Department of State, where he negotiated U.S. peaceful nuclear cooperation agreements and helped shape U.S. policy to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. He also served in the U.S. Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna. Since his retirement from the State Department, he has been a partner in Bengelsdorf, McGoldrick and Associates, LLC., an international consulting firm.

Harvard Kennedy School – Belfer Center for Science & International Affairs, Limiting Transfers of Enrichment and Reprocessing Technology: Issues, Constraints, Options

<http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/MTA-NSG-report-color.pdf>, MRL

However real, this problem is a limited one so far. **Very few states** **that do not already have such capabilities have shown any real interest in acquiring them over the near and mid-term.** In addition, most states with civil nuclear power programs do not pursue E&R capabilities. **A country would have little economic or programmatic incentive to build E&R facilities to service a small number of nuclear reactors and would face serious technical challenges in developing E&R capabilities that are commercially viable**. Countries that have sought E&R capabilities have done so for a variety of reasons—to carry out entirely legitimate, peaceful programs (e.g., West Germany, the Netherlands, Japan); to remove doubts about the reliability of fuel supply from foreign sources (e.g., Eurodif, Urenco, Japan, Germany, India, Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa); to conserve nuclear fuel resources through reprocessing (e.g., Japan, France, UK, Russia, Germany, India); to achieve the prestige of possessing advanced, sophisticated fuel cycle facilities as a symbol of national achievement, and an important component of their national security (e.g., Argentina, Brazil, India, Iran); to satisfy the demands of an influential nuclear bureaucracy (as was especially true in the case of India); or to sell enrichment or reprocessing services on the international market (e.g., US, France, Germany, the Netherlands, UK, Russia, Argentina and Iran). Countries with nuclear power programs have made varying degrees of progress in finding a solution to the management of their spent fuel and nuclear wastes, but none have actually implemented a program for the permanent disposal of their spent fuel or nuclear wastes. **Small countries face particularly formidable obstacles in locating suitable and politically acceptable sites for the disposal of nuclear wastes. Some countries may look to reprocessing as a means of either reducing the quantity and toxicity of waste that will require disposal and/or conserving resources**. **They may also consider the use of plutonium as fuel in their nuclear power reactors.** **A few have also sought such E&R technologies to serve** as part a dedicated nuclear weapons program (e.g., the U.S., UK, Russia, France, China, Israel, India, Libya, South Africa, Taiwan, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, DPRK); **to create an option for establishing a nuclear weapons capability on short notice** (e.g., Brazil and the ROK); or to pursue both peaceful and military purposes (U.S., Russia, UK, France, China, Argentina, Brazil, India, South Africa). Whatever the reasons for seeking E&R capabilities, **the spread of these sensitive nuclear facilities to additional countries will**, for the reasons outlined above, **place considerable strains on the international nonproliferation regime**.

***US push for nuclear power increases it***

**Farmer and Makhijani 10 –** Members of the Santa Fe Institute and the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (J. Doyne and Arjun, “A US Nuclear Future?,” Nature, 9/23/10)

Scaled-up dangers

There are also undesirable side effects of using nuclear power. **To make a large dent in CO**2 **emissions, 2,000–3,000 reactors would be needed worldwide by 2050 to replace an equivalent coal capacity and to increase the share of nuclear electricity to about 30%. This poses a huge proliferation hazard. Two medium-sized uranium–enrichment plants would need to be built every year** to fuel so many nuclear reactors, **increasing the risk that some fuel would be diverted and enriched to weapons-grade material. A major US push for nuclear power will make developing countries more likely to demand the capacity to enrich their own fuel, vastly hampering efforts to clamp down on nuclear proliferation.**

In addition, **each** 1,000-megawatt **reactor generates about 30 nuclear-bombs' worth of plutonium each year**. **There is still no long-term solution for the safe disposal of nuclear waste**. This year, the office managing the US **Yucca** Mountain storage project **is being closed down, leaving the discussion** potentially **back at square one** after a 30-year and $12-billion effort.

**A2: Can’t develop weapon with our plant**

***The idea that there exists a “proliferation proof” power plant is untrue – all plants can be converted and extra centrifuges can be built once the initial hurdle is overcome***

Harold **Feiveson**, Senior Research Policy Analyst, Program on Science and Global Security, “Can Future Nuclear Power Be Made Proliferation Resistant?”, Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, July 20**08**, http://www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/files/future\_nuclear\_power.pdf

**To help understand the implications for proliferation of a substantial expansion of nuclear power, we consider five nominal scenarios based predominantly on specific reactor types**: • Advanced **light water reactors** (LWRs) and/or **gas-cooled thermal reactors** on a oncethrough fuel cycle In this scenario, LWRs and gas-cooled reactors such as the pebble bed reactors operate on a once-through fuel cycle through 2050 (as described in the MIT study) and also to the end of the century. The reactors will be fueled by low-enriched uranium. Spent fuel will be put directly into geological repositories. • **Actinide burning based on fast reactors** **This is the vision of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (**GNEP). Spent fuel from LWRs and from a fleet of fast reactors will be reprocessed to separate plutonium and other transuranics (TRU – americium, curium, and neptunium). These will be fabricated into fuel for fast reactors and will be fissioned in the fast reactors in several cycles, such that the plutonium and other TRU are eventually mostly burned away. The fission products will be put into geological repositories. • **Fast breeder reactors in a closed fuel cycle** We imagine, in equilibrium, a division of LWRs and fast breeders in roughly a 55-45 ratio, similar to that described in the MIT study. Spent fuel from both types of reactors will be reprocessed and the separated plutonium used to start-up and re-fuel the breeder reactors. • **Thorium fuel cycles** Several different thorium cycles are considered. In particular, we note the possibility of breakeven breeding in a molten salt reactor. While such a reactor requires enriched uranium (typically 20 % U-235) for startup, relatively little further supplies of enriched fuel are required during subsequent operation. The U-233 produced by neutron absorption in Th-232 is never separated from the fuel, and it is also denatured by the addition of U-238 which means that isotope separation would be required to obtain weapons-grade U-233. In addition, the isotope U-232, which has a high gamma-emitting daughter, is produced during reactor operation, thus further complicating attempts to obtain weapons-usable U-233 from this cycle. • **Nuclear batteries in a hub-spoke configuration** At a central facility, reactors nominally in the range of 20-100 MWe would be fueled either with 20% uranium or plutonium, sealed, and then transported to countries deploying the reactors. The reactors would not need to be refueled during their core life, nominally 20 to 30 years, at the end of which time they would be sent back to the central facility, where the plutonium would be separated and re-fabricated into cores for the replacement reactors. The five scenarios are described in more detail in Appendix A. **Although** clearly many **technological hurdles stand in the way of the new technologies**, **we assume** for purposes of illustration that **they will all be overcome**. Also, **while each scenario highlights a particular reactor concept, there will be some mixing of reactor types** as is discussed in the Appendix. Here we highlight a few of the characteristics of the scenarios that are most relevant to our later analysis of proliferation resistance**. Today, the countries with nuclear power programs are mostly either already nuclear weapon states or industrialized democracies with no current intentions to acquire nuclear weapons**. See Figure 4.1. 10 **A robust nuclear future will, however, present a different picture. The scene of significant nuclear growth over the next half century will have to be largely in the developing countries**. This is where by far the greatest increase in electricity production is projected. If one adopts the MIT estimates of which countries will have nuclear power in a 1500 MWe nuclear future in 2050, they include many which today have essentially no or a negligible amount of nuclear power: Italy, South Africa, Portugal, Brazil, Argentina, Algeria, Morocco, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, Vietnam, Egypt, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Thailand, North Korea, and several former Soviet republics. 11 See Figure 4.2. **The introduction of nuclear power in these countries suggests the magnitude of the safeguards and institutional challenge, given that some of the new countries will doubtless raise international concerns of the kind now being highlighted by Iran’s nuclear energy program**. Naturally, the spread of countries with nuclear power will be still more substantial by 2100. One potential attraction of the nuclear battery scenario is that many of the new countries might well be content to import the batteries without attempting to develop their own fuel cycle facilities or nuclear infrastructure. Material Flows in **the** Five **Scenarios** Table 4.1 **show**s **some of the material flows associated, at equilibrium, with each of the five fuel cycles featured** – based on a 1 GWe capacity. As described in Appendix A, however, all the scenarios will involve some mixing of fuel cycles, thus affecting the cumulative material flows through 2050 and 2100. The cumulative flows associated with a 1500 GWe capacity are shown in the Appendix. The limited intrinsic resistance of any fuel cycle to country proliferation **Whichever scenario is considered, there would be few technical constraints on a country, once it had a nuclear infrastructure in place, from using its nuclear program to produce weapon-usable material**. § Marked 20:32 § **The character of the fuel cycle adopted by a country could, however, impact the time it would need to produce or to divert the material, and it could affect its ability to achieve a diversion clandestinely**. In the next section, we address some of the implications of this realization for safeguards and institutional arrangements governing the construction and proliferation of nuclear reactors and fuel cycle facilities. The special problem of centrifuge enrichment Once fully established, the nuclear fuel cycles based on thorium technologies and the nuclear battery would not require a large capacity for uranium enrichment. Deployment of these fuel cycles will, however, take time, so in all five of the scenarios, there would have to be a very large increase in uranium enrichment over the next 50 years or longer. By 2050, in the once-through and hub-spoke scenarios, annual worldwide uranium enrichment capacity would be on the order of one-quarter million tons of separative work units (SWU). This would be about four times the current enrichment capacity worldwide. Required enrichment would be less in the other scenarios, but significant nonetheless. In itself, a four-fold increase in uranium enrichment could be managed without a corresponding increase in the risks of proliferation. For example, the large enrichment enterprises today—the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Russia’s enrichment enterprise, Urenco, and Eurodif—could all certainly construct new plants and increase their output accordingly, supplying LEU to nuclear reactors worldwide, without any evident new risks. **Nevertheless, in an expanding nuclear system, it is likely that some countries—for reasons of energy security, technological pride, or flexibility to produce weapons useable material should they ever decide to do so—will want to construct their own national enrichment facilities. Such facilities would in all likelihood be based on the gas centrifuge, which appears today the enrichment technology of choice for economic reasons**. **Centrifuges raise two serious proliferation concerns**, **especially compared to gaseous diffusion**, **the other principal enrichment technology today.** **They need relatively little electricity and have few emissions thus making clandestine facilities more difficult to detect. Moreover, a gas centrifuge cascade could be switched relatively quickly from producing LEU to the production of HEU**. 13 The economies of scale for centrifuge plants suggest that any plant less than about one million SWU per year capacity (or possibly more) would not be efficient. Such a plant could service about ten 1-GWe reactors. If we use this measure and the MIT scenario for 2050, **20 countries would have at least this capacity, including Indonesia, Iran, and Pakistan**. See Figure 4.3. Naturally, not all countries with over 10 GWe of capacity would necessarily build their own enrichment facility, and even a one million SWU plant might not be able to compete with LEU supplied by the main enrichment enterprises, such as Urenco. The cost penalty in most cases would, however, be low; even a doubling of the cost of enrichment would raise the cost of electricity only slightly – about 1.5 mills per kWh. 14 **Therefore, the proliferation of centrifuge plants looms as one of the most significant challenges in a robust nuclear future.**

## 2nr

***More ev***

**DeYoung, 9/2/12** (Karen, associate editor and senior national security correspondent for the Washington Post, she has served as bureau chief in Latin America and London and correspondent covering the the White House, U.S. foreign policy and the intelligence community, as well as assistant managing editor for national news, national editor and foreign editor. She has won numerous awards for national and international reporting, The Washington Post: “US Intervention in Syria Appears Unlikely Say Officials,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-intervention-in-syria-appears-unlikely-say-officials/2012/09/02/c1cd4e9a-f2bb-11e1-a612-3cfc842a6d89_story.html>, ts)

**Despite the rising death toll, there is little U.S. appetite for another distant war or public pressure on President Obama to intervene.** In a news conference last month, Obama said the Syrian government’s use of its chemical weapons stockpiles would constitute a “red line” that would change his calculus. Republican presidential nominee **Mitt Romney has criticized Obama as tentative on Syria, but he has not called for military intervention. And a senior Romney adviser last week rejected calls for a “no-fly zone.” For now, U.S. efforts are focused on helping close ally Turkey, which is bearing the brunt of what the United Nations said are nearly 230,000 refugees who have fled Syria at a rapidly increasing rate.** Bolstering Turkey Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton traveled to Turkey last month to discuss Ankara’s call for a protected zone for the refugees inside Syria**. Clinton promised additional U.S. humanitarian assistance, but she reiterated that military measures are unworkable or shortsighted, according to American and other officials who described the meetings on the standard diplomatic condition of anonymity**. Although France and others have voiced support for some form of military action, Britain and the bulk of NATO share the United States’ reluctance, diplomats said.

**A2: Thumper – Foreign Policy**

***Foreign policy irrelevant – voters don’t care, its already priced in and Romney can’t exploit***

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/7, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12467)

A second piece of **advice for Romney: Shut up about foreign policy. It’s clearly not your forte. You sound** shrill at best and, at worst, **uninformed. Romney isn’t going to beat Obama on foreign policy. It will be on the economy**. Polls show that **Obama gets considerably better job-approval ratings on handling foreign policy than on anything else**. For Romney, the bad news is that **Obama is rated reasonably well on foreign policy**. The good news is that **voters don’t seem to be voting on foreign policy**.