**Intermittency does not disturb the base load or wind being able to solve for the environment**

**MTC, 04**

In collaboration with the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative’s Renewable Energy Trust Fund, the Renewable Energy Research Laboratory “Wind Power: Capacity Factor, Intermittency, and what happens when the wind doesn’t blow?” <http://www.umass.edu/windenergy/publications/published/communityWindFactSheets/RERL_Fact_Sheet_2a_Capacity_Factor.pdf>, accessed 10/3/12,WYO/JF

**The wind does not always blow**; sometimes a wind power plant stands idle. Furthermore, **wind power is really not “dispatchable” –** you can’t necessarily start it up when you most need it. **As wind power is first added to a region’s grid, it does not replace an equivalent amount of existing generating capacity – i.e. the thermal generators that already existed will not immediately be dismantled**. **Does intermittency imply that wind power cannot have beneficial impact on the environment?** **No. We need to distinguish here between capacity and production.** The first is the amount of installed power in a region, and is measured in MW. P**roduction is how much energy is produced by that capacity, and is measured in MWh. While wind power does not replace an equal amount of fossil-fuel capacity, it does replace production – for every MWh that is produced by a wind turbine, one MWh is not produced by another generator. The damage done by our existing electricity generation is primarily a function of production, not capacity**. **Burning less coal has a positive environmental impact, even if the coal plant is not shut down permanently.** In Massachusetts, the avoided production would mostly be from fossil-fuel plants. So for every MWh that is produced by a wind turbine here, that causes about two thirds of a ton of CO2 not to be produced (see page 4 for a discussion of marginal emissions in New England.) **The impact of intermittence on the grid Intermittency does have an impact on the grid, though it is not the impact that wind power critics usually assume**. When the concentration of wind power in a region is low, the impact is negligible. Keep in mind that loads fluctuate constantly, **so a small amount of fluctuating generation can be said to act as a “negative load” and have almost no measurable impact on the grid.** Many modern wind turbines can supply some grid support as well (referred to as “ancillary services,” e.g. voltage support), just as most power plants do. As the concentration of wind power increases in a region, though, intermittence and the difficulty of forecasting wind power production do have a real cost associated with them. Recent studies of wind power installed on United States grids have attempted to determine the actual cost of intermittency, They indicate it is currently in the area of a 2-5 tenths of a cent per kWh, depending on penetration. The higher costs were for 20% penetration. A few tenths of a cent per kWh is not insignificant, but it is still a small percentage of the total cost of generating power (which for wind power might be in the range of 2-6 ¢/kWh). Intermittency does impose a cost but that cost is typically not prohibitive, as some people imagine.

## Warming

**Even if the plan is not perfect, it still sends a credible signal of climate leadership that can boost American credibility**

**CFR 12**

[Council on Foreign Relations, staff, “The Global Climate Change Regime”, updated July 5, p. <http://www.cfr.org/climate-change/global-climate-change-regime/p21831> //wyo-tjc]

**The failure to pass comprehensive U.S. climate legislation**, **with a sweeping carbon cap-and-trade** at its base, **is a significant setback to U.S. mitigation efforts**. **Cutting U.S. emissions remains an essential step toward a climate-change solution at home and abroad**, providing not only an environmentally sound solution to the problem, but **giving the United States leverage in international bargaining as well**. The increasingly intractable position of the United States became more apparent during the COP-17 meeting in Durban. There, **the United States faced nearly universal criticism for not showing the leadership necessary for addressing climate change**.**While a cap-and-trade system remains ideal**, **deep cuts in U.S. emissions can be pursued a variety of ways, including** energy-efficiency regulations, **subsidies for renewable energy, and tax incentives for low-carbon technologies**. **Effort to reach consensus on these solutions should be pursued in the short term**, keeping in mind that a broad-based and economy-wide price on carbon is essential to driving the very deep emissions cuts that will be needed through 2050 and beyond at a reasonable economic cost.

## Economy

**[\_\_\_] Extend Royal – economic decline causes war – 3 reasons**

**--Redistribution of power causes miscalculation as global economic trends shift. Their defense doesn’t assume shifting global power or miscalculation means we should win full risk of impact**

**--Hampers trade expectations and encourages protectionism that most recent studies show increases the likelihood to trigger conflict because it undermines cooperative economic interdependency**

**--Diversionary theory indicates that governments have incentive to create military conflict during hard economic times to increase popularity and create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect.**

**[\_\_\_] Outweighs**

**[Magnitude]**

**Economic collapse causes escalating nuclear exchange that destroys civilization and the biosphere.**

**Bearden**, **2k** (T.E., Director of the Association of Distinguished American Scientists, “The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How To Solve It Quickly”, Space Energy Access Systems, http://www.seaspower.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm)

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. **Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased** the intensity and number of their conflicts, **to the point where** the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**) now possessed by some 25 nations, **are** almost **certain to be released**. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea { } launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China - whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States - attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the **mutual treaties** involved in such scenarios **will** quickly **draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly**. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, **once a few nukes are launched, adversaries** and potential adversaries **are** then **compelled to launch on perception of preparations** by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed . **The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere**, at least for many decades.

.

**[Probability] There is a strong historical correlation between economic decline and war.**

**Mead 9** — Henry Kissinger Senior Fellow at the CFR, Professor at Yale (Walter Russel, "What Doesn't Kill You Makes You Stronger," The New Republic)

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. **Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists** who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, **the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies.** As a result, **developing countries** and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots **tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes**--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, **financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth.** This may be happening yet again. **None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession.** History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. **If financial crises have been a normal part of life** during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, **so has war**. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: **The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars.** Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but **the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring** Adolf **Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might** start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to **be born**? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, **if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.**

**Economic collapse causes nuclear war with Russia**

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, “[Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis_b_201147.html),” *The Huffington Post,*, 5.10.9, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html ) ET

**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 upheava**l. 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.**

## CP

Conditionality is bad:

**Time Skew: allows them to neutralize large chunks of 2ac time, hurting 1AR strat. The 2AC matters most because it puts out all the arguments that the aff can go.**

**Decrease Education: multiple worlds cause muddled debates that preclude consistency of education.**

**Voting issue: for ground, fairness, and education.**

## K

**(\_\_\_) A. Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac**

**(\_\_\_) B. It is predictable, the resolution demands USFG action**

**(\_\_\_) C. It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the Kritik, it’s the only way to test competition and determine the desirability of one strategy over another**

**Finally, It is a voter for competitive equity—prefer our interpretation, it allows both teams to compete, other roles of the ballot are arbitrary and self serving.**

**The criticism is not a reason that traditional approaches to the environment should be abandoned, but rather that state based approaches need to be expanded to include broader scholarship**

**Bryant and Wilson, 1998**

[Raymond and Geoff, Dept. of Geography at King’s College London, “Rethinking environmental management.” Progress in Human Geography 22,3 (1998) pp. 321-343] /Wyo-MB

**Many** other fruitful **interactions** between social science disciplines and subdisciplines could be mentioned (e.g., environmental history, environmental sociology), but these three examples suffice to **illustrate the increasing importance of the social sciences to a reevaluated environmental management**. Thus, and as Figure 1 suggests, environmental management should be a research field largely within the discipline of geography, but which none the less shares an affinity with other social science disciplines and their environmental subdisciplines (cf. Middleton, 1995). **A central goal, therefore, in any effort to re-evaluate environmental management, ought to be to strengthen links to selected disciplines and subdisciplines in such a way as to encourage a more inclusive appreciation of environmental management and environmental managers**. **To revitalize environmental management is also to reassess the definition of this field's scholarly community**. If **environmental management** is to be a more relevant field of study, then it follows that it **ought to reach out to a wider group of scholars** than has hitherto been the case. It is important to emphasize that this question has not even been an issue in most traditional approaches to environmental management ± it was simply understood that the community encompassed only those professional experts linked to the state (e.g., Dorney, 1987; Buckley, 1991; Atchia and Tropp, 1995). Those experts comprised mainly scholars working in the natural sciences and selected `hard' social sciences (e.g., psychology, see Williams, 1987). **A revitalized environmental management must break with this traditionally narrow approach by opening itself to a much more inclusive set of researchers and activists**, not necessarily linked to the state, **and reflecting a wide range of disciplinary influences. The point here is not that `traditional' scholars are no longer relevant to a revitalized environmental management. Rather, it is that the contributions of other researchers hither to excluded from the field need also to be accorded a place in the community**. These researchers may work for various nonstate actors ± environmental NGOs, IFIs, TNCs or grassroots organizations (e.g., people's organizations) ± or work for themselves as independent scholars or consultants. To take but one example, Friends of the Earth routinely commissions critical research on environmental management issues ranging from local-level issues (e.g., highway construction, habitat protection) to global concerns (international mahogany trade). These studies examine the environmental management activities of state agencies, IFIs, businesses, grassroots actors and others and, in doing so, they contribute (at the moment still rather inadvertently!) to the development of the research field (e.g., Friends of the Earth, 1992; 1994). **The adoption of a more inclusive understanding of `scholarly community' in this manner will reinforce over the long term a central message of this article ± namely that, whether understood as a process or as a field of study, environmental management ought not to be the exclusive preserve of state-linked `experts'.**

**In the case of the ecological system, it’s imperative to focus on consequentialism and scientific reasoning- alternatives aren’t sensible and it’s the only way to avoid further destruction.**

**Polasky et al 11**

(Stephen, Stephen R. Carpenter, Carl Folke and Bonnie Keeler, Department of Applied Economics & Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, University of Minnesota, Center for Limnology, University of Wisconsin, Beijer Institute, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Institute on the Environment, University of Minnesota, Trends in Ecology and Evolution, “Decision-making under great uncertainty: environmental management in an era of global change,” August 2011, <http://www.urbaneco.washington.edu/sbs/docs/data/3313_PolaskyetalDecisionMakingTREE.pdf//wyo-mm>)

**The potential of human action to cause global change with signiﬁcant impacts on current and future well-being makes it important to consider potential consequences** when making choices. **Turning a blind eye to potentially large problems and simply hoping that things will work out is not a sensible approach.** The only unsurprising thing about the future is that there will be surprises. **Enhancing the ability to learn and maintaining the ability to respond are important** elements of successfully dealing with surprises. **Scientiﬁc assessments have a key role to play in improving decision-making regarding global change. Making good decisions, even with limited information and great uncertainty, is necessary if we hope to steer the global social–ecological system towards sustainable trajectories and away from potentially destructive trajectories**.

**We should compare different theoretical approaches to the environment using cost benefit analysis**

**Alonsob et al, 2008**

[Enrique Alonsob, Biodiversity UNESCO Chair, ESCET-Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain, and Pablo Martínez de Anguitaa, Department of Environmental Technology, ESCET-Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain, and María Ángeles Martínc, Department of Natural Resources, University San Pablo CEU, Madrid, Spain, “Environmental economic, political and ethical integration in a common decision-making framework.” Journal of Environmental Management, Volume 88, Issue 1, July 2008, Pages 154–164, Accessed online via science direct] /Wyo-MB

**A value** is an enduring conception of the preferable which **influences choice and action** (Brown, 1984). Traditionally, neoclassical **utility theory has assumed** a value monism, i.e., **all values are commensurable and ultimately reducible to a single measure: some form of implicit or explicit cost-benefit analysis or calculation** lies behind almost every human action, object and behaviour (Frank, 1997). **Based on this metric, we should be able to measure people's preferences and values for environmental goods.**

**Alt fails, we need consumption policies established through the government because it’s the only effective mechanism to deal with the problems we’re enduring.**

**Power and Mont 10**

(Kate and Oksana, European Topic Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production, Copenhagen, Denmark, Collaboration & Learning for Sustainable Innovation ERSCP-EMSU conference, “Dispelling the Myths about consumption behavior,” 2010, accessed via asp//wyo-mm)

The framing of behaviour change policy instruments is of crucial importance in promoting the values of society: **reinforcing** materialistic and self-interested **values is unlikely to provide the longer-term acceptance of systemic policy interventions** that is **needed to tackle the** many **environmental issues we face today. We need the economic and infrastructural changes that reward “doing the right thing” and normalise sustainable lifestyles**; and **we also need a change in values and public opinion that makes sustainable levels and patterns of consumption desirable. We need consumption policies that are based on an understanding of consumption at the societal, rather than individual level**.

**If there’s a 1% risk that our scenario is correct you vote aff: scientific consensus indicates the planet doesn’t have time to come to an absolute understanding.**

**Coplan 12**

(Karl S., Professor of Law at Pace Law School and Co-Director of its Environmental Litigation Clinic since 1994 and practiced land use and environmental litigation for eight years, “Climate Change, Political Truth, and the Marketplace of Ideas,” 2012, Social Science Research Network//wyo-mm)

These two foundational First Amendment ideas – free speech as truth-discovery and free speech as self-government – coalesce into the notion that in a representative democracy like the United States, the only truths worthy of government action are those that have prevailed in the political marketplace – “political truths.”22 There is no government orthodoxy, and decisions dependant on competing theories about the best social, economic, environmental, or foreign policy are to be decided according to the power of these competing ideas to prevail in the political marketplace. **When it comes to global climate change**, however, the **scientific consensus, that catastrophic global warming is likely as long as current patterns of energy production and consumption continue, has not achieved popular acceptance**.23 **Scientific consensus holds that immediate global action to reduce fossil fuel consumption is necessary to avert this catastrophe**.24 **Assuming** that **the scientific consensus represents “truth**” (or at least a sufficiently close approximation to truth), **the planet does not have time for this truth to overcome the incorrect political consensus in “the long run**.” If First Amendment marketplace of ideas principles and self-governance principles demand that the United States forego painful measures to reduce fossil fuel consumption until it is too late, does this indicate that our system of self-government is not up to the task of responding to a slow-motion global catastrophe like climate change?

**We need to think about the securitization of the environment: it’s critical to build future resilience- as important as a potential terror attack.**

**Coaffee 08**

(Jon, School of Environment and Development, The University of Manchester, PhD in Urban Geography analysing at the impacts of risk, terrorism and security on urban development and planning, Energy Policy, “Risk, resilience, and environmentally sustainable cities,” October 18, 2008, Science Direct//wyo-mm)

**Concern for environmental sustainability, linked to climate change and the related fear of natural disaster, is as important as possible terrorist risk** as an influence on city and building design. **This points to the need to think critically about building resilience into critical urban infrastructure to take account of both security and environmental issues.** This push to incorporate resiliency principles into systems of planning and design has been undertaken in many cities in the context of widespread urban revitalisation. **This presents opportunities to integrate an array of security features into the design and maintenance of the city in response to the occurrence of and fear of crime and terrorism** (Atkinson and Helms, 2007) **alongside tackling concerns for environmental sustainability** (McEvoy et al., 2006; Roaf et al., 2005).

## Rem

**No impact- Diversifying suppliers, recycling, reducing usage, and replacing our use of rare earth minerals solves in the short term**

**Berry, 11**

Renee Berry and Mihir Torsekar, 3-11 (Office of Industries, US International Trade Commission, USITC Executive Briefings on Trade, “Supplies of Critical Rare Earths to US Industries Are Constrained by China’s Policies,”)

U.S. INDUSTRY RESPONSES TO CHINA’S POLICIES ON RARE EARTH EXPORTS **In response to price increases and potential shortages, U.S. industries are pursuing diverse strategies**: · Recycle: Many **companies have increased rare earth recycling efforts**. One global electronics company for instance, estimates that recycling could fulfill 10% of its rare earth needs. · Reduce/Replace: **U.S. companies and research labs are developing alternative technologies that reduce or replace rare earth usage**. For example, electromagnets are seen as an alternative to permanent rare earth magnets in motors for electric and hybrid vehicles. **Similarly, General Electric (GE)—the leading U.S. wind turbine manufacturer—has been using non-rare earth elements**, such as rhenium, to make engine turbine blades. GE is also working with the U.S. Department of Energy to reduce the rare earth content in permanent magnets by up to 80% using nanotechnology. · Diversify suppliers: **The expected emergence of rare earth mining facilities in both the United States and Australia over the next two years may provide U.S. industries with alternative suppliers of these elements**. (The United States, once the world’s largest supplier of rare earths, halted production in 2002 due in large part to environmental concerns). **Although all these measures have the potential to reduce U.S. dependence on imports of rare earths from China over the next several years, supply limitations, import dependence, and price volatility are likely to continue in the short term**.

**No conflict escalation- China will respond peacefully to international pressure on Mineral exports**

Aaron **Souppouris, 8-22**

(“China raises export quota for rare earth metals”, the verge)

**In the face of mounting international pressure, China has raised its export quota for rare earth metals**. Chinas controls around 95 percent of the world's production of the metals, which are used when manufacturing a wide range of military, commercial, and personal electronics. **Back in October last year**, Bautou Steel, **a Chinese company that just happens to be the world's largest producer of rare earths, openly announced that it would cease production for a month in order to drive up prices.**¶ **Now, five months after the US, EU, and Japan filed a trade complaint against it, China has increased its export quota by 2.7 percent.** The Wall Street Journal reports that the quota rise largely symbolic, however, as demand has fallen by around 37 percent so far this year, despite Ben Popper's attempts to embed the world's rare earth deposits in his body.

**Wind energy being debated now- PTC**

**Bryce 9/17**

(Robert, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, National Review Online, “The Cost of Wind-Energy Jobs,” September 17, 2012, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/316854/cost-wind-energy-jobs-robert-bryce//wyo-mm)

**The battle over the federal** production tax credit (**PTC) for wind**, which amounts to 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour and expires at the end of the year, **is heating up. Last month, the Senate Finance Committee approved a plan to extend the PTC. Republican nominee Mitt Romney has said** that, **if elected, he will let the credit expire.** President Obama wants to extend it: Last week, in a speech at the Democratic National Convention, he declared that “thousands of Americans have jobs today building wind turbines.”

**Alaska has many mineral reserves- solves in the long term**

David **Szumigala 11**

(Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, “Rare Earth Elements- A Brief Overview of These Elements, Including their Uses, Worldwide Resources, and Known Occurrences in Alaska)

Mineral resources comprise a major part of Alaska’s economic assets. **Alaska is considered highly prospective with regard to strategic and critical minerals** **needed for domestic uses**. **Alaska’s diverse geology is permissible for a wide range of mineral deposit types**. Figure 5 shows a graph of mineral commodities currently imported into the United States. **Alaska currently produces some of these minerals,** has produced some in the past, and has the potential to produce some quantity of most of these imported mineral commodities in the future. The location and magnitude of these resources are largely unknown. The State of Alaska cannot efficiently manage or develop assets that are unknown and not quantified. The benefits of a thorough mineral-resource information base include: 1) Enhancing community and local government economies and revenue opportunities; 2) Stimulating private-sector exploration and competitive development of Alaska’s mineral resources; 3) Developing transportation corridors and infrastructures to known resources; and 4) Providing sound scientific information to support long-term decisions on management of state-interest lands. Figure 5. The United States relies on imports of critical minerals to satisfy current needs. Alaska has the potential to produce many of these minerals and materials. Alaska currently and historically has produced 24 of the 65 shown in this figure. Figure modified from U.S. Geological Survey, 2010. **Many areas of Alaska are geologically permissible for hosting REEs**, but the lack of basic data statewide hinders evaluation of Alaska’s REE potential. The most significant REE prospect in Alaska is the Bokan Mountain property, located 37 miles southwest of Ketchikan. Preliminary assessments suggest the area contains one of the largest REE deposits in North America, with significant enrichments in heavy REEs. Alaska has more than 70 additional known mineral occurrences (attached map) and millions of acres of selected or conveyed lands with the potential to contain REEs, but the mineral-resource potential of these occurrences and lands is poorly understood. In 2010, U.S. House and Senate bills were introduced to encourage reestablishment of domestic REE industries. The Alaska Legislature’s passed House Resolution (HR16) in 2010? urging Congress to advance development of new REE reserves in the U.S., and continued exploration for REE deposits in Alaska. The USGS compiled worldwide data on rare earth element mines, deposits, and occurrences from a variety of sources (Orris and Grauch, 2002). The report classifies the known occurrences by a number of geological critieria. The Alaskan occurrences cited in Orris and Grauch (2002) and Long and others (2010) are summarized in Table Z. Many of the occurrences have not been well studied and their economic potential is not really known (Orris and Gauch, 2002).

**Supply will exceed demand within 5 years**

**Yan Zhou, 11**

 (China Daily, "Rare earths output ratio to decrease," http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2011-06/16/content\_12708457.htm)

BEIJING - **The world's supply of rare-earth minerals will outstrip demand within five years, reversing global reliance on China's exports** as more foreign players begin exploration of their own, industrial executives said. The soaring price of rare earths will also trigger global players to cash in on the valuable minerals. **More countries with large rare-earth deposits will resume exploration after freezing it for years,** **which will lead to a global reallocation of the minerals**, Wang Hongqian, general manager of China Nonferrous Metal Industry's Foreign Engineering and Construction Co Ltd (NFC), told China Daily. Consequently, "the current tight-supply situation will not last," Wang said. The State-owned NFC has tapped into Guangdong province, the mid-heavy rare-earth-rich region, by teaming up with local firms. NFC Southern Rare Earth (Xinfeng) Co, in which NFC owns 76 percent equity, received authorities' approval in May to build the world's biggest ion-type rare-earth separation project, with an annual capacity of 7,000 tons. **Rare earth is the collective name for 17 metallic elements, of which the mid-heavy types are the most valuable because of their wide uses.** The metals are needed for some advanced technologies, such as smart phones, hybrid cars and missiles. China, which supplies more than 90 percent of the minerals, adopted strict exploration and export regulations after rampant exploration caused heavy environmental pollution. **Although it is the world's top rare-earth supplier, China controls only about 36 percent of the world's deposits.** Countries with large reserves, such as the United States and Australia, have yet to unfreeze exploration of the minerals. "More countries participating in the exploration of their own supply of rare earths will help ease the tight-supply situation and ease demand," said Chen Zhanheng, director of academic department, the Chinese Society of Rare Earths (CSRE).

**US-China war won’t happen – economic interdependence**

**Weede**, Former Professor of Sociology at the University of Bonn, 2010

(Erich, retired in 2004, current member of the Mont Pelerin Society, “The Capitalist Peace and the Rise of China: Establishing Global Harmony by Economic Interdependence”, International Interactions 36:2, 206-213, 5/18/10, accessed 6/20/11) JDB

**Economic cooperation and interdependence provide much more hope for the immediate future than democratization. The more countries trade with each other, the less likely military disputes between them become. Given the size of both economies and the distance between America and China, they already trade a lot with each other. As China is the first Asian giant to become capable of challenging the U.S., these pacifying ties happen to be in place where they are most needed.** From a capitalist peace perspective there is another piece of good news. Although trade between India and China had been negligible for a long time, since 1999 it has grown. **By 2009, China had become India’s biggest trading partner. Economic interdependence or trade may exert some pacifying impact on the relationship between Asia’s neighboring giants. Comparing the war-proneness of the Middle East with the avoidance of major military conflicts in the Far East over the past three decades, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the East Asian focus on economic openness and interdependence, on commerce, exports and growth did contribute to the pacification of East Asia.**

## Elections

**Obama will inevitably win- strong economic signs overwhelm Romney’s debate performance**

**Francis Oct. 5th**

[David Francis, US News Money Article Author, October 5th, 2012, Are Economic Indicators Foreshadowing an Obama Win?, <http://money.usnews.com/money/personal-finance/mutual-funds/articles/2012/10/05/are-economic-indicators-foreshadowing-an-obama-win>, uwyo//amp]

**There is now a firm consensus** among media analysts **that** Republican presidential candidate Mitt **Romney soundly defeated** Democratic President Barack **Obama in Wednesday's debate,** outmaneuvering the president on many issues and often putting Obama on the defensive. But **will Romney's victory matter?** Three debates remain—one between the vice presidential candidates and two more presidential debates—and **there is little agreement on whether these contests have a significant impact on voters.** [See 4 Steps to Lock Down Your Portfolio for the Election.] But **most pollsters acknowledge that the economy represents the most important issue in this election. In recent months, it was widely thought that the sluggish recovery of the U.S. economy would benefit Romney. However, with only a handful of weeks left until Election Day, the economy is showing signs of life.** According to experts interviewed by U.S. News, **after nearly four years into Obama's presidency, several signs indicate that the state of the economy may now work in the president's favor.** "**What we're seeing** right now, because the economic indicators are slowly improving**, is a little bit of confidence coming back to decision-makers, including businesses and consumers,"** says Kimberly Amadeo, author of Beyond the Great Recession: What Happened and How to Prosper.

**Romney will win- Intrade betting proves**

**Bingham Oct. 4th**

[Amy Bingham, ABC News October 4th, 2012, <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/10/mitt-romney-dominates-in-post-debate-betting/>, uwyo//amp]

It will be days before public opinion polls will have tallied how President Obama and Mitt Romney performed at the first presidential debate. But**, while the odds are still with the president, betting men have been casting their lots for Romney. On both Intrade**, an Ireland-based online betting market**, and BetFair, i**ts English counterpart, **the odds that Romney will win the election spiked in the aftermath of his strong debate performance as bettors poured thousands of pounds and dollars into predicting who will win the White House** in November. **Bettors on Intrade**, primarily Americans **wagering millions, boost Romney’s chances 7 percentage points** from his closing value on Tuesday to his closing value Thursday, the largest spike Romney has seen on the 2012 market. **Obama’s odds, on the other, dropped 14 points** from a 79-percent high the day before the debate to a 65-percent low the day after.

**Romney is actually winning- media bias is manipulating polls**

**Gate Sept. 26th**

[Gate, September 26th, 2012, If The Election Were Held Today, Romney Would Win Big Over Obama, <http://www.norcalblogs.com/gate/2012/09/if-the-election-were-held-today-romney-would-win-big-over-obama.php>, uwyo//amp]

**When you get beyond the medias attempt to manipulate the poll, you will learn** that, not counting those who are still undecided, **if the election were held today, Romney would win 51.8% to 44.1**% over Obama. Truth is, **Obama can take every undecided vote between now and November 6th, and Romney would still win.** However **the undecided voters will split, so let's consider** the split that resulted in the most recent election, **the 2010 midterms. That would mean 58% of undecided voters will pull the lever for the Republican while, with the remaining 42% going to the Democrat. That would put the final tally at 59.74% to 41.26%, which would be a** historic **landslide for** Mitt **Romney.**

**Romney wins: peaking in voter enthusiasm necessary in battleground states.**

**Ferrechio 9/11**

(Susan, Chief Congressional Correspondent, Washington Examiner, “Polls show Romney soars with independent voters,” September 11, 2012, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/polls-show-romney-soars-with-independent-voters/article/2507679#.UFJD8o1lQvk//wyo-mm>)

**Romney** also **appears to have an advantage over Obama when it comes to voter enthusiasm**. The **CNN/ORC International poll showed Republicans leading Democrats among the most enthusiastic voters, 62 percent to 56 percent**. The **enthusiasm level helps determine which party will show up in greater numbers to vote. "This Republican enthusiasm advantage has manifested itself in an** unprecedented and historic grassroots **effort that will have a significant impact on turnout in battleground states on Election Day,"** Romney campaign pollster Neil Newhouse said in a Monday memo aimed at downplaying reports of an Obama bounce.

#### Plan would be massively popular with voters

**CSI 12**

[Civil Society Institue, “SURVEY: CONGRESS, WHITE HOUSE FOCUS ON FOSSIL FUELS, NUCLEAR POWER IS OUT OF TOUCH WITH VIEWS OF MAINSTREAM AMERICA” November 3 -- <http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/110311release.cfm>]

If Congress thinks it has found a winning issue in trashing wind and solar power ... and if the Obama Administration believes that voters will reward it for boosting coal, gas and nuclear power ... then both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue are making serious miscalculations about the sentiments of mainstream Americans - including Republicans and Tea Party supporters -- one year before the 2012 elections, according to the findings of a major survey of 1,049 Americans conducted October 21-24, 2011 by ORC International for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI).¶ Documenting a major gulf between the views of Americans and the Congress/White House on energy policy, the CSI survey includes the following key findings:¶ **• If Washington had to choose between fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies and wind/solar subsidies, "clean energy" aid would get support from three times more Americans than fossil fuel/nuclear energy subsidies**. Only a bit more than one in 10 American adults (13 percent) - including just 20 percent of Republicans, 9 percent of Independents, 10 percent of Democrats, and only 24 percent of Tea Party supporters - are in favor of concentrating federal energy subsidies on the coal, nuclear power and natural gas industries. When it comes to focusing federal subsidies on wind and solar, 38 percent of all Americans are supportive -- about three times the support level for fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies. Only about one in 10 Americans (13 percent) - including just 26 percent of Tea Party supporters -- believes that "no energy source should receive federal subsidies."¶ • Fossil fuel subsidies are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. Six in 10 Americans - including a strikingly uniform 59 percent of Republicans, 65 percent of Independents, 59 percent of Democrats, and 59 percent of Tea Party members -- oppose "federal subsidies for oil and gas, coal, natural gas and other fossil fuel companies."¶ • Nuclear reactor loan guarantees are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. More than two out of three Americans (67 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 66 percent of Independents, 68 percent of Democrats and 62 percent of Tea Party backers - disagree that "taxpayers and ratepayers should provide taxpayer-backed loan guarantees for the construction of new nuclear power reactors in the United States through proposed tens of billions in federal loan guarantees for new reactors."¶ • Most Americans want the U.S. to shift federal loan guarantee support from nuclear power to wind and solar energy. About seven in 10 Americans (71 percent) - including 55 percent of Republicans, 72 percent of Independents, 84 percent of Democrats, and almost half (47 percent) of Tea Party backers -- strongly or somewhat support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors and towards clean renewable energy such as wind and solar."¶ • A strong majority of Americans want the U.S. to make the investments needed to be a clean energy leader on a global basis. More than three in four Americans (77 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 75 percent of Independents, 88 percent of Democrats, and 56 percent of Tea Party members -- agree with the following statement: "The U.S. needs to be a clean energy technology leader and it should invest in the research and domestic manufacturing of wind, solar and energy efficiency technologies."¶ Pam Solo, founder and president, Civil Society Institute, said: "Americans of all political stripes have moved ahead of Washington and want our nation to make smarter choices about cleaner and safer sources of power. Common sense is the driving force in American opinion, which focuses not on whether Washington should help usher in a renewable, clean energy future, but how it should proceed in doing so. Americans believe that the energy industries have an undue influence over decisions made by Washington. They want leadership and problem solving from Washington for a clean energy future. Americans understand that we can no longer have our economy and environment tethered to 'old' energy solutions that are unsafe, unhealthy and simply unable to meet our long-term needs."¶ Graham Hueber, senior researcher, ORC International, said: "One clear message of this survey sit that **there is no clear 'Old Fuel Constituency' in the sense of a large number of unified Americans who favor** **fossil fuels** and nuclear power over wind and solar power. In fact, Republicans and Tea Party supporters who might seem like the most logical place for such a constituency are somewhat more likely than others to support federal subsidies for fossil fuels and nuclear power, but they also would prefer development of cleaner sources of energy. These are actually quite striking findings in the context of the 2012 election campaign."¶

**Obama not winning Col now- they’re in a dead heat**

**Richardson Sept. 14th**

[Obama, Romney still dead even in Colorado - Washington Times http://www.washingtontimes.com/blog/inside-politics/2012/sep/14/obama-romney-still-dead-even-colorado/#ixzz26Uy8tVMm , uwyo//amp]

DENVER — President **Obama and** Mitt **Romney have** practically **made Colorado their second home, but all those campaign stops and television ads haven't broken the deadlock. A survey of Coloradans** released Friday by The Denver Post **showed the candidates still stuck in a one-point dead heat, with Mr. Obama leading by 47 to 46 percentage points. The margin of error for the poll is +/- 4 percentage** points, meaning **the candidates are** essentially **tied.** **What about when Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson is included? In that case, it's still a one-point race, with the Democrat Obama ahead of the Republican Romney by 45 to 44 percentage point**s. Mr. Johnson takes 3 percent of the vote. Denver political analyst Floyd Ciruli said **the results "really raise the importance of the October debate here**." The first presidential debate is scheduled for Oct. 3 at the University of Denver. "**This race could come down to a few thousand votes in Colorado**, which means we'll be seeing a lot more them," said Mr. Ciruli.

**Colorado will be the only way to compensate for bigger swing state losses- it is key to Obama’s reelection**

**Sale 2012**

[Anna Sale, politics journalist, July 08, 2012, Anna in the Swing States: Colorado's Swinging Suburbs and Untapped Latino Voters, <http://www.wnyc.org/articles/its-free-country/2012/jul/08/colorados-swinging-suburbs-and-untapped-latino-voters/>, uwyo//amp]

At the start of this summer, Mitt **Romney was cutting into** President Barack **Obama's lead in the key swing state of Colorado,** even as the president's advantage with Latino voters here was expanding. With the unemployment rate stuck above eight percent and immigration reform newly prominent on the president's priority list, we're asking Colorado's swing suburban voters if they're souring on the president they helped elect, and whether Latino voters here have been convinced enough by Obama's recent moves to make up that difference. Colorado’s swelling suburbs and the growing numbers of Latino voters are most often cited as the drivers behind recent Democratic gains in the western state. Latino voters made up just 13 percent of the electorate in 2008, but they proved decisive by overwhelming favoring Obama while white voters almost evenly split. Suburban voters were pivotal for another reason: their massive share of the vote in Colorado. They cast more than half of all votes here four years ago, and after supporting George W. Bush in 2004, they swung ten points to give Obama a slight edge over John McCain. Obama won Colorado by nine points in 2008, the first time a Democrat had a presidential race won here since 1992. **This year, Colorado is in many ways the lynchpin in the Obama campaign’s strategy to remake the electoral map. As Obama campaign manager Jim Messina laid out last year, if the president repeats that win in Colorado, and captures Iowa, Nevada, New Mexico and the states John Kerry won in 2004, Obama wins another term. This western strategy diminishes the importance of Ohio and Florida, even though those perennial battlegrounds are much bigger electoral prizes compared to Colorado’s relatively modest nine electoral votes**. The Colorado electorate is largely broken up in thirds among Democrats, Republicans, and independents. Since 2008, the ranks of the unaffiliated, independent voters have grown in Colorado, and Democrats and Republicans now make up a slightly smaller percentage of registered voters in Colorado than they did four years ago. Much of the registration gains for Democrats and independents has happened in congressional districts with urban areas, contributing to the Democrats' recent success there.

**Colorado will only reach voter enthusiasm if Obama takes further steps toward clean energy**

**Casey 2011**

[Mike Casey, founder and president of Tigercomm. He uses his 27 years of communications experience to counsel cleantech company executives, pro-sustainability nonprofit leaders and elected officials on building and running their communications programs, Can Obama Go Back to Political base(ics)?, November 28, 2011, <http://www.greatenergychallengeblog.com/2011/11/28/can-obama-go-back-to-political-baseics/>, uwyo//amp]

President **Obama made a smart move** this month **by putting** the **Keystone XL** pipeline **project into the deep freeze. It had been poor politics** for him — and it would have been even worse policy for the country, especially when you consider the aggressive retooling of our world energy sources demanded by the International Energy Agency findings in its latest World Energy Outlook. But for the president’s staff, the question that lingers is whether it will relearn what it had mastered so well in 2008 — that **while you have to campaign in the center, your base voters’ enthusiasm matters a lot. Based on articles** like this one in Bloomberg Businessweek, **about how environmentalists “matter less to Obama 2012,” it certainly doesn’t seem that way**. For instance, the Businessweek article quotes Obama campaign spokesman Ben LaBolt commenting that “[w]hen voters compare Obama’s record with [the Republican candidates for president], ‘there will be no question about who will continue our progress.’” The problem is, for ego-conscious millennials (the key, according to a new analysis by Center for American Progress political analysts Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin, to the 2012 election) like former Microsoft executive Jabe Blumenthal, who care deeply about environmental issues and who want to feel that their concerns are being heard at the highest levels, simply asserting that “I’m not Rick Perry” or “I’m not Mitt Romney” won’t work. To the contrary, Blumenthal says in the Businessweek piece, it’s “simply not true” that the specter of Romney, Perry or Gingrich will be sufficient cause for him to open his checkbook to the Obama campaign, as he did in 2008. Throughout the Keystone XL process, the message from Washington pundits and experts was that environmentalists “will not be happy, but **they have nowhere else to go**.” It’s hard to imagine such an arrogant statement being directed at African-American, gay or Latino voters, but the “nowhere else to go” sentiment directed at environmentalists seemed to have taught them it was time to chuck the tradition of patty-cake politics and “principled loserism” they’ve operated with for so long. The clincher in the Keystone fight was when committed Obama 2008 volunteers, donors and staffers started correcting the “nowhere else to go” idea. These Obama supporters recognized that they did indeed have somewhere else they could go: home, And not just on election day, but on all the days between now and then. **In key states such as Colorado, where the green base is a lot of the base, these base voters realized that they could make themselves matter**. In addition, environmental leaders such as 350.org’s Bill McKibben, Sierra Club’s Mike Brune, Friends of the Earth’s Erich Pica, and Greenpeace’s Phil Radford have shown they aren’t interested in the “nowhere to go” approach. **I’m still not sure why the White House let things get to the point where supporters had to threaten to withhold their time, money and effort — all over a boondoggle that wouldn’t have dropped gas prices at all**. To me, the politics around the Keystone XL pipeline were clear from the start. First there were the wildly inflated claims of jobs from an industry with a history of inflating them. And, of the jobs that would have been created, most would have been in states that were politically out of reach for Obama, and many of those would likely have been created after the election. Worse, the project had become a cafeteria line for TransCanada lobbyists, creating a paper trail of revolving door influence-peddling and inside dealing that the media would have acquired and used long into an Obama second term. On top of all that, the president’s approval of this project would have further depressed his base while benefiting an industry that is resolutely opposed to him — including his arch political enemies, the Koch brothers. It all leaves me scratching my head. But, hey, as a clean energy advocate, I’ll take the result. Going forward, **there’s an opportunity for the Obama staff to stop confusing** the critical task of **courting the political center with the ill-advised practice of coddling lobbyists from a hostile oil industry.** For the environmental community, **there’s an opportunity to not resume the folded-hands, broken-hearted mode so much of its leadership has operated from over the last three decades. It will be interesting to see what the younger environmental.**

**Fossil fuel expansion is a hot button issue for voters in swing states- Obama’s base vehemently opposes expansion**

**Stop the Frack Attack 2012**

[Stop the Frack Attack Press Release, Eco Watch a grassroots environmental movement, 07/03/2012, Celebrities Rally to Stop Fracking, <http://ecowatch.org/2012/celebrities-rally/>, uwyo//amp]

Today, **celebrities and environmental leaders joined the call for the first-ever national mobilization on fracking** on July 28 in Washington, D.C., called “Stop the Frack Attack.” The event will have three demands for Congress: stop dangerous fracking, close seven legal loopholes that exempt the oil and gas industry from parts of the Safe Drinking Water, Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, **and implement a pathway towards 100 percent clean renewable energy**. Mark Ruffalo, Pete Seeger, Lois Gibbs, Bill McKibben, Ed Begley Jr., Ed Asner, Josh Fox, Gus Speth, Cornel West, Vandana Shiva, Holly Near, James Hansen, Dar Williams, Michael Kieschnick, Joe Uehlein and Margot Kidder join more than 100 organizations and community groups in their call to action**. “Fracking is proof our addiction to fossil fuels has gone too far,”** said Margot Kidder. “**In the face of this kind of destruction, doing nothing is not an option.** I’ll be in D.C. on July 28 because I’m worried about the world my grandchildren will inherit without immediate action. We have to stop the destruction, and we have to do it now.” **Fracking is a hot-button issue in swing states including PA, OH, CO, NM, NC, and MT. In New York, high-volume fracking in shale is on hold while the state reviews its impacts, and the fight against the practice includes calls for a total ban.** However, Governor Cuomo is threatening to authorize the practice, possibly starting in selected parts of the state, despite the concerns of communities that would be impacted.

**Relations decline inevitable**

**Bovt 12**

(Georgy, Political Analyst – Moscow Times, "Whether Obama or Romney, the Reset Is Dead", Moscow Times, 9-11, [http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/whether-obama-or-romney-the-reset-is-dead/467947.html )](http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/whether-obama-or-romney-the-reset-is-dead/467947.html%20%29), accessed 9/22/12,WYO/JF

**During every U.S. presidential election** campaign, **there is a debate in Russia over whether the Republican or Democratic candidate would be more beneficial for the Kremlin**. Russian analysts and politicians always fail to understand that Americans have shown little interest in foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. **Even when foreign policy is mentioned in the campaign, Russia is far down the list as a priority item.** The volume of **U.S-Russian trade remains small**. The recent Exxon-Rosneft deal notwithstanding, **U.S. interest in Russia's energy projects has fallen,** particularly as the Kremlin has increased its role in this sector. To make matters worse, **the United States is determined to establish clean energy and energy independence, while Russia's gas exports are feeling the pinch from stiff competition with the U.S. development** of shale gas production. Of course, traditional areas of cooperation remain: the transit of shipments to and from Afghanistan through Russia, Iran's nuclear program and the struggle against international terrorism. But **the transit route into Afghanistan cannot,** by itself, **greatly influence bilateral relations as a whole**, and progress on the other two points seems to have reached a plateau beyond which little potential remains for bringing the two countries into closer cooperation. **On the positive side, a new visa agreement came into force this week** that will facilitate greater contact between both countries' citizens. **But it will be years before that** significantly **influences** overall U.S.-Russian **relations**. A new agreement regarding child adoptions has also been implemented after a few disturbing adoption stories prompted Russia's media, with the help of government propaganda, to spoil the U.S. image in Russia. Meanwhile**, both** U.S. President Barack **Obama and** Republican candidate Mitt **Romney support the U.S. missile defense** **program in principle**, although the exact form and scope of its deployment differ among the candidates. **Even though** President [Vladimir **Putin**](http://www.themoscowtimes.com/mt_profile/vladimir_putin/432538.html), during his interview with RT state television last week, **expressed guarded optimism over the prospect of reaching an agreement on missile defense with Obama**, Russia seems to underestimate the degree to which Americans are fixated on missile defense as a central component of their national security**. It is highly unlikely that any** U.S. administration — **Democratic or Republican** — **will ever agree to major concessions on missile defense.** It even seemed that Kremlin propagandists were happy when in March Romney called Russia the United States' No. 1 foe. They were given another present when Obama, addressing the Democratic National Convention last week, said Romney's comment only proved that he lacked foreign policy experience and was locked in Cold War thinking. For the next two months, however, the two candidates are unlikely to devote much attention to Russia. **Russia's internal politics will also be one of the key factors shaping future U.S.-Russian relations**. The two-year jail sentence slapped on three members of Pussy Riot for their anti-Putin prayer in Moscow's main cathedral has already become a subject of discussion between Foreign Minister [Sergei Lavrov](http://www.themoscowtimes.com/mt_profile/sergei_lavrov/433770.html)and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Even the most pragmatic "pro-reset" U.S. administration would criticize to one degree or another Russia's poor record on human rights. **It appears that Russia is moving increasingly toward confrontation rather than rapprochement with the West**. **The Kremlin** now **seems fully committed to spreading the myth that the U.S. State Department is the cause behind most of Russia's domestic problems and is bent on undermining its national security** by deploying missile defense installations in Europe and by supporting the opposition. There are other disturbing signals as well. Take, for example, the United Russia bill that would prohibit Russian officials from owning bank accounts and property overseas, with particular attention paid to their holdings in the West. The ideological underpinning of this bill is that assets located in the West are tantamount to betrayal of the motherland. **Then there is Russia's opposition to the U.S. Magnitsky Act. The Kremlin interprets this initiative as yet another confirmation of its suspicions that Washington is conspiring against it** and that the bill's real U.S. motive is to blackmail Russian officials by threatening to freeze their overseas bank accounts and property. **An increase in these anti-Western attitudes does not bode well for U.S.-Russian relations, even if Obama is re-elected in November**. Regardless of which candidate wins, the reset is bound to either slowly die a natural death under Obama or be extinguished outright under Romney. **As a result, the most we can likely expect from U.S.-Russian relations in the next four years is cooperation on a limited range of mundane issues. Under these conditions, avoiding excessive anti-Russian or anti-U.S. rhetoric from both sides would itself be considered a major achievement in bilateral relations.**

**just posturing**

**Canwest 3/17/09** (Canwest News Service, “Russia's militarization may be sabre-rattling: expert.” Peter O’Neil. Lexis.)

**Russian sabre-rattling increased** Tuesday as President Dmitry Medvedev, **complaining of a threat by the U.S.-dominated North Atlantic Treaty Alliance** at its borders, promised a ``large-scale'' expansion of his country's conventional and nuclear arsenal. **Russia has also spoken openly about vague plans to locate long-range strategic bombers in either Cuba or Venezuela**, evoking chilling memories of the Cuban Missile Crisis that took the world to the brink of nuclear war in 1962. **But two analysts told Canwest News Service that much of the noise** from Russia, a country facing particularly difficult economic woes due to plunging energy prices, **amounts to posturing directed at both domestic and international audiences**. ``The Russian bear is lean and hungry in these hard times. But its teeth are in danger of falling out, and it can do little more than growl,'' said Fen Hampson, of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs in Ottawa, in an e-mail.

**Distrust will not spill-over into open conflict.**

**Sakwa 08** RICHARD SAKWA, h ead of the department of Politics and International Relations at the University of Kent, International Afairs 8, March2008, (2008) 241–267

**The end of the Cold War has been repeatedly announced, yet the beast stubbornly lives on.97 Nearly two decades after the fall of communism we have once again entered a period of self-reinforcing suspicion and distrust between the major nuclear powers. This does not necessarily mean that the world will enter a period of sustained and institutionalized rivalry between two powers that act as magnetic poles in global afairs. The conditions for a replay of the old Cold War in its classic form are simply not present.** **Russia and America do not lead riva**l **ideological projects on a global scale; although disagreements over such issues as the appropriate role of multilateral mechanisms do exist, they exist also between NATO allies.** **Nor are there sustained and entrenched policy differences over such issues as nuclear** **proliferation, global warming or any number of other funda­mental issues facing the world. Russia is just one among a number of potential great powers, and therefore old-fashioned bipolarism is a thing of the past, and Russian–American relations are no longer the axis on which world politics turns. Even the issue that has much exercised the policy community in Washington, Russia’s alleged ‘democratic backsliding’, is a matter of interpretation, and in any case new leaderships in both countries may provide an opportunity for the regime question to become less sharp.98 The term ‘Cold War’, therefore, is a contem­porary international relations metaphor for a fundamentally strained relationship that cannot be resolved within the framework of the world views of either party but requires a rethinking of both.**