**2AC Elections**

1. **Highway Bill thumps the link**
2. **This proves that transportation infrastructure is popular in the House and port security will be passed.**

Thorp 6/29 [NBC's Frank “Congress sends student loan and transportation package to Obama”]

Updated 2:12 p.m. - **Congress ended months of partisan bickering on Friday by passing and sending to President Barack Obama a comprehensive extension of highway and infrastructure projects,** along with a one-year extension of low student loan rates that were set to double. **The House voted 373 to 52 to approve a $120 billion, 27-month bill to fund highway projects**. Attached to that bill was the student loan extension, which prevented rates from doubling from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent on July 1. **The Senate approved the package shortly thereafter in a 74-19 vote**. The legislation now heads to the White House for the president's signature.

1. **No Link A) the election is too far off in the future to determine now**
2. **How can anyone possibly make the argument that the election is set for a winner.**

**Silver, 5/15/12** (Nate,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/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/>)

What I am less convinced by is the idea that **anything in the campaign** — the day-to-day stories that the news media covers — **has** **mattered** very much **so far.** One of the reasons that campaign stories have been so trivial lately is because if one of the campaigns has an especially strong line of attack on their opponent, or a great piece of opposition research, it does not make a lot of sense to drop it now when **most voters are not paying attention yet. It is still extremely early for a general election campaign**. If the period after Labor Day qualifies as the pennant race, and the summer of the general election year the regular season, we are still playing preseason baseball now.

**Plan is popular- receiving big bipartisan support from House Lawmakers.**

**Getting support means that the aff can pass the plan because both sides agree.**

**Mickey McCarter 07/02/2012**[“Aviation, Port Security Bills Enjoy Bipartisan Support from House Lawmakers”][http://www.hstoday.us/briefings/today-s-news-analysis/single-article/aviation-port-security-bills-enjoy-bipartisan-support-from-house lawmakers/8774d00b80793d7b125324dc9dad3510.html](http://www.hstoday.us/briefings/today-s-news-analysis/single-article/aviation-port-security-bills-enjoy-bipartisan-support-from-house%20%20lawmakers/8774d00b80793d7b125324dc9dad3510.html)

**Democrats applauded last week the passage by the House of several homeland security bills designed to strengthen aviation and port security.** **The bills**, including the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act (HR 1447), the Securing Maritime Activities through Risk–based Targeting **(SMART)** for **Port Security Act** (HR 4251) and the Gauging American Port Security **(GAPS) Act** (HR 4005) **enjoyed bipartisan support.** None of the bills has companion legislation in the Senate but all three moved there for consideration. The Senate could take up the bills or they could become included in a conference for the homeland security appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013. Rep. Bennie Thompson (D-Miss.), ranking member of the House Homeland Security Committee, pointed out that Democrats on his committee sponsored to two of the bills and had significant input on the third. Thompson himself introduced the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act, which would authorize the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) to provide feedback on policies and procedures at the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). The ASAC would be made up of travel industry stakeholders that are impacted by TSA regulations. Under the bill, the administrator of TSA would appoint ASAC members and set up working groups for air cargo, general aviation and perimeter security**. The SMART Port Security Act, introduced by Rep. Candice Miller (R-Mich.), would improve coordination between US Customs and Border Protection and the US Coast Guard,** as previously reported by Homeland Security Today**. The bill also would provide relief to port workers who face the prospect of having to renew their** Transportation Worker Identification Credential **(TWIC) cards in October 2012**. Thompson pressed for that provision, given that the Coast Guard has not yet set up readers for the TWIC cards, which essentially have been reduced to regular identification cards despite the promise of their biometric verification capabilities. The cost of a TWIC card, $132.50, for another five-year period would be unreasonably burdensome on port workers who cannot take advantage of all of its security features, Thompson argued. "Changes to the TWIC program could affect offsetting receipts and subsequent direct spending; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply," the Congressional Budget Office said of Thompson's provision in a report on June 11. Finally, the GAPS Act would require the Department of Homeland Security to examine gaps in port security and report to Congress with a plan to address those gaps. **Rep. Janice Hahn (D-Calif.), who sponsored the bill, hailed its passage, 411-9**, Thursday. In a statement, Hahn said, "The loopholes that continue to exist in port security keep me up at night. My first question as a member of the Homeland Security Committee was to Lee Hamilton, vice chair of the 9/11 Commission, on what Congress should be doing to protect our ports. Mr. Hamilton's response that Congress wasn't focused enough on our ports meant we needed to act. "US ports receive roughly 50,000 calls from ships annually, with 2 billion tons of freight and 134 million passengers, Hahn reported. The contribution of this cargo to the US economy is staggeringly significant, but only 3 percent or less of cargo undergoes scanning. That low amount opens up opportunities for terrorists to smuggle people or weapons into the United States, she argued. A terrorist attack on the Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach would cost billions to the economy of California and displace thousands of port workers, Hahn warned. Geraldine Knatz, executive director of the Port of Los Angeles, praised the GAPS Act as an effort to prevent such a catastrophe. "It's a tribute to both the importance of the issue and Representative Hahn's tenacity that Congress passed her legislation a mere four months after she introduced the bill," Knatz said in a statement. "Trade gateways, like the Port of Los Angeles, are critical pieces of our nation's economic infrastructure. Keeping these gateways safe is a national priority." Thompson also welcomed passage of all three bills Thursday. "As all of us have a stake in securing our nation, my Aviation Security Advisory Committee bill will ensure that the stakeholders who are expected to comply with the policies and procedures developed by TSA have a seat at the table. Then we can be confident that TSA policies are both effective from a security standpoint and address the economic and commercial realities of our nation's airports," Thompson said in a statement. "The SMART Port Act is rooted in not only the improvements to the TWIC program but also what it seeks to do to improve coordination and cooperation between DHS' maritime components and strengthen procurement practices. This bill is the result of bipartisan efforts to strengthen the security of America's ports and waterways and ensure the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security efforts are as effective and efficient as practicable," Thompson added. "Enactment of the GAPS Act will help ensure that our limited security resources can be targeted to those threats that put our ports at greatest risk. Our nation's ports are as diverse as the people they serve and the importance of this infrastructure to the global supply chain cannot be overstated," he concluded.

**3. No internal link – popularity isn’t key – the election is rigged – republicans will steal it.**

1. **Other issues thump the link – even if the plan is unpopular – other controversies will inevitably come up between now and November**

**B) Romney is out-fundraising Obama  
Vogel and Phillip 6-21-12** (Kenneth and Abby, Politico, “Mitt Romney winning mega-donor war,” http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0612/77680.html#ixzz1yq6Z5yQZ)

Romney surged past President Barack Obama in May fundraising on the shoulders of big donors — an advantage the Republican nominee seems likely to sustain through November. **Romney and his super PAC allies and party team raised about $86 million in May, compared with roughly $65 million raised by Obama and his allies, according to campaign finance reports filed Wednesday.** And Romney’s not stopping there; his team is gearing up for an elaborate display of donor schmoozing this weekend, inviting 100 supporters who have raised $100,000 or more to spend the weekend at a tony Utah ski resort with the former Massachusetts governor, his top campaign staff and GOP dignitaries such as Karl Rove and a host of prospective running mates, including Tim Pawlenty, Rob Portman, Paul Ryan and Bobby Jindal. **Obama’s trying to keep up. While the president likes to cast his campaign as small-donor-powered, Wednesday’s reports show that his allies are mounting their own big-money push, landing a trio of new million-dollar donors to a supportive super PAC and raising bigger checks into a campaign committee they quietly restructured to allow larger donations. Taken together, the reports, filed with the Federal Election Commission, paint a picture of a Romney fundraising network built for the new big-money age that appears well positioned to challenge an Obama operation that in some ways is still struggling to adapt.** “It’s easier to raise money in big chunks if there are people who are willing to give it that way, then it is to mobilize thousands of people to give $20 each,” said Bob Biersack, a leading campaign finance tracker who recently joined the Center for Responsive Politics after decades at the FEC.

1. **No internal link – Regulations don’t solve China and India emissions:**
2. **They just totally disregard other countries that emit greenhouse gases this is bad because then the problem of warming will never go away**

James **Taylor, 3/28/2012** (“The EPA Triples Down On 'None of the Above' Energy Policy,”

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2012/03/28/the-epa-triples-down-on-none-of-the-above-energy-policy/>)

U.S. carbon dioxide emissions have fallen since the beginning of the century, and the U.S. Energy Information Administration does not anticipate any appreciable rise in emissions for at least the next several decades. True, **global emissions have risen by approximately one-third this century, but the United States has had no part in that global increase.** The reason why global carbon dioxide emissions continue to rise is **nations such as China and India continue to ramp up their industrialization. China, for example, emits more carbon dioxide than the entire Western Hemisphere** and is increasing its carbon dioxide emissions by an average of 10 percent per year. Even if the United States theoretically eliminated all of its emissions today, such action would be rendered moot in less than a decade merely by the corresponding increase from China.

**A2:Iran Strikes**

**Obama won’t attack Iran- too big a risk-causes chain reactions**

**Even if you give them the argument that attacking makes him look good it is still bad for the world and our economy in the short and long run.**

**Uri Avnery 03/12/2012**[“Israel Will Not Attack Iran”] <http://palestinechronicle.com/view_article_details.php?id=19158>

Israel will not attack Iran. Period. The United States will not attack Iran. Period. **The United States will not attack. Not this year, nor in years to come. For a reason far more important than electoral considerations or military limitations. The United States will not attack, because an attack would spell a national disaster for itself and a sweeping disaster for the whole world**. "If you want to understand the policy of a country, take a look at the map," said Napoleon. **Minutes after an attack is launched, Iran will close the Strait of Hormuz, through which passes almost all the oil exported by Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, Iraq and Iran - 40% of the world’s sea-borne oil passes through the strait. A few minutes after that, oil prices will rise, will double, triple or quadruple - and the U.S. and global economy will collapse.** Such small issues do not cross the minds of generals, military commentators and other wise guys who look at the world between narrow "security" blinkers. Closing the Strait would be the easiest of military operations. A few missiles, launched from either the sea or the land, would do it. **To reopen it, it would not be enough to send the US Navy's mighty aircraft carriers on show cruises. The United States would have to conquer large parts of Iran, so as to put the Strait out of range of the Iranian missiles. Iran is larger than Germany, France, Spain and Italy combined. It would be a long war, something on the scale of the Vietnam War.** For Iran, there is no difference between an Israeli attack and an American attack. They would be treated as one and the same. In both cases, the consequence will be the blocking of the Strait and a large scale war**. All of which is more than enough for the United States not to attack, and to forbid Israel from attacking.** It's 56 years since Israel went to war without giving notice to the Americans and getting their consent. When Israel did this in 1956, President Eisenhower took away all the achievements of victory, to the last millimeter. Before the Six Day War and on the eve of the First Lebanon War, the government of Israel sent special envoys to Washington to ensure unequivocal consent. If this time it did attack against the Americans' will, who would restock the IDF armories?

**Israel has no protection if an attack is waged on Iran**

**Uri Avnery 03/12/2012**[“Israel Will Not Attack Iran”] <http://palestinechronicle.com/view_article_details.php?id=19158>

**Who would protect the cities of Israel, which would be exposed to many tens of thousands of missiles from Iran and its proxies? Not to mention the wave of anti-Semitism which can be expected to burst out once the American public finds out that it was Israel, and Israel alone, which brought upon them a national disaster. American diplomatic and economic pressure might be sufficient to stop Iran’s gallop towards the Bomb.** It worked in Gaddafi's Libya and is now happening in the North Korea of Kim. The Persians are a nation of merchants, and it might be possible to formulate a deal which would be worth their while. This is questionable, because a few years ago the Neo-Conservatives in Washington engaged in glib talk about how easy it would be to occupy Iran – which surely convinced the Iranians that they must acquire the ultimate weapon of deterrence.

**Iran wont attack US or Israel- haven’t attacked at all in 1000 years.**

**Vote affirmative the Iranian people aren’t of any threats, they won’t attack unless one is sent at them. The d/a has long timeframe to assume an attack on Iran.**

**Uri Avnery 03/12/2012**[“Israel Will Not Attack Iran”] <http://palestinechronicle.com/view_article_details.php?id=19158>

What would we have done in their place? Or rather, what did we actually do (according to foreign reports, etc.) when we were in their position? So what is going to happen? **If no deal is reached, Iran will develop nuclear weapons. That's not the end of the world.** As has been pointed out by some of our more courageous security chiefs, **this is not an existential threat. We'll live in a situation of a balance of terror.** Like America and Russia during the Cold War. Like India and Pakistan now. **Not pleasant, but not too terrible, either. Iran has not attacked any other country in a thousand years.** Ahmadinejad talks like a wild demagogue, but **the Iranian leadership actually treads very carefully. Israel does not threaten any Iranian interest.** Joint national suicide is not an option. Education Minister Gideon Sa'ar boasted, and rightly, that Netanyahu had managed to distract the whole world's attention, away from the Palestinians and to the Iranian problem. A fantastic success, indeed. Obama in effect tells him: OK, go and play with settlements as much as you want, but please leave Iran for the adults.

**Iran is not a threat- 5 reasons.**

**Intelligence proves that Iran doesn’t have nukes or a program to develop them which means U.S has no reason to attack.**

**Michael Edwards 2/ 27/ 2012** [“5 Reasons Iran is NOT a Threat to the U.S.”] <http://www.infowars.com/5-reasons-iran-is-not-a-threat-to-the-u-s/>

The Obama Administration, by Executive Order, has moved another step closer to preemptive war with Iran by declaring a National Emergency to deal with this supposed threat. A National Emergency, which gives the president extraordinary power to subvert the Constitution, is legally defined as “A situation beyond the ordinary which threatens the health or safety of citizens and which cannot be properly addressed by the use of other law.” Given the immense power the executive receives during such “emergencies”, one would think the U.S. must face a clear and present danger in order to justify such actions. Yet, all recent wars fought by America and paid for by U.S. tax dollars were preceded by little more than an Executive Order declaring a national emergency. And, notably, the president makes these declarations without the need for a vote by the Congress as stipulated by the U.S. Constitution. So what has changed with Iran that now requires a National Emergency? It seems the U.S. is just itching for another fight, because it’s clear that Iran poses no threat to the ‘health and safety’ of U.S. citizens that cannot be dealt with by ‘other laws’. **Here are 5 reasons why a National Emergency should not be declared to deal with Iran:**

1. **Never Attacked US: Iran has never attacked the United States, or even any of her interests overseas.** In fact, they have not attacked or invaded anyone in at least 270 years**. And they haven’t even threatened to harm the U.S. unless of course they are attacked first.**  Do we want to continue to be a nation that attacks others without provocation, or one that defends our country against genuine aggressors? **Iran is not an aggressor and certainly not a national emergency threat.**

1. **No Nuclear Weapon: Claims that Iran is developing a nuclear weapon seems to be the only argument warmongers have to suggest a preemptive strike. Yet, all U.S. intelligence agencies universally agree that Iran does not have a nuclear weapons program. Even if they did, why is that a reason to attack them? Just having a weapon doesn’t make a country a threat. Plenty of countries have nuclear weapons and we don’t consider them a threat.**

1. **Self Preservation: Iran will not attack the West militarily with a nuclear weapon, or even conventionally, because they know they would be inviting their immediate destruction.** Iran is a sophisticated secular society, much like Iraq was before America invaded. In fact, Iran has the third largest Jewish population in the world who live in harmony with Muslims and others. **In other words, they have a lot to lose to invite war with anyone, and they know that any move viewed as aggression would be met with swift and overwhelming force**. The West wants the world to believe their leadership is primitive and stupid, but they aren’t.

1. **Surrounded By U.S. Bases: Over 45 U.S. bases surround Iran. These bases are in addition to the fleets of U.S. warships parked in waters near Iran. A picture is worth a thousand words. Who’s the real threat here?**

1. **Conventional War is Obsolete: Iran actually has a modern armed forces that could fight back conventionally. However, conventional war is completely obsolete**. It should be likened to sticks and stones compared to the known advanced technology the world powers possess. **Besides nuclear weapons and other WMDs, there are secret weather weapons, space-based weapons, microwave weapons etc.** Russia admits to having a weather weapon that can destroy the U.S. in 15 minutes. Surely America and Europe have the same technology, and probably China, too. **These make conventional warfare nothing more than manufactured violence for economic control and managed population reduction. Again, Iran represents nothing resembling a threat to America in the face of such technology.**

America was never attacked or even threatened with attack by Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Libya, or Somalia. Yet by executive decree, taxpayers continue to fund the U.S. war machine to murder and maim innocent civilians in those countries. Conveniently, the “war on terror” has given America the excuse to preemptively strike any nation who is said to oppose them. And it seems Iran is next unless the American people stop living in fear of manufactured threats.