## Economy

### 1NC Econ Advantage Frontline

**From Anja Beth Swoap and Andrew Callas (NU Sophomores CMT)**

#### 1.Keynesianism fails

#### A. Keynesianism always fails - empirics prove governments create business cycles

[Read](http://www.articledashboard.com/profile/C.-Read/90069), ’11 [C. Read, writer for Article Dashboard, 2011, <http://www.articledashboard.com/Article/Keynesian-economics-is-a-failure/643935>] Callas

Keynesian exuberance for the powers of stimulating demand or the 'consumer' has been in vogue since the 1930s. It is sheer nonsense which is taught in every school across the globe. Keynesian economics is little more than intellectual pablum used by those in power or by a technocratic and largely illiterate elite to increase their power; enhance government; print money and otherwise destroy normal economic relationships. Keynes' theory, so believed by professors is in practice a disaster. Keynes was a left wing wall flower and a member of the deranged Bloomsbury group of inter-World War British pacifists. He was an arrogant theorist who truly believed in the magical elixir of large government and in the technocratic dream of controlling billions of personal, business and economic decisions, to programmatically construct a perfect world order. Keynes gave intellect and jargon filled cover and rationale to politicians and demagogues who would cite his book, 'The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money', to justify state interventionism. According to this theory which has failed in practice every time it has been tried, governments can stimulate an economy through granting consumers, workers and businesses sums of borrowed money. This is termed a 'stimulus'. This debt or current deficit financing stimulus, is then paid back or retired, when the economy strengthened by consumer spending and business investment, produces a surplus of tax revenues. The stimulus is needed, so argued Keynes, to overcome business cycles, downturns and unexpected events which would decrease jobs, increase unemployment and impact state revenues. By macro and micro-managing economic and production processes, the state, so thought Keynes, would avoid cyclical variations and ensure that the lowest level of unemployment could be maintained. Government power was thus indispensable to full employment and income equality. There are many problems with such a counter-rational plan to economic management. None of Keynes' core assumptions make sense when they are analysed either separately or together. Business cycles have historically been caused by governments, and they are usually a response to government policies to increase the size of the state through trade barriers, higher taxation, more spending, more regulation and programs of fear and compliance. The Great Depression, the 70s Stagflation and the current financial crisis are all obvious examples of this fact. Government causing economic malaise would appear to mean that government programs are not the solutions required to either get out of an economic downturn, nor to prevent future derailments from taking place. The main impact of Keynesian economic stimuli is to increase debt; raise future tax rates and distort the normal functionings of economic markets and personal and corporate decision making. Governments choose winners and confirm losers. The winners will include companies which get bailed out, those receiving welfare, unions and others having their jobs protected, those receiving redistributed incomes and those paid off for political support. The losers invariably include firms both domestic and international who want fair and free trade; higher income families; small businesses who are classified under high income categories; future generations who must pay off the debt; and consumers who pay a higher costs for all products and services. Under Keynesian philosophy, government and technocrats assume the role of God. Given the poverty of God heads throughout history, this is probably not a noble supposition to support. Brian Reidl from Heritage Institute wrong an excellent article recently on the fallacy that government spending, or what is termed Keynesian deficit spending, run by God-heads, is beneficia. In this article he makes the following important points about demand-side management and the Keynesian fetish for economic control. “Government cannot create new purchasing power out of thin air. If Congress funds new spending with taxes, it is simply redistributing existing income. If Congress instead borrows the money from domestic investors, those investors will have that much less to invest or to spend in the private economy. If Congress borrows the money from foreigners, the balance of payments will adjust by equally reducing net exports, leaving GDP unchanged. Every dollar Congress spends must first come from somewhere else. This does not mean that government spending has no economic impact at all. Government spending often alters the consumption of total demand, such as increasing consumption at the expense of investment.” When stimulus packages are created the money has to come from someone via taxes, or be printed. Both are net negatives to the economy. Economic growth only results from producing more goods and services (not from redistributing existing income), and that requires productivity growth and growth in the labor supply as productivity not only increases wealth but also wages and wage opportunities. Historically of course government spending has reduced productivity and long-term economic growth due to some obvious reasons. As government spends more it raises taxes which reduces profits, productivity and wage and job creation. As government incurs more debt through stimulus and demand side packages it reduces the incentive to produce and displaces money by removing the more productive private sector from the economic equation and replacing it with a far less effective state dollar, taxed or printed on government printing press. The inefficiency of government policy in health, housing, education, and general industry are obvious creating huge costs which must be borne by ordinary taxpayers – ineffective solutions at a higher price one can say. And as Reidl sources and proves:

#### B. Short-term focus dooms Keynesian economics

Ross 11 (Ron, Ph.D. is an economist, “[Fatal Flaws of Keynesian Economics](http://spectator.org/archives/2011/07/22/fatal-flaws-of-keynesian-econo)”, The American Spectator, 7/22/11, <http://spectator.org/archives/2011/07/22/fatal-flaws-of-keynesian-econo>) Swoap

There's no real mystery about why Keynesianism fails. There are numerous reasons why and they've been known for decades. Keynesians have an unrealistic and unsupportable view of how the economy works and how people make decisions. Keynesian policy advocates focus primarily on the short run -- with no regard for the future implications of current events -- and they assume that all economic decision-makers do the same. Consider the following quote by John Maynard Keynes: "But the long run is a misleading guide to current affairs. In the long run we are all dead. Economists set themselves too easy, too useless a task if in tempestuous seasons they can only tell us that when the storm is long past the ocean will be flat again." After passage of the stimulus package, Lawrence Summers, Obama's chief economic advisor at the time, often said that the spending should be "timely, targeted, and temporary." Although those sound like desirable objectives, they illustrate the Keynesian focus on the short term. Sure it would be convenient if you could just spend a bunch of money and make the economy get well, but it's not that simple.

#### 2. Economy empirically resilient

Zumbrun and Varghese 12 (Joshua and Romy, reporters for Bloomberg News, “Fed’s Plosser Says U.S. Economy Proving Resilient to Shocks”, Bloomberg Businessweek, 5/9/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-05-09/fed-s-plosser-says-u-dot-s-dot-economy-proving-resilient-to-shocks>) Swoap

Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank President Charles Plosser said the U.S. economy has proven “remarkably resilient” to shocks that can damage growth, including surging oil prices and natural disasters. “The economy has now grown for 11 consecutive quarters,” Plosser said today according to remarks prepared for a speech at the Philadelphia Fed. “Growth is not robust. But growth in the past year has continued despite significant risks and external and internal headwinds.” Plosser, who did not discuss his economic outlook or the future for monetary policy, cited shocks to the economy last year, including the tsunami in Japan that disrupted global supply chains, Europe’s credit crisis that has damaged the continent’s banking system and political unrest in the Middle East and North Africa. “The U.S. economy has a history of being remarkably resilient,” said Plosser, who doesn’t have a vote on policy this year. “These shocks held GDP growth to less than 1 percent in the first half of 2011, and many analysts were concerned that the economy was heading toward a double dip. Yet, the economy proved resilient and growth picked up in the second half of the year.”

#### 2. US not key to global economy- emerging economies more important

The Economist 07 (“America's vulnerable economy”, 11/15/07, <http://www.economist.com/node/10134118>) Swoap

The best hope that global growth can stay strong lies instead with emerging economies. A decade ago, the thought that so much depended on these crisis-prone places would have been terrifying. Yet thanks largely to economic reforms, their annual growth rate has surged to around 7%. This year they will contribute half of the globe's GDP growth, measured at market exchange rates, over three times as much as America. In the past, emerging economies have often needed bailing out by the rich world. This time they could be the rescuers.Of course, a recession in America would reduce emerging economies' exports, but they are less vulnerable than they used to be. America's importance as an engine of global growth has been exaggerated. Since 2000 its share of world imports has dropped from 19% to 14%. Its vast current-account deficit has started to shrink, meaning that America is no longer pulling along the rest of the world. Yet growth in emerging economies has quickened, partly thanks to demand at home. In the first half of this year the increase in consumer spending (in actual dollar terms) in China and India added more to global GDP growth than that in America. Most emerging economies are in healthier shape than ever (see [article](http://www.economist.com/node/10136509)). They are no longer financially dependent on the rest of the world, but have large foreign-exchange reserves—no less than three-quarters of the global total. Though there are some notable exceptions, most of them have small budget deficits (another change from the past), so they can boost spending to offset weaker exports if need be.

#### 3. Economic decline empirically doesn’t lead to war

Naim 10 (Moises, a Senior Associate in the International Economics program at the [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carnegie_Endowment_for_International_Peace), “[It Didn't Happen](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/it_didnt_happen)”, Foreign Policy, January/February 2010, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/it_didnt_happen>) Swoap

Just a few months ago, the consensus among influential thinkers was that the economic crisis would unleash a wave of geopolitical plagues. Xenophobic outbursts, civil wars, collapsing currencies, protectionism, international conflicts, and street riots were only some of the dire consequences expected by the experts. It didn't happen. Although the crash did cause severe economic damage and widespread human suffering, and though the world did change in important ways for the worse -- the International Monetary Fund, for example, estimates that the global economy's new and permanent trajectory is a 10 percent lower rate of GDP growth than before the crisis -- the scary predictions for the most part failed to materialize. Sadly, the same experts who failed to foresee the economic crisis were also blindsided by the speed of the recovery. More than a year into the crisis, we now know just how off they were. From telling us about the imminent collapse of the international financial system to prophecies of a 10-year recession, here are six of the most common predictions about the crisis that have been proven wrong:

#### **5.** Immigration is what’s key to the US economy

Donohue 12 (Tom, president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, “Immigrant Entrepreneurs Remain Vital to U.S. Economy”, Free Enterprise, 1/31/12, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/education-workforce/immigrant-entrepreneurs-remain-vital-us-economy>) Swoap

We are a nation of immigrants bound together by the unique American ideals of individual freedom and responsibility and driven by the limitless opportunities of free enterprise. These powerful draws of freedom and opportunity have brought the world’s best and brightest to our shores for generations. Immigrants helped lay the economic foundation of our country, and they can play an equally important role in our future. Today, as we face a sluggish recovery and persistently high unemployment, the energy, ideas, hard work, and determination of immigrant entrepreneurs are strengthening our efforts to grow the economy, create jobs, and keep America competitive. The contributions that immigrant entrepreneurs make to our economy are evident in enterprises large and small. They are helping rejuvenate their own communities and create employment opportunities for their neighbors through local real estate ventures, ethnic food stores, restaurants, and retail services. In many cases, they see a need, come up with an idea to meet it, and enrich themselves and their neighborhoods in the process. They are tapping into high-growth sectors and starting businesses in food manufacturing, transportation, construction, money transfer and travel services, and tourism. These growth businesses put Americans to work at home and often connect our markets with customers outside of the United States.

#### 6. Financial executives are confident in the economy

George 12 (Jefferson, Bank of America Merrill Lynch, “Optimism About the Economy Improves Among U.S. CFOs in Latest Bank of America Merrill Lynch CFO Outlook Survey”, BusinessWire, 5/3/12) Swoap

U.S. financial executives are much more optimistic about the national economy than they were last fall, with nearly two-thirds expecting it to grow in 2012, but they remain cautious about the global economy, according to the latest Bank of America Merrill Lynch CFO Outlook survey. Of 251 executives surveyed recently, 63 percent said they expected the U.S. economy to expand this year, up significantly from 38 percent in the previous survey conducted in fall 2011. Only 4 percent expects the economy to decline, down from 11 percent. CFOs gave the current economy a score of 53 out of 100, up from 44 in the previous report. The global economy received a score of 47, up slightly from 43. CFOs’ optimism extended to hiring, with 51 percent expecting their companies to add employees in 2012, up from 46 percent. Executives also increasingly forecast higher revenues and profits this year, according to the survey. “Although challenges remain, CFOs clearly feel better about the economy and opportunities for growth in 2012 than they did in late 2011,” said Laura Whitley, head of Global Commercial Banking at Bank of America Merrill Lynch. “With more executives expecting increases in revenues, profits and personnel, it’s not surprising that optimism about the U.S. economy as a whole is improving.” As for barriers to business growth, government involvement was the most popular response, chosen by 37 percent of CFOs, followed by weak customer demand, domestic competition and operating costs. When executives were asked how the U.S. government can encourage domestic business growth, the top response was simplify laws and regulations, chosen by 56 percent of CFOs, followed by change corporate tax policy, reduce the budget deficit, and offer tax credits or incentives.

### Econ Adv Exts - #1 - Keynesianism Fails

#### Keynesian economics fail- incorrect assumptions about demand increases

Wolf 11 (Charles, corporate chair in international economics at the RAND Corporation and senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, “Where Keynes Went Wrong”, RAND 11/7/11, <http://www.rand.org/blog/2011/11/where-keynes-went-wrong.html>) Swoap

All economic theories involve assumptions. The critical question is whether the assumptions are realistic. If there is uncertainty about the answer, the follow-on question is: How much will it matter if the assumptions are wrong? Keynes assumed that the initial deficient level of aggregate demand would remain unchanged until the stimulative ("pump-priming") effect of additional government spending kicked in. In other words, increased government spending, or its anticipation, would not further diminish pre-existing levels of consumer demand and investment demand. However, Keynes's failure to consider the possibility of an adverse effect from government spending—that it might lead to still further decay in the prior levels of consumption and investment—was a fundamental flaw in the theory. So how might government spending actually undermine its explicit purpose of boosting aggregate demand? It is quite plausible that the behavior of consumers and investors might change as an unintended consequence of the increased government spending, and might do so in ways that would partly, fully, or even more than fully offset the attempted effort to raise aggregate demand. Consider "Ricardian equivalence"—a conjecture advanced by David Ricardo a century before Keynes's general theory and thus something Keynes was aware of, or should have been aware of. Ricardian equivalence suggested that consumers might reduce their spending to prepare for the tax increases they'd face in the future to pay for government spending financed by borrowing in the present. In recent years, Ricardo's conjecture has been applied and tested in a formal model developed by Robert Barro. That prior consumption demand might actually have been reduced as a result of recent government stimulus spending is suggested by two indicators: Since mid-2009, household savings increased by 2-3 percent of GDP, and household debt decreased by 8.6 percent ($1.1 trillion). It is also plausible that investment demand might shrink as a result of increased government spending or its anticipation. This diminution might occur if investors have recourse to other investment opportunities that seem more profitable or less risky than those that would accompany or follow the attempted government stimulus. For example, such opportunities might lie in investing abroad where tax liabilities are less onerous, rather than investing at home; or investors might choose to invest in long-term instruments (30-year U.S. government bonds) while reducing investment in fixed capital or equities. These opportunities might seem rosier because of anticipated increases in future taxes, or because of increased regulatory restrictions that might (and did) accompany the increased government spending. In fact, such alternative investment opportunities are much more numerous and accessible now than in Keynes's era. Failure to consider the potentially adverse effect of government spending on the preexisting level of aggregate demand was and remains a disabling flaw in Keynesian theory—then and now. If the theory's underlying logic is flawed, it can be expected that policies and programs based on it will fail. They have in the past. They should be avoided in the future.

#### Keynesian theory wrong- government fiscal intervention fails

Ebeling 04 (Richard M. teaches economics at Northwood University, “[Henry Hazlitt and the Failure of Keynesian Economics](http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/henry-hazlitt-and-the-failure-of-keynesian-economics/)”, The Freeman, November 04, Volume 54, Issue 9, <http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/henry-hazlitt-and-the-failure-of-keynesian-economics/>) Swoap

The central flaw in Keynes’s thinking, Hazlitt insisted, was his unwillingness to acknowledge that the high unemployment in Great Britain in the 1920s and the United States in the 1930s was caused by government intervention, including the empowering of labor unions, that made many prices and wages virtually “rigid.” Political and special-interest power prevented markets from competitively re-establishing a balance between supply and demand for various goods. Hence, the market was trapped in wage and price distortions that destroyed employment and production opportunities, resulting in the Great Depression. (Hazlitt did not deny that the contraction of the money supply in the early 1930s increased the degree to which prices and wages had to fall to re-establish full employment.) Hazlitt considered Keynes’s inflationary “fix” crude and dangerous. First, Hazlitt pointed out that Keynes’s focus on macroeconomic “aggregates” concealed the microeconomic relationships among a multitude of individual prices and wages. The price level, wage level, total output, aggregate demand, and aggregate supply were all statistical fictions that had no reality in the actual market. Thus the wage level could not be too high relative to the general price level. But in the 1930s many wages for different types of labor were out of balance with the prices of individual goods sold on the market. What was needed to restore full employment was an adjustment of numerous individual wages and resource prices to the lower prices of many consumer goods. The extent to which any individual money wage or resource price might have to adjust downwards depended on the distinct supply and demand conditions in each of the individual markets.

#### Government stimulus fails- reduces private investment and kills the economy long-term

WSO 12 (Wall Street Oasis, “Three’s a Crowd: The Failure of Keynesian Economics, Part 2”, 6/21/12, <http://www.wallstreetoasis.com/blog/three%E2%80%99s-a-crowd-the-failure-of-keynesian-economics-part-2>) Swoap

A central failure in Keynes’ thought becomes obvious when you ask yourself this simple question:where does the government get the additional money to spend in excess of its tax revenue? Deficit spending must be financed. Government bonds must be sold to acquire the money.¶ There are two options here: the debt can be sold to the federal reserve which pays with base money it creates at zero cost, causing money stock expansion through the banking system. That’s a monetary policy, however, and we must analytically preclude a change in that in order to evaluate pure Keynesian fiscal policy.¶ So instead, suppose the government sells the bonds to financial transactors and other private citizens. The government now has more money to spend, but those private parties now have less to spend. Why should current expenditure rise?¶ It probably doesn’t, due in part to simple credit rationing. When the government enters the financial markets to borrow hundreds of billions of dollars it has to sell its bonds at low enough prices and high enough yields to find buyers. In short, it raises bond interest rates (yields), causing other rates to rise by arbitrage. Now it can spend the money it acquired.¶ There are two offsets, however. First, at the higher interest rates, private sector borrowers will borrow and spend less than they would at the lower rates. Government borrowing thus ‘crowds out’ some private investment spending. Second, at the higher interest rate people increase their private saving (since savings now earn more), reducing their consumption spending to do so.¶ So, yes, government spending goes up, but private consumption and investment spending decline equivalently. No meaningful increase in aggregate demand, output, or employment occurs. Worse, the decline in private investment likely reduces capital formation, productivity growth, and hence economic growth in the long-run.¶ In objection to this argument, Keynesians noted that domestic interest rates did not reliably correlate with government borrowing in the way classical credit rationing theory implied. Admitting that fact, economist Robert Barro responded that, when the government borrows to finance additional deficit spending, citizens may correctly anticipate the additional future taxation they will have to bear to pay off interest and principle on the added public debt.¶ In response, such rational taxpayers would increase their present saving – reducing their current consumer spending - so they could pay those future taxes. The effect of increased current government spending on total expenditure would again be offset.

#### Keynesian economics ignores the real economic engine: entrepreneurs

Moore 11 (Stephen, American economic writer and policy analyst, member of the [Wall Street Journal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wall_Street_Journal) editorial board, “Shortest Possible Course on Why Keynes was wrong and dangerous”, Eye2TheLongRun, 8/22/11, <http://eye2thelongrun.blogspot.com/2011/08/shortest-possible-course-on-why-keynes.html>) Swoap

As Donald Boudreaux, professor of economics at George Mason University and author of the invaluable blog Cafe Hayek, puts it: "Macroeconomics was nothing more than a dismissal of the rules of economics." Over the years, this has led to some horrific blunders, such as the New Deal decision to pay farmers to burn crops and slaughter livestock to keep food prices high: To encourage food production, destroy it. The grand pursuit of economics is to overcome scarcity and increase the production of goods and services. Keynesians believe that the economic problem is abundance: too much production and goods on the shelf and too few consumers. Consumers lined up for blocks to buy things in empty stores in communist Russia, but that never sparked production. In macroeconomics today, there is a fatal disregard for the heroes of the economy: the entrepreneur, the risk-taker, the one who innovates and creates the things we want to buy. "All economic problems are about removing impediments to supply, not demand," Arthur Laffer reminds us. So here we are, three years of mostly impotent stimulus experiments and the economy still hobbled. Keynesians would be expected to be second-guessing the wisdom of their theories. Instead, Prof. Romer recently complained that the political system will not allow Mr. Obama to "go back and ask for more" stimulus.

#### Keynesianism fails in American context

CAPS 10 (The Motley Fool, multimedia financial-services company, “Why Keynesian Economics is Failing America”, 7/17/10, <http://caps.fool.com/Blogs/why-keynesian-economics-is/421302>) Swoap

So why is Keynesian economics failing now? Well I would argue that it was doomed to fail--in this context--since the beginning. Why? The U.S. national debt. Why is this so problematic? Well the national debt has grown to a level that is serious--serious enough to consume 30% of US GDP by 2015. So many want to be fiscally responsible at a time when others--including the administration--want to spend enormous amounts of money. Prior to the stimulus bill being enacted into law, Obama and his constituents did acknowledge their concerns over the national debt and the importance of spending it prudently. But Keynesian economics cannot have fiscal restrictions. Having spending concerns due to high preexisting levels of debt places constraints on Keynes, limiting its flexibility and effectiveness. When looking to employ Keynes, preexisting fiscal problems make it extremely difficult to have success via the stimulus method, as timing, methodology, and magnitude of stimulus must all be implemented with superhuman accuracy. In order words, a solid balance sheet is a prerequisite to employing Keynes. With poor financial standing, people become concerned with "how long?" and "how much?" it will take before it can be withdrawn, undermining confidence. These questions cannot be the priority which they have become in order for Keynes to yield fruitful results. We must be under the illusion that the government can spend indefinitely, if need be, and how much the government spends does not trump efforts to spur a recovery. We of course are experiencing an increasing view of the opposite.

### Econ Adv Exts - #2 - Econ Resilient

#### US economy resilient thanks to private sector

WSJ 11 (Wall Street Journal, “The Resilient Economy”, 10/31/11, <http://search.proquest.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/docview/900974796/1381A33891A26809FF9/7?accountid=12861>) Swoap

Left on its own to grow and innovate, the U.S. private economy is a remarkable engine of prosperity. That truth was underscored again with yesterday's report that third quarter gross domestic product expanded by 2.5% at an annual rate. Considering all of the government and other headwinds this year, that's almost cause for cheering. The report represents a modest bounce from the miserable 0.4% and 1.3% growth in the year's first two quarters, and it should allay fears of any immediate recession. Private inventories subtracted 1.08 percentage points from GDP, which means room for businesses to restock in the fourth quarter. Government spending contributed little, with federal outlays balancing out state and local reductions. Growth was all the doing of private businesses and consumers.

#### Predictions are exaggerated- economic collapse won’t happen

Vomund 12 (David, wenty years of investment and portfolio management experience, owner of Vomund Investment Management, “Market Pulse: It's (still) OK to be optimistic”, North Lake Tahoe Bonanza, 7/4/12, <http://www.tahoebonanza.com/article/20120704/NEWS/120709972/1061&ParentProfile=1050>) Swoap

The financial and even the general media report day after day all the dire consequences from the “inevitable” collapse of the European Union. While I agree that there would be serious problems if countries default, and for sure the shock waves would be felt here, the worst case is far from inevitable. We all well recall the inflation and record high interest rates and gasoline prices in the mid-70s, the even greater inflation and rates in 1981, odd and even days at the pumps, the sentiment after the 1987 crash (here we go again, another depression), subsequent mini-crashes and selling when Iraq invaded Kuwait, the Y2K scare, the sell-off after 9/11. The worst-case scenarios so many thought inevitable had the market, our economy and even in some ways society itself collapsing in a death spiral. Of course, nothing of the sort happened. Why? Worst-case outcomes were not in anyone's interest so appropriate actions were taken. My point once again is that while it's easy to sign on to the worst and usually the most logical case — often merely a straight-line extension of current trends — doing so has seldom if ever been profitable. In fact, doing just the opposite has been enormously profitable. Buying stocks in 1974, or in August of 1982, or after the 1987 crash — despite all the apparent reasons not to — created fortunes for those with foresight and courage. So here we go again with worries about defaults in Europe, solvency, recessions, the fiscal cliff, the election and a market collapse. Not so fast. Nothing is inevitable so let's not assume the worst case will prevail. Actually the slowing economy, not Europe, is my top concern now.

#### American economy strong and recovering

The Economist 7/14 (“Comeback kid”, The Economist, 7/14/12, <http://www.economist.com/node/21558576>) Swoap

America’s economy is certainly in a tender state. But the pessimism of the presidential slanging-match misses something vital. Led by its inventive private sector, the economy is remaking itself (see [article](http://www.economist.com/node/21558591)). Old weaknesses are being remedied and new strengths discovered, with an agility that has much to teach stagnant Europe and dirigiste Asia. Balance your imbalances America’s sluggishness stems above all from pre-crisis excesses and the misshapen economy they created. Until 2008 growth relied too heavily on consumer spending and house-buying, both of them financed by foreign savings channelled through an undercapitalised financial system. Household debt, already nearly 100% of income in 2000, reached 133% in 2007. Recoveries from debt-driven busts always take years, as households and banks repair their balance-sheets. Nonetheless, in the past three years that repair has proceeded fast. America’s houses are now among the world’s most undervalued: 19% below fair value, according to our house-price index. And because the Treasury and other regulators, unlike their euro-zone counterparts, chose to confront the rot in their financial system quickly, American banks have had to write off debts and raise equity faster than their peers. (Citigroup alone has flushed through some $143 billion of loan losses; no euro-zone bank has set aside more than $30 billion.) American capital ratios are among the world’s highest. And consumers have cut back, too: debts are now 114% of income. New strengths have also been found. One is a more dynamic export sector. The weaker dollar helps explain why the trade deficit has shrunk from 6% of GDP in 2006 to about 4% today. But other, more permanent, shifts—especially the growth of a consuming class in emerging markets—augur well. On the campaign trail, both parties attack China as a currency-fiddling, rule-breaking supplier of cheap imports (see [Lexington](http://www.economist.com/node/21558581)). But a richer China has become the third-largest market for America’s exports, up 53% since 2007.

#### The US economy is strong and improving

AP 12 [Associated Press, News Reporters, May 1st, 2012, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/05/01/us-manufacturing-grows-at-fastest-pace-since-june/#ixzz21TXAcJGa>] Callas

WASHINGTON – U.S. manufacturing grew last month at the fastest pace in 10 months, suggesting that the economy is healthier than recent data had indicated. New orders, production and a measure of hiring all rose. The April survey from the Institute for Supply Management was a hopeful sign ahead of Friday's monthly jobs report and helped the Dow Jones industrial average end the day at its highest level in more than four years. The trade group of purchasing managers said Tuesday that its index of manufacturing activity reached 54.8 in April, the highest level since June. Readings above 50 indicate expansion. The sharp increase surprised analysts, who had predicted a decline after several regional reports showed manufacturing growth weakened last month. The gain led investors to shift money out of bonds and into stocks. The Dow Jones industrial added 66 points to 13,279, its best close since Dec. 28, 2007. Broader indexes also surged. The ISM manufacturing index is closely watched in part because it's the first major economic report for each month. April's big gain followed a series of weaker reports in recent weeks that showed hiring slowed, applications for unemployment benefits rose and factory output dropped. "This survey will ease concerns that the softer tone of the incoming news in recent months marked the start of a renewed slowdown in growth," Paul Dales, an economist at Capital Economics, said in a note to clients. "We think the latest recovery is made of sterner stuff, although we doubt it will set the world alight." The latest reading is well above the recession low of 33.1 and above the long-run average of 52.8. But it's still below the pre-recession high of 61.4. Dan Meckstroth, chief economist at the Manufacturers' Alliance, notes that in the past 20 years, the index has been at or above 54.8 only one-third of the time. A measure of employment in the ISM's survey rose to a 10-month high. That indicates that factories are hiring at a solid pace. A gauge of new orders jumped to its highest level in a year. That could signal faster production in the coming months. Export orders also rose, offsetting worries that weaker economies in Europe and China could drag on U.S. exports. A separate report showed China's factory sector is still growing. A survey of purchasing managers in China found that the manufacturing sector expanded for the fifth straight month in April. Rich Bergmann, managing director of Accenture's global manufacturing practice, said large manufacturers are driving U.S. growth. They are pushing their suppliers to boost output, which has led many to hire more workers. Large companies are also helping smaller companies in their supply chain, Bergmann said, by guaranteeing a certain level of orders or helping smaller companies obtain financing to expand. "There's just a tremendous trickle-down effect in these industries," Bergmann said. "That's a very positive trend that we think will continue." Boeing reported a 58 percent jump in profit in the January-March quarter. Orders for its more-fuel-efficient 737 jetliner soared. The company added 11,000 employees last year. The global airplane manufacturer's growth has benefited companies like Charlotte, N.C.-based Goodrich Corp., which makes aircraft components. Its sales to large aircraft makers jumped 27 percent in the first quarter. Caterpillar, the world's largest manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, last week reported that its profit grew 29 percent in the January-March quarter. The company said it is boosting its manufacturing capacity to handle a record backlog of orders. Small companies are also reporting big gains. Boston-based Spreadshirt.com, which prints custom T-shirts, other clothing and accessories, plans to start production at a new plant in Las Vegas in July. The company's revenue doubled in the first three months of this year. The company is about to sign a five-year lease for the Las Vegas factory and has purchased about $1 million in new printing equipment. The company plans to hire nearly 100 people by the end of this year, on top of its current work force of 150. "I'm pretty confident that we can sustain this growth," said Mark Venezia, vice president for global sales and marketing. "We're opening up a new facility banking on that." Factories account for only about 9 percent of total payrolls but added 13 percent of the new jobs last year. Manufacturers have added 120,000 jobs in the past three months, about one-fifth of all net gains. Economists predict manufacturers added 20,000 jobs in April, according to a survey by FactSet. Still, manufacturing represents only about 12 percent of economic activity. Other areas continue to struggle. A separate report showed U.S. builders barely increased their spending on construction projects in March after two straight months of declines. A pickup in single-family home construction and commercial projects offset a steep drop in state and local government building. The 0.1 percent gain left construction spending at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $808.1 billion, the Commerce Department said. That's roughly half the level of what economists consider to be healthy.

#### US and global economy are resistant to shock

Newsweek 06 (“The Great Shock Absorber”, 1/15/06, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2006/01/15/the-great-shock-absorber.html>) Swoap

Does this mean that recessions are a relic of the past? No, but recent events do suggest that the global economy's "immune system" is now strong enough to absorb shocks that 25 years ago would probably have triggered a downturn. In fact, over the past two decades, recessions have not disappeared, but have become considerably milder in many parts of the world. What explains this enhanced recession resistance? The answer: a combination of good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility. Since the mid-1980s, central banks worldwide have had great success in taming inflation. This has meant that long-term interest rates are at levels not seen in more than 40 years. A low-inflation and low-interest-rate environment is especially conducive to sustained, robust growth. Moreover, central bankers have avoided some of the policy mistakes of the earlier oil shocks (in the mid-1970s and early 1980s), during which they typically did too much too late, and exacerbated the ensuing recessions. Even more important, in recent years the Fed has been particularly adept at crisis management, aggressively cutting interest rates in response to stock-market crashes, terrorist attacks and weakness in the economy. The benign inflationary picture has also benefited from increasing competitive pressures, both worldwide (thanks to globalization and the rise of Asia as a manufacturing juggernaut) and domestically (thanks to technology and deregulation). Since the late 1970s, the United States, the United Kingdom and a handful of other countries have been especially aggressive in deregulating their financial and industrial sectors. This has greatly increased the flexibility of their economies and reduced their vulnerability to inflationary shocks. Looking ahead, what all this means is that a global or U.S. recession will likely be avoided in 2006, and probably in 2007 as well. Whether the current expansion will be able to break the record set in the 1990s for longevity will depend on the ability of central banks to keep the inflation dragon at bay and to avoid policy mistakes. The prospects look good. Inflation is likely to remain a low-level threat for some time, and Ben Bernanke, the incoming chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, spent much of his academic career studying the past mistakes of the Fed and has vowed not to repeat them.

#### US more resilient than other countries-productivity helps

McMullen 09 (Alia, was the Economics Reporter for Canada’s Financial Post , “Japan, Italy, U.K. may suffer deeper downturn than U.S.”, Financial Post, 2/10/09, <http://www.vancouversun.com/story_print.html?id=1270972&sponsor=>) Swoap

The United States may have kick-started the global recession, but its emergence has uncovered structural deficiencies in a number of developed countries around the globe. The evidence suggests countries such as the United Kingdom, Japan and Italy will suffer a heavier downturn than the United States, in what has become the worst global recession since the Second World War. But as others sink, the U.S. economy has shown some resilient signs. Non-farm business productivity grew 3.2% in the fourth quarter after growth of 1.5% the previous quarter, data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics showed on Thursday. Paul Ashworth, an economist at Capital Economics said the relatively high rate of U.S. productivity in the past 13 years would help output and profit recover. Productivity might also help the U.S. economy outperform those of other developed countries. Even so, the U.S.’s ability to remain productive gives it an economic advantage over a country such as Italy, where productivity has been in decline since 2001.

#### US economy is improving – it is getting more resilient

Robb, ’12[Greg, reporter for Market Watch, May 15, 2012, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2012-05-15/economy/31706090_1_financial-reform-volcker-rule-treasury-secretary-timothy-geithner>] Callas

WASHINGTON (MarketWatch) -- Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner on Tuesday said the U.S. economy is gradually getting stronger, with areas of strength broadening. "We are doing a lot of the really tough work you need to...dig our way out of the mess that caused the crisis and I think growth now looks more broad-based and resilient," Geithner said at a conference sponsored by the Peter G. Peterson Foundation. Geithner said J.P. Morgan's $2 billion trading loss was a failure of risk management. He said it made a "very powerful case for financial reform - the reforms we have ahead and the reforms we have already put in place." Geithner said he has not talked to Jamie Dimon since the J.P. Morgan Chase & Co's [(US:jpm)](http://www.marketwatch.com/investing/stock/jpm?countrycode=US&link=MW_story_quote) CEO announced the loss late last week. The test of financial reform is to make sure bank mistakes don't put the economy at risk, Geithner said. "We are going to work very hard to ensure that these reforms are tough and effective - not just the Volcker rule - but the broader complement of reforms on capital and liquidity and derivatives markets," he said.

### Econ Adv Exts - #3 - US Not K2 Global Econ

#### US can’t save the global economy

Market News International 12 (“Evans: U.S. Consumer Can't Save Global Economy Again”, The Bond Buyer, 7/9/11, <http://www.bondbuyer.com/issues/121_131/chicago-fed-bank-president-evans-us-consumer-cant-save-global-economy-1041636-1.html>, Lexis) Swoap

President Charles Evans said Monday that the global economy can't rely on the spending of U.S. consumers to pull it out of the current downturn. "I just have to tell you - if you don't know this already, if you haven't heard enough, that that American consumer doesn't exist anymore. The American consumer is challenged by a reduction in resident house prices that one way or another has taken on more mortgage debt or they did through bad planning, moral hazard or bad luck and they face employment risk," he said in a question and answer session after giving a speech at the Sasin Bangkok Forum here. "The chances they are going to expand their purchasing in order to apply a noticeable (push) to the world economy is not there any more. And so then the question is what keeps the world economy chugging in the circumstances?" Evans said policymakers around the world are trying to work out the answer to that question. But "business models that worked for countries in the past are going to be challenged in this case."

**US economy good- healthy compared to other countries**  
Beller, ’12 [Margo D. Special to CNBC.com, Friday, April 27, 2012, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/47205857/Despite_GDP_Data_US_Economy_in_Good_Shape_Barton_Biggs>] Callas

The U.S. economy "looks health and is in pretty good shape" compared with other developed countries, despite data showing cooling growth in the first quarter, **hedge fund** investor Barton Biggs told CNBC Friday. Earlier Friday the [**Commerce Department**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/47202822/)reported **gross domestic product** expanded at a 2.2 percent annual rate, slowing from the fourth quarter's 3 percent rate and below economists' expectations of 2.5 percent growth. "The numbers this morning, they’re a little less than expected. But the last two quarters, real GDP growth in the U.S. has averaged out to 2.6 percent and the GDP deflator is just 1.2 percent," the managing partner of Traxis Partners told [**"Squawk on the Street,"**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/15838381/) referring to an [**economic metric**](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/g/gdppricedeflator.asp#axzz1tFu1zpfl) that factors in **inflation** . "For an economy that’s on a sustained growth pattern, you couldn’t ask for better numbers," said the [**bullish**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/15840232/video/3000062184/play/1/) Biggs. He likes American technology ompanies, with an investment basket of "mature" firms that includes Cisco Systems [[CSCO 16.03 -0.33 (-2.02%) ]](http://data.cnbc.com/quotes/csco),Intel [[INTC 25.105 -0.415 (-1.63%) ]](http://data.cnbc.com/quotes/intc) and Microsoft [[MSFT 29.13 -0.985 (-3.27%) ]](http://data.cnbc.com/quotes/msft), and "new" firms including Apple [[AAPL 596.93 -7.37 (-1.22%) ]](http://data.cnbc.com/quotes/aapl),Qualcomm [[QCOM 56.96 -0.72 (-1.25%) ]](http://data.cnbc.com/quotes/qcom) and VMWare [[VMW 88.06 -1.74 (-1.94%) ]](http://data.cnbc.com/quotes/vmw). [**Europe**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/47201694/), however, is of big concern to Biggs "It's clear the...people of Europe have sent a message to the politicians that they’re tired of[austerity](http://www.cnbc.com/id/47200362/), they want more stimulation and more growth," he said. "It’s very hard to see how that’s going to work out." [**China**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/47198340/), meanwhile, has "pretty artfully created a soft landing and stabilized growth at around 7 percent to 8 percent, which is pretty darn good for the second-biggest economy in the world, and the markets are starting to suggest they’ve been able to stabilize their real estate markets," he said.He disagrees with those **short-selling** China, including another hedge-fund titan, [**Jim Chanos**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/47198340/). "I think China’s fine and will be a positive surprise in the months to come. It will be a big plus for world markets," Biggs said.

#### World economy not tied to the US economy

Wolf 00 (Martin, one of the world's most influential writers on economics, associate editor of Financial Times, “After the Crash”, Foreign Policy No. 120 Sep/Oct 2000, p. 50-51, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/1149711.pdf?acceptTC=true>) Swoap

The notion that the strong U.S. economy "saved" the rest of the world during the global financial turmoil of the late 1990s has become increasingly fashionable. Even U.S. Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers recently referred to the United States as "the main engine of global growth." However, this proposition is not strictly true. Since the United States accounts for slightly more than a quarter of global economic activ- ity, it certainly exerts a powerful influence. But positive correlations between U.S. business cycles and those of other countries have not, historically, been that high. Among leading industrial countries, only the United Kingdom and Canada have displayed business cycles that move together with those of the United States. Indeed, if the U.S. economy helped prevent a global recession following the financial crises of 1997 and 1998, it was precisely because its business cycle was not closely synchronized with many other economies. Otherwise the United States would have fallen into a recession along with the crisis-ridden regions.

#### American economy doesn’t affect the world economy

Naim 10 (Moises, a Senior Associate in the International Economics program at the [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carnegie_Endowment_for_International_Peace), “[It Didn't Happen](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/it_didnt_happen)”, Foreign Policy, January/February 2010, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/it_didnt_happen>) Swoap

It didn't. As the economies of America and Europe screeched to a halt during the nightmarish first quarter of 2009, China's economy accelerated, part of a broader trend in which emerging markets fared better through the crisis than the world's most advanced economies. As the rich countries entered a deep recession and the woes of the U.S. financial market affected banking systems everywhere, the idea that emerging economies could "decouple" from the advanced ones was widely mocked. But decouple they did. Some emerging economies relied on their domestic markets, others on exports to other growing countries (China, for example, displaced the United States last year as Brazil's top export market). Still others had ample foreign reserves, low exposure to toxic financial assets, or, like Chile, had taken measures in anticipation of an eventual global slowdown. Not all developing countries managed to escape the worst of the crisis -- and many, such as Mexico and Iran, were deeply hurt -- but many others managed to avoid the fate of the advanced economies.

### Econ Adv Exts - #4 - Econ Collapse Does Not Cause War

#### Economic decline can’t change fundamental order- no conflict will arise

Blackwill 09 (Robert D., was the [United States Ambassador](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Ambassador) to [India](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/India) (2001–2003), and [United States National Security Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_National_Security_Council) Deputy for [Iraq](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq), “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic

Recession—A Caution”, RAND corporation, 2009 <http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2009/RAND_OP275.pdf>)Swoap

For the countries that matter most in the global order, perhaps unsurprisingly, none of these decisive variables have changed very much since the global downturn began, except for nations’ weaker economic performances. h at single factor is not likely to trump all these other abiding geopolitical determinants and therefore produce international structural change. Moreover, the fundamental power relationships between and among the world’s foremost countries have also not altered, nor have those nations’ perceptions of their vital national interests and how best to promote and defend them. To sum up this pivotal concept, in the absence of war, revolution, or other extreme international or domestic disruptions, for nation-states, the powerful abiding conditions just listed do not evolve much except over the very long term, and thus neither do countries’ strategic intent and core external policies— even, as today, in the face of world economic trials. h is point was made earlier about Russia’s enduring national security goals, which go back hundreds of years. Similarly, a Gulf monarch recently advised—with respect to Iran—not to fasten on the views of President Ahmadinejad or Supreme Leader Khamenei. Rather, he counseled that, to best understand contemporary Iranian policy, one should more usefully read the histories, objectives, and strategies of the Persian kings Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes, who successively ruled a vast empire around 500 BC. 32

#### Predictions are false- economic decline doesn’t cause conflict

Barnett 09 (Thomas P.M., chief analyst at Wikistrat and a contributing editor for Esquire, worked in US national security circles since the end of the Cold War, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis”, World Politics Review, 9/24/09, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/4213/the-new-rules-security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis>) Swoap

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts [listed by GlobalSecurity.org](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/index.html) can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends.

#### Economic crisis doesn’t lead to conflict

Zakaria 09 (Fareed, was the managing editor of Foreign Affairs,  Ph.D. in political science from Harvard, “The Secrets of Stability”, Newsweek, 12/11/09, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html>) Swoap

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. 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?"

### Econ Adv Exts - #5 - Alt Things K2 Econ

#### Small business hiring vital to the economy

Redmond 12 (Billie, President of Coldwell Banker Commercial TradeMark Properties, Inc, “Small Businesses Are Key to the Economy, Not Big Government”, US News, 6/18/12) Swoap

The solution to the jobs problem is small business, not more government. [Job Creators Alliance](http://www.jobcreatorsalliance.org/home.aspx) has laid out a roadmap to sustainable economic recovery—and that path is paved with commonsense regulatory reform, certainty about future taxes, and the return of spending sanity to our federal government. In recent years, the federal government has unleashed a regulatory onslaught on small businesses in the private sector and has made it much harder for the engine of our economy to function as it should. Until policymakers and elected officials start to listen to the voice of the entrepreneur and small business owner, it's hard to see how [job creation](http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/economic-intelligence/2012/06/18/small-businesses-are-key-to-the-economy-not-big-government) will come back. A March [Small Business Outlook Survey](http://www.uschambersmallbusinessnation.com/uploads/Chamber%20Economy%20Survey_March%202012%20Final.pdf) conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce shows that concerns about over-regulation are the highest we've seen in the past year. Small business owners are hesitant to hire because of uncertainty created by the plethora of threatening regulations coming from and pending in Washington. There is something to be said about the correlation between the unemployment rate and the increasing concern about regulations coming out of Washington. America needs the government to step down and let true job creators lead the way to recovery.

#### Education is the future of the US economy

Shultz and Hanushek (George P. and Eric A., served as the [United States Secretary of Labor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Secretary_of_Labor),  [U.S. Secretary of the Treasury](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Secretary_of_the_Treasury), and Paul and Jean Hanna Senior Fellow at the [Hoover Institution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hoover_Institution) of [Stanford University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stanford_University) respectively, “Education Is the Key to a Healthy Economy”, Wall Street Journal, 5/1/12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303513404577356422025164482.html>) Swoap

In addressing our current fiscal and economic woes, too often we neglect a key ingredient of our nation's economic future—the human capital produced by our K-12 school system. An improved education system would lead to a dramatically different future for the U.S., because educational outcomes strongly affect economic growth and the distribution of income. Over the past half century, countries with higher math and science skills have grown faster than those with lower-skilled populations. In the chart nearby, we compare GDP-per-capita growth rates between 1960 and 2000 with achievement results on international math assessment tests. The countries include almost all of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries plus a number of developing countries. What stands out is that all the countries follow a nearly straight line that slopes upward—as scores rise, so does economic growth. Peru, South Africa and the Philippines are at the bottom; Singapore and Taiwan, the top. The U.S. growth rate lies above the line because—despite the more recent shortcomings of our schools—we've long benefited from our commitment to the free movement of labor and capital, strong property rights, a limited degree of government intrusion in the economy, and strong colleges and universities. But each of these advantages has eroded considerably and should not be counted on to keep us above the line in the future.

**Action on the housing market vital to the economy**Bloomberg Editors 12 [Bloomberg Editors, January 8, 2012, , <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-09/action-on-stalled-housing-market-vital-for-u-s-economic-expansion-view.html>] Callas

In an unusual step, the [Federal Reserve](http://topics.bloomberg.com/federal-reserve/) sent a [white paper](http://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/other-reports/files/housing-white-paper-20120104.pdf) to congressional committees last week, urging them to look again at what ails the U.S. housing market and at possible remedies. More can be done, the Fed says, to help it revive.

Good advice. Housing is where the recession started, and it remains one of the main things holding back the recovery. Friday’s unemployment numbers -- nonfarm payrolls grew by 200,000 in December, and the jobless rate ticked down to 8.5 percent from 8.7 percent -- join other tentative signs of an improving economy, but the housing mess is mostly getting worse. There’s still a grave risk it might stop, not just delay, the expansion. The Fed’s paper underlines the scale of the problem. The decline in U.S. [house prices](http://topics.bloomberg.com/house-prices/) has wiped out a staggering $7 trillion in [home equity](http://topics.bloomberg.com/home-equity/). The ratio of housing wealth to disposable income has crashed from 140 percent at its peak to 55 percent, the lowest since the figures began to be collected in the 1950s. The number of “underwater” mortgages has grown to 12 million: More than one in five homeowners owes more than the property is worth. It’s surprising the economy is making any headway at all into a gale of this force.

#### Fixing the economy requires fixing the housing market – the housing market is vital for the economy

Summers, ’11[Lawrence, President of HARvard university, October 24, 2011, <http://blogs.reuters.com/lawrencesummers/2011/10/24/to-fix-the-economy-fix-the-housing-market/>] Callas

The central irony of financial crisis is that while it is caused by too much confidence, too much borrowing and lending and too much spending, it can only be resolved with more confidence, more borrowing and lending, and more spending. Most policy failures in the United States stem from a failure to appreciate this truism and therefore to take steps that would have been productive pre-crisis but are counterproductive now, with the economy severely constrained by lack of confidence and demand. Thus even as the gap between the economy’s production and its capacity increases and is projected to increase further, fiscal policy turns contractionary, financial regulation turns towards a focus on discouraging risk taking, and monetary policy is constrained by concerns about excess liquidity. Most significantly the nation’s housing policies especially with regard to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac–institutions whose very purpose is to mitigate cyclicality in housing and who today dominate the mortgage market–have become a textbook case of disastrous and procyclical policy. Annual construction of new single family homes has plummeted from the 1.7 million range in the middle of the last decade to the 450 thousand range at present. With housing starts averaging well over a million during the 1990s, the [shortfall in housing construction](http://www.realestateindustrynews.com/new-homes/new-home-construction-increases-slightly-still-on-pace-for-record-low-year/) now projected dwarfs the excess of construction during the bubble period and is the largest single component of the shortfall in GDP. Losses on owner-occupied housing have reduced consumers’ wealth by more than $7 trillion over the last 5 years, and uncertainty about the future value of their homes, as well as the inability to refinance at reasonable rates, deters household outlays on durable goods. The continuing weakness of the housing sector is a major source of risk for major U.S. financial institutions raising significantly the costs of the loans they offer. In retrospect it obviously would have been better if financial institutions and those involved in regulating them–especially the FHFA–recognized that house prices can go down as well as up; if more rigor had been applied in providing credit; if the GSEs had been more careful in monitoring those originating and servicing loans; and if all those involved had been more vigilant about fraudulent behavior. The question now is what should be done to address the housing market, given the drag it represents on the national economy. With virtually all mortgages in the United States provided by the Federal government or guaranteed by the GSEs, this is inevitably a matter of government policy. Unfortunately, for the last several years policy has been preoccupied with backward-looking attempts to address the consequences of past errors in mortgage extension by addressing homeowners on a case-by-case basis, and decisions regarding the GSEs have been left to their conservator FHFA which has taken a narrow view of the public interest. FHFA has not acted on its conservatorship mandate to insure that the GSEs act to stabilize the nation’s housing market, and taken no account of the reality that the narrow financial interest of the GSEs depends on a national housing recovery. Instead of focusing on the stabilization of the housing market, its focus has been on reversing its previous policies heedless of changes in the environment, and in treating mortgage finance as a morality play involving homeowners, financial institutions and banks rather than an important component of national economic policy. A better approach would involve a number of changes in policy. First, and perhaps most fundamentally, credit standards for those seeking to buy homes are too high and rigorous in America today. This reduces demand for houses, lowers prices and increases foreclosures, leading to further tightening of credit standards and a vicious growth-destroying cycle. Publicly available statistics suggest that the characteristics of the average applicant in 2004 would make an applicant among the most risky today. Of course the pattern should be opposite, given that the odds of a further 35 percent decline in house prices are much lower than they were at past bubble valuations. Second, as President Obama stressed in [presenting his jobs bill](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/09/08/fact-sheet-american-jobs-act), there is no reason why those who are current on GSE guaranteed mortgages should not be able to take advantage of lower rates. From the point of view of the guarantor as distinct from the mortgage holder, lower rates are all to the good since they reduce the risk of default. Yet, at least until now the GSEs have made refinancings very difficult by insisting on significant fees and by requiring that any new refinancier take on all the liability for errors in underwriting the original mortgage, at a cost to American households of tens of billions a year. Third, stabilizing the housing market will require doing something about the large and growing inventory of foreclosed properties. The same property sold in a foreclosure sale nets about 30 percent less than if sold in the ordinary way and the knowledge that that there is a huge overhang of foreclosed properties deters home purchases. Aggressive efforts by the GSEs to finance mass sales of foreclosed properties to those prepared to rent them out could benefit both potential renters and the housing market. Fourth, there is the issue of preventing foreclosures which was the initial focus of housing policy efforts. The truth is that it is far from clear what the right way forward is. While the Obama administration HAMP effort has been [widely criticized for overly restrictive eligibility criteria](http://www.propublica.org/article/by-the-numbers-a-revealing-look-at-the-mortgage-mod-meltdown#one-in-five), the reality is that a large fraction of those receiving assistance have ultimately been unable to meet even their reduced obligations. This suggests that the task of helping homeowners without either damaging the financial system or simply delaying inevitable outcomes is more difficult than is often supposed. Surely there is a strong case for experimentation with principal reduction strategies at the local level. The GSEs should be required to drop their current posture of opposition to experimentation and move on a more constructive posture. Fifth, there were clearly substantial abuses by major financial institutions and most everyone in the mortgage industry during the bubble period. Just compensation to the victims is a legitimate objective of public policy. But allowing negotiation over the past to be the dominant thrust of present policy creates overhangs of uncertainty that impose huge costs on the financial system and inhibits current lending. It is equally in the interests of bank shareholders and the housing market that a rapid resolution of disputes be achieved. The FHFA should be striving to bring the current period of uncertainty to a rapid conclusion.

### Econ Adv Exts - #6 - Econ High Now/No collapse coming

#### US economy strong despite challenges

Koba 11 (Mark, Senior Editor at CNBC, “American Economic Decline? Exaggerated”, CNBC, 12/9/11, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/44271677/American_Economic_Decline_Exaggerated>) Swoap

With a recent [ratings downgrade,](http://www.cnbc.com/id/44287216/) chronic unemployment, a [growing budget deficit](http://www.cnbc.com/id/44343102/) and a political system that seems determined to self-destruct, it might appear that the U.S. is losing its grip as the world's top economic power.But analysts say that despite the laundry list of troubles—and predications of an American decline—the country is far from losing its ranking as the number one economy on the globe. "The U.S. economy is the largest in the world, and the country has one of the highest average incomes in the world," says Matthew Rafferty, professor of economics in the Quinnipiac University School of Business. "There are few countries that are likely to rival the U.S. in the near future." "I don't see U.S. power being eclipsed in the short term or even medium term," says Usha Haley, professor of international business at Massey University in Auckland, New Zealand. "The U.S. has problems of course, but the demise of the USA is much exaggerated." What's keeping the U.S. afloat in a sea of economic woes, analysts say, is what's kept it upright in the past—innovation and the ability to produce. "Silicon Valley is still the world leader in technology, and Wall Street is still the center of the financial world and of capitalism itself," says Charles Sizemore, CFA and editor of the Sizemore Investment Letter. "And we're manufacturing more today than we did in the 1970s. It's just with less labor."

#### Economy recovering now- manufacturing industry proves

Rugaber 12 (Christopher S, AP Economics Writer, “US factory growth shows economy more resilient”, StarHerald, 5/2/12, <http://www.starherald.com/news/business/us-factory-growth-shows-economy-more-resilient/article_63c28924-946e-11e1-97aa-001a4bcf887a.html>) Swoap

U.S. manufacturing grew last month at the fastest pace in 10 months, suggesting that the economy is healthier than recent data had indicated. New orders, production and a measure of hiring all rose. The April survey from the Institute for Supply Management was a hopeful sign ahead of Friday’s monthly jobs report and helped the Dow Jones industrial average end the day at its highest level in more than four years. The trade group of purchasing managers said Tuesday that its index of manufacturing activity reached 54.8 in April, the highest level since June. Readings above 50 indicate expansion. The sharp increase surprised analysts, who had predicted a decline after several regional reports showed manufacturing growth weakened last month. The gain led investors to shift money out of bonds and into stocks. The Dow Jones industrial added 66 points to 13,279, its best close since Dec. 28, 2007. Broader indexes also surged. The ISM manufacturing index is closely watched in part because it’s the first major economic report for each month. April’s big gain followed a series of weaker reports in recent weeks that showed hiring slowed, applications for unemployment benefits rose and factory output dropped. “This survey will ease concerns that the softer tone of the incoming news in recent months marked the start of a renewed slowdown in growth," Paul Dales, an economist at Capital Economics, said in a note to clients. "We think the latest recovery is made of sterner stuff, although we doubt it will set the world alight."

#### Economy is strong and recovering-jobs and GDP growth

Gnuschke 12 (John E. Director of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research and the Center for Manpower Studies and Professor of Economics at the University of Memphis, “Look for a stronger economy in 2012.”, Business Perspectives, 1/1/12, Volume 21 Issue 1, <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/Business-Perspectives/282581018.html>) Swoap

Positive signs in the real estate market will increase worker mobility, reduce the barriers to recruiting industries, and solidify the financial base of consumers in Memphis. Real estate was the industry that led us in the post-2000 expansion and the subsequent recession, and it will be the industry that must recover before the Memphis economy fully recovers. Among the most important charts and graphs in this edition of Business Perspectives are those related to jobs and those related to major local industries--financial, real estate, and transportation-based industries including distribution and logistics. Low interest rates set the table for the recovery, but they cannot make the recovery happen. Only the growth of job opportunities and the growth of market drivers like real estate will indicate that the great recession is a thing of the past. The outlook for the economy in 2012 is for a stronger recovery, nearing 2.75 percent growth in GDP, with declining unemployment rates under 8.0 percent nationally by year end combined with renewed signs of strength in most major market sectors. A global economic recovery, combined with high single-digit growth returning to China and an acceptable debt recovery plan in place in Europe, will lead the way to an increasingly bullish 2012. Memphis will respond with modest growth in employment, less than 10,000 net new jobs, but stronger growth than experienced during the last few years. The government and private segments of the local economy will also show signs of new growth as the year progresses.

## Hegemony

### Hegemony Advantage frontline

#### 1 - US hegemony naturally declining now due to imperial overstretch - convergence theory proves

Beckley 2011, (Michael Beckley, A research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “ China’s Century?”. 2011. AD: 7/26/12. http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf|Ashwin)

At its core, the debate about U.S. decline is a debate about the relevance of history. Declinists contend that history tends to repeat itself and that the history¶ of world politics can be characterized as a “succession of hegemonies,”¶ 8¶ as the¶ recurrent “rise and fall of the great powers,”¶ 9¶ as an “observable pattern of¶ great power emergence,”¶ 10¶ or as a series of “long cycles.”¶ 11¶ The Habsburg,¶ French, and British Empires were defeated and surpassed by rising challengers. It is therefore natural for America’s “unipolar moment” to be similarly¶ consigned to the ash-heap of history. Several established academic theories underpin this cyclical view of history.¶ First, declinists fuse hegemonic stability theory with traditional balance of¶ power theory.¶ 13¶ In this view, the United States, like Great Britain in the nineteenth century, supplies the world with public goods. Weaker states not only free-ride on these services, but also engage in sabotage, erecting diplomatic¶ and economic obstacles to U.S. initiatives and forming anti-American alliances.¶ 14¶ As a result, others rise while the United States suffers from “imperial¶ overstretch.”¶ 15¶ Second is the theory of convergence and its claim that, in an open global¶ economy, poor countries tend to grow faster than rich countries.¶ 16¶ China, like¶ Germany, Japan, and South Korea before it, can reap the “advantages of backwardness,” adopting modern technologies and methods while skipping the¶ long, arduous process of inventing them.¶ 17¶ Meanwhile U.S. investment in foreign countries “tends to abort the reinvigoration of the American domestic¶ economy and its technical infrastructure.”¶ 18¶ Globalization thus stimulates¶ growth abroad while undercutting it at home, diffusing not just technology¶ but also technological and military capabilities.

#### And, US hegemony decline inevitable - Sino-Russian soft balancing is countering

Ferguson 12(Chaka, Journal of Strategic StudiesVolume 35, Issue 2, April 2012, pages 197-222, “The Strategic Use of Soft Balancing: The Normative Dimensions of the Chinese–Russian ‘Strategic Partnership”, AD: 07/24/12, [http://www.tandfonline.com/action/doSearch?action=runSearch&type=advanced&result=true&prevSearch=%2Bauthorsfield%3A(Ferguson%2C+Chaka | Kushal)](http://www.tandfonline.com/action/doSearch?action=runSearch&type=advanced&result=true&prevSearch=%2Bauthorsfield%3A(Ferguson%2C+Chaka%20|%20Kushal))

Explaining the Sino-Russo ‘strategic partnership’ since the end of the Cold War has proven to be vexing from a theoretical standpoint. Perceptions of the partnership have ranged from the highly alarmist to the extremely skeptical.1 Scholars and policymakers addressing the subject frequently offer contradictory views, within their own analyses, about the strategic relationship between Beijing and Moscow.2 Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, descriptions of the alignment between the two great powers often have been inconsistent: although many scholars argue that China and Russia are attempting to change the international system from unipolarity to multipolarity, they deny any larger balance of power phenomenon is at work against the United States.3¶ In his detailed overview of the relationship between Moscow and Beijing, Yong Deng underscores the problem of explaining the ‘strategic partnership’ by pointing to the complexity it involves. Deng argues that the partnership is ‘puzzling on several grounds’, including the dissipation of the ideological bond between the Soviet Union and China, the differences in their domestic systems, power disparities between the two, and Russia's fear of a ‘yellow peril’ migrating from China. ‘According to realist theories,’ Deng writes, ‘such divergent paths of material fortune and misfortune foretold strategic animosity rather than partnership.’4 Deng makes an accurate assessment about the inadequacy of neorealism to account for the current strategic partnership. Yet there is a dichotomy underlying his logic behind the alignment as well:¶ The status interests of China and Russia are simultaneously driven by a pro-system bias and a revisionist agenda vis-à-vis the world order. Both seek a stable relationship with the United States and integration into the Western-led international community. Thus, both take pains to reassure the outside world that their strategic ties are emphatically not aimed at any third party. Yet they need each other's support to enhance their diplomatic leverage in a world where the West clearly has an upper hand. In the words of one Chinese analyst, **Sino-Russian strategic ties are a ‘response’ and ‘warning’ to Western pressure and US hegemonism.** [my emphasis]**5¶ At least five analysts make a similar case about China and Russia: that they are relying on a strategy of counterbalancing the United States while simultaneously engaging it.**6 Furthermore, many scholars argue that traditional balance-of-power theory cannot explain the current relationship between Russia and China.7 Contrary to skeptics of a putative Sino-Russo axis against the United States, however, this article argues that a neoclassical realist framework can best explain the ‘strategic partnership’ by re-conceptualizing it as a form of ‘soft balancing’.8¶ Conceiving of the strategic partnership as a form of soft balancing provides a better explanation of Chinese and Russian behavior. Unlike traditional alliance politics, Moscow and Beijing are not forging a formal alliance to counter US preeminence in the military and economic spheres, although military deficiencies do shape their responses to US hegemony; nor have the two powers sought to bandwagon or ally with the United States. Rather, they have adopted a strategy that uses normative power to offset the superior American capabilities across military and economic dimensions. Using a soft balancing framework to analyze the ‘strategic partnership’ can provide novel insights into state behavior under unipolarity by highlighting the role norms play in the global balance of power.9¶ Specifically, this article explores how the strategic partnership has played out within the confines of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and through Chinese–Russian bilateral relations from the US-led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 through the Yekaterinburg summit in 2009. To be sure, the two great powers have cooperated in other arenas to balance the United States; for example their voting patterns in the United Nations (UN) Security Council have been similar in matters regarding American preferences.10 However, since its establishment in 2001, the SCO has gained the attention of policymakers, strategists and scholars around the world because of its potential to become a major player on the Eurasian landmass.11 Scrutiny of the organization intensified during the administration of US President George W. Bush and continues under that of President Barack Obama hard’ and ‘soft’ balancing and distinguishes the SCO from past military alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. The second section details the evolution because, as realists argue, structural considerations, not leadership styles, are the main factor explaining world politics.¶ Drawing from the emerging soft balancing literature, this article defines the concept as nonmilitary alignments of at lseast two states that are designed to reduce or remove the military presence and external influence of an outside power from a specific region. Analytically, a bloc's adoption of any of the three following tactics can evince soft balancing behavior: **indirect attempts to reduce or remove the military presence of the external actor from a region; removing regional actors allied politically with the external great power; and reducing economic, cultural and normative influences promoted by an external actor.¶** The article begins with an overview of the key concepts of soft balancing. The mechanics of soft balancing rely mainly on indirect and/or non-confrontational tactics, which this author argues are primarily normative in nature. The heavy reliance on norms to balance power is a crucial distinction between ‘of the SCO from a border regime into a key component of the larger Sino-Russo partnership. The third section chronicles the role of the SCO in balancing US military and political influence in Central Asia, with an emphasis on ‘soft power’ assets, such as the promotion of alternative doctrines of democracy and emphasis on regionalization.12 It concludes with an assessment of the role soft balancing has played in the strategic partnership.¶ Unlike previous treatments of soft balancing, this paper goes beyond theoretical discourses by examining the strategic deployment and practical implications of a soft balancing strategy. There have been few, if any, analyses of soft balancing from a strategic standpoint, or broader discussions of the use of ‘soft’ or ‘normative’ power in strategic studies.13 This article hopes to fill that void by demonstrating how states can exploit their normative capabilities in a similar fashion to their military or hard power assets. In a unipolar system, increases in military capabilities are unlikely to achieve global balance because the hegemon's hard power far outstrips that of its nearest competitors. States therefore must rely on other capabilities if they seek to set preferences favorable to achieve their interests without directly confronting superior power.

#### U.S. hegemony causes more war than it prevents- incentives the rise of belligerent regional powers

**Cambanis 12** (Thanassis, The Boston Globe, “The lonely superpower”, 01/22/12, AD: 07/24/12, <http://articles.boston.com/2012-01-22/ideas/30646076_1_cold-war-nuclear-war-arms-race> | Kushal)

After decades of nuclear brinkmanship, Americans felt profound relief when the Cold War ended. The Soviet Union’s collapse in 1989 transformed the world almost overnight from a battleground between two global giants -- a bipolar world, in scholarly parlance -- to a unipolar world, in which the United States outstripped all other powers.¶ In foreign policy circles, it was taken for granted that this dominance was good for America. Experts merely differed over how long the “unipolar moment” could last, or how big a peace dividend America could expect. Some even argued that the end of the arms race between Moscow and Washington had eliminated the threat of world war.Now, however, with a few decades of experience to study, a young international relations theorist at Yale University has proposed a provocative new view: American dominance has destabilized the world in new ways, and the United States is no better off in the wake of the Cold War. In fact, he says, a world with a single superpower and a crowded second tier of distant competitors encourages, rather than discourages, violent conflict--not just among the also-rans, but even involving the single great power itself.¶ In a paper that appeared in the most recent issue of the influential journal International Security, political scientist Nuno P. Monteiro lays out his case. America, he points out, has been at war for 13 of the 22 years since the end of the Cold War, about double the proportion of time it spent at war during the previous two centuries. “I’m trying to debunk the idea that a world with one great power is better,” he said in an interview. “If you don’t have one problem, you have another.”¶ Sure, Monteiro says, the risk of apocalyptic war has decreased, since there’s no military equal to America’s that could engage it in mutually assured destruction. But, he argues, the lethal, expensive wars in the Persian Gulf, the Balkans, and Afghanistan have proved a major drain on the country.¶ Even worse, Monteiro claims, America’s position as a dominant power, unbalanced by any other alpha states actually exacerbates dangerous tensions rather than relieving them. Prickly states that Monteiro calls “recalcitrant minor powers” (think Iran, North Korea, and Pakistan), whose interests or regime types clash with the lone superpower, will have an incentive to provoke a conflict. Even if they are likely to lose, the fight may be worth it, since concession will mean defeat as well. **This is the logic by which North Korea and Pakistan both acquired nuclear weapons, even during the era of American global dominance, and by which Iraq and Afghanistan preferred to fight rather than surrender to invading Americans**.¶

#### Economic recession highlights hegemonic decline- era of unipolarity rapidly ending

**Layne 12** (Christopher, Texas A & M University, International Studies Quarterly, “his Time It's Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana”, 03/01/12, AD: 07/24/12, <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/isqu/2012/00000056/00000001/art00014> | Kushal)

Before the Great Recession's foreshocks in fall 2007, most American security studies scholars believed that unipolarity—and perforce American hegemony—would be enduring features of international politics far into the future. However, in the Great Recession's aftermath, it is apparent that much has changed since 2007. Predictions of continuing unipolarity have been superseded by premonitions of American decline and geopolitical transformation. The Great Recession has had a two-fold impact. First, it highlighted the shift of global wealth—and power—from West to East, a trend illustrated by China's breathtakingly rapid rise to great power status. Second, it has raised doubts about the robustness of US primacy's economic and financial underpinnings. This article argues that the Aunipolar moment is over, and the Pax Americana—the era of American ascendancy in international politics that began in 1945—is fast winding down. This article challenges the conventional wisdom among International Relations/Security Studies scholars on three counts. First, it shows that contrary to the claims of unipolar stability theorists, the distribution of power in the international system no longer is unipolar. Second, this article revisits the 1980s' debate about American decline and demonstrates that the Great Recession has vindicated the so-called declinists of that decade. Finally, this article takes on the Ainstitutional lock-in argument, which holds that by strengthening the Pax Americana's legacy institutions, the United States can perpetuate the essential elements of the international order it constructed following World War II even as the material foundations of American primacy erode.

#### Hegemony is the root cause of terrorism against America, continuing to fight against terrorism leads to more galvanized attacks

Muzaffar 2007, (Chandra Muzaffar, Author, and political scientist, Chandra Muzaffar is President of the International ¶ Movement for a Just World (JUST), an international NGO concerned with challenges to social ¶ justice and human dignity in global politics. “HEGEMONY, TERRORISM, AND WAR—IS DEMOCRACY THE

ANTIDOTE?”. 2007. AD: 7/25/12. http://static7.userland.com/ulvs1-j/gems/wlr/08muzaffar.pdf|Ashwin)

Al-Qaeda, the world’s most notorious terrorist network, was, in a sense, a ¶ response to the most obvious manifestation of global hegemony, namely, ¶ military power. As soon as the United States had established a military base in ¶ Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, in 1991, immediately after the Kuwait War, the alQaeda leader, Osama bin Laden, announced to the world that he would attack ¶ Dhahran. He considered the establishment of an “infidel” military base in ¶ Islam’s holiest land—Saudi Arabia, where Islam’s two holiest cities, Mecca and ¶ Media, are situated—an act of sacrilege.1¶ In June 1996, al-Qaeda was allegedly ¶ involved in a bomb attack upon the base, killing 19 American airmen and ¶ wounding 250 others. Two years later, al-Qaeda targeted U.S. embassies in ¶ Kenya and Tanzania. This was followed by the 2000 assault on a U.S. warship, ¶ the USS Cole, off the coast of Yemen. ¶ The climax was of course the infamous 9-11 episode when al-Qaeda ¶ operatives allegedly smashed aircrafts into the World Trade Center (WTC) in ¶ New York and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. Almost three thousand men ¶ and women were massacred in those horrendous tragedies on the eleventh of ¶ September 2001. There is no need to emphasize that the WTC was a symbol ¶ of U.S.’s global economic power while the Pentagon represented its global ¶ military might. After 9-11, U.S. global hegemony continued to provoke al-Qaeda and other ¶ terrorist outfits. Since the U.S. and its allies had invaded Afghanistan in ¶ October 2001 in order to oust the Taliban regime that was protecting Osama, ¶ the invasion became the justification for further terrorist attacks. The Bali ¶ bombings of October 2002, purportedly carried out by a group affiliated with ¶ al-Qaeda, the Jemaah Islamiyyah, were primarily to avenge the Afghan ¶ invasion. Then in March 2003, the U.S. and its allies embarked upon a second ¶ military invasion. This time the target was Iraq. One year after Iraq was ¶ conquered, al-Qaeda struck again; it was responsible for a dastardly carnage at ¶ a Madrid railway station. The unconcealed aim was to compel the Spanish ¶ government to withdraw its soldiers from the U.S. led force in Iraq. Al-Qaeda ¶ succeeded in its objective.¶ If we reflect upon al-Qaeda attacks, it is obvious that the military, political, ¶ and economic dimensions of U.S. hegemony figure prominently on its radar ¶ screen. It is seldom acknowledged, however, that the cultural dimension of ¶ hegemony has also been a consideration. For instance, during their trial, a ¶ couple of the Bali bombers inveighed against Western cultural imperialism and ¶ how it was destroying the identity and integrity of indigenous communities.¶ By arguing that hegemony in all its manifestations breeds terrorism, we are ¶ in no way condoning terrorism. Al-Qaeda’s deliberate targeting of noncombatants and civilians in general—in East Africa, on 9-11, in Bali, in ¶ Madrid—has been condemned by right-thinking people everywhere. Leading ¶ Muslim theologians and scholars have not only denounced al-Qaeda’s ¶ misdeeds from a humanitarian perspective, but have also castigated Osama ¶ and his underlings as men who have shamelessly violated the essence of ¶ Islamic teachings.2 Nonetheless, if we fail to recognize how hegemony—¶ control and dominance over people—leads to acts of terror, we will be no ¶ better than the proverbial ostrich that buries its head in the sand.

## Heg Ext #1 –Decline Inevitable

#### The United States is caught in the spiral of “hegemon’s dilemma”-it is experiencing unchangeable economic decline and rising costs, leading to replacement as the hegemon

Beckley 2011, (Michael Beckley, A research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “ China’s Century?”. 2011. AD: 7/26/12. http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf|Ashwin)

According to declinists, the United States is suffering from a classic case of the¶ “hegemon’s dilemma.”¶ 21¶ To maximize its absolute economic gains, the United¶ States must provide and police a regime of free commerce regardless of what¶ other countries do. This policy, however, “insures that it will experience a relative economic decline and in time, therefore, a decline in its hegemonic position.”¶ 22¶ In this view, the United States is either benevolent or impotent,¶ unwilling or unable to force others to help maintain the international order.¶ 23¶ Declinists do not agree on why the hegemon sacriªces its resources and energy¶ to support the system—for some, the hegemon acts out of self-interest;¶ 24¶ for¶ others, the hegemon is motivated by “conscience, duty, obligation, or such oldfashioned notions as noblesse oblige”¶ 25¶ —but they do agree that the public¶ goods the United States provides “are not productive investments, they constitute an economic drain on the economy of the dominant state.”¶ 26¶ The hegemon’s dilemma is most pronounced in three areas: security, finance, and trade. First, in the security realm, the very extent of the hegemon’s¶ influence multiplies and magniªes threats to its core interests and, as a result,¶ the resources the hegemon must expend to defend them.¶ 27¶ Ancient Rome, for¶ example, sought security through territorial expansion, but this strategy simply created more distant frontiers to defend. U.S. hegemony may depend less¶ on direct territorial control, but the basic pattern of greater power begetting¶ greater military burdens still seems to apply—the United States now formally¶ guarantees the security of more than ªfty countries, has fought twice as many¶ wars after the Cold War as during it, and spends 25 percent more (in real dollars) on defense today than it did in 1968 at the height of combat in¶ Vietnam.¶ 28¶ Second, because the United States allows the dollar to function as a global¶ reserve and exchange unit, it must run persistent balance-of-payments deªcits¶ to supply the world with liquidity. Doing so, however, undermines not only¶ the competitiveness of U.S. exports but also the conªdence of markets and¶ central banks in the dollar, thereby increasing the risk of a dollar collapse.¶ 29¶ Even if foreigners hold on to their dollar-denominated assets, the United¶ States’ rising deficits trigger higher interest rates and, as a consequence, slower¶ rates of economic growth.¶ 30¶ In addition, foreign creditors can wield their dollars as weapons, manipulating U.S. policy by threatening to sell their reserves.¶ 31¶ China’s holdings, at $1.5 trillion and climbing, loom especially large¶ in this respect.¶ 32¶ Third, because its economy accounts for a large portion of the world economy, the United States must maintain an open market, even in the face of foreign protectionism, to prevent the collapse of the global free trade regime.¶ 33¶ As Arthur Stein writes, “Hegemons do not impose openness, they bear its costs.”¶ 34¶ Declinists tout Britain’s unilateral repeal of the Corn Laws in 1849¶ and the United States’ tolerance of Japanese, Korean, and European trade barriers during the Cold War as prime examples of such “asymmetrical trade¶ agreements

#### Soft balancing directly challenges US hegemony

**Ferguson 12** (Chaka, Journal of Strategic StudiesVolume 35, Issue 2, April 2012, pages 197-222, “The Strategic Use of Soft Balancing: The Normative Dimensions of the Chinese–Russian ‘Strategic Partnership”, AD: 07/24/12, [http://www.tandfonline.com/action/doSearch?action=runSearch&type=advanced&result=true&prevSearch=%2Bauthorsfield%3A(Ferguson%2C+Chaka | Kushal)](http://www.tandfonline.com/action/doSearch?action=runSearch&type=advanced&result=true&prevSearch=%2Bauthorsfield%3A(Ferguson%2C+Chaka%20|%20Kushal))

Soft balancing began to surface as a concept in the mid-2000s to account for the conspicuous absence of hard balancing against the United States after the denouement of the Cold War. Proponents of soft balancing, mainly realist theorists, argued that contrary to predictions that the ‘balance of power’ had no utility in a post-Cold War world, balancing strategies were indeed emerging. Supporters maintained that the balance of power dynamic still persisted in international politics, but that changes in the configuration of the international system required new balancing logics. They also argued that the absence of strategic balance as an outcome did not mean that states were abandoning balancing as an overall strategy because balancing is not always a successful policy. Furthermore, balancing strategies in a unipolar world would require new tactics to deal with an existing hegemonic power, a rare phenomenon in world history.14**¶ Soft balancing theorists describe the strategy as the adoption of indirect tactics to counterbalance the interests of a hegemonic power.** Robert Pape, a leading proponent of soft balancing, defines it as the following**: ‘Actions that do not directly challenge US military preponderance but that use nonmilitary tools to delay, frustrate, and undermine aggressive unilateral US military policies.’15 This can be through regional blocs, international institutions, economic statecraft and diplomatic arrangements.** Another soft balancing supporter, T.V. Paul, offers a similar observation, concluding that ‘in the post-Cold War era, second-tier major power states have been increasingly resorting to soft balancing strategies to counter the growing military might and unilateral tendencies of the United States without harming their economic ties to it’.16¶ Theoretically, soft balancing follows systemic logic. In a multipolar system, the increased number of great powers enlarges the pool of possible dyads for alliance formation.17 The use of alliances was less effective as a balancing strategy during the Cold War bipolar system, where defections from either bloc had little impact on the overall strategic balance of power at the systemic level.18 In a unipolar system, the capabilities of the hegemonic state or superpower so far outstrip those of its nearest competitors that neither alliance formations nor internal arms buildups are effective.19 Great powers wishing to balance the unipole, then, must adopt different strategies, which in many cases are normative in nature.

#### U.S. hegemony declining now- post American primacy world solves better

**Larison 10** (Daniel, “A Bright Post-Hegemonic Future”, 04/05/10, AD: 07/23/12, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/a-bright-post-hegemonic-future/> | Kushal)

Michael Auslin does his best to paint a picture of the dire “dimming of our age” (via Scoblete) that will come with gradual reduction in U.S. military presence overseas, and the future he predicts does not seem very gloomy at all:¶ The upshot of these three trends will likely be a series of decisions to slowly, but irrevocably reduce America’s overseas global military presence and limit our capacity to uphold peace and intervene around the globe. And, as we hollow out our capabilities, China will be fielding ever more accurate anti-ship ballistic missiles, advanced fighter aircraft, and stealthy submarines; Russia will continue to expand its influence over its “near abroad” while modernizing its nuclear arsenal; and Iran will develop nuclear weapons, leading to an arms race or preemptive attacks in the Middle East.¶ Under such conditions, global trade flows will be stressed, the free flow of capital will be constrained, and foreign governments will expand their regulatory and confiscatory powers against their domestic economies in order to fund their own military expansions.¶ In other words, unsustainable U.S. hegemony will not be as great as it was, and that will mean that other major and rising powers will be able to exert something more like the normal influence in their regions that such powers have exerted throughout most of modern history. Will there be conflicts in such a world? Of course, there will be, but we already have a number of conflicts in the world that have either been deemed irrelevant to the maintenance of Pax Americana or they are the products of policies designed to perpetuate Pax Americana. In practice, securing this “peace” has involved starting several wars, the largest and most destructive of which has been the war in Iraq, as well as supporting proxies and allies as they escalated conflicts with their neighbors.¶ China will build up its military, as it is already doing, and Russia will continue to extend its influence into its “near-abroad,” and Iran will develop nuclear weapons. What is important to stress here is that all of these things already are or soon will be happening anyway. **These things are happening** despite, and perhaps in some cases **because of, American military presence** in their respective regions. The reality of multipolarity makes these first two more or less unavoidable, and as we have been seeing over the last few years there is nothing short of full-scale war with Iran that could realistically interrupt the development of its nuclear program. If Iran definitely decides to acquire nuclear weapons, there is remarkably little that any outside government can do to prevent this from happening. One sure way to guarantee that Iran pursues this route is to continue to act punitively towards Iran. If Western powers actively resist Russian efforts to exercise influence along its own borders as the U.S. and some European states have been doing, all that will result is the use of Russia’s smaller neighbors as Western proxies. This will have very unfortunate consequences for the proxies, which the Russians will intimidate and/or attack and which Western powers will not aid in direct conflicts with Russia.¶ Too many American policymakers and policy analysts remain devoted to restoring a degree of American preeminence that existed in 1991-92 and will probably never come again. **The reality is that we may not even see American preeminence** c. 2008, much less the way it was twenty years ago. Our policies and our military deployments around the world have not adjusted to this reality. Now some of our closest allies are forcing us to come to terms with the way the world has changed.¶ Of course, one could simply dismiss Auslin’s argument as an attempt to justify the current, indefensible size of the absurdly overgrown warfare and security state. This would hardly be the first time that a defender of an entrenched government program or institution resorted to exaggerating the calamities that reduction in services would create. It is also not the first time that such a defender simply imagines a threat to the program or institution. As usual, the danger/promise of reducing America’s overseas military presence is not nearly as great as Auslin claims.¶ What provoked this vision of the “dimming of our age”? The British Foreign Affairs Select Committee’s report pronouncing the “special relationship” dead and the continued resistance by the DPJ government in Japan to the location of a Marine air station in Okinawa. Oh, and health care. It is telling that the foreign examples Auslin provides are the results of national backlashes against perceived excessive identification with or dependence on U.S. power. Britain walked in lockstep with the United States before and during the war in Iraq, and it was badly burned by the experience. Japan has tolerated a continued military presence on Okinawa despite a history of abuses suffered by the civilian population. Some of our best allies feel used or put-upon, and their complaints stem from precisely the sort of overbearing hegemonist attitude that tends to treat many of our allies more like satrapies rather than treating them as sovereign, independent states with their own interests.¶ So some of the countries that theoretically benefit most from the American ability to “to uphold peace and intervene around the globe” want to adjust their relationships with the U.S. so that their national interests are better served. Britain and Japan are not proposing to scrap their alliances with America, nor are they necessarily declaring their opposition to America’s active role in their parts of the world, but they do seem to be saying that they should give more thought to how often their security and foreign policies line up closely with our own. Instead of taking advantage of the potential for increased burden-sharing these moves represent and instead of encouraging allies to tap into their own resources to provide for their defense, we hear laments foretelling the “dimming of our age.”¶ As for the so-called “romantic belief in global fraternity,” which very few people actually hold, there have been no greater romantics than the idealists who have deluded themselves and many of us that the interests of the rest of the world and the interests of the United States frequently converge. American hegemonists have been fairly certain that democratization and globalization advance American power, and so they have tried to encourage both on the unfounded assumptions that economic interdependence and democracy will tend to prevent conflict and will lead other governments to align with Washington. As both emerging-market democracies and long-established industrialized democratic powers have been showing us in recent years, **neither democratization nor globalization magnifies American power, but instead has tended to create more increasingly powerful centers of resistance to Washington’s policies**. In a way, that is a credit to past successes of U.S. policy: American power provided the protection and shelter to permit war-ravaged nations to rebuild and become capable of providing for their own needs and defense. The collapse of the Soviet Union gave us the chance to end our abnormal and untraditional global role, and Washington failed to seize the opportunity. We are now at a point when we can still disentangle ourselves from many places around the world largely on our own terms and when we can shift the burdens for regional security to the regional powers and institutions that are capable of taking them up, but there seems to be no political will and no imagination needed to make this happen.

#### Cuts in military spending and increase in multilateralism signal hegemonic decline

**Parent and MacDonald 11** (Joseph and Paul, Council of Foreign Relations, “The Wisdom of Retrenchment”, December 2011, AD: 07/24/12, [http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136510/joseph-m-parent-and-paul-k-macdonald/the-wisdom-of-retrenchment#](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136510/joseph-m-parent-and-paul-k-macdonald/the-wisdom-of-retrenchment) | Kushal)

In the wake of the Cold War, U.S. foreign policy underwent a profound transformation. Unrestrained by superpower competition, the United States' ambitions spilled over their former limits. Washington increased its military spending far faster than any of its rivals, expanded NATO, and started dispatching forces around the world on humanitarian missions while letting key allies drift away. These trends accelerated after 9/11, as the United States went to war in Afghanistan and Iraq, ramped up its counterterrorism operations around the world, sped up its missile defense program, and set up new bases in distant lands.¶ Today, however, U.S. power has begun to wane. As other states rise in prominence, the United States' undisciplined spending habits and open-ended foreign policy commitments are catching up with the country. Spurred on by skyrocketing government debt and the emergence of the Tea Party movement, budget hawks are circling Washington. Before leaving office earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates announced cuts to the tune of $78 billion over the next five years, and the recent debt-ceiling deal could trigger another $350 billion in cuts from the defense budget over ten years. In addition to fiscal discipline, Washington appears to have rediscovered the virtues of multilateralism and a restrained foreign policy. It has narrowed its war aims in Afghanistan and Iraq, taken NATO expansion off its agenda, and let France and the United Kingdom lead the intervention in Libya.

Proliferation signals end of U.S. hegemony

**Maass 10** (Richard, PhD in political science from Notre Dame, “Nuclear Proliferation and Declining U.S. Hegemony”, 2010, AD: 07/26/12, <http://www.hamilton.edu/documents//levitt-center/Maass_article.pdf> | Kushal)

On August 29, 1949, The Soviet Union successfully tested its¶ first nuclear fission bomb, signaling the end of U.S. hegemony in the¶ international arena. On September 11th, 2001, the world’s single most¶ powerful nation watched in awe as the very symbols of its prosperity¶ fell to rubble in the streets of New York City. The United States¶ undisputedly “has a greater share of world power than any other¶ country in history” (Brooks and Wolforth, 2008, pg. 2). Yet even a¶ global hegemon is ultimately fallible and vulnerable to rash acts of¶ violence as it conducts itself in a rational manner and assumes the¶ same from other states. Conventional strategic thought and military¶ action no longer prevail in an era of increased globalization.¶ Developing states and irrational actors play increasingly influential¶ roles in the international arena. Beginning with the U.S.S.R. in 1949,¶ nuclear proliferation has exponentially increased states’ relative¶ military capabilities as well as global levels of political instability.¶ Through ideas such as nuclear peace theory, liberal political scholars¶ developed several models under which nuclear weapons not only¶ maintain but increase global tranquility. These philosophies assume¶ rationality on the part of political actors in an increasingly irrational¶ world plagued by terrorism, despotic totalitarianism, geo-political¶ instability and failed international institutionalism. Realistically,¶ “proliferation of nuclear [weapons]…constitutes a threat to¶ international peace and security” (UN Security Council, 2006, pg. 1).¶ Nuclear security threats arise in four forms: the threat of existing¶ arsenals, the emergence of new nuclear states, the collapse of¶ international non-proliferation regimes and the rise of nuclear¶ terrorism. Due to their asymmetric destabilizing and equalizing effects,¶ nuclear weapons erode the unipolarity of the international system by¶ balancing political actors’ relative military power and security. In the¶ face of this inevitable nuclear proliferation and its effects on relative¶ power, the United States must accept a position of declining¶ hegemony.¶

## Heg Ext. #2 Unsustainable

#### Collapse of U.S. hegemony inevitable- regional powers, declining primacy, and empirics prove

**Hamraie 10** (James, Editor of the Emory Political Review, “U.S. Hegemony is Unsustainable”, EPR Emory Political Review¶ Volume VIII, Issue 2, 2010, AD: 07/23/12, <http://www.students.emory.edu/EPR/81386_SinglePage%20MT.pdf> | Kushal)

The election of President Barack Obama, the withdrawal of troops from forward deployment in Iraq, and the mending of ties with foreign nations that were alienated during the War on Terror, have helped to create an atmosphere of optimism for the continued primacy of the United States as the leading nation in the international arena. This optimism, however, is premature. Despite the perceptual stability of U.S. dominance over the past two decades, **the continuation of its primacy will inevitably decline**.¶ This claim is neither extreme nor unprecedented. History is ripe with examples that show that **all great empires collapse**. The fall of Rome, Britain, the Mongols, the Han Dynasty, and the Byzantine Empire show that changes in the balance of power are quite frequent. An analysis of the structure of unipolarity combined with a focus on recent events shows that a number of issues in all sectors of power, including economic, military, and diplomatic sectors, limit the ability of the United States to prevent counter-balancing and the weakening of power projection, eventually causing a shift to a world where the United States shares the stage with rising powers.¶ Economic woes have affected the ability of the United States to maintain its supremacy. The recent financial crises, the erosion of U.S. competitiveness in business and education, and the declining purchasing power of the dollar have created domestic turmoil and dented the leading view of U.S. dominance among international allies. These factors, coupled with dependence on foreign oil and energy resources, are weakening U.S. flexibility and allowing foreign nations with exploding economies, such as China and India, to close the gap. For example, if China’s booming growth continues, then China’s total GDP would be 2.5 times that of the United States. A weaker economy has high domestic dissatisfaction contributing to a greater urgency to focus on national issues instead of international affairs. It is essential for the United States to maintain its flexibility in international involvement and conflict resolution because it lends the impression that the U.S. does not have its hands tied and that the U.S. military is still extremely powerful. A strong economy also lessens the amount of domestic spending on social services and foundation-level economic stimulus and allows for greater allocation of resources into research and development of new military technologies and upkeep of military supplies. Both of these factors are essential for conventional combat readiness and warfare, and allow the U.S. armed forces to sustain their lead over other nations.¶ Diplomatic woes arise from the United States’ diminished image. Although the War on Terror initially forged alliances and international sympathy, the unilateral policy decisions, human rights abuses, and exceptionalism that followed transformed the perception of the United States from a benevolent world power to an international bully willing to neglect multilateral solutions in favor of ad-hoc cowboy diplomacy. The abuses of Abu Ghraib, arguments over the Kyoto Protocol and global warming, and the invasion of Iraq are only a few examples of policies that have spurred heavy disdain and lasting animosity with both allies and hostile nations. Although Obama’s election has caused many foreign countries to begin changing their attitude towards the United States and public polls have illustrated a stronger approval rating of the United States, there are still major issues that need to be settled. The U.S. has failed to take concrete action on a majority of issues that the international community has been asking the United States to follow through on for over a decade. These include the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Law of the Sea Treaty, and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Being a world leader requires more than raw power. Sustaining alliances and goodwill with other nations is essential. Additionally, if the United States can convince other nations to comply with its wishes, it can lower the costs of shaping the global stage to reflect its interests. This arrangement, coupled with the evolving balance of power, can cause other nations to support the U.S. and oppose its potential challengers. For instance, the changing security dynamics in East Asia show that self-interest is spurring countries to be less willing to oppose neighbors on important issues or strategic circumstances. This is due to a fear of losing economic and trading ties, despite a long history of cooperation and positive relations with the United States.¶ Imperial overstretch, domestic costs of forward deployment, fighting capability, and overburdening security and humanitarian commitments has caused a decline in military power, the lifeline of U.S. global dominance. The growing strength of foreign militaries exacerbates the effect of these problems. The post-Cold War apex of American power has begun to erode while other nations with larger populations are training substantial military forces with increasingly sophisticated technology. Recent events illustrate the implication of these factors on the decline of U.S. power and the growing strength of potential global rivals. India and China are economic powerhouses, whose growth has allowed for greater modernization. Despite the military edge currently held by the U.S., domestic sentiment has drifted away from an overwhelming focus on defense spending since the invasion of and subsequent public backlash from Operation Iraqi Freedom. Additionally, China’s expanding naval forces, such as the nuclear-armed submarines, are lessening the effect of U.S. nuclear supremacy and first-strike leverage. Furthermore, in other important global regions, **Brazil is vying for regional hegemony, China is building security and economic ties with African nations, and Russia is legitimizing interventionist policies with the invasion of Georgia and fiery rhetoric over national expansion and national missile defense.¶**

#### U.S. supremacy diminishing- impossible to sustain indefinitely

**Rose 09** (Zak, staff writer for the Antillean, “Is America’s hegemony really necessary to maintain world order?”, 05/25/09, AD: 07/23/12, http://www.antillean.org/2009/05/25/us-hegemony-and-the-world-order/ | Kushal)

However, with the recent economic crash in the USA, some have begun to speculate that the country’s capacity to act as global hegemon is diminishing. This belief is reinforced by some of President Obama’s foreign policy activities. He has talked openly of creating a world of equal partners, and has taken steps towards reconciliation with long-standing political enemies, such as Cuba. Do these things signal the end of US supremacy?¶ Probably. **It would be no real surprise if US power waned.** The strain of acting as global hegemon is too great for any state to sustain indefinitely – history has seen countless powers rise and fall. Being the top tier in a hierarchy of nations means absorbing concentrated blame when international affairs go awry. To be the chief supervisor of a world order requires tremendous resources, and it means funneling those resources away from oneself. Eventually, populations become unwilling to pay these prices. Constant blame calls a country’s trustworthiness and competence into question (the private military contractor formerly known as Blackwater, anyone?) and hurts the pride of its citizens. With ballooning problems stemming from the economic crash, Americans may very well feel that issues at home deserve more attention than issues abroad. Compound this with a sinking global reputation following some debacles under the Bush administration, and it seems quite plausible that the Americans might willingly step down from their role as global hegemon.

and expansion is reached [the point at which ¶ hegemonic expansion achieves its peak], the tendency is for the economic ¶ costs of maintaining the status quo to rise faster than the economic capacity ¶ to support the status quo."22 There are two reasons for this: first, protection ¶ costs of maintaining the new empire increase; second, it is harder to raise the ¶ revenues to cover those costs. Protection costs rise partly because the hege- ¶ mon tends to pay too much for defense and allows allies to be free riders. ¶ Weapons costs increase. "Increases in the numbers and strengths of rival, ¶ challenging powers force the dominant state to expend more resources to ¶ maintain its superior military or political position." "Eventually the revenues generated by continuing political, territorial, and economic expansion ¶ are insufficient to underwrite the costs of an imperial or hegemonic posi- ¶ tion."23 As Carlo Cipolla points out: ¶ The growth of living standards within an empire pushes up the cost of ¶ an army. In the modern world the economic problems are less than of ¶ paying manpower than that of possessing very expensive equipment that ¶ becomes very rapidly obsolete. But whatever the specific elements in- ¶ volved, the problem remains essentially the same: military expenditure ¶ powerfully contributes to the growth of total public consumption.24 ¶ Protection costs rise because peoples on the frontiers of the hegemonic ¶ empire become aware of the advantages possessed by the imperial civiliza- ¶ tion and seek to emulate its ways. This narrows the gap in military power ¶ between the advanced empire and the peripheral states. The hegemonic ¶ power must then spend more to maintain its relative ascendancy. ¶ The imperial overlord has more difficulty meeting these rising costs be- ¶ cause of the typical 'S' curve of economic growth. "In the absence of new ¶ spurts of innovation or a borrowing of technology from abroad, the growth ¶ of the wealth and power of a society begins to slow, describing an S-shaped ¶ curve."25 Gilpin offers three reasons for this: 1. Both private and public expenditure tend to grow more rapidly than ¶ gross national product as society gains wealth. ¶ 2. According to Cipolla, "In a mature economy, the largest fraction is in ¶ the so-called service sector (the professions, banking, etc). Although ¶ a service economy continues to grow through its investment in the ¶ creation of knowledge and human capital, service industries tend to ¶ have a lower rate of productivity growth than manufactures." ¶ 3. Affluence corrupts. A pernicious belief develops "that the world ¶ they (or, rather their forebears) created is the right, natural and God- ¶ given state of affairs.... With such a state of mind a people neither ¶ concedes to the just demands of rising challengers nor makes the ¶ necessary sacrifices to defend its threatened world." "Social values, ¶ attitudes, and behavior change in ways that undercut the efficiency ¶ of the economy and the dedication of individuals and groups to the ¶ commonweal.' 26 ¶ Thus, the hegemonic power must spend more to defend its increasingly ¶ exposed position against imitative rivals at the very time when its own ¶ population and economic system are unable to make the necessary sacrifices ¶ to achieve the superior economic growth needed to finance higher military ¶ expenditures. Decline then becomes inexorable. The law of uneven growth ¶ (which Gilpin derives from Lenin) suggests that no power can stay atop the ¶ world pyramid for any great length of time.

## Heg Ext. #3 Heg Causes Conflict

#### Unipolarity spurs regional conflicts

**Cambanis 12** (Thanassis, The Boston Globe, “The lonely superpower”, 01/22/12, AD: 07/24/12, <http://articles.boston.com/2012-01-22/ideas/30646076_1_cold-war-nuclear-war-arms-race> | Kushal)

When the Soviet Union began its collapse in 1989, the United States was the last man standing, wielding a level of global dominance that had been unknown before in modern history. Policy makers and thinkers almost universally agreed that dominance would be a good thing, at least for America: It removed the threat of superpower war, and lesser powers would presumably choose to concede to American desires rather than provoke a regional war they were bound to lose.¶ That is what the 1991 Gulf War was about: establishing the new rules of a unipolar world. Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, Monteiro believes, because he miscalculated what the United States was willing to accept. After meeting Saddam with overwhelming force, America expected that the rest of the world would capitulate to its demands with much less fuss.¶ Monteiro compared the conflicts of the multipolar 18th century to those of the Cold War and current unipolar moment. What he found is that the unipolar world isn’t necessarily better than what preceded it, either for the United States or for the rest of the world. **It might even be worse**. “Uncertainty increases in unipolarity,” Monteiro says. “If another great power were around, we wouldn’t be able to get involved in all these wars.”¶ In the unipolar period, a growing class of minor powers has provoked the United States, willing to engage in brinkmanship up to and including violent conflict. Look no further than Iran’s recent threats to close the Strait of Hormuz to oil shipping and to strike the American Navy. Naturally, Iran wouldn’t be able to win such a showdown. But Iran knows well that the United States wants to avoid the significant costs of a war, and might back down in a confrontation, thereby rewarding Iran’s aggressive gambits. And if (or once) Iran crosses the nuclear threshold, it will have an even greater capacity to deter the United States. During the Cold War, on the other hand, regional powers tended to rely on their patron’s nuclear umbrella rather than seeking nukes of their own, and would have had no incentive to defy the United States by developing them.¶ Absent a rival superpower to check its reach, the United States has felt unrestrained, and at times even obligated, to intervene as a global police officer or arbiter of international norms against crimes such as genocide. Time and again in the post-Cold War age, **minor countries that were supposed to meekly fall in line with American imperatives instead defied them, drawing America into conflicts in the Balkans, Somalia, Haiti, Iraq, and Afghanistan. This wasn’t what was supposed to happen: The world was supposed to be much safer for a unipolar superpower, not more costly and hazardous.**

#### Hegemonic power is always used for war-negates any claims about solving for conflict

Muzaffar 2007, (Chandra Muzaffar, Author, and political scientist, Chandra Muzaffar is President of the International ¶ Movement for a Just World (JUST), an international NGO concerned with challenges to social ¶ justice and human dignity in global politics. “HEGEMONY, TERRORISM, AND WAR—IS DEMOCRACY THE

ANTIDOTE?”. 2007. AD: 7/25/12. http://static7.userland.com/ulvs1-j/gems/wlr/08muzaffar.pdf|Ashwin)

From terrorism let us now turn to war. There is no doubt at all that ¶ hegemony uses war to extend and expand its power. Recent examples provide ¶ the evidence.¶ The U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 enabled the superpower to ¶ plant its flag in that country, and, at the same time, to extend its influence over ¶ Central Asia—a region of the world where Russia still carries some weight and ¶ which China eyes with some interest. Apart from American bases in a couple ¶ of Central Asian republics, its geopolitical presence in the oil rich region also ¶ means that it is capable of exercising some control over the export of that ¶ commodity. This has enhanced its hegemonic power both regionally and ¶ globally.5¶ Similarly, the U.S.’s conquest of Iraq in 2003 was designed to strengthen its ¶ dominant position in the world’s largest oil exporting region. Iraq itself has the second largest oil reserves in the Middle East. It is also blessed with a ¶ abundance of water—a fact of some significance since the Middle East, ¶ according to some analysts, may be one of those areas that could well witness ¶ conflicts over water in the future. Besides, Iraq is strategically located, with ¶ Syria, Iran, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia as its immediate neighbors.¶ Going to war in Iraq had another motive. It was to oust President Saddam ¶ Hussein and to destroy the Baathist government because Saddam was a ¶ staunch opponent of Israel. Weakening and eliminating governments and ¶ people’s movements in the Middle East that regard Israel as a morally and politically illegitimate entity has been central to U.S. foreign policy for almost ¶ four decades now. Given Iraq’s oil wealth and its scientific military ¶ infrastructure, it was potentially a formidable foe of the U.S.’s closest ally and ¶ partner in the Middle East. This is why Saddam had to be crushed—for ¶ Israel’s sake.6¶ Deploying the U.S.’s massive military might serve to secure its hegemonic ¶ power and to assist its allies to enhance their strength which is at the core of ¶ the agenda of the Bush Administration as defined by the “neo-cons.” Even ¶ before George W. Bush assumed the presidency in early 2001, the neo-cons ¶ like Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, John Bolton, and Lewis “Scooter” Libby ¶ among others, in association with Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld, were ¶ already planning and plotting to use U.S. fire power to re-shape the politics of ¶ the Middle East in order to reinforce its grip over the region’s oil and to fortify ¶ Israel’s position.7.¶ Crippling the democratically elected Hamas in Palestine and ¶ trying to replace it with a leadership that is subservient to Israel’s interest, ¶ attempting to eliminate an autonomous movement like Hizbullah in Lebanon ¶ with the aim of bolstering a weak pro-U.S. regime in Beirut, targeting the ¶ independent-minded government in Damascus, and most of all, manipulating ¶ the nuclear issue to prepare the ground for some sort of military action against ¶ an Iran that refuses to bow to the U.S. and Israel—apart from the Iraq war—¶ are all part-and-parcel of the neo-cons’ elaborate agenda for establishing total ¶ hegemony over the Middle East as a prerequisite for global hegemony.

#### U.S. hegemony predicated on imperialism- inevitably causes more war than it solves

Shor 10(Francis, Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies, Issue 2, “War in the Era of Declining U.S.¶ Global Hegemony”, 2010, AD: 07/23/12, <http://www.criticalglobalisation.com/Issue2/65_81_DECLINING_US_HEGEMONY_JCGS2.pdf> | Kushal)

While the Long War builds on the deep roots of U.S. imperial militarism, it¶ also becomes the most recent articulation of the search for global dominance. That¶ global dominance relies heavily on the forward positioning of military power¶ throughout the world, but especially in areas laden with oil and other precious¶ resources essential to the perpetuation of U.S. hegemony. However, while there may¶ be an economic connection between U.S. imperial policy and the geopolitics of the¶ extension of U.S. military power**, it is important to understand how that imperial¶ militarism has an inherent logic that drives its thrust for global dominance.** Certainly, if¶ not yet recognized by the American public, others in those strategically significant¶ parts of the world readily understand how the presence of the U.S. military, in¶ whatever guise, embodies the search, whether illusive or not, for global dominance.¶ According to the Indian activist and writer, Arundhati Roy, “It’s become clear that the¶ War against Terror is not really about terror, and the War on Iraq not only about oil.¶ **It’s about a superpower’s self-destructive impulse toward supremacy, stranglehold,¶ global hegemony**” (2004, p. 34).¶ While it is true, to a certain extent, that transnational capital performs global¶ functions unbound by the nation state, **the calculus by which the United States¶ attempts to exercise global dominance and hegemony is firmly rooted in its practice of¶ military imperialism and war**. In fact, at some level, one could agree with the¶ formulation by Emmanuel Todd that **the United States “is battling to maintain its¶ status as the world’s financial center by making a symbolic show of its military might in¶ the heart of Eurasia, thereby hoping to forget and have others ignore America’s¶ industrial weakness, its financial need, and its predatory character**”(2003, p. xviii.). For¶ Todd, the U.S. has lost its hegemony and can only flaunt its “theatrical¶ micromilitarism’ through the ‘war on terrorism” (2003, pp. 134 and 202). Other critics,¶ like Samir Amin, are less sanguine about the disappearance of U.S. hegemony although¶ its expression, noting the similarity with Todd’s perspective, “rests far more on its¶ excessive military power than on the advantages of its economic system” (2004, p. 76).¶ He goes on to remark that the “fight against the imperialism of the United States and¶ its militarist option is everyone’s – its major victims in Asia, Africa, and Latin America,¶ the Japanese and European peoples condemned to subordination, even the North¶ American people” (2004, p. 83). In Beyond U.S. Hegemony, Amin looks to ways of¶ creating “Solidarity in the South” as a potential and real alternative to U.S. imperialism¶ (2006, pp. 84-11).

#### Pax Americana fails to ensure stability

Cambanis 12(Thanassis, The Boston Globe, “The lonely superpower”, 01/22/12, AD: 07/24/12, <http://articles.boston.com/2012-01-22/ideas/30646076_1_cold-war-nuclear-war-arms-race> | Kushal)

But Monteiro says that critics exaggerate the distinctions between the wars of today and yesteryear, and many top thinkers in the world of security policy are finding his argument persuasive. If he’s right, it means that the most optimistic version of the post-Cold War era -- a “pax Americana” in which the surviving superpower can genuinely enjoy its ascendancy -- **was always illusory**. In the short term, a dominant United States should expect an endless slate of violent challenges from weak powers. And in the longer term, it means that Washington shouldn’t worry too much about rising powers like China or Russia or the European Union; America might even be better off with a rival powerful enough to provide a balance. You could call it the curse of plenty: Too much power attracts countless challenges, whereas a world in which power is split among several superstates might just offer a paradoxical stability.

#### Unipolarity fails- terrorism, proliferation, and climate change

Weber 06(2Steven Weber is professor of political science and director of the Institute for International Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, “How Globalization Went Bad”, 12/27/06, AD: 07/26/12, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2006/12/27/how_globalization_went_bad> | Kushal)

The world today is more dangerous and less orderly than it was supposed to be. Ten or 15 years ago, the naive expectations were that the "end of history" was near. The reality has been the opposite. The world has more international terrorism and more nuclear proliferation today than it did in 1990. International institutions are weaker. The threats of pandemic disease and climate change are stronger. Cleavages of religious and cultural ideology are more intense. The global financial system is more unbalanced and precarious.¶ It wasn't supposed to be like this. The end of the Cold War was supposed to make global politics and economics easier to manage, not harder. What went wrong? The bad news of the 21st century is that globalization has a significant dark side. The container ships that carry manufactured Chinese goods to and from the United States also carry drugs. The airplanes that fly passengers nonstop from New York to Singapore also transport infectious diseases. And the Internet has proved just as adept at spreading deadly, extremist ideologies as it has e-commerce.¶ The conventional belief is that the single greatest challenge of geopolitics today is managing this dark side of globalization, chipping away at the illegitimate co-travelers that exploit openness, mobility, and freedom, without putting too much sand in the gears. The current U.S. strategy is to push for more trade, more connectivity, more markets, and more openness. America does so for a good reason -- it benefits from globalization more than any other country in the world. The United States acknowledges globalization's dark side but attributes it merely to exploitative behavior by criminals, religious extremists, and other anachronistic elements that can be eliminated. The dark side of globalization, America says, with very little subtlety, can be mitigated by the expansion of American power, sometimes unilaterally and sometimes through multilateral institutions, depending on how the United States likes it. In other words, America is aiming for a "flat," globalized world coordinated by a single superpower.¶ That's nice work if you can get it. But the United States almost certainly cannot. Not only because other countries won't let it, but, more profoundly, because that line of thinking is faulty. The predominance of American power has many benefits, but the management of globalization is not one of them. The mobility of ideas, capital, technology, and people is hardly new. But the rapid advance of globalization's evils is. Most of that advance has taken place since 1990. Why? Because what changed profoundly in the 1990s was the polarity of the international system. For the first time in modern history, globalization was superimposed onto a world with a single superpower. What we have discovered in the past 15 years is that it is a dangerous mixture. The negative effects of globalization since 1990 are not the result of globalization itself. They are the dark side of American predominance.¶ THE DANGERS OF UNIPOLARITY¶ A straightforward piece of logic from market economics helps explain why unipolarity and globalization don’t mix. Monopolies, regardless of who holds them, are almost always bad for both the market and the monopolist. We propose three simple axioms of "globalization under unipolarity" that reveal these dangers.¶ Axiom 1: Above a certain threshold of power, the rate at which new global problems are generated will exceed the rate at which old problems are fixed.¶ Power does two things in international politics: It enhances the capability of a state to do things, but it also increases the number of things that a state must worry about. At a certain point, the latter starts to overtake the former. It's the familiar law of diminishing returns. Because powerful states have large spheres of influence and their security and economic interests touch every region of the world, they are threatened by the risk of things going wrong -- anywhere. That is particularly true for the United States, which leverages its ability to go anywhere and do anything through massive debt. No one knows exactly when the law of diminishing returns will kick in. But, historically, it starts to happen long before a single great power dominates the entire globe, which is why large empires from Byzantium to Rome have always reached a point of unsustainability.¶ That may already be happening to the United States today, on issues ranging from oil dependency and nuclear proliferation to pandemics and global warming. What Axiom 1 tells you is that more U.S. power is not the answer; it's actually part of the problem. A multipolar world would almost certainly manage the globe's pressing problems more effectively. The larger the number of great powers in the global system, the greater the chance that at least one of them would exercise some control over a given combination of space, other actors, and problems. Such reasoning doesn't rest on hopeful notions that the great powers will work together. They might do so. But even if they don't, the result is distributed governance, where some great power is interested in most every part of the world through productive competition.

## Heg Ext. #4 Multipolarity Good

#### American supremacy declining- rise of China and Europe ensures a peaceful multipolar world

**Khanna 08** (Parag Khanna, senior research fellow in the American Strategy Program of the New America Foundation, “Waving Goodbye to Hegemony”, 01/27/08, AD: 07/26/12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/27/magazine/27world-t.html?_r=3&oref=slogin&pagewanted=all> | Kushal)

Karl Marx and Max Weber both chastised Far Eastern cultures for being despotic, agrarian and feudal, lacking the ingredients for organizational success. Oswald Spengler saw it differently, arguing that mankind both lives and thinks in unique cultural systems, with Western ideals neither transferable nor relevant. Today the Asian landscape still features ancient civilizations but also by far the most people and, by certain measures, the most money of any region in the world. With or without America, Asia is shaping the world’s destiny — **and exposing the flaws of the grand narrative of Western civilization in the process.** ¶ The rise of China in the East and of the European Union within the West has fundamentally altered a globe that recently appeared to have only an American gravity — pro or anti. As Europe’s and China’s spirits rise with every move into new domains of influence, America’s spirit is weakened. The E.U. may uphold the principles of the United Nations that America once dominated, but how much longer will it do so as its own social standards rise far above this lowest common denominator? And why should China or other Asian countries become “responsible stakeholders,” in former Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick’s words, in an American-led international order when they had no seat at the table when the rules were drafted? Even as America stumbles back toward multilateralism, others are walking away from the American game and playing by their own rules. ¶ The self-deluding universalism of the American imperium — that the world inherently needs a single leader and that American liberal ideology must be accepted as the basis of global order — has paradoxically resulted in America quickly becoming an ever-lonelier superpower. Just as there is a geopolitical marketplace, there is a marketplace of models of success for the second world to emulate, not least the Chinese model of economic growth without political liberalization (itself an affront to Western modernization theory). As the historian Arnold Toynbee observed half a century ago, Western imperialism united the globe, but it did not assure that the West would dominate forever — materially or morally. Despite the “mirage of immortality” that afflicts global empires, the only reliable rule of history is its cycles of imperial rise and decline, and as Toynbee also pithily noted, the only direction to go from the apogee of power is down. ¶ The web of globalization now has three spiders. What makes America unique in this seemingly value-free contest is not its liberal democratic ideals — which Europe may now represent better than America does — but rather its geography. America is isolated, while Europe and China occupy two ends of the great Eurasian landmass that is the perennial center of ¶ gravity of geopolitics. When America dominated NATO and led a rigid Pacific alliance system with Japan, South Korea, ¶ Australia and Thailand, it successfully managed the Herculean task of running the world from one side of it. Now its very presence in Eurasia is tenuous; it has been shunned by the E.U. and Turkey, is unwelcome in much of the Middle East and has lost much of East Asia’s confidence. “Accidental empire” or not, America must quickly accept and adjust to this reality. ¶ **Maintaining America’s empire can only get costlier in both blood and treasure. It isn’t worth it, and history promises the effort will fail. It already has**. ¶ Would the world not be more stable if America could be reaccepted as its organizing principle and leader? It’s very much too late to be asking, because the answer is unfolding before our eyes. Neither China nor the E.U. will replace the U.S. as the world’s sole leader; rather all three will constantly struggle to gain influence on their own and balance one another. Europe will promote its supranational integration model as a path to resolving Mideast disputes and organizing Africa, while China will push a Beijing consensus based on respect for sovereignty and mutual economic benefit. America must make itself irresistible to stay in the game. ¶ I believe that a complex, multicultural landscape filled with transnational challenges from terrorism to global warming is completely unmanageable by a single authority, whether the United States or the United Nations. Globalization resists centralization of almost any kind. Instead, what we see gradually happening in climate-change negotiations (as in Bali in December) — and need to see more of in the areas of preventing nuclear proliferation and rebuilding failed states — is a far greater sense of a division of labor among the Big Three, a concrete burden-sharing among them by which they are judged not by their rhetoric but the responsibilities they fulfill. The arbitrarily composed Security Council is not the place to hash out such a division of labor. Neither are any of the other multilateral bodies bogged down with weighted voting and cacophonously irrelevant voices. The big issues are for the Big Three to sort out among themselves.

#### Multilateralism necessary in a globalized, economically interdependent world, both to survive and to secure the US from threats-including terrorism

Heinbecker 2004, (Paul Heinbecker, Canadian International Council, “Multilateral Cooperation and Peace and Security”. Autumn 2004. AD; 7/26/12. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40203982|Ashwin)

To discuss multilateral reform it is necessary also to discuss the US attitudes and policies ¶ that affect that reform. A fundamental question ¶ at ¶ the beginning ¶ of this new ¶ century, ¶ in the wake of 9/1 1, is whether the US will be with the international community or against it. Will other countries be able to work with the United States in the larger, common interest, or have to work around it? Will the United States be the subject of multilateral cooperation or the object of it (not ¶ in the sense of ¶ facing ¶ coalitions that will seek to balance American power, although ¶ that, too, is ¶ imaginable ¶ if the United States were further to ¶ ignore ¶ international law and to show no "decent ¶ respect ¶ to the ¶ opinions ¶ of ¶ mankind")?1 We live in an ¶ increasingly globalized, integrated, ¶ interdependent world that ¶ requires cooperative management ¶ to function ¶ effectively and no ¶ single country, not even the United States, has the ¶ capability ¶ to run alone even if it wants to. Happily, notwithstanding ¶ the ¶ aspirations ¶ of a few hard-headed, soft-handed Washington ¶ consultants and commentators, misplaced Canadian ¶ speech writers, and ¶ other vicarious ¶ imperialists, ¶ there is scant evidence that most ¶ Americans want to. Americans, particularly Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, ¶ triggered 50 years of ¶ cooperative ¶ international ¶ institution-building, ¶ treaty-making, ¶ and network-developing ¶ that have ¶ changed ¶ the way ¶ the ¶ world thinks about international relations and the way ¶ it manages ¶ them. In the process, ¶ the world has become too ¶ complex ¶ and the ¶ United States too dependent ¶ on others (as others are on the US), to ¶ transcend the ¶ system ¶ or to determine, by ¶ itself, its outcomes. ¶ Moreover, the US is the world’s ¶ greatest debtor,10 sinking progressively ¶ and deeper ¶ into debt. The historical ¶ experience regarding ¶ the ¶ long- ¶ term viability of debtor-empires ¶ cannot be ¶ encouraging ¶ from a neo- ¶ conservative perspective.11 ¶ Finally, and perhaps most ¶ important, ¶ it is self-evident that military power, even vast military power, is not the solution to all security problems, particularly not terrorism. The attacks carried out by al Qaeda ¶ and the resistance in Iraq to occupation have graphically revealed the limits of military power in the 21st century, even its counterproductive potential, in assuring a nation's security. To fight terrorists requires intelligence sharing, police cooperation, and diplomatic skill as much ¶ as, or more than, it ¶ requires military power. Terrorism prevention ¶ requires policies ¶ that drain terrorism of its ¶ support ¶ and ¶ grievance ¶ of its ¶ power, which means promoting ¶ international ¶ equity ¶ and human dig- ¶ nity. In both cases, multilateral cooperation ¶ is ¶ indispensable ¶ to success

#### US Hegemony cannot solve the harms of the status quo-multilateral cooperation key

Heinbecker 2004, (Paul Heinbecker, Canadian International Council, “Multilateral Cooperation and Peace and Security”. Autumn 2004. AD; 7/26/12. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40203982|Ashwin)

There is an alternative to unilateral marauding and that is enlightened multilateral cooperation. Whatever happens ¶ in ¶ Iraq, ¶ and whatever the ¶ United States does there and elsewhere, multilateral cooperation will continue because it has to, not just because political theory abhors a vacuum and supposes the restoration of balance this is not the 19th century ¶ - but because there is a whole range of international problems, including security problems, that simply will not yield to national action alone or even to coalitions of the willing. For international security, for trade and finance, for health and environmental protection, for human rights and human development in sum, for the totality of modern life - multilateral cooperation is indispensable. Truly global problems ¶ can ¶ only be solved ¶ through global cooperation. Multilateral ¶ cooperation, ¶ not multilateralism as an ¶ ideology ¶ or end in ¶ itself, will remain essential. The United Nations will remain ¶ integral ¶ to ¶ that ¶ cooperation. The United States took the lead in ¶ building ¶ the exist- ¶ ing complex ¶ of institutions, treaties, and networks of rules, laws, and ¶ norms of international ¶ cooperation, ¶ a ¶ system ¶ that ¶ very much serves its ¶ interests. It is unlikely simply ¶ to abandon it. While Washington ¶ constantly deprecated ¶ the UN in the ¶ lead-up ¶ to the ¶ Iraq War, it did ¶ respect ¶ the ¶ legal ¶ niceties in ¶ negotiating ¶ resolution 1442 in November 2002: it ¶ sought ¶ to ¶ negotiate ¶ a second, authorizing ¶ resolution in March 2003; formally ¶ notified the ¶ president ¶ of the Security Council for its reasons for ¶ military action, as ¶ required by ¶ the charter; and returned to the Council ¶ for a series of resolutions ¶ authorizing ¶ action by ¶ the US ¶ occupation ¶ force. In creating the multilateral system, the US was not merely waiting for the day when its power would permit it to transcend it. The US led this creative effort because it really was a better way to run international affairs. The leadership role of this multilateral cooperation remains open to the United States to fill, as it has done since Roosevelt. But whether the US ¶ does so or not, the world will muddle ¶ through, more ¶ effectively ¶ if the US ¶ leads, undoubtedly, but muddle ¶ through ¶ it will nonetheless.

## Terrorism

### Terrorism Frontline

#### 1 - No existential threat from terrorism – emotional fears exacerbate threat

Mueller and Stewart 10 [John Mueller is a professor of political science at Ohio State University. Mark G. Stewart is a professor of civil engineering and director of the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia. They wrote the book *Terror, Security, and Money: Balancing the Risks, and Costs of Homeland Security*. “Hardly Existential: Thinking Rationally About Terrorism” [http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66186/john-mueller-and-mark-g-stewart/hardly-existential?page=3#](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66186/john-mueller-and-mark-g-stewart/hardly-existential?page=3), 4-2-2010] Lin

Over the last several decades, academics, policymakers, and regulators worldwide have developed risk-assessment techniques to evaluate hazards to human life, such as pesticide use, pollution, and nuclear power plants. In the process, they have reached a substantial consensus about which risks are acceptable and which are unacceptable. When these techniques are applied to terrorism, it becomes clear that terrorism is far from an existential threat. Instead, it presents an acceptable risk, one so low that spending to further reduce its likelihood or consequences is scarcely justified. An unacceptable risk is often called de manifestis, meaning of obvious or evident concern -- a risk so high that no "reasonable person" would deem it acceptable. A widely cited de manifestis risk assessment comes from a 1980 United States Supreme Court decision regarding workers' risk from inhaling gasoline vapors. It concluded that an annual fatality risk -- the chance per year that a worker would die of inhalation -- of 1 in 40,000 is unacceptable. This is in line with standard practice in the regulatory world. Typically, risks considered unacceptable are those found likely to kill more than 1 in 10,000 or 1 in 100,000 per year. At the other end of the spectrum are risks that are considered acceptable, and there is a fair degree of agreement about that area of risk as well. For example, after extensive research and public consultation, the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission decided in 1986 that the fatality risk posed by accidents at nuclear power plants should not exceed 1 in 2 million per year and 1 in 500,000 per year from nuclear power plant operations. The governments of Australia, Japan, and the United Kingdom have come up with similar numbers for assessing hazards. So did a review of 132 U.S. federal government regulatory decisions dealing with public exposure to environmental carcinogens, which found that regulatory action always occurred if the individual annual fatality risk exceeded 1 in 700,000. Impressively, the study found a great deal of consistency among a wide range of federal agencies about what is considered an acceptable level of risk. Vastly more lives could have been saved if counterterrorism funds had instead been spent on combating hazards that present unacceptable risks. There is a general agreement about risk, then, in the established regulatory practices of several developed countries: risks are deemed unacceptable if the annual fatality risk is higher than 1 in 10,000 or perhaps higher than 1 in 100,000 and acceptable if the figure is lower than 1 in 1 million or 1 in 2 million. Between these two ranges is an area in which risk might be considered "tolerable." These established considerations are designed to provide a viable, if somewhat rough, guideline for public policy. In all cases, measures and regulations intended to reduce risk must satisfy essential cost-benefit considerations. Clearly, hazards that fall in the unacceptable range should command the most attention and resources. Those in the tolerable range may also warrant consideration -- but since they are less urgent, they should be combated with relatively inexpensive measures. Those hazards in the acceptable range are of little, or even negligible, concern, so precautions to reduce their risks even further would scarcely be worth pursuing unless they are remarkably inexpensive. If the U.S. Department of Homeland Security wants to apply a risk-based approach to decision-making, as it frequently claims it does, these risk-acceptance criteria seem to be most appropriate. To this end, the table below lists the annual fatality risks for a wide variety of these dangers, including terrorism. As can be seen, annual terrorism fatality risks, particularly for areas outside of war zones, are less than one in one million and therefore generally lie within the range regulators deem safe or acceptable, requiring no further regulations, particularly those likely to be expensive. They are similar to the risks of using home appliances (200 deaths per year in the United States) or of commercial aviation (103 deaths per year). Compared with dying at the hands of a terrorist, Americans are twice as likely to perish in a natural disaster and nearly a thousand times more likely to be killed in some type of accident. The same general conclusion holds when the full damage inflicted by terrorists -- not only the loss of life but direct and indirect economic costs -- is aggregated. As a hazard, terrorism, at least outside of war zones, does not inflict enough damage to justify substantially increasing expenditures to deal with it. Because they are so blatantly intentional, deaths resulting from terrorism do, of course, arouse special emotions. And they often have wide political ramifications, as citizens demand that politicians "do something." Many people therefore consider them more significant and more painful to endure than deaths by other causes. But quite a few dangers, particularly ones concerning pollution and nuclear power plants, also stir considerable political and emotional feelings, and these have been taken into account by regulators when devising their assessments of risk acceptability. Moreover, the table also includes another kind of hazard that arouses strong emotions and is intentional -- homicide -- and its frequency generally registers, unlike terrorism, in the unacceptable category. In order to deal with the emotional and political aspects of terrorism, a study recently conducted for the U.S. Department of Homeland Security suggested that lives lost to terrorism should be considered twice as valued as those lost to other hazards. That is, $1 billion spent on saving one hundred deaths from terrorism might be considered equivalent to $1 billion spent on saving two hundred deaths from other dangers. But even with that generous (and perhaps morally questionable) bias, or even with still more generous ones, counterterrorism expenditures fail a standard cost-benefit assessment.

#### 2 - Terrorists can’t get nuclear weapons – too many obstacles and squo solves security

Linzer 4 [Dafna Linzer is a Washington Post Staff Writer “Nuclear Capabilities May Elude Terrorists, Experts Say” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A32285-2004Dec28.html, 12-29-2004] Lin

Despite the obvious gravity of the threat, however, counterterrorism and nuclear experts in and out of government say they consider the danger more distant than immediate. They point to enormous technical and logistical obstacles confronting would-be nuclear terrorists, and to the fact that neither al Qaeda nor any other group has come close to demonstrating the means to overcome them. While the dangers certainly are real, there is considerable disagreement among security experts about the probabilities for "catastrophic terrorism." In the case of nuclear and biological weapons, the subjects of articles today and tomorrow, there are technical and scientific hurdles that have proved daunting, even for nations with sizable budgets and state-of-the-art facilities. Chemical weapons, which will be explored in an article Friday, would be somewhat easier to devise or obtain, but also far less likely to yield huge numbers of casualties. A radiological device would have similar limitations for terrorists. So difficult are the challenges that senior officials on President Bush's national security team believe al Qaeda has shifted its attention to other efforts, at least for now. "I would say that from the perspective of terrorism, the overwhelming bulk of the evidence we have is that their efforts are focused on biological and chemical" weapons, said John R. Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security. "Not to say there aren't any dealings with radiological materials, but the technology for bio and chem is comparatively so much easier that that's where their efforts are concentrating." Still, the sheer magnitude of the danger posed by a nuclear weapon in terrorist hands -- and classified intelligence assessments that deem such a scenario plausible -- has spurred intelligence and military operations to combat a threat once dismissed as all but nonexistent. The effort includes billions of dollars spent on attempts to secure borders, retrain weapons scientists in other countries and lock up dangerous materials and stockpiles.

#### 3 - They can't solve terrorism - only solving for the motivations is effective

Singer 01 (P.W., American political scientist, an international relations scholar and a preeminent specialist on 21st century warfare, currently a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, where he is Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative. Brookings Institute Analysis Paper #14 – November 2001. “PAKISTAN’S MADRASSAHS: ENSURING A SYSTEM OF EDUCATION NOT JIHAD” <http://www.911investigations.net/IMG/pdf/doc-311.pdf>) Cass

While the religious schools are a matter for internal Pakistani policy, America does have¶ a vested interest in ensuring both that Pakistan is able to fulfill its obligations in the¶ education sphere and that terrorist training schools are closed. To succeed in countering¶ the negative influence of those Madrassahs, which have been hijacked by extremists, the¶ US must provide dedicated aid to education reform efforts, and also explore the¶ possibility of a broadened program designed to combat the culture of violence. This will¶ include providing both increased cultural contacts and economic hope. Efforts to combat¶ terrorism will not be successful unless they also deal with the underlying institutions that¶ support the threat.

### Terrorism Adv Exts - #1 - No threat

#### The threat of terrorism has been over exaggerated by specialists and politicians

Mueller and Stewart 10 [John Mueller is a professor of political science at Ohio State University. Mark G. Stewart is a professor of civil engineering and director of the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia. They wrote the book *Terror, Security, and Money: Balancing the Risks, and Costs of Homeland Security*. “Hardly Existential: Thinking Rationally About Terrorism” [http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66186/john-mueller-and-mark-g-stewart/hardly-existential?page=3#](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66186/john-mueller-and-mark-g-stewart/hardly-existential?page=3), 4-2-2010] Lin

An impressively large number of politicians, opinion makers, scholars, bureaucrats, and ordinary people hold that terrorism -- and al Qaeda in particular -- poses an existential threat to the United States. This alarming characterization, which was commonly employed by members of the George W. Bush administration, has also been used by some Obama advisers, including the counterterrorism specialist Bruce Riedel. Some officials, such as former U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff, have parsed the concept further, declaring the struggle against terrorism to be a "significant existential" one.

### Terrorism Adv Exts - #2 - Terrorists can't get nukes

#### Security features and roadblocks to acquiring and launching nuclear weapons

Linzer 4 [Dafna Linzer is a Washington Post Staff Writer “Nuclear Capabilities May Elude Terrorists, Experts Say” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A32285-2004Dec28.html, 12-29-2004] Lin

It is unclear how quickly either country could detect a theft, but experts said it would be very difficult for terrorists to figure out on their own how to work a Russian or Pakistani bomb. Newer Russian weapons, for example, are equipped with heat- and time-sensitive locking systems, known as permissive action links, that experts say would be extremely difficult to defeat without help from insiders. "You'd have to run it through a specific sequence of events, including changes in temperature, pressure and environmental conditions before the weapon would allow itself to be armed, for the fuses to fall into place and then for it to allow itself to be fired," said Charles D. Ferguson, science and technology fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. "You don't get it off the shelf, enter a code and have it go off." The strategy would require help from facility guards, employees with knowledge of the security and arming features of the weapons, not to mention access to a launching system. Older Russian nuclear weapons have simpler protection mechanisms and could be easier to obtain on the black market. But nuclear experts said even the simplest device has some security features that would have to be defeated before it could be used. "There is a whole generation of weapons designed for artillery shells, manufactured in the 1950s, that aren't going to have sophisticated locking devices," said Laura Holgate, who ran nonproliferation programs at the Pentagon and the Energy Department from 1995 to 2001. "But it is a tougher task to take a weapon created by a country, even the 1950s version, a tougher job for a group of even highly qualified Chechen terrorists to make it go boom." Transporting a weapon out of Russia would provide another formidable obstacle for terrorists.

### Terrorism Adv Exts - #3 - Can't solve motivation

#### Must solve extremist ideologies - otherwise terrorism is inevitable

Blair 07 (Tony, served as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 2 May 1997 to 27 June 2007, Council on Foreign Relations: Foreign Affairs, Vol. 86, No. 1 (Jan. - Feb., 2007), pp. 79-90. “A Battle for Global Values”. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032212 .) Cass

Some people believe that terrorist attacks are caused entirely by¶ the West's suppression of Muslims. Some people seriously believe¶ that if we only got out of Iraq and Afghanistan, the attacks would¶ stop. And, in some ways most perniciously, many look at Israel and¶ think we pay too great a price for supporting it and sympathize with¶ those who condemn it.¶ If we recognized this struggle for what it truly is, we would at least¶ be on the first steps of the path to winning it. But a vast part of¶ Western opinion is not remotely near this point yet.¶ This ideology has to be taken on-and taken on everywhere.¶ Islamist terrorism will not be defeated until we confront not just the¶ methods of the extremists but also their ideas. I do not mean just¶ telling them that terrorist activity is wrong. I mean telling them that¶ their attitude toward the United States is absurd, that their concept¶ of governance is prefeudal, that their positions on women and other¶ faiths are reactionary. We must reject not just their barbaric acts but¶ also their false sense of grievance against the West, their attempt¶ to persuade us that it is others and not they themselves who are¶ responsible for their violence.¶ In the era of globalization, the outcome of this clash between¶ extremism and progress will determine our future. We can no more¶ opt out of this struggle than we can opt out of the climate changing¶ around us. Inaction-pushing the responsibility onto the United¶ States alone or deluding ourselves that this terrorism is a series of¶ individual isolated incidents rather than a global movement-would¶ be profoundly and fundamentally wrong.

### Terrorism Exts - AT: Infrastructure Terrorism

#### Nuclear terrorists don't threaten infrastructure

Mueller and Stewart 10 [John Mueller is a professor of political science at Ohio State University. Mark G. Stewart is a professor of civil engineering and director of the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia. They wrote the book *Terror, Security, and Money: Balancing the Risks, and Costs of Homeland Security*. “Hardly Existential: Thinking Rationally About Terrorism” [http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66186/john-mueller-and-mark-g-stewart/hardly-existential?page=3#](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66186/john-mueller-and-mark-g-stewart/hardly-existential?page=3), 4-2-2010] Lin

To border on becoming unacceptable by established risk conventions -- that is, to reach an annual fatality risk of 1 in 100,000 -- the number of fatalities from terrorist attacks in the United States and Canada would have to increase 35-fold; in Great Britain (excluding Northern Ireland), more than 50-fold; and in Australia, more than 70-fold. For the United States, this would mean experiencing attacks on the scale of 9/11 at least once a year, or 18 Oklahoma City bombings every year. For this to come about, terrorists would probably have to acquire nuclear weapons, the likelihood of which is highly questionable. If that fear is deemed viable, however, the policy implications would be to spend entirely, or almost entirely, on dealing with that limited concern. Massive expenditures to protect "critical infrastructure," for example, are unlikely to be effective against a nuclear explosion. In fact, there is little evidence that terrorists are becoming any more destructive, particularly in the West. Some analysts have found that, if anything, terrorist activity is diminishing, at least outside of war zones. As a hazard to human life in the United States, or in virtually any country outside of a war zone, terrorism under present conditions presents a threat that is hardly existential. Applying widely accepted criteria established after much research by regulators and decision-makers, the risks from terrorism are low enough to be deemed acceptable. Overall, vastly more lives could have been saved if counterterrorism funds had instead been spent on combating hazards that present unacceptable risks.

### **Terrorism Exts - AT: Internet**

#### **Terrorists can’t use internet guides to make weapons**

Friedman 7/17 [Benjamin H. Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at the Cato institute. He is the co-editor of two books, including Terrorizing Ourselves: Why U.S. Counterterrorism Policy Is Failing and How to Fix It. “Homegrown Failure: Why the Domestic Terror Threat Is Overblown” [http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/homegrown-failure-why-domestic-terror-threat-is-overblown, 7/17/2012](http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/homegrown-failure-why-domestic-terror-threat-is-overblown,%207/17/2012)] Lin

Contrary to much recent analysis, the internet does not solve these problems. As Anne Stenersen of the Norwegian Defence Research Establishment has shown, online guides to bomb-making, poison manufacture and other tools of mayhem provide unreliable information. Authorities can monitor such sites or set up their own to mislead or trap malfeasants. Moreover, internet-based instruction does not provide the sort of rapid interaction between trainer and trainee that characterises most successful training in complex tasks. The internet is an even more useless for mastering acts of violence that require teamwork. There is a reason why organisations that effectively coordinate activity, whether it is the Marines Corps or Real Madrid, avoid virtual training.

### Terrorism Exts - AT: Al Qaeda

#### Al-Qaeda not likely to attack the US mainland

Vice Admiral Jacoby 04 (Lowell E., U.S. Navy Director, Defense Intelligence Agency

“Current and Projected National Security Threats to the United States” Statement For the Record, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 24 February. <https://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2004_hr/022404jacoby.pdf>) Cass

Al-Qaida’s planning has become more decentralized and has shifted to softer targets. The network increasingly generates attacks in alliance with like-minded groups like Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) in Southeast Asia. The arrest of senior al-Qaida and JI leader Hambali last summer eliminated a significant link between the two groups. However, the al-Qaida/JI nexus will endure because the two groups have a shared ideology and experience during the period of Soviet involvement in Afghanistan. While al-Qaida does not control the daily operations of JI or affiliated groups, congruence of broad goals promise continued attacks against US interests and our partners in the GWOT.

### Terrorism Exts - AT: Domestic Terrorism

#### Homegrown American jihadists fail – lack of organization, funds, training

Friedman 7/17 [Benjamin H. Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at the Cato institute. He is the co-editor of two books, including Terrorizing Ourselves: Why U.S. Counterterrorism Policy Is Failing and How to Fix It. “Homegrown Failure: Why the Domestic Terror Threat Is Overblown” [http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/homegrown-failure-why-domestic-terror-threat-is-overblown, 7/17/2012](http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/homegrown-failure-why-domestic-terror-threat-is-overblown,%207/17/2012)] Lin

Homegrown American jihadists cannot acquire the funds and training needed for terroristic expertise. Most would quickly kill themselves once they achieved it Despite their serial failure, U.S. leaders describe homegrown terrorists as cunning and their threat as great. Napolitano says they are especially dangerous because they can come from “any direction, and with little or no warning.” Mueller warns that they “understand our culture, our security protocols, and our vulnerabilities. They use the Internet, social media, and marketing skills to influence like-minded individuals.” The failure of U.S.-born jihadists, however, reflects more than luck. There are at least two good reasons for it. The first is al Qaeda’s ideology. By supporting the murder of most people, including most Muslims, al Qaeda ensures that it remains wildly unpopular in most places. Their ideology is especially noxious to those living in coherent, liberal societies like the United States. Americans drawn to al Qaeda are likely to be a troubled and disaffected lot, lacking traits that most organisations value in recruits. A more important reason source of failure is organisational weakness. Mass violence has historically been the product of bureaucratic, hierarchical organisations that belong to states or insurgencies resembling them. Only bureaucratic organisations who have the tools train and motivate many to act on the orders of a few, which is historically how mass violence with small arms occurred. As agents of states or other organisations that monopolise violence, bureaucratic organisations alone have got the physical security, expertise and capital need to manufacture mass killing weapons like artillery, strike aircraft, and nuclear weapons. Because they are generally clandestine, terrorist groups usually lack these attributes. They struggle to gain and transfer deadly knowledge, amass wealth, build the physical plants needed to make sophisticated weapons or mass enough manpower to sustain attacks on populations. Those flaws are especially evident in al Qaeda, which has always been more a loosely linked set of radicals than an organisation that commands adherents. Homegrown American jihadists, who generally lack guidance even from al Qaeda’s withering core, are about the least organised terrorists imaginable. They cannot acquire the funds and training needed for terroristic expertise. Most would quickly kill themselves once they achieved it.

### Terrorism Exts - States CP helpers

#### The states solve better for terrorism

Wise & Nader 02 (Charles R., professor of public affairs at Indiana University, former director of intergovernmental affairs for the U.S. Department of Justice; Rania, doctoral student in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University. “Organizing the Federal System for Homeland Security: Problems, Issues, and Dilemmas”, Public Administration Review, Vol. 62, Special Issue, pp. 44-57. September. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3110169.pdf>) Cass

The challenges of improving homeland security in the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11 and subsequent events, such as the anthrax outbreak, have exposed numerous deficiencies of governmental functioning in the prevention and response to terrorist attacks, as well as operational adaptation by response agencies and officials at all levels of government. Citizens have witnessed both glaring gaps in coordinated action by federal, state, and local agencies and effective joint mobilization to deal with the consequences of the attacks. A new recognition exists of the criticality of governments to act effectively on an intergovernmental, interorganizational, interdisciplinary basis, as well as a recognition that the required relationships are not in place and, in many instances, may not be even understood. We have come to understand that meeting the challenges of homeland security will require significant changes in the way governments are organized and operate. As one analyst put it, "So when the twin towers collapsed on September 11, it was not only physical walls that came tumbling down, it was also decades-old divisions of labor between the various parts of American government: between federal and local, intelligence and law enforcement, military and civilian, and above all, foreign and domestic. There is no clear 'at home' or 'abroad' anymore. There is just one tightly interconnected world of dangers" (Freedberg 2001, 1). While the dangers and the tasks needed to confront them may be interconnected, this does not mean the activities of U.S. governments are systematically interconnected to perform them. The problem is that "The U.S. government was just not designed with terrorists in mind," and" the war on terrorism ultimately involves every agency and level of government" (Freedberg 2001, 3). The task of reorganizing and reorienting government operations will be substantial. The U.S. Commission on National Security/ 21st Century (the Hart-Rudman Commission), chartered by the secretary of defense in 1998, found that "the assets and organizations that now exist for homeland security are scattered across more than two dozen departments and agencies and all fifty states" (USCNS 2001, 10). We can anticipate numerous changes in the intergovernmental system. Some have cautioned against rapid, sweeping policy or program changes in pursuit of homeland security with major intergovernmental implications, and they have called for reasoned discussion of future needs and responsibilities and analysis of which level of government might appropriately step in to handle them (Walters 2001, 12). Homeland security implies a significant reconfiguring of a substantial portion of the public service. Changes are being made-and will continue to be made in the political, financial, legal-regulatory, and operational dimensions of intergovernmental functioning. For homeland security, as for other critical public functions, public-service leaders must discover "what configuration of organizations, public and private, is needed and what arrangements between them provide the most effective relationships to perform a needed function" (Wise 1990, 142). This task is critical in the area of homeland security, because, as the General Accounting Office has pointed out, a national strategy rather than a purely federal strategy is essential: "To develop this essential national strategy, the federal role needs to be considered in relation to other levels of government, the goals and objectives for preparedness, and the most appropriate tools to assist and enable other levels of government and the private sector to achieve these goals" (Posner 2002, 7).

#### The state’s involvement is necessary to preparedness

Wise & Nader 02 (Charles R., professor of public affairs at Indiana University, former director of intergovernmental affairs for the U.S. Department of Justice; Rania, doctoral student in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University. “Organizing the Federal System for Homeland Security: Problems, Issues, and Dilemmas”, Public Administration Review, Vol. 62, Special Issue, pp. 44-57. September. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3110169.pdf>) Cass

Because the United States has dealt continually with¶ such disasters as floods, forest fires, earthquakes, hazardous¶ materials spills, and riots, governments have some¶ experience in working together during emergencies. However,¶ terrorist attacks impose a new level of social, economic,¶ and fiscal dislocation on the nation and its communities,¶ and they involve the use of many specialized¶ resources that are beyond the capabilities of state and local¶ governments (Posner 2002, 4). In addition, the surprise¶ nature of terrorist attacks and their potential to cause catastrophic¶ damage quickly, in so many different ways, using¶ difficult-to-anticipate modalities requires government agencies¶ to diagnose the threat(s), decide on the most effective¶ courses of action, and respond in an integrated fashion¶ within extremely compressed time frames. Unlike floods¶ or forest fires, in many terrorist attacks, the time is limited¶ for assessing the extent of the threat(s) and their consequences,¶ as well as more serious sources of uncertainty¶ attending the assessment and the response. Three broad¶ types of uncertainty include (1) understanding of the performance¶ of various types of terrorist weapons on civilian¶ populations (for instance, the effect of anthrax powder);¶ (2) warning time; and (3) predicting public reaction and¶ behavior to a terrorist attack (such as chemical or biological)¶ in their midst (Falkenrath2 000, 19-20). Nonetheless,¶ national terrorism preparedness requires that numerous¶ federal, state, local, and private entities be prepared to operate¶ in close coordination to meet the threat and to mitigate¶ its consequences. In short, national terrorism preparedness,¶ crisis management, and consequence management¶ must operate as a closely coupled system. How close the¶ intergovernmental system has come to being prepared to¶ operate this way has been revealed by the many counterterrorism and consequence-management exercises the federal¶ government has sponsored since 1995. "The exercises¶ have revealed critically deficient capabilities, inadequate¶ response plans, and serious intergovernmental conflicts that¶ would emerge in a real situation"( Falkenrath2 000, 21).¶ A national strategy to improve intergovernmental operational¶ capability would involve assigning well-understood¶ roles to federal, state, and local governments and to¶ the private sector. Role assignment and role fulfillment¶ would be facilitated by performance pursuant to the strategy¶ of risk assessment, vulnerability analysis, and infrastructure-¶ criticality analysis (Walker2 001, 5). As two local¶ fire officials responding to the Gilmore Commission¶ survey stated, "We need recommendations on the risk our¶ area is in for weapons of mass destruction" and "we need¶ to know what potential exposure we have in our area. We¶ have no idea if we should be preparing for these incidents¶ or not" (Advisory Panel 2002, G-8-2).¶

### Terrorism Exts - Xeno-Racism Turn

#### Alarmist anti-terrorism sentiments promote a xeno-racism against compliant Islam citizens that will tear apart the fabric of society

Fekete 04 (Liz, deputy director of the Institute of Race Relations and senior researcher on

the IRR’s European Race Audit. “Anti-Muslim racism and the European security state”. <http://www.soc.iastate.edu/soc529a/PDF%20files/Fekete.pdf>) Cass

Europe is, we have been warned, facing a ‘global threat’, posed, post-¶ September 11, by ‘Islamic extremism’. In a speech to his Sedgefield constituency, Prime Minister Blair spoke in apocalyptic tones of a¶ threat that is ‘real and existential’; that needs to be fought ‘whatever¶ the political cost’.1 Yet the threat to our ‘values’, to nations that are¶ ‘free, democratic and benefiting from economic progress’, comes not¶ just from Blair’s many-headed monster of ‘international terrorism’,¶ but from a domestic peril of Europe’s own making. And, arguably, it¶ will have longer-lasting results and inflict greater damage on European¶ civil society, traditional values and way of life than any external danger.¶ It derives from the very way that that danger is conceived and, hence,¶ the measures taken to counter it. It is inherent in the counter-terrorism¶ measures the EU has adopted since September 11, which extend the¶ definition of terrorism, as it is in the emergency laws passed by¶ member states which undermine the fundamentals of justice. It marks¶ the first stages in Europe’s assumption of a fundamentally different¶ authoritarian paradigm of the state. It is based on a concept of national¶ security that is shot through with xeno-racism – which is the precise¶ term Sivanandan uses to describe the new racism that has emerged¶ across Europe over the last ten years and is directed at those who,¶ displaced and dispossessed by globalisation, are being thrown up on¶ Europe’s shores.2 It is xeno in form in that it is directed against¶ foreigners irrespective of colour; it is racism in substance in that it¶ bears all the hallmarks of demonisation and exclusion of the old¶ racism – and the mechanisms that set that foreign-ness in situ are legal¶ and structural and institutional.¶ What appears to have happened post-September 11, though, is that¶ the parameters of that institutionalised xeno-racism – anti-foreignness¶ – have been expanded to include minority ethnic communities that have¶ been settled in Europe for decades – simply because they are Muslim.¶ Since Islam now represents ‘threat’ to Europe, its Muslim residents,¶ even though they are citizens, even though they may be European¶ born, are caught up in the ever-expanding loop of xeno-racism. They¶ do not merely threaten Europe as the ‘enemy within’ in the war on¶ terror, their adherence to Islamic norms and values threatens the¶ notion of Europeanness itself. Under the guise of patriotism, a wholesale¶ anti-Islamic racism has been unleashed which itself threatens to¶ destroy the fabric of the multicultural society.

#### Muslim xeno-racism hinders the US’ ability to overcome terrorism

Hathaway 04 (Robert M., director of the Asia Program at the Woodrow Wilson

International Center for Scholars. “ISLAMIZATION AND THE

PAKISTANI ECONOMY”. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. <http://www.chicagobooth.edu/alumni/clubs/pakistan/docs/Islamizationandpakistanieconomy-2004-woodrowwilsoncenter.pdf>) Cass

In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade¶ Center and the Pentagon and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, it is¶ more important than ever that Americans develop a more nuanced¶ understanding of Islam and the Islamic world. Notwithstanding its enormous¶ power, the United States can no longer afford to remain uninformed¶ about the people, culture, and values of the countries where Islam¶ exerts a predominant influence. Thinking in stereotypes or blindly lumping¶ all Muslims into one-size-fits-all mental categories will not help win¶ the war on terrorism. More broadly, fostering an undifferentiated image of¶ Islam and the nations where Islam prevails is counterproductive to the¶ achievement of a range of important U.S. interests, and violates American¶ values of inclusiveness and fair-mindedness.

#### American alarmism gives terrorists the upper hand—increases perceived size of the threat

Beck 02 (Ulrich, Professor of Sociology at the University of Munich and British

Journal of Sociology Visiting Centennial Professor at the London School of

Economics and Political Science. Theory Culture Society 19; 39. <http://tcs.sagepub.com/content/19/4/39.abstract>) Cass

The main question is: who defines the identity of a ‘transnational terrorist’? Neither judges, nor international courts, but powerful governments and states. They empower themselves by defining who is their terrorist enemy, their bin Laden. The fundamental distinctions between war and peace, attack and self-defence collapse. Terrorist enemy images are deterritorialized, de-nationalized and flexible state constructions that legitimize the global intervention of military powers as ‘self-defence’. President George W. Bush painted a frightening picture of ‘tens of thousands’ of al-Qaida trained terrorists ‘in at least a dozen countries’. Bush uses the most expansive interpretation: ‘They are to be destroyed.’ Bush’s alarmism has a paradoxical effect: it gives Islamic terrorists what they want most – a recognition of their power. Bush has encouraged the terrorists to believe that the United States really can be badly hurt by terrorist actions like these. So there is a hidden mutual enforcement between Bush’s empowerment and the empowerment of the terrorists. US intelligence agencies are increasingly concerned that future attempts by terrorists to attack the United States may involve Asian or African al-Qaida members, a tactic intended to elude the racial profiles developed by US security personnel. Thus the internal law enforcement and the external counter-threat of US intervention not only focus on Arab faces, but possibly on Indonesian, Filipino, Malaysian or African faces. In order to broaden terrorist enemy images, which, to a large extent, are a one-sided construction of the powerful US state, expanded parameters are being developed so as to include networks and individuals who may be connected to Asian and African terrorist organizations. This way, Washington constructs the threat as immense. Bush insists that permanent mobilization of the American nation is required, that the military budget be vastly increased, that civil liberties be restricted and that critics be chided as unpatriotic. So there is another difference: the pluralization of experts and expert rationalities, which characterizes ecological and financial risks, is then replaced by the gross simplification of enemy images, constructed by governments and intelligence agencies without and beyond public discourse and democratic participation. So there are huge differences between the external risks of ecological conflicts, the internal risks of financial conflicts and the intentional terrorist threat. Another big difference is the speed of acknowledgement. Global environmental and financial risks are still not truly recognized. But with the horrific images of New York and Washington, terrorist groups instantly established themselves as new global players competing with nations, the economy and civil society in the eyes of the world. The terrorist threat, of course, is reproduced by the global media. To summarize the specific characteristics of terrorist threat: (bad) intention replaces accident, active trust becomes active mistrust, the context of individual risk is replaced by the context of systemic risks, private insurance is (partly) replaced by state insurance, the power of definition of experts has been replaced by that of states and intelligence agencies; and the pluralization of expert rationalities has turned into the simplification of enemy images.1 Having outlined their differences, it should be no surprise that the three kinds of global risk, that is ecological, financial and terrorist threat, also interact. And terrorism again is the focal point. On the one hand, the dangers from terrorism increase exponentially with technical progress. Advances in financial and communication technology are what made global terrorism possible in the first place. And the same innovations that have individualized financial risks have also individualized war. But the most horrifying connection is that all the risk conflicts that are stored away as potential could now be intentionally unleashed. Every advance from gene technology to nanotechnology opens a ‘Pandora’s box’ that could be used as a terrorist’s toolkit. Thus the terrorist threat has made everyone into a disaster movie scriptwriter, now condemned to imagine the effects of a home-made atomic bomb assembled with the help of gene or nanotechnology; or the collapse of global computer networks by the introduction of squads of viruses and so on.

## Warming

### Warming Frontline

#### 1 - Alt cause - methane

Harris 10 (January 26. Richard. Correspondent in Science at the National Public Radio. “Methane Causes Vicious Cycle in Global Warming” <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=122638800> Pismarov)

Carbon dioxide is the gas we most associate with global warming, but methane gas also plays an important role. For reasons that are not well understood, methane gas stopped increasing in the atmosphere in the 1990s. But now it appears to be once again on the rise. Scientists are trying to understand why — and what to do about it. Methane gas comes from all sorts of sources including wetlands, rice paddies, cow tummies, coal mines, garbage dumps and even termites. Drew Shindell, at NASA's Goddard Institute in New York, says, "It's gone up by 150 percent since the pre-industrial period. So that's an enormous increase. CO2, by contrast, has gone up by something like 30 percent." Molecule for molecule, methane is much more effective than carbon dioxide at trapping heat in the atmosphere. And that's just part of the trouble. "Methane is much more complicated once it gets into the atmosphere than something like carbon dioxide is," Shindell says, "and that's because it reacts with a lot of different important chemicals."

#### 2 - Adaptation checks impact

**Michaels** **2007** (Patrick J. Senior Fellow in environmental studies at the Cato Instituate. “Global Warming: No Urgent Danger; No Quick Fix” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/global-warming-no-urgent-danger-no-quick-fix> Pismarov)

It's summer, it's hot and global warming is on the cover of Newsweek. Scare stories abound. We may only have 10 years to stop this! The future survival of our species is at stake! OK, the media aren't exactly nonpartisan, especially on global warming. So what's the real story and what do we need to know? Fact: The average surface temperature of the Earth is about 0.8 C warmer than it was in 1900, and human beings have something to do with it. But does that portend an unmitigated disaster? Can we do anything meaningful about it at this time? And if we can't, what should or can we do in the future? These are politically loaded questions that must be answered truthfully, especially when considering legislation designed to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide, the main global warming gas. Unfortunately, they'll probably be ignored. Right now there are a slew of bills before Congress, and many in various states, that mandate massively reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Some actually propose cutting our CO2 output to 80 percent or 90 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2050. Let's be charitable and simply call that legislative arrogance. U.S. emissions are up about 18 percent from 1990 as they stand. Whenever you hear about these large cuts, ask the truth: How is this realistically going to happen? I did that on an international television panel two weeks ago. My opponent, who advocated these cuts, dropped his jaw and said nothing, ultimately uttering a curse word for the entire world to hear. The fact of the matter is he had no answer because there isn't one. Nor would legislation in any state or Washington, D.C., have any standing in Beijing. Although the final figures aren't in yet, it's beginning to look like China has just passed the United States as the world's largest emitter of carbon dioxide. Like the United States, China has oodles of coal, and the Chinese are putting in at least one new coal-fired power plant a month. (Some reports have it at an astonishing one per week.) And just as it does in the United States, when coal burns in China, it turns largely to carbon dioxide and water. What we do in the United States is having less and less of an effect on the concentration of carbon dioxide in the world's atmosphere. We certainly adapted to 0.8 C temperature change quite well in the 20th century, as life expectancy doubled and some crop yields quintupled. And who knows what new and miraculously efficient power sources will develop in the next hundred years. The stories about the ocean rising 20 feet as massive amounts of ice slide off of Greenland by 2100 are also fiction. For the entire half century from 1915 through 1965, Greenland was significantly warmer than it has been for the last decade. There was no disaster. More important, there's a large body of evidence that for much of the period from 3,000 to 9,000 years ago, at least the Eurasian Arctic was 2.5 C to 7 C warmer than now in the summer, when ice melts. Greenland's ice didn't disappear then, either. Then there is the topic of interest this time of year — hurricanes. Will hurricanes become stronger or more frequent because of warming? My own work suggests that late in the 21st century there might be an increase in strong storms, but that it will be very hard to detect because of year-to-year variability. Right now, after accounting for increasing coastal population and property values, there is no increase in damages caused by these killers. The biggest of them all was the Great Miami Hurricane of 1926. If it occurred today, it would easily cause twice as much damage as 2005's vaunted Hurricane Katrina. So let's get real and give the politically incorrect answers to global warming's inconvenient questions. Global warming is real, but it does not portend immediate disaster, and there's currently no suite of technologies that can do much about it. The obvious solution is to forgo costs today on ineffective attempts to stop it, and to save our money for investment in future technologies and inevitable adaptation.

#### 3 - No impact to warming- models of warming are all flawed.

**Happer 2011** (William. Chairman of the Marshall Institute and the Professor of Physics at Princeton University.“The Truth About Greenhouse Gases” <http://www.marshall.org/article.php?id=953&print=1> Pismarov)

There have been many warmings and coolings in the past when the CO2 levels did not change. A well-known example is the medieval warming, about the year 1000, when the Vikings settled Greenland (when it was green) and wine was exported from England. This warm period was followed by the “little ice age” when the Thames would frequently freeze over during the winter. There is no evidence for significant increase of CO2 in the medieval warm period, nor for a significant decrease at the time of the subsequent little ice age. Documented famines with millions of deaths occurred during the little ice age because the cold weather killed the crops. Since the end of the little ice age, the earth has been warming in fits and starts, and humanity’s quality of life has improved accordingly. A rare case of good correlation between CO2 levels and temperature is provided by ice-core records of the cycles of glacial and interglacial periods of the last million years of so. But these records show that changes in temperature preceded changes in CO2 levels, so that the levels were an effect of temperature changes. This was probably due to outgassing of CO2 from the warming oceans and the reverse effect when they cooled. The most recent continental ice sheets began to melt some twenty thousand years ago. During the “Younger Dryas” some 12,000 years ago, the earth very dramatically cooled and warmed by as much as 10 degrees Celsius in fifty years. The earth’s climate has always been changing. Our present global warming is not at all unusual by the standards of geological history, and it is probably benefiting the biosphere. Indeed, there is very little correlation between the estimates of CO2 and of the earth’s temperature over the past 550 million years (the “Phanerozoic” period). The message is clear that several factors must influence the earth’s temperature, and that while CO2 is one of these factors, it is seldom the dominant one. The other factors are not well understood. Plausible candidates are spontaneous variations of the complicated fluid flow patterns in the oceans and atmosphere of the earth—perhaps influenced by continental drift, volcanoes, variations of the earth’s orbital parameters (ellipticity, spin-axis orientation, etc.), asteroid and comet impacts, variations in the sun’s output (not only the visible radiation but the amount of ultraviolet light, and the solar.

#### 4 - CO2 improves plant growth –solution to food shortages

Idso, Idso and Idso 10 (Sherwood, Keith and Craig, founders, former presidents, and chairpeople of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, “Food Security: The Real Planetary Problem,” Co2 Science, Vol. 13, No. 51, 22 December 2010, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N51/EDIT.php>)

In a paper recently published in the Journal of Proteome Research, Sarkar et al. (2010) write that "increasing population and unsustainable exploitation of nature and natural resources have made 'food security' a burning issue in the 21st century," echoing sentiments much like those expressed by Farrell (2009), who has noted that "the alarming increase in biofuel production, the projected demand for livestock products, and the estimated food to feed the additional 700 million people who will arrive here by 2016, will have unprecedented consequences," among which are likely to be the unsavory facts that "arable land, the environment, water supply and sustainability of the agricultural system will all be affected," and not in a positive manner. Furthermore, when the human population of the globe reaches 8.7-11.3 billion by the year 2050 (Bengtsson et al., 2006), the situation will become truly intolerable, unless something is done, far in advance of that date, to dramatically mitigate the situation. Thus, as Sarkar et al. suggest, "a normal approach for any nation/region is to strengthen its agricultural production for meeting future demands and provide food security." But a major difficulty, which could well spoil mankind's ability to do so, is the ongoing rise in the atmosphere's ozone concentration, which is the subject of Sarkar et al.'s new paper. In a study designed to elucidate the many ways in which ozone (O3) is harmful to plants, the eight researchers grew two high-yielding cultivars (Sonalika and HUW 510) of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) out-of-doors at the Agriculture Research Farm of India's Banaras Hindu University. This was done within open-top chambers that they maintained at the ambient O3 concentration and at elevated O3 concentrations of 25% and 50% above ambient during the peak O3 period of the day (10:00 to 15:00 hours local time) for a total of fifty days, during which period they measured numerous responses of the plants to the two levels of ozone enrichment. So what did they find? Sarkar et al. determined, among several other things, that the moderate increases in the air's O3 concentration resulted in higher foliar injury, a reduction in photosynthetic efficiency, induced inhibition in photochemical efficacy of photosystem II, lowered concentrations of photosynthetic pigments and proteins, plus what they describe as "drastic reductions" in RuBisCO large and small subunits, while noting that major leaf photosynthetic proteins and important energy metabolism proteins were also "drastically reduced." In discussing the results of their study, the scientists from India, Japan and Nepal remark that anthropogenic activities have made ozone a "major environmental pollutant of our time," while noting that some are predicting it to be an even "greater problem for the future." And adding this dilemma to the problem of feeding the world over the next few decades and beyond, humanity's future is not looking good. In fact, it's incredibly bleak. So what can be done to help us weather this potentially devastating perfect storm? Sarkar et al. suggest that we focus on "engineering crops for future high O3," concentrating on maintaining "effective stomatal conductance of plants which can avoid O3 entry but not hamper their productivity." We agree. But not knowing to what extent we will be successful in this endeavor, we need to do something else that we know will work; and that is to allow the air's CO2 content to rise, unimpeded by the misguided efforts of climate alarmists who would curtail anthropogenic CO2 emissions in the guise of fighting what they claim is anthropogenic-induced global warming. This contention is largely theoretical and wholly unproven; but we know that atmospheric CO2 enrichment nearly always acts to increase both the productivity and water use efficiency of nearly all plants, as a result of literally hundreds, if not thousands, of real-world experiments, while it often more than compensates for the negative effects of O3 pollution. Clearly, we are going to need all of the help we can possibly get to make it unscathed through even the first half of the 21st century; and we cannot afford to throw away any of the means we have at our disposal to help us in this great effort. We have got to see carbon dioxide for what it truly is -- the elixir of life: one of the two raw materials (the other being water) that combine during the process of photosynthesis to produce the substances of plant tissues that provide the food for nearly all human and animal life on the planet, either directly, in the case of herbivores, or indirectly in the case of other life forms. And that makes carbon dioxide just the opposite of what the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently declared it to be -- a dangerous air pollutant. Shame on them! ... and on all those who demonize this life-giving molecule that we expel to the air every time we exhale.

#### 5 - Warming increases species diversity.

Avery 03 (November 4. Dennis. Director of the Hudson Institute Center for Global Food Issues. “Global warming and the Fortune of Species,” American Outlook Today. Pismarov)

The environmental movement is telling us that global warming might cause a mass extinction of wild species. This is a serious concern, since the Earth has clearly been warming for 150 years, either due to human activities or a natural cycle. George Woodwell, a cofounder of the Environmental Defense Fund, said of global warming in 1989, “The changes expected are rapid enough to exceed the capacity of forests to migrate or otherwise adapt.” More recently, biologist Camille Root of Stanford University warned, “In my opinion, we’re sitting at the edge of a mass extinction.” “The Specter of Species Extinction,” a new study published in September by the science-oriented Marshall Institute, concludes the opposite of Dr. Root—that global warming will bring more species diversity, not less, to most parts of globe. Rather than wiping out species, moderately warmer global temperatures will extend the ranges of thousands of plants and animals, enriching the diversity of most forests, mountains, and marine environments. The Marshall report stresses that warmer temperatures give most trees, plants, animals, and fish the opportunity to extend their ranges toward the poles—without imposing any “heat limits” that would force them to give up the ranges they currently occupy. “The southern boundary of a tree’s natural range is not determined by temperature, but by competition between the northern species and more southerly-adapted species that have inherently greater growth rates.” The Marshall researchers conclude that only over hundreds of years would the faster growing trees from the south be able to out-compete the already mature trees of the northern species. Forests and plants would only be able to shift their ranges northward and southward very slowly, giving the mammals, birds, fish, lichens, mushrooms, and other species that depend on the plant life ample time to shift with them. Critical to the Marshall analysis is the reality that higher CO2 levels act as fertilizer for trees and plants, and that higher CO2 levels also reduce the amount of energy “wasted” by virtually all plant species on a process called photorespiration. As long as temperatures and CO2 are both rising, trees and plants will be vigorous enough to exploit warming’s opportunities to expand their range, rather than getting death notices from Greenpeace.

#### 6 - Human-induced warming is preventing the next ice age

Kaufman et al 9 (Darrell S., David P. Schneider, Nicholas P. McKay, Caspar M. Ammann, Raymond S. Bradley, Keith R. Briffa, Gifford H. Miller, Bette L. Otto-Bliesner, Jonathan T. Overpeck, Bo M. Vinther, “Arctic warming overtakes 2,000 years of natural cooling,” AtmosNews, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research National Center for Atmospheric Research, 3 September 2009, <https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/news/846/arctic-warming-overtakes-2000-years-natural-cooling>)

Arctic temperatures in the 1990s reached their warmest level of any decade in at least 2,000 years, new research indicates. The study, which incorporates geologic records and computer simulations, provides new evidence that the Arctic would be cooling if not for greenhouse gas emissions that are overpowering natural climate patterns. The international study, led by Northern Arizona University and the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), will be published in the September 4 edition of Science. It was primarily funded by the National Science Foundation, NCAR's sponsor. The scientists reconstructed summer temperatures across the Arctic over the last 2,000 years by decade, extending a view of climate far beyond the 400 years of Arctic-wide records previously available at that level of detail. They found that thousands of years of gradual Arctic cooling, related to natural changes in Earth's orbit, would continue today if not for emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. "This result is particularly important because the Arctic, perhaps more than any other region on Earth, is facing dramatic impacts from climate change," says NCAR scientist David Schneider, one of the co-authors. "This study provides us with a long-term record that reveals how greenhouse gases from human activities are overwhelming the Arctic's natural climate system." Darrell Kaufman of Northern Arizona University, the lead author and head of the synthesis project, says the results indicate that recent warming is more anomalous than previously documented. "Scientists have known for a while that the current period of warming was preceded by a long-term cooling trend," says Kaufman. "But our reconstruction quantifies the cooling with greater certainty than before." The new study is the first to quantify a pervasive cooling across the Arctic on a decade-by-decade basis that is related to an approximately 21,000-year cyclical wobble in Earth's tilt relative to the Sun. Over the last 7,000 years, the timing of Earth's closest pass by the Sun has shifted from September to January. This has gradually reduced the intensity of sunlight reaching the Arctic in summertime, when Earth is farther from the Sun. The research team's temperature analysis shows that summer temperatures in the Arctic, in step with the reduced energy from the Sun, cooled at an average rate of about 0.2 degrees Celsius (about .36 degrees Fahrenheit) per thousand years. The temperatures eventually bottomed out during the "Little Ice Age," a period of widespread cooling that lasted roughly from the 16th to the mid-19th centuries. Even though the orbital cycle that produced the cooling continued, it was overwhelmed in the 20th century by human-induced warming. The result was summer temperatures in the Arctic by the year 2000 that were about 1.4 degrees C (2.5 degrees F) higher than would have been expected from the continued cyclical cooling alone. "If it hadn't been for the increase in human-produced greenhouse gases, summer temperatures in the Arctic should have cooled gradually over the last century," says Bette Otto-Bliesner, an NCAR scientist who participated in the study. To reconstruct Arctic temperatures over the last 2,000 years, the study team incorporated three types of field-based data, each of which captured the response of a different component of the Arctic's climate system to changes in temperature. These data included temperature reconstructions published by the study team earlier this year. The reconstructions were based on evidence provided by sediments from Arctic lakes, which yielded two kinds of clues: changes in the abundance of silica remnants left behind by algae, which reflect the length of the growing season, and the thickness of annually deposited sediment layers, which increases during warmer summers as deposits from glacial meltwater increase. The research also incorporated previously published data from glacial ice and tree rings that were calibrated against the instrumental temperature record. The scientists compared the temperatures inferred from the field-based data with simulations run with the Community Climate System Model, a computer model of global climate based at NCAR.

The impact is extinction by 2028 - iceage is comparatively worse than warming

Chapman 8 (Phil, Geophysicist, Former NASA Astronaut, “Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh,” The Austrailian, 4-34, <http://www.sciencealert.com.au/opinions/20082105-17356.html>)

It is time to put aside the global warming dogma, at least to begin contingency planning about what to do if we are moving into another little ice age, similar to the one that lasted from 1100 to 1850. There is no doubt that the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do. There are many more people now and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it. Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases. There is also another possibility, remote but much more serious. The Greenland and Antarctic ice cores and other evidence show that for the past several million years, severe glaciation has almost always afflicted our planet. The bleak truth is that, under normal conditions, most of North America and Europe are buried under about 1.5km of ice. This bitterly frigid climate is interrupted occasionally by brief warm interglacials, typically lasting less than 10,000 years. The interglacial we have enjoyed throughout recorded human history, called the Holocene, began 11,000 years ago, so the ice is overdue. We also know that glaciation can occur quickly: the required decline in global temperature is about 12C and it can happen in 20 years. The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1,000 years. On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027. By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining. Australia may escape total annihilation but would surely be overrun by millions of refugees. Once the glaciation starts, it will last 1000 centuries, an incomprehensible stretch of time.

### ---XT: Alt Cause to Warming

**Methane gas plays an important role in causing warming. Methane is on the rise and it is much more complicated to get out of the atmosphere because it reacts with different chemicals. Even if the aff can solve CO2, they would have to solve methane gas outputs to solve warming- that’s Harris.**

#### Alt cause- sunspots.

Kemm 2008 (Kelvin. “Evidence of Sunspot Involvement in Climate Change too Compelling to be Brushed Aside” <http://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/evidence-of-sunspot-involvement-in-climate-change-compelling-2008-10-31> Pismarov)

Over the last few years, the evidence that sunspots on our sun are directly related to climate change on earth has been steadily increasing. I explained the exact proposed mechanism in some detail previously. Great work in this field is being carried out by Dr Henrik Svensmark and coworkers in Denmark and elsewhere. Briefly, the mechanism is that cosmic rays impact on the earth from deep space. These cosmic rays penetrate our atmosphere and lead to the formation of cloud cover. The cosmic rays nucleate sites in the atmosphere, from which clouds form from the natural water vapour. If one puts a spoonful of coffee powder into a cup of microwaved water, the water forms bubbles of foam on the coffee grains. This is basically the same principle as the cosmic rays forming clouds in the atmosphere. The earth’s magnetic field, which acts as a shielding, is altered by the sun’s activity, which, in turn, is indicated by means of the number of sunspots. As the earth’s magnetic shield varies, so the cloud cover varies. Few sunspots mean a weaker earth shield, which means more cosmic rays, which mean more clouds, which mean a cooling earth. The correlation for this effect, going back thousands of years, is good, remarkably so. Scientifically, this looks believable, and it is consistent with the theory and observation. In contrast, the argument that man-made carbon dioxide (CO2) is causing warming does not fit the facts at all. Firstly, there was no industrial CO2 produced in vast quantities when the Roman Warming period occurred, or when the Medieval Warming period occurred. Both are well documented in various archives, such as the historical and archaeological. But there is more – global warming is extremely complex, and it is really naïve to believe that a relatively simple theory will explain it satisfactorily. It is far too simple just to say: CO2 traps heat and, therefore, more CO2 means more heat, and so we have global warming. As the makers of heat-seeking missiles know very well, the CO2 in the atmosphere has ‘windows’ in it. This means that certain ‘heat frequencies’ pass through the atmosphere easily but other frequencies are trapped. It is these windows that the missile uses to hunt its prey. As a consequence, there are ‘frequency bands’ related to the CO2 cover of the earth. In various ‘bands’, the infrared passes through easily, or not so easily. Further, CO2 can trap incoming heat from space and outgoing heat being radiated from the earth. The frequency bands linked to the CO2 also become saturated – they cannot just keep sucking up more and more heat. Essentially, this CO2 argument is very complex. Over the last century, the temperature changes in our planet’s atmosphere, let alone ground and sea, just do not match the atmospheric CO2 concentration at all. This is cause for warning bells that, perhaps, this whole CO2 argument is not correct. In comparison, the cosmic ray and sunspot information match well. However, as I have said, this whole atmospheric temperature issue is very complex, and no capable scientist in the field is going to say otherwise. Right now, we have been experiencing a rather long period of sunspot inactivity on our sun, some 200 days plus. This has happened before. Formal sun- spot data collection started in 1749 and has been monitored ever since. But long before that date, sunspots were known and informal measurements were taken. It is, therefore, known that the Little Ice Age, which took place from the midseventeenth century to the eighteenth century, was preceded and paralleled by a period of some 50 years with a virtual absence of sunspots, according to informal records. In more recent times, we have had relatively long periods without sunspots. This year, we passed the mark of 200 days without sunspots, which is unusual. In fact, the sun has been blanker now than in any other year since 1954, when it was spotless for 241 days, and this year is now being called the sun’s quietest year of the space age. The sun was also very quiet in 1913, so runs of 200-plus spotless days are rare, but not that rare. As I have already said, the global warming and cooling issue is complex, and so a run of 200-plus days without sunspots cannot be compared to a 50-year quiet period during the Little Ice Age, but it is cause for some scientific thinking. Further, a cooling that could be initiated by a lack of sunspots will induce other climatic effects that will either favour warming or cooling. The jury is still out on exactly what happens, but the evidence for sunspot involvement in climate change is just too compelling for it to be brushed aside by those who want to cling to the simplistic idea that man-made CO2 is the only factor.

### ---XT: Adapting/Squo Solves

#### Adaption is inevitable- empirics prove that we have adapted to a 0.8 C temperature change. Our life expectancy has doubled and some crop yields have quintupled- that’s Michaels.

#### Algae solves warming

Macfarlane 9 (Jo, “Amazing discovery of green algae which could save the world from global warming,” Mail Online, 2 January 2009, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1104772/Amazing-discovery-green-algae-save-world-global-warming.html>)

Melting icebergs, so long the iconic image of global warming, are triggering a natural process that could delay or even end climate change, British scientists have found. A team working on board the Royal Navy’s HMS Endurance off the coast of Antarctica have discovered tiny particles of iron are released into the sea as the ice melts. The iron feeds algae, which blooms and sucks up damaging carbon dioxide (CO2), then sinks, locking away the harmful greenhouse gas for hundreds of years. British scientists have discovered that green algae could bury CO2 omissions at the bottom of the ocean. The team think the process could hold the key to staving off globally rising temperatures. Lead researcher Professor Rob Raiswell, from Leeds University, said: ‘The Earth itself seems to want to save us.’ As a result of the findings, a ground-breaking experiment will be held this month off the British island of South Georgia, 800 miles south east of the Falklands. It will see if the phenomenon could be harnessed to contain rising carbon emissions. Researchers will use several tons of iron sulphate to create an artificial bloom of algae. The patch will be so large it will be visible from space. Scientists already knew that releasing iron into the sea stimulates the growth of algae. But environmentalists had warned that to do so artificially might damage the planet’s fragile ecosystem. Last year, the UN banned iron fertilisation in the Great Southern Ocean. The team working on board HMS Endurance off the coast of Antartica have discovered tiny particles of iron are released into the sea as ice melts. However, the new findings show the mechanism has actually been operating naturally for millions of years within the isolated southern waters. And it has led to the researchers being granted permission by the UN to move ahead with the experiment. The scientist who will lead the next stage of the study, Professor Victor Smetacek, said: ‘The gas is sure to be out of the Earth’s atmosphere for several hundred years.’ The aim is to discover whether artificially fertilising the area will create more algae in the Great Southern Ocean. That ocean is an untapped resource for soaking up CO2 because it doesn’t have much iron, unlike other seas. It covers 20million square miles, and scientists say that if this could all be treated with iron, the resulting algae would remove three-and-a-half gigatons of carbon dioxide. This is equivalent to one eighth of all emissions annually created by burning fossil fuels such as oil, gas and coal. It would also be equal to removing all carbon dioxide emitted from every power plant, chimney and car exhaust in the rapidly expanding industries of India and Japan. Lead researcher Prof Rob Raiswell thinks the process could hold the key to staving off globally rising temperatures However, the experts warn it is too early to say whether it will work. The team from ice patrol ship HMS Endurance used sledgehammers to chip deep into the interior of a 33ft-long mass of polar ice from half-a-dozen house-sized icebergs that had blown ashore in Antarctica. Once back in the UK, they used a special microscope to analyse the samples, which revealed what they had been looking for – tiny iron particles, only a few millionths of a millimetre wide, embedded deep within the ice. Until now, it was thought that the only source of iron in the Southern Ocean was wind blowing in metal compounds from the deserts of nearby continents like Australia. But the research has disproved this. Prof Raiswell said: ‘These particles measure only a fraction of a millimetre, but they have great importance for the global climate.’ Rising global temperatures, particularly over the past 50 years, have increased the rate at which polar ice melts, causing sea levels to rise. Ten of the warmest years on record have been since 1991, with experts predicting that 2009 could be the hottest year yet. The climate-change effect is set to substantially increase over the coming decades, as developing industrial nations pump out more CO2. Temperatures along the Antarctic Peninsula alone have increased by 2.5C over the past 50 years. But for every percentage point increase in the amount of ice that breaks off, Prof Raiswell calculates that a further 26million tons of CO2 is removed from the atmosphere.

#### Acid rain solves global warming

Knight 4 (Will, “Acid rain limits global warming,” NewScientist, 3 August 2004, <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn6231-acid-rain-limits-global-warming.html>)

Acid rain restricts global warming by reducing methane emissions from natural wetland areas, suggests a global climate study. Acid rain is the result of industrial pollution, which causes rainwater to carry small quantities of acidic compounds such as sulphuric and nitric acid. Contaminated rainwater can upset the chemical balance rivers and lakes, killing fish and other organisms and also damage plants, trees and buildings. But the new study shows that sulphur in acid rain may have benefits, limiting global warming by counteracting the natural production of methane gases by microbes in wetland areas. Methane is thought to account for 22 percent of the human-enhanced greenhouse effect. And microbes in wetland areas are its biggest producers. They feed off substrates such as hydrogen and acetate in peat and emit methane into the atmosphere. Global warming itself will only fuel the production of methane as heating up the microbes causes them to produce even more methane. But the new model suggests that sulphur pollution from industry mitigates this. This is because sulphur-eating bacteria also found in wetland regions outcompete the methane-emitting microbes for substrates. Experiments have shown that sulphur deposits can reduce methane production in small regions by up to 30 per cent by activating the sulphur-eating bacteria. Complete picture. "The study highlights the importance of representing the full Earth system in your climate model," says Richard Betts, a climate systems expert at the UK's Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research. "You need to look at the interaction between greenhouse gases and other effects on the biosphere." Betts told New Scientist that the research provides a more complete picture of how this pollution affects the planet. But he notes that acid rain remains a major problem for the environment. The new study, led by Vincent Gauci of the UK's Open University, sought to determine how real sulphur pollution may affect wetland areas globally. Gauci and colleagues created a computer model at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center to simulate this interaction. The simulation incorporated the latest data on global methane emissions and sulphur pollution along with climate change models and data from wetland field studies. "Basically we looked at where wetlands and acid rain overlap," Gauci told New Scientist. Feedback effect. The model examined and predicted the interaction between sulphur pollution and natural methane emissions from wetland areas from 1960 to 2080. "Even as early as 1960 we found that methane has been suppressed by sulphur pollution," Gauci says. Furthermore, the model suggests that sulphur pollution will continue to suppress methane emissions despite the feedback effect that global warming has on the process. While sulphur emissions reduce methane emissions by about eight per cent currently, the figure should rise to 15 per cent by about 2030, predicts the model. "All our projections show that, if you don't include acid rain, methane pollution is going to increase," Gauci adds. Sulphur pollution is already estimated to have cut methane emissions from wetlands from about 175 to 160 million tonnes per year in 2004. By 2030, this is predicted to fall to 155 million tonnes per year with the help of sulphur-eating bacteria.

### ---XT: No Impact

#### No impact to warming- there is no evidence of a significant increase in CO2 levels affecting the environment- that’s Happer.

**Climate scientists overgeneralize the complexity of the climate and ignore biological evidence – they exaggerate warming’s importance because they have a personal stake – warming saves lives during the winter – and China and India’s economic growth outweigh. Prefer our evidence – he’s a brilliant physicist with a background in climate science from before models took over**

**Lemonick 9** (Michael D., senior writer for Climate Central, a nonpartisan organization whose mission is to communicate climate science to the public, previously a senior writer at Time magazine, where he covered science and the environment for more than 20 years, “Freeman Dyson Takes on the Climate Establishment, 4 June 2009, <http://e360.yale.edu/feature/freeman_dyson_takes_on_the_climate_establishment/2151/>)

**Princeton physicist Freeman Dyson has been roundly criticized for insisting global warming is not an urgent problem**, with many climate scientists dismissing him as woefully ill-informed. In an interview with Yale Environment 360, Dyson explains his iconoclastic views and why he believes they have stirred such controversy. On March 3, The New York Times Magazine created a major flap in the climate-change community by running a cover story on the theoretical physicist Freeman Dyson that focused largely on his views of human-induced global warming. Basically, he doesn’t buy it. The climate models used to forecast what will happen as we continue to pump CO2 into the atmosphere are unreliable, Dyson claims, and so, therefore, are the projections. In an interview with YaleEnvironment 360, his first since the Times article appeared, **Dyson contends that since carbon dioxide is good for plants, a warmer planet could be a very good thing. And if CO2 does get to be a problem, Dyson believes we can just do some genetic engineering to create a new species of super-tree that can suck up the excess.** These sorts of arguments are advanced routinely by climate-change skeptics, and dismissed just as routinely by those who work in the field as clueless at best and deliberately misleading at worst. **Dyson is hard**er **to dismiss**, though, in part **because of his brilliance. He’s on the faculty at the Institute for Advanced Study, where as a young physicist he hobnobbed with Albert Einstein.** When Julian Schwinger, Sin-Itiro Tomonaga and Richard Feynman shared **the 1965 Nobel Prize in physics for quantum electrodynamics, Dyson was widely acknowledged to be almost equally deserving — but the Nobel Committee only gives out three prizes for a given discovery.** Nevertheless, large numbers of climate modelers and others who actually work on climate change — as Dyson does not — rolled their collective eyes at assertions they consider appallingly ill-informed. In his interview with Yale Environment 360, Dyson also makes numerous assertions of fact — from his claim that warming today is largely confined to the Arctic to his contention that human activities are not primarily responsible for rising global temperatures — that climate scientists say are flat-out wrong. Many climate scientists were especially distressed that the Times gave his views such prominence. Even worse, when the profile’s author, Nicholas Dawidoff, was asked on NPR’s “On The Media” whether it mattered if Dyson was right or wrong in his views, Dawidoff answered, “Oh, absolutely not. I don’t care what he thinks. I have no investment in what he thinks. I’m just interested in how he thinks and the depth and the singularity of his point of view.” This is, to put it bluntly, bizarre. It matters a great deal whether he’s right or wrong, given that his views have been trumpeted in such a prominent forum with essentially no challenge. So I visited Dyson in his Princeton office in May to probe a little deeper into his views on climate change. Yale Environment 360: First of all, was that article substantially accurate about your views? Freeman Dyson: It’s difficult to say, “Yes” or “No.” It was reasonably accurate on details, because they did send a fact-checker. So I was able to correct the worst mistakes. But what I could not correct was the general emphasis of the thing. He had his agenda. Obviously he wanted to write a piece about global warming and I was just the instrument for that, and I am not so much interested in global warming. He portrayed me as sort of obsessed with the subject, which I am definitely not. To me it is a very small part of my life. I don’t claim to be an expert. I never did. I simply find that a lot of these claims that experts are making are absurd. Not that I know better, but I know a few things. My objections to the global warming propaganda are not so much over the technical facts, about which I do not know much, but it’s rather against the way those people behave and the kind of intolerance to criticism that a lot of them have. I think that’s what upsets me. e360: So it’s a sense you get from the way the argument is conducted that it’s not being done in an honest way. Dyson: **I think the difference between me and most of the experts is that I think I have a much wider view of the whole subject. I was involved in climate studies seriously about 30 years ago.** That’s how I got interested. There was an outfit called the Institute for Energy Analysis at Oak Ridge. I visited Oak Ridge many times, and worked with those people, and I thought they were excellent. And the beauty of it was that **it was multi-disciplinary. There were experts not just on hydrodynamics of the atmosphere, which of course is important, but also experts on vegetation, on soil, on trees, and so it was sort of half biological and half physics. And I felt that was a very good balance. And there you got a very strong feeling for how uncertain the whole business is, that the five reservoirs of carbon all are in close contact — the atmosphere, the upper level of the ocean, the land vegetation, the topsoil, and the fossil fuels. They are all about equal in size. They all interact with each other strongly. So you can’t understand any of them unless you understand all of them.** Essentially that was the conclusion. It’s a problem of very complicated ecology, and to isolate the atmosphere and the ocean just as a hydrodynamics problem makes no sense. Thirty years ago, there was a sort of a political split between the Oak Ridge community, which included biology, and people who were doing these fluid dynamics models, which don’t include biology. They got the lion’s share of money and attention. And since then, **this group of pure modeling experts has become dominant. I got out of the field then. I didn’t like the way it was going.** It left me with a bad taste. Syukuro **Manabe**, right here in Princeton, **was the first person who did climate models with enhanced carbon dioxide and they were excellent models. And he used to say very firmly that these models are very good tools for understanding climate, but they are not good tools for predicting climate.** I think that’s absolutely right. **They are models, but they don’t pretend to be the real world.** They are purely fluid dynamics. You can learn a lot from them, but you cannot learn what’s going to happen 10 years from now. What’s wrong with the models. I mean, I haven’t examined them in detail, (but) I know roughly what’s in them. And **the basic problem is that in the case of climate, very small structures, like clouds, dominate. And you cannot model them in any realistic way. They are far too small and too diverse. So they say, ‘We represent cloudiness by a parameter,’ but I call it a fudge factor.** So then you have a formula, which tells you if you have so much cloudiness and so much humidity, and so much temperature, and so much pressure, what will be the result... But if you are using it for a different climate, when you have twice as much carbon dioxide, there is no guarantee that that’s right. There is no way to test it. **We know that plants do react very strongly to enhanced carbon dioxide. At Oak Ridge, they did lots of experiments with enhanced carbon dioxide and it has a drastic effect on plants because it is the main food source for the plants... So if you change the carbon dioxide drastically by a factor of two, the whole behavior of the plant is different.** Anyway, that’s so typical of the things they ignore. **They are totally missing the biological side, which is probably more than half of the real system.** e360: Do you think it’s because they don’t consider it important, or they just don’t know how to model it? Dyson: Well, both. I mean it’s a fact that they don’t know how to model it. And the question is, how does it happen that they end up believing their models? But I have seen that happen in many fields. **You sit in front of a computer screen for 10 years and you start to think of your model as being real. It is also true that the whole livelihood of all these people depends on people being scared. Really, just psychologically, it would be very difficult for them to come out and say, “Don’t worry, there isn’t a problem.” It’s sort of natural, since their whole life depends on it being a problem.** I don’t say that they’re dishonest. But I think it’s just a normal human reaction. It’s true of the military also. They always magnify the threat. Not because they are dishonest; they really believe that there is a threat and it is their job to take care of it. I think it’s the same as the climate community, that **they do in a way have a tremendous vested interest in the problem being taken more seriously than it is.** e360: When I wrote my first story about this in 1987, I had to say this is all theoretical, we haven’t actually detected any signal of climate change. Now, people point to all sorts of signals, which are just the sort of things that were being predicted, based in part on the models. They made predictions and they’ve tested the predictions by seeing what happened in the real world, and they seem to be at least in the same direction, and in about the same magnitude, they were predicting. So isn’t that a hint that there is something right about the models? Dyson: Of course. **No doubt that warming is happening. I don’t think it is correct to say “global,” but certainly warming is happening.** I have been to Greenland a year ago and saw it for myself. And that’s where the warming is most extreme. And it’s spectacular, no doubt about it. And **glaciers are shrinking and so on. But**, there are all sorts of things that are not said, which decreases my feeling of alarm. First of all, **the people in Greenland love it.** They tell you it’s made their lives a lot easier. They hope it continues. I am not saying none of these consequences are happening. I am just questioning whether they are harmful. **There’s a lot made out of the people who died in heat waves. And there is no doubt that we have heat waves and people die. What they don’t say is actually five times as many people die of cold in winters as die of heat in summer. And it is also true that more of the warming happens in winter than in summer.** So, if anything, it’s heavily favorable as far as that goes. **It certainly saves more lives in winter than it costs in summer.** So that kind of argument is never made. And I see a systematic bias in the way things are reported. Anything that looks bad is reported, and anything that looks good is not reported. A lot of these things are not anything to do with human activities. Take **the shrinking of glaciers**, which certainly **has been going on for 300 years and has been well documented.** So it certainly wasn’t due to human activities, most of the time. **There’s been a very strong warming, in fact, ever since the Little Ice Age, which was most intense in the 17th century. That certainly was not due to human activity.** And the most serious of almost all the problems is the rising sea level. But there again, we have no evidence that this is due to climate change. A good deal of evidence says it’s not. I mean, we know that that’s been going on for 12,000 years, and there’s very doubtful arguments as to what’s been happening in the last 50 years and (whether) human activities have been important. It’s not clear whether it’s been accelerating or not. But certainly, most of it is not due to human activities. So it would be a shame if we’ve made huge efforts to stop global warming and the sea continued to rise. That would be a tragedy. Sea level is a real problem, but we should be attacking it directly and not attacking the wrong problem. e360: Another criticism that’s been leveled is that your thoughts and predictions about the climate models are relatively unsophisticated, because you haven’t been in close contact with the people who are doing them. But if you sit down and actually talk to the people about what goes into the models today and what they are thinking about and how they think about clouds, you might discover that your assumptions about what they are doing are not correct. Is that plausible? Do you think it might inform you better to actually sit down with these people and find out what they are doing today? Dyson: Well, it depends on what you mean by sitting down with people. I do sit down with people. I don’t go over their calculations in detail. But I think I understand pretty well the world they live in. I guess one thing I don’t want to do is to spend all my time arguing this business. I mean, I am not the person to do that. I have two great disadvantages. First of all, I am 85 years old. Obviously, I’m an old fuddy-duddy. So, I have no credibility. And, secondly, I am not an expert, and that’s not going to change. I am not going to make myself an expert. What I do think I have is a better judgment, maybe because I have lived a bit longer, and maybe because I’ve done other things. So I am fairly confident about my judgment, and I doubt whether that will change. But I am certainly willing to change my mind about details. And if they find any real evidence that global warming is doing harm, I would be impressed. That’s the crucial point: I don’t see the evidence... And why should you imagine that the climate of the 18th century — what they call the pre-industrial climate — is somehow the best possible? e360: I don’t think people actually believe that. I think they believe it’s the one during which our modern civilization arose. And that a rapid change to a different set of circumstances wouldn’t be worse in a grand sense, but it would be very badly suited to the infrastructure that we have got. Dyson: That’s sort of what I would call part of the propaganda — to take for granted that any change is bad. e360: It’s more that any change is disruptive. You don’t think that’s reasonable? Dyson: Well, **disruptive is not the same as bad. A lot of disruptive things actually are good. That’s the point. There’s this sort of mindset that assumes any change is bad. You can call it disruptive or you can call it change. But it doesn’t have to be bad.** e360: One thing is that if the temperature change projections are accurate for the next 100 years, it would be equivalent to the change that took us out of the last Ice Age into the present interglacial period, which is a very dramatic change. Dyson: Yes, that’s highly unlikely. But it’s possible certainly. e360: And the further argument is that this would happen much more quickly than that change happened. So it is hard to imagine that, at least in the short run, it could be anything but highly destructive. Dyson: There’s hidden assumptions there, which I question, that you can describe the climate by a single number. In the case of the Ice Age, that might be true, that it was cold everywhere. The ice was only in the northern regions, but it was also much colder at the equator in the Ice Age. That’s not true of this change in temperature today. **The change that’s now going on is very strongly concentrated in the Arctic. In fact in three respects, it’s not global, which I think is very important. First of all, it is mainly in the Arctic. Secondly, it’s mainly in the winter rather than summer. And thirdly, it’s mainly in the night rather than at the daytime. In all three respects, the warming is happening where it is cold, not where it is hot.** e360: So, the idea is that the parts that are being disrupted are the parts that are inhospitable to begin with? Dyson: Mostly. It is not 100 percent. But mostly they are, Greenland being a great example. e360: Do you mind being thrust in the limelight of talking about this when it is not your main interest. You’ve suddenly become the poster child for global warming skepticism. Dyson: Yes, it is definitely a tactical mistake to use somebody like me for that job, because I am so easily shot down. I’d much rather the job would be done by somebody who is young and a real expert. But unfortunately, those people don’t come forward. e360: Are there people who are knowledgeable about this topic who could do the job of pointing out what you see as the flaws? Dyson: I am sure there are. But I don’t know who they are. I have a lot of friends who think the same way I do. But I am sorry to say that most of them are old, and most of them are not experts. My views are very widely shared. Anyway, the ideal protagonist I am still looking for. So the answer to your question is, I will do the job if nobody else shows up, but I regard it as a duty rather than as a pleasure. e360: Because it is important for you that people not take drastic actions about a problem that you are not convinced exists? Dyson: Yes. And **I feel very strongly that China and India getting rich is the most important thing that’s going on in the world at present. That’s a real revolution, that the center of gravity of the whole population of the world would be middle class, and that’s a wonderful thing to happen. It would be a shame if we persuade them to stop that just for the sake of a problem that’s not that serious. And I’m happy every time I see that the Chinese and Indians make a strong statement about going ahead with burning coal. Because that’s what it really depends on, is coal. They can’t do without coal. We could, but they certainly can’t.** So I think it is very important that they should not be under pressure. Luckily they are, in fact, pretty self-confident; (neither) of those countries pays too much attention to us. But that’s my motivation... Anyhow, I think we have probably said enough.

**It is hubris to attribute all climate change to human activity – the impacts are not as extreme as they are being made out to be – and economic growth in developing countries outweighs**

**Christy 7 (John R.,** director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and a participant in the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, **“My Nobel Moment,”** <http://www.johnkaighn.com/nobel.html>)

I've had a lot of fun recently with my tiny (and unofficial) slice of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize awarded to the lntergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). But, though I as one of thousands of IPCC participants, I don't think I will add "0.0001 Nobel Laureate" to my resume. The other 'half of the prize was awarded to former Vice President Al Gore, whose carbon footprint would stomp my neighborhood flat. But that's another story. Both halves of the award honor promoting the message that Earth's temperature is rising due to human-based emissions of greenhouse gases. The Nobel committee praises Mr. Gore and the IPCC for "alerting us to a potential catastrophe and for spurring us to a carbonless economy. I'm sure the majority (but not all) of my IPCC colleagues cringe when I say this, but **I see neither the developing catastrophe nor the smoking gun proving that human activity is to blame for most of the warming we see. Rather, I see a reliance on climate models (useful but never "proof") and the coincidence that changes in carbon dioxide and global temperatures have loose similarity over time.** Not all of us climate scientists are panicked about global warming. **There are some of us who remain so humbled by the task of measuring and understanding the extraordinarily complex climate system that we are skeptical of our ability to know what it is doing and why. As we build climate data sets, from scratch and look into the guts of the climate system, however, we don't find the alarmist theory matching observations.** (The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration satellite data we analyze at the University of Alabama in Huntsville does show modest warming - around 2.5 degrees Fahrenheit per century, if current warming trends of 0.25 degrees per decade continue.) It is my turn to cringe when I hear overstated confidence from those who describe the projected evolution of global weather patterns over the next 100 years, especially when I consider how difficult it is to accurately predict that system's behavior over the next five days. Mother Nature simply operates at a level of complexity that is, at this point, beyond the mastery of mere mortals (such as scientists) and the tools available to us. As my high school physics teacher admonished us in those we-shall-conquer-the-world-with-a-slide-rule days, "Begin all of your scientific pronouncements with 'At our present level of ignorance, we think we know . . .” I haven't seen that type of climate humility lately.   Rather I see jump to conclusions advocates and, unfortunately, some scientists who see in every weather anomaly the specter of a global-warming apocalypse.  **Explaining each successive phenomenon as a result of human action gives them comfort and an easy answer. Others of us scratch our heads and try to understand the real causes behind what we see. We discount the possibility that everything is caused by human actions, because everything we've seen the climate do has happened before.  Sea levels rise and fall continually. The Arctic ice cap has shrunk before. One millennium there are hippos swimming in the Thames, and a geological blink later there is an ice bridge linking Asia and North America. One of the challenges in studying global climate is keeping a global perspective, especially when much of the research focuses on data gathered from spots around the globe.**  Often observations from one region get more attention than equally valid data from another. The recent CNN report "Planet in Peril," for instance, spent considerable time discussing shrinking Arc tic sea ice cover. CNN did not note that winter sea ice around Antarctica last month set a record maximum (yes, maximum) for coverage since aerial measurements started. Then there is the challenge of translating global trends to local climate. For instance, hasn't global warming led to the five-year drought and fires in the U.S. Southwest? Not necessarily. There has been a drought, but it would be a stretch to link this drought to carbon dioxide. If you look at the 1,000-year climate record for the western U.S. you will see not five-year but 50-year-Iong droughts. The 12th and 13th centuries were particularly dry.  The inconvenient truth is that the last century has been fairly benign in the American West. A return to the region's long-term "normal" climate would present huge challenges for urban planners. Without a doubt, atmospheric carbon dioxide is increasing due primarily to carbon-based energy production (with its undisputed benefits to humanity) and many people ardently. Believe we must "do something" about its alleged consequence, global warming.  This might seem like a legitimate concern given the potential disasters that are announced almost daily, so I've looked at a couple of ways in which humans might reduce CO2 emissions and their impact on temperatures. California and some Northeastern states have decided to force their residents to buy cars that average 43 miles-per-gallon within the next decade. Even if you applied this law to the entire world, the net effect would reduce projected warming by about 0.05 degrees Fahrenheit by 2100, an amount so minuscule as to be undetectable. Global temperatures vary more than that from day to day. **Suppose you are very serious about making a dent in carbon emissions and could replace about 10% of the world's energy sources with non-CO2-emitting nuclear power by 2020-roughly equivalent to halving U.S. emissions.  Based on IPCC-like projections, the required 1,000. new nuclear power plants would slow the warming by about 0.2 degrees Fahrenheit per century. It's a dent. But what is the economic and human price, and what is it worth given the scientific uncertainty? My experience as a missionary teacher in Africa opened my eyes to this simple fact:  Without access to energy, life is brutal and short. The uncertain impacts of global warming far in the future must be weighed against disasters at our doorsteps today.** Bjorn Lomborg's Copenhagen-Consensus 2004, a cost-benefit analysis of health issues by leading economists (including three Nobelists), calculated that spending on health issues such as micronutrients for children, HIV/AIDS and water purification has benefits 50 to 200 times those of attempting to marginally limit "global warming." Given the scientific uncertainty and our relative impotence regarding climate change, the moral imperative here seems clear to me.

**Climate change data is flawed – urban centers and oversensitive thermometers**

**Balling 3** (Robert, Director of the Office of Climatology at Arizona State University, “The Increase in Global Temperature: What it Does and Does Not Tell Us,” Marshall Institute Policy Outlook, September 2003, <http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/170.pdf>)

Missing Data. One of the problems with the¶ surface temperature record is that **substantial¶ parts of the globe lack the measurements¶ needed to generate monthly temperature¶ records for various 5° latitude by 5° longitude¶ grid cells. Ocean areas off major shipping¶ lanes, ice-covered areas, and many desert and¶ mountainous areas often lack temperature¶ records. And not surprisingly, the area of the Earth¶ without valid data increases¶ further back in time and also¶ during periods of global¶ strife.** Less than 30 percent¶ of the planet had temperature records at various¶ times in the 20th century,¶ and even today, fully 20 percent of Earth is not¶ covered by the Jones database (Figure 2). While¶ missing data poses substantial problems for¶ generating an accurate trend over the past¶ 100-plus years, it is noteworthy that **global¶ temperature has increased during the past¶ three decades, a period when coverage has¶ hovered near 80 percent. Still, the amount of¶ bias resulting from missing data is unknown.**¶ Urban Heat Island. **Many weather stations¶ are located in growing urban areas where the¶ climatic effects of the urbanization process may¶ overwhelm the effects of the buildup of¶ greenhouse gases.** Energy reaching the Earth’s¶ surface can be either reflected or absorbed.¶ Some of the energy that is absorbed heats the¶ Earth and air, and evaporates surface water;¶ the rest is re-radiated. Urbanization affects¶ these processes in several ways. The most¶ important is the waterproofing of the urban¶ surface. **In many cities, the natural vegetation¶ is largely removed, and the surface covered¶ by nearly impervious materials. Precipitation¶ quickly runs off the urban surface into**¶ One of the problems with the¶ surface temperature record is¶ that substantial parts of the¶ globe lack the measurements¶ needed to generate monthly¶ temperature records...**underground storm sewers, minimizing surface¶ moisture in the city. As a result, some of the¶ climate system energy that would have been¶ used to evaporate water is used to heat the¶ surface and air. Other¶ effects of urbanization¶ include heat storage by¶ concrete, asphalt, and other¶ building materials; urban¶ canyons that reduce the reradiation of climate system¶ energy; release of heat from¶ a variety of anthropogenic¶ activities within the city;¶ and the trapping of re-radiated energy by soot¶ and other low-level atmospheric aerosols.**¶ There is no doubt that urbanization leads to¶ warming. In its latest assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)¶ estimated that urbanization has added 0.006°C¶ per decade to global warming, about nine¶ percent of the global warming rate of 0.069°C¶ per decade over the 1900 - 2002 time period.¶ Instrument Problems and Adjustments.¶ **Traditional mercury-in-glass thermometers are being replaced worldwide by** thermistors,¶ **electronic instruments capable of continuous temperature monitoring. The change in instruments may be introducing a warming bias into the record for three reasons. ¶ 1. During the summer season, turbulent¶ eddies of air pass by instrument shelters.¶ In the past, the warm¶ eddies would have passed¶ by the glass thermometers¶ too quickly to heat the¶ glass and mercury. But the¶ new, highly sensitive electronic sensors immediately recognize and record the¶ temperature of each turbulent eddy, and as a result increase daily temperature readings. ¶ 2. The shelter itself introduces yet another¶ warming trend; its fresh white paint**, which¶ deteriorates over time, **changes the shelter’s¶ reflectivity** ultimately the temperature¶ within the shelter. ¶ 3. **The use of continuous temperature monitors also removes the cooling bias that was¶ introduced by reading temperatures early in¶ the morning, formerly standard practice**,¶ which has been shown to contribute over¶ 0.05°C per decade to reported temperatures¶ in the U.S. Figure 2. Plot of area of the Earth with valid near-surface air temperature data from 1900 to 2002.¶ **Many weather stations are¶ located in growing urban areas¶ where the climatic effects of the¶ urbanization process may¶ overwhelm the effects of the¶ buildup of greenhouse gases. Because the spread of¶ thermistors has occurred¶ primarily in the last three¶ decades and mainly in the¶ industrialized and developed world, a reasonable¶ upper limit for its effect on¶ overall global warming is¶ about 0.10-0.15°C. ¶ Finally, many weather stations have been¶ moved from colder river valleys to warmer¶ airport sites, leading to a warming bias in the¶ temperature record. Clearly, such inadvertent,¶ but very real, warming biases can and do affect¶ temperature records on local, regional, hemispheric, and global scales.** In combination,¶ they could artificially inflate the observed¶ warming by 0.2 to 0.3ºC.¶ With 71 percent of the earth covered by¶ ocean, any discussion of temperature bias must¶ acknowledge the special problems of measurements over the water. Many marine “surface”¶ temperatures are measurements of the temperature of the ocean, not the air adjacent to its¶ surface; the assumption being that the surface¶ water temperatures would be close to air temperature, particularly at night. Some vessels¶ had weather stations on board to measure¶ actual air temperature; of course, the accuracy¶ of a weather station on the deck of the ship¶ would be impacted by its position and the¶ actual height of the deck above the sea surface.¶ In 2001, Christy et al. concluded that trends¶ in sea-surface temperatures are not the same¶ as trends in air temperature and that using¶ sea-surface temperature measurements for¶ air temperature measurements may compromise the¶ depiction of temperatures¶ through time.¶ The problems with¶ the historical temperature¶ records notwithstanding, it¶ is very likely that the recent¶ upward trend in Figure 1 is¶ very real and that the upward signal is greater¶ than any noise introduced from uncertainties in¶ the record. However, the general error is most¶ likely to be in the warming direction, with a¶ maximum possible (though unlikely) value of¶ 0.3°C. The indicated rise of 0.7ºC is likely to be¶ an overestimate. ¶ However, the retreat of mountain glaciers,¶ decrease in spring snow cover and sea ice, and¶ the increase in water vapor are all consistent¶ with surface warming in recent decades. **It is¶ tempting to conclude that the warming in the¶ historical temperature record is a response to¶ the buildup of greenhouse gases, but many¶ other possible explanations exist.**

#### Studies prove that the Earth has not been warming for the past 15 years.

Rose 12 (January 29. David. Writer for the Science DailyMail . “Forget global warming- it’s Cycle 25 We need to worry about”. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2093264/Forget-global-warming--Cycle-25-need-worry-NASA-scientists-right-Thames-freezing-again.html#ixzz21TUHEyqA> Pismarov)

The supposed ‘consensus’ on man-made global warming is facing an inconvenient challenge after the release of new temperature data showing the planet has not warmed for the past 15 years. The figures suggest that we could even be heading for a mini ice age to rival the 70-year temperature drop that saw frost fairs held on the Thames in the 17th Century. Based on readings from more than 30,000 measuring stations, the data was issued last week without fanfare by the Met Office and the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit. It confirms that the rising trend in world temperatures ended in 1997. Meanwhile, leading climate scientists yesterday told The Mail on Sunday that, after emitting unusually high levels of energy throughout the 20th Century, the sun is now heading towards a ‘grand minimum’ in its output, threatening cold summers, bitter winters and a shortening of the season available for growing food. Solar output goes through 11-year cycles, with high numbers of sunspots seen at their peak. We are now at what should be the peak of what scientists call ‘Cycle 24’ – which is why last week’s solar storm resulted in sightings of the aurora borealis further south than usual. But sunspot numbers are running at less than half those seen during cycle peaks in the 20th Century. Analysis by experts at NASA and the University of Arizona – derived from magnetic-field measurements 120,000 miles beneath the sun’s surface – suggest that Cycle 25, whose peak is due in 2022, will be a great deal weaker still. According to a paper issued last week by the Met Office, there is a 92 per cent chance that both Cycle 25 and those taking place in the following decades will be as weak as, or weaker than, the ‘Dalton minimum’ of 1790 to 1830.

#### No warming- studies are inaccurate.

Moore 95 (Thomas Gale. Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution. “Global Warming: A Boon to Humans and Other Animals” <http://www.stanford.edu/~moore/Boon_To_Man.html> Pismarov)

In fact, the evidence supporting the claim that the earth has grown warmer is shaky; the theory is weak; and the models on which the conclusions are based cannot even replicate the current climate. It is asserted, for example, that over the last hundred years the average temperature at the earth's surface has gone up by 0.5deg. Centigrade or about 1deg. Fahrenheit. Given the paucity of data in the Southern Hemisphere, the evidence that in the United States, with the best records, temperatures have failed to rise; the British naval records that find no significant change in temperatures at sea since the mid-1800s; and that the reported increases occurred mainly prior to 1940 -- before the rapid rise in CO2 -- the public is entitled to be wary. Moreover, even the National Academy of Sciences is skeptical of the validity of the computer models and warns that the modeling of clouds -- a key factor -- is inadequate and poorly understood.

### ---XT: CO2 K2 Ag

#### Allowing the CO2 levels to rise is key to plant growth. 700 million more people will be inhabiting the earth by 2016. Doing the plan is a misguided effort to stop warming will inevitably cause the aff’s impacts- that’s Idso.

#### CO2 is good- key to agriculture and forests.

Worstall 12 (Tim. Fellow at the Adam Institute in London and a Forbes Contributor. “Global Warming Will Increase Tropical Rain Forests” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2012/07/08/global-warming-will-increase-tropical-forests/> Pismarov)

Climate change, this global warming thing, it's going to mean that the tropical forests frazzle up and then we all die, right? It will mean the death of the "lungs of the planet" – such as the miles upon miles of Amazon jungle – which turn CO2 into the O2 that we inhale. It's up for humanity, basically. Except, according to one new [paper](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nature11238.html) in *Nature*, that's not the way it will work. CO2 is indeed plant food and more plant food means more plants, more forests and thus we're all saved: or perhaps not quite as screwed as some seem to think at least. The point is this: Experimental studies have generally shown that plants do not show a large response to CO2fertilisation. “However, most of these studies were conducted in northern ecosystems or on commercially important species” explains Steven Higgins, lead author of the study from the Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre and Goethe-University. “In fact, only one experimental study has investigated how savanna plants will respond to changing CO2concentrations and this study showed that savanna trees were essentially CO2-starved under pre-industrial CO2 concentrations, and that their growth really starts taking off at the CO2 concentrations we are currently experiencing.“ Purists will cavil at this description, but grasslands and forests compete with each other. Forest cover kills off the grass and thus grasslands only thrive where trees don't. Savannas are, to a useful level of truth, the front line where the battle is taking place. As the paper points out, the trees on these savannas are finding their growth limited by the amount of food they can get: the CO2 from the atmosphere. As we burn more fossils that will go up, the trees will get more food and forests will advance across those grasslands.

### ---XT: WarmingBiodiversity

#### Warmer temperatures will extend ranges of thousands of plants and animals to move towards the poles and expand opportunities to grow- that’s Avery.

#### We can’t stop global warming- past the tipping point

**Wentz 6/29** (Skip, Writer for the Independent Record, June 29, 2011 12:00 am “Are we at the point of no return?” [http://helenair.com/lifestyles/article\_42755e46- AT10-11e0-a33e-001cc4c002e0.html](http://helenair.com/lifestyles/article_42755e46-a210-11e0-a33e-001cc4c002e0.html) Pismarov)

About 20 years ago, I read a book on global warming called “The Next One Hundred Years.” The book was filled with dire — and, as it turns out, alarmingly accurate predictions — about what would happen as the earth heated up: There would be an uptick in violent, unpredictable storms, severe droughts in arid regions and massive flooding elsewhere. Disappearing glaciers would threaten much of the world’s water supply as rising seas inundated coastlines. Furthermore, the author maintained that we had already loaded the atmosphere with so much heat-trapping carbon dioxide that, even if we stopped adding CO2 right then, it would take more than a century for the atmosphere to revert to natural, pre-industrial levels. I became depressed, because I knew that CO2 pollution and other environmental degradation would only increase in the coming decades. It seemed that my efforts on behalf of the environment — starting an “ecological design” program at an architecture school and trying to live an environmentally conscious life — would have no effect against the industrial and financial juggernaut that was gobbling up the planet’s resources and spitting them out as pollution. Still, being both a hopeful and a defiant soul, and seeing humanity’s back against the wall, so to speak, I vowed to fight on, learning about and teaching environmentalism. Early prognosticators thought we had two or three generations to turn things around; the serious effects of global warming would manifest themselves about 2050. Perhaps humanity would change its ways before it was too late. But I was also aware of the imminent threat of uncontrollable feedback loops that could be triggered by global warming: how heat-reflecting ice could melt, exposing the dark, heat-absorbing water or land beneath it to sunlight; and those warmer masses, in turn, would accelerate the melting of the ice. Or how the warming of the frozen tundra could release huge quantities of methane, a greenhouse gas that traps 20 to 40 times as much heat as CO2; and the newly trapped heat would accelerate the warming of the tundra. Once such massive feedback loops get started, there is nothing humans can do to stop them. So I decided to keep an eye on the planet’s feedback loops to assess humanity’s chances as the situation developed. When I read “The Next One Hundred Years,” the CO2 content of the atmosphere was below 350 parts per million (ppm), the maximum level most experts think could ensure climate stability. Two decades have passed and no serious efforts have been made to reduce our CO2 output, which now stands at 394 ppm and is climbing rapidly. Along the way I learned about peak oil, peak uranium, peak food supply … peak everything, including the peak capacity of the oceans to sequester CO2. But like most people, I stubbornly clung to the idea that we would have time to address these mounting problems, to adjust, to fix things. Then suddenly, almost imperceptibly, the predictions started coming true. Look at the past two years: record floods in Pakistan, Australia and Mississippi. Rising seas inundating Bangladesh and Micronesia. Record drought and fires in Russia, Australia, Arizona. Record springtime tornadoes in the midwest and south. The peaks are peaking, the ice is melting, the tundra thawing and the feedback loops rolling — two generations ahead of schedule. It’s too late — we’ve passed the environmental tipping point, and everything will change

### ---XT: Ice Age

#### Warming prevents the ice age.

Business Wire 91 (Feb 14. Press Release. “Study: global warming may be beneficial,” Lexis. Pismarov)

Global warming may be needed in order to prevent the next ice age, which is long overdue on nature's timetable, according to a study produced by the National Center for Policy Analysis. ''The costs of global warming are being exaggerated and the benefits are being ignored,'' said the study's author, Kent Jeffreys, who is director of environmental studies at the Competitive Enterprise Institute in Washington. Drawing on scientific evidence which Jeffreys says has been overlooked in the global warming policy debate, the study says that: -- In the past two to three million years, the earth's temperature has gone through at least 17 climate cycles, with ice ages lasting about 100,000 years interrupted by warm periods lasting about 10,000 years. -- Since the current warm period is about 13,000 years old, the next ice age is long overdue. -- During the coldest period of the last ice age, about 25,000 years ago, most of North America was completely covered by ice. ''The natural temperature of the earth is cold, not warm,'' said Jeffreys. ''The warm temperature we now enjoy has existed only 10 percent of the time over the last three million years and only 2 percent of the time over the last 15 million years.'' Jeffreys said there is no hard evidence that we are experiencing a global warming. But it may be just what is needed. ''Enhancing the greenhouse effect may be necessary for our survival,'' he said. The study said that human emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) from the use of carbon-based fuels may have other benefits for the planet. According to Jeffreys: -- Humans contribute only 5 percent of the CO2 in the atmosphere, while nature contributes 95 percent. -- Throughout the earth's 4.5 billion year history there have been wide swings in the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere, but the long-term trend is toward less CO2. -- If the long-term trend continues, and there is no scientific reason why it should not, the earth will eventually become a lifeless planet

#### Ice age is inevitable – there’s only a risk that warming prevents it.

Flam ’02 (August 23. Faye. Philadelphia Inquirer, “It's hot now, but scientists predict there's an ice age coming,” Pismarov)

The Earth's orbit actually gets more elliptical, making the seasonal variations more extreme. Right now the orbit is relatively round. Currently, the earth is closest to the sun in the northern hemisphere's winter, making the winters milder and summers cooler. Most of the Earth's land is now in the northern hemisphere, so this situation means more snow can stay on the ground all summer, reflecting more sunlight away and thereby pulling the temperature further down, which encourages still more snow and more cooling. That could start to pull us back into the next ice age. Without human influence, the cycle is likely to repeat. But now the total concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is more than 30 percent higher than it was at the beginning of the century, and temperatures are rising. "The warming will certainly launch us into a new interval in terms of climate, far outside what we've seen before," said Crowley. He said it's a big enough influence to cause the cycle of ice ages to "skip a beat."

## Oil Dependence

### Oil Advantage Frontline

#### 1 - Foreign oil dependence low now---domestic production is taking the lead

White 11, Writer for the LA Times-­Ron White covers the maritime industry, trade, transportation and the oil industry. He spent 15 years as a reporter, editor and editorial writer at the Washington Post. 10/29/11[Ronald, “U.S. dependence on foreign oil wanes as domestic production booms” LA Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/oct/29/business/la-fi-oil-boom-20111029]ADravid'

U.S. dependence on foreign oil wanes as domestic production booms Energy producers are using technology and new drilling techniques to find crude and coax more production from old wells. October 29, 2011|By Ronald D. White, Los Angeles Times In a downtown Los Angeles skyscraper, Hal Washburn is drilling for oil. Using a black high-definition computer screen, the petroleum engineer traces the ghostly white outlines of century-year-old vertical oil wells punctuated by the bright green and red of more recent efforts. The newer wells flare with what look like thousands of tiny hairs; the hotter the color, the greater the amount of oil. "Today, we drill a lot of wells on the computer before we drill underground," said Washburn, chief executive of Breitburn Energy Partners. The new crude being tapped — on screen and in real life — comes from Santa Barbara County's Orcutt oil field, one of the state's oldest, previously thought to be in terminal decline. "It's been a huge home run for us," Washburn said. Domestic energy producers like Breitburn have helped reverse the nation's once-escalating dependence on foreign oil by finding new ways to figure out the secrets buried beneath our feet. U.S. net petroleum imports have fallen to about 47% of the nation's consumption, down from a record 60.3% in 2005, Energy Information Administration statistics show. It's been 15 years since the nation's reliance on foreign oil has been this low. Several factors figure into the import decline, but a big one is a little surprising: U.S. petroleum exploration is experiencing a quiet renaissance with the help of technology and new drilling techniques. The number of oil rigs in production in the U.S. has reached a 24-year high, according to oil field services company Baker Hughes. In 2005, domestic production was 1.89 billion barrels. This year, experts say, production is expected to surpass 2 billion barrels. Over the last decade, geoscientists and engineers have come as close as technologically possible to creating a transparent image of the underground, bringing new life to old wells and finding billion-barrel formations, called "elephants." "What's happening across the U.S. demonstrates how technology again and again opens new doors, and also old doors, that people thought were closed forever," l "Three-dimensional seismic technology has become much more sophisticated. New drilling methods allow them to penetrate formations that were once thought to be impenetrable. So we've seen a lot of investment dollars going back into areas that had appeared very unpromising." Orcutt is one example. In 1901, wildcatters found "brown shale," a sign that oil was present in exploitable quantities. But they bypassed that shallow layer and went straight down; various operators eventually drilled nearly 2,000 vertical wells that averaged about 3,000 feet in depth. Breitburn acquired the field in 2004 and determined that the shallow layer of diatomite — a very porous, lightweight rock — contained more oil than any other part of the formation. "They didn't have the science. They didn't have a clue," said Breitburn's William S. Fong, senior staff reservoir engineer. "We have doubled the oil production in this field, and it is all coming from the shallow layer, no more than 900 feet deep." Monthly oil production at Orcutt has climbed to nearly 90,000 barrels from 50,000 barrels. In Santa Fe Springs, another Breitburn oil field is delivering about 2,000 barrels a day rather than the 700 barrels a day it would have using old vertical well techniques. The gains have come from offset angle drilling, where the wells are dug at angles between 45 degrees and 80 degrees, into areas between old vertical wells where crude still remains, said Chuck Hawkins, Breitburn's project manager. Breitburn isn't the only California oil company looking to reverse California's long decline in oil production. Over the last five years, privately held Signal Hill Petroleum has buried 6,000 small yellow canisters around Long Beach and Signal Hill that contain sophisticated equipment so sensitive it can record the vibrations of a person walking past. The devices work in tandem with the company's fleet of "vibroseis" trucks, 68,000-pound vehicles that use hydraulics to bounce. The bouncing trucks produce vibrations that create images of formations as far as 3 miles underground, said Dave Slater, chief operating officer for Signal Hill Petroleum. Slater says his small, 110-employee company and a subsidiary, the 70-employee Nodal Seismic, have sunk "tens of millions of dollars" into the effort. **When we import oil, we really get no jobs out of it, no taxes from that oil. It's just a huge suction on the economy** "," Slater said. "And down below us, we believe there is a lot of oil that hasn't been tapped." The leading edge of the production boom has come in parts of Texas, such as the Eagle Ford shale formation and the Permian Basin, as well as the Bakken formation, a huge reservoir under parts of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana and Saskatchewan, said Fadel Gheit, senior energy analyst for Oppenheimer and Co. Gheit added that much of the work is from smaller oil companies that few people are familiar with. There's so much oil coming out of the Bakken formation that it has outstripped the existing pipeline capacity to move it to refineries for processing. Railroads such as BNSF and Canadian National have been pressed into service to move some of the crude. New production isn't the only reason for the drop in foreign oil dependency. Ethanol now accounts for a larger share of every gallon of gasoline, reducing the amount of refined oil needed. In addition, U.S. demand for gasoline and other refined products has declined, in part from the global recession and subsequent weak economic recovery. Refineries also have gotten more efficient and waste less oil in processing fuels. But the most important change has been "the ability to make the ground below seem transparent," said Jonathan G. Kuespert, Breitburn's senior geoscience advisor. "We were never able to do that before."

#### 2 - No peak oil---oil supply capacity is growing faster than consumption

Perry 12,Dr. Mark J. Perry is a professor of economics and finance in the School of Management at the Flint campus of the University of Michigan. Perry holds two graduate degrees in economics (M.A. and Ph.D.) from George Mason University in Washington, D.C. In addition, he holds an MBA degree in finance from the Curtis L. Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. Since 1997, Professor Perry has been a member of the Board of Scholars for the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, a nonpartisan research and public policy institute in Michigan, 6/26/12[Mark, “No Peak Oil In Sight: We’ve Got An Unprecedented Upsurge In Global Oil Production Underway” Daily Markets, <http://www.dailymarkets.com/ec>onomy/2012 /06/26/no-peak-oil-in-sight-weve-got-an-unprecedented-upsurge-in-global-oil-production-underway/]ADravid

**The global oil boom underway represents the most significant increase in any decade since the 1980s.**In the tradition of resource economist Julian Simon, here are some of the conclusions and predictions from new research just published by Harvard Research Fellow Leonardo Maugeri, titled “Oil: The Next Revolution; The Unprecedented Upsurge of Oil Production Capacity”" 1. **Contrary to what most people believe, oil is not in short supply and oil supply capacity is growing worldwide at such an unprecedented level that it might outpace consumption. From a purely physical point of view, there are huge volumes of conventional and unconventional oils still to be developed, with no “peak-oil” in sight. The full deployment of the world’s oil potential depends only on price, technology, and political factors. More than 80 percent of the additional production under development globally appears to be profitable with a price of oil higher than $70 per barrel. 2. The shale/tight oil boom in the United States is not a temporary bubble, but the most important revolution in the oil sector in decades. It will probably trigger worldwide emulation, although the U.S. boom is difficult to be replicated given the unique features of the U.S. oil (and gas) arena. Whatever the timing, emulation over the next decades might bear surprising results, given the fact that most shale/tight oil resources in the world are still unknown and untapped.** China appears to be the first country to follow the U.S. example. Moreover**, the extension of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing combined to conventional oil fields might dramatically increase world’s oil production and revive mature, declining oilfields**. 3. In the aggregate, **conventional oil production is also growing throughout the world,** although some areas (e.g. the North Sea), face an apparently irreversible decline of the production capacity. In most traditional producing countries, **old oilfields go through a production revival thanks to better techniques and knowledge, or advanced exploration and production technologies,** so far used only in the U.S. and in the North Sea. Huge parts of the world are still relatively unexplored for conventional oil (for example, the Arctic Sea or most of sub-Saharan Africa). 4. **Over the next decades, the growing role of unconventional oils will make the Western hemisphere the new center of gravity of oil exploration and production. 5. Based on original, bottom-up, field-by-field analysis of most oil exploration and development projects in the world, this paper suggests that an unrestricted, additional production of more than 49 million barrels per day (mbd) of oil is targeted for 2020, the equivalent of more than half the current world production capacity of 93 mbd.** 6. After adjusting this substantial figure considering the risk factors affecting the actual accomplishment of the projects on a country-by-country basis, the additional production that could come by 2020 is about 29 mbd. Factoring in depletion rates of currently producing oilfields and their “reserve growth,” the net additional production capacity by 2020 could be 17.6 mbd, yielding a world oil production capacity of 110.6 mbd by that date – as shown in Figure 1 above. This would represent the most significant increase in any decade since the 1980s. MP: **Peak what?**

#### 3 - Oil shocks unlikely---geopolitical considerations exaggerated

**Yetiv 12,** Dr. Steve Yetiv is University Professor of Political Science and International Studies at Old Dominion University.-- He received Harvard University awards for excellence in teaching (1992 and 1993); the U.S. Secretary of State's Open Forum Distinguished Public Service Award from the U.S. State Department for "contributions to national and international affairs"(1996); the Virginia Social Science Association's Scholar Award (1999); the Choice Outstanding Academic Book awards (in 1998 and in 2005); the Robert L. Stern Award for Outstanding Teacher from ODU's College of Arts & Letters (2007); the Burgess Award for outstanding researcher in the College of Arts & Letters (2010); and ODU’s University Professor designation (2010-) 3/4/12[Steve, “Oil Shock Not as Likely as You Think” Jakarta Globe, [http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/commentary/oil-shock-not-as-likely-as-you-think/508788]ADravid](http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/commentary/oil-shock-not-as-likely-as-you-think/508788%5dADravid)

**Oil prices are up more than 30 percent from six months ago amid fears that Israel or the United States may strike Iran. Concerns have spread that military conflict would cause a major shock to oil prices, damaging the US and global economies. While the situation is serious, such predictions are unlikely to pan out.** **Understanding how such fears are exaggerated would clarify the stakes in the standoff and underscore how scholars, market analysts and oil traders often overestimate the effect geopolitical events will have on prices**. For starters, **Iran and Saudi Arabia have been at loggerheads since Iran’s 1979 revolution,** with Tehran intermittently trying to undermine the Saudi regime. The last thing Sunni-dominated Saudi Arabia wants is a nuclear Shiite Iran to which it would have to kowtow. **The Saudis are ready to use their spare and idle oil capacity to make up for any disruption in the 2.4 million barrels Iran exports per day, as the Saudi oil minister recently noted. In the event of war, it is almost certain that the United States would coordinate an oil release with the International Energy Agency. The IEA requires each of its 28 members to hold enough oil in the form of international oil company stocks and/or strategic petroleum reserves to withstand a total cutoff of imports for 90 days.** When the US-led coalition attacked Iraqi forces in Kuwait in 1991, a US-IEA joint release helped significantly lower world oil prices. **Even if the IEA does not act, the United States has strategic oil reserves it could release on its own. IEA members hold more than 1.6 billion barrels of oil, with the United States alone holding well over 700 million barrels. That capacity could be used to defray the loss of Iran’s oil exports for many months.** President Obama referred to this capacity Friday when noting that new sanctions that target Iran’s oil exports on Iran would not harm allies. Recent tensions sparked fears that Iran would close the Strait of Hormuz, through which 17 percent of the world’s oil flows**. Tehran can certainly disrupt oil transit, but, whatever its threats, it does not have the capability to challenge the US Navy for long.** Such a fight would be one of history’s biggest mismatches. **Another concern is that terror groups Hamas and Hezbollah, which are linked to Iran and sometimes viewed as its proxies, would attack Israel** if the Jewish state or the United States strikes Iran. That is quite possible. But **such conflicts have little to do with oil disruptions. Oil traders would eventually understand that an Israeli border conflict means little for oil prices** unless it triggers a wider Middle East battle, such as the 1973 Arab-Israeli war. The chances of that are slim unless one believes that Sunni, Arab Egypt — a state in chaos — would suddenly align with Shiite, Persian Iran, an unprecedented alliance. And without Egypt, a broader war is not possible. Those concerned about the fallout of a war with Iran should also consider that Libya’s oil exports, which were cut off from February to October last year, are likely to reach pre-conflict levels in the next three to six months. That is one less constraint on the global oil supply. We should also consider that Europe’s economic woes, the lackluster US economy and China’s slowing rate of growth are restraining the global demand for oil. Prices would jump much more if an Iran war coincided with higher global economic growth and oil demand. And what of oil speculators? They are driving prices higher, hoping to make a quick buck on rate changes. Speculators would probably start to sell oil futures as war breaks out, seeking to cash in on their bets. This is another factor that would cause prices to fall. Would all these conditions remain the same if Israel, and not the United States, were to attack Iran? Probably, because the United States, the IEA and Saudi Arabia are committed to price stability during major crises and because markets will work regardless of antagonists. The Saudis would act in part because they want to see Iran fail. And Washington would likely be dragged into any conflict. During the past two decades, **oil traders and security analysts have repeatedly overestimated the effect global crises would have on oil prices**. Last year, for example, it was feared that the Arab Spring would undermine the Saudi regime and drive oil prices through the roof, but this never happened. Consider, too, that Turkey’s invasion of northern Iraq in 2008, to squash the Kurdish rebels, drove oil prices higher — even though the action had no impact on oil supply and delivery. The potential crisis with Iran may well turn out to be another example of exaggerated fears. If war comes, **oil prices will surely rise. But contrary to conventional wisdom, they are not likely to stay high for long.**

#### 4 - Oil dependence better than alternatives---transition will negatively impact economy and consumers

Mutasem 12,Sam is a Senior Executive in the power industry with 25 years experience in Operations, Maintenance and Asset Management. He was Managing Director for a fortune 500 independent power company, responsible for a portfolio of 11 power plants totaling 6000 MW, as well as a $1 Billion international power generation company overseeing four separate IPP businesses. Sam has earned a B.S degree from the University of Texas and an MBA from the University of Houston. He is a member of the Board of Directors at Circle Energy Oil & Gas, the American Management Association and the Gulf Coast Power Association. Sam also is registered professional Engineer in the state of Texas. 3/1/12[Sam, “Dependence on Oil...Good or Bad?” Energy Pulse, [http://www.energypulse.net/centers/article/article\_display.cfm?a\_id=2512]ADravid](http://www.energypulse.net/centers/article/article_display.cfm?a_id=2512%5dADravid)

**Many** in the energy industry, due to varying reasons and drivers, **express a great need to reduce or eliminate our dependence on foreign oil as quickly as possible...a matter of National Security. I agree the lower the dependence on foreign oil would eliminate many of the economic uncertainties associated with political unrest around the world, disruption of supplies, and the continually increasing demand. These factors impact the cost of living of the American consumer and may squeeze corporate profits. With the world getting smaller and the economies are interdependent, commodity price in the US will follow the global price. So whether we depend on foreign oil to some extent or eliminate it all together the domestic price of oil will be set by the global market and if the price is up companies will certainly not sell it for less just because we are not importing any oil.** As it is, the US imports 20% of its needs from Canada and only 8% from the Middle East. The remainder is produced domestically. On the other hand, **if we drive to reduce the global dependence on oil, until we find an alternative, we will negatively impact the US economy and the US consumer**. One fact that most do not realize is that **all the oil traded globally is nominated in US dollar**. What does that mean? **As the demand on oil increase so does the price. As a result the demand on the US dollar will increase and so will the purchasing power of the American Consumer. The Dollar...remains King**! Therefore **the drive to reduce dependence on oil may have its benefits, but it will come at a cost that should be mitigated as an integral part of the strategy to reduce dependence on oil. Reducing dependence on oil cannot be approached with a tunnel vision strategy because the lower the dependence on oil the lower the demand on the dollar and the lower the purchasing power of the American consumer.** So, what is more...a matter of National Security? In my opinion **there is no alternative to a diversified strategy particularly when it comes to energy and natural resources**. This includes diversification in the fuel mix we use, the sources of the fuels, and the markets we target. Although we should continue to develop and advance renewable energy, there is no question in my mind that oil, natural gas, and coal will remain the dominant fuels for the foreseeable future because these fuels are abundant and economical. What we need to focus on is making these fuels more environmentally friendly by aggressively investing and developing new technologies to accomplish that. Yes, with such a strategy, there will remain uncertainties that we will have to deal with. However this approach will mitigate our risks and help...Keep the Dollar as King. The question for those who advocate to eliminate our dependence on oil, how do you propose maintain the value of the dollar as the demand on the dollar and our purchasing power decrease?

#### 5 - US Uses Oil Dependency as leverage for global stability– We Get it from Our Tech and Expertise

Howard 08 Roger Howard is a writer and broadcaster specializing in the Middle east. A recent publication of his was “Iran Oil: The New Middle East Challenge to America and The Oil Hunters: Exploration and Espionage in the Middle East” (“An Ode to Oil”, Wall Street Journal, 11/29/2008) Kerwin

Instead, the dependency of foreign oil producers on their customers plays straight into America's strategic hands. Washington is ¶ conceivably in a position to hold producers to ransom by threatening to accelerate a drive to develop or implement alternative ¶ fuels, realizing the warning once uttered by Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, the former Saudi oil minister who pointed out that "the ¶ Stone Age did not end for lack of stone." Back in 1973, as they protested at Washington's stance on the Arab-Israeli dispute, ¶ Middle East producers were in a position to impose an oil embargo on the Western world. But a generation later, technological¶ advances, and the strength of public and scientific concern about global warming, have turned the tables.¶ The United States has powerful political leverage over producers because it holds the key to future oil supply as well as market ¶ demand. The age of "easy oil" is over, and as fears grow that oil is becoming harder to get, so too will the dependency of producers ¶ on increasingly sophisticated Western technology and expertise.¶ Such skills will be particularly important in two key areas of oil production. One is finding and extracting offshore deposits, like ¶ the massive reserves reckoned to be under the Caspian and Arctic seas, or in Brazil's recently discovered Tupi field. The other is ¶ prolonging the lifespan of declining wells through enhanced "tertiary" recovery. Because Western companies have a clear ¶ technological edge over their global competitors in these hugely demanding areas, Washington exerts some powerful political ¶ leverage over exporters, many of whom openly anticipate the moment when their production peaks before gradually starting to decline.

### Oil Dependency Exts - #1 – Dependence Low Now/SQ Decreasing

#### US oil dependence lowering---oil intake has dropped and fuel efficient vehicles are on the rise

Doggett 11, Energy correspondent for Reuters--started covering U.S. energy policy for Reuters in 1997 and began journalistic career in Washington in 1990, 07/25/11[Tom, “U.S. Oil Dependency Drops Below 50 Percent, Energy Department Reports” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/25/us-oil-dependency-drops-energydepartment_> n\_867131.html]ADravid

WASHINGTON (Reuters/Tom Doggett) - **U.S. dependence on imported oil fell below 50 percent in 2010 for the first time in more than a decade, thanks in part to the weak economy and more fuel efficient vehicles,** the Energy Department said on Wednesday. **The department's Energy Information Administration said it expected the moderating trend in U.S. oil-import dependency to continue through the next decade due to improvements in energy efficiency and even higher fuel economy standards**. The new data could undercut efforts by Republican lawmakers to expand offshore oil drilling to reduce oil imports, and support the position of the Obama administration and environmental groups that higher mileage requirements for cars and trucks would help cut dependence on foreign oil. Imports of crude and petroleum products accounted for 49.3 percent of U.S. oil demand last year, down from the recent high of 60.3 percent in 2005. **It also marked the first time since 1997 that America's foreign oil addiction fell under the 50 percent threshold.** "This decline partly reflects the downturn in the underlying economy after the financial crisis of 2008," the EIA said in its weekly review of the oil market**. Increased domestic production of ethanol and other biofuels that are blended with gasoline and consumer purchases of more fuel efficient vehicles also slashed the need for oil imports,** according to the EIA. Crude **oil production, especially in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico, increased by 334,000 barrels per day (bpd) between 2005 and 2010, which also cut into foreign oil purchases.** **U.S. demand for gasoline, jet fuel, heating oil and other petroleum products that were processed from crude oil dropped by 1.7 million bpd to 19.1 million bpd in 2010 from 20.8 million bpd in 2005. At the same time, U.S. exports of petroleum products more than doubled to a record 2.3 million bpd last year from 1.1 million bpd in 2005.** "**Nowhere have U.S. product exports increased more than in the Americas, including Mexico, Canada, Central and South America and the Caribbean, thanks to economic and population growth and inadequate refining capacity in those countries," the EIA said.**

As a result, U.S. net imports of refined petroleum products fell last year to their lowest level since 1973, when the government began collecting such data.

#### US demand for oil low---decreasing oil prices reflect decreasing consumption

**Carey 12,** Glen Carey is a reporter for Bloomberg News Sales & Marketing at Advisen Copywriter/Producer at McCann Erickson- Producer at Bloomberg Television[Glen, “Saudi Shares Drop on Oil Price Decline, Fed Economic Forecast” Bloomberg News, [http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-06-23/saudi-shares-drop-on-oil-price-decline-fed-economic-forecast]ADravid](http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-06-23/saudi-shares-drop-on-oil-price-decline-fed-economic-forecast%5dADravid)

**Shares in Saudi Arabia,** the only Gulf Arab stock market open on Saturdays, **fell the most in more than a week as oil prices declined and after the U.S. Federal Reserve cut its economic forecast**. Saudi Basic Industries Corp. (SABIC), **the world’s largest petrochemicals maker known as Sabic, dropped for the first time in four days.** Saudi Kayan Petrochemical Co. (KAYAN) fell the most since June 12. Al-Rajhi Bank (RJHI), the biggest by market value, lost the most in a week. The Tadawul All Share Index (SASEIDX) retreated 0.9 percent 6,774.26 in Riyadh at the close. **Stocks “are clearly responding to downward pressure in oil**,” Jarmo Kotilaine, chief economist at Jeddah-based National Commercial Bank, said in a phone interview. **“The oil price is something that fuels the fiscal engine and the broader economic mood.**” Saudi Arabia, the biggest Arab economy that depends on oil exports to support government spending, is the largest producer in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. OPEC’s basket of crudes dropped on June 22 below $90 a barrel for the first time in more than 17 months. Fed officials lowered their forecasts for U.S. economic growth and raised their predictions for unemployment in each of the next three years. Policy makers now see 1.9 percent to 2.4 percent growth in 2012, down from their April forecast of 2.4 percent to 2.9 percent. The Saudi market is “slightly down because of the reduced growth rates in the U.S.,” Turki Fadaak, head of research at Albilad Investment Co. in Riyadh, said today. Sabic declined 0.5 percent to 91.5 riyals, the lowest close since June 18, while Saudi Kayan fell 1 percent to 15.1 riyals. Al-Rajhi dropped 1 percent to 73.5 riyals.

#### Oil Demand Down – Slowed since April

Reuters 6/29 (“UPDATE 2-US April Oil Demand down 1.77 pct from year ago-EIA”, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/28/usa-eia-monthly-idINL2E8HSBKK20120628>, 6/29/2012) Kerwin

U.S. oil consumption in April was weaker¶ than expected, the U.S. government said on Thursday, but after months of¶ declines there are signs oil demand may finally be leveling off.¶ The Energy Information Administration said in its Petroleum Supply Monthly¶ report that oil demand for the world's top consumer dropped to 18.283 million¶ barrels per day, which was 470,000 bpd lower than previously estimated.¶ With this downward revision, demand was off by 330,000 bpd, or 1.77 percent,¶ from the 18.613 million bpd posted for the month last year. The EIA had¶ initially forecast a 0.75 pct increase year over year.¶ Still the dip in demand in April, the 13th consecutive monthly decline, was¶ much less than the revised 5.58 percent decrease in March. ¶ "While we do not expect U.S. oil demand to rebound through the remainder of¶ 2012 into robust annual growth, the continued trend of deepening contraction¶ should fade," JP Morgan said in a research note on Wednesday.¶ U.S. gasoline consumption was revised upward 1.5 percent to 8.817 million¶ bpd, a 0.63 percent increase from April 2011 and the first rise in U.S. gasoline¶ use since February 2011.¶ The EIA's oil demand figure for April was lower than the 18.549 million bpd¶ reported by the American Petroleum Institute for the month. ¶ EIA said demand for distillate fuels fell 4.64 percent from a year ago to¶ 3.656 million bpd in April, while jet fuel use dipped a slight 0.29 percent at¶ 1.359 million bpd.

#### Oil Demand is down 3% From Last Year

Reuters 7/20 (“UPDATE 1-US June oil demand drops 3 pct from year ago-API”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/20/usa-api-monthly-idUSL2E8IK4J120120720, 7/20/2012) Kerwin

US oil demand down 2.6 percent in first half of 2012 \* Gasoline demand down 2.5 pct in June, distillate down 0.7 pct (Adds details from report, table)¶ WASHINGTON, July 20 (Reuters) - U.S. crude oil demand dropped in June, bogged down by the¶ flagging U.S. economy, industry group American Petroleum Institute said on Friday. ¶ Petroleum consumption in June declined 3 percent from a year ago to 18.691 million barrels¶ per day. Demand was down 2.6 percent for the first half of the year from the same period in¶ 2011.¶ "A weakening economy requires less fuel, and this by most measures is a weakening economy,"¶ said API chief economist John Felmy. "The fall in demand in June is particularly notable and¶ consistent with other disappointing metrics in the economy, including falling retail sales and¶ contraction in the manufacturing sector." Gasoline demand was down 2.5 percent in June at 8.821 million bpd. Consumption of the fuel¶ was down 1 percent for the first six months of the year.¶ API's oil demand figure for June is lower than the U.S. Energy Information Administration's¶ preliminary estimate of consumption at 19.125 million bpd for the month. The EIA issues its¶ revised June demand number at the end of August. Demand for distillate fuel, which includes diesel and heating oil, fell a slight 0.7 percent to 3.876 million bpd in June. Jet fuel consumption climbed 0.7 percent to 1.555 million bpd for the month. ¶ Total imports in June accounted for 58.5 percent of U.S. oil demand, down from 60.3 percent a year earlier.

US is becoming energy efficient – Closest to self-sufficiency in 20 years

Miller et. al. 2/6 Rich Miller, Asjylyn Loder and Jim Polson are writers for Bloomberg (“Americans Gaining Energy Independence With U.S. As Top Producer”, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-07/americans-gaining-energy-independence-with-u-s-as-top-producer.html>, 2/6/2012) Kerwin

The U.S. is the closest it has been in almost 20 years to achieving energy self-sufficiency, a goal the nation has been pursuing since the 1973 Arab oil embargo triggered a recession and led to lines at gasoline stations.¶ Domestic oil output is the highest in eight years. The U.S. is producing so much natural gas that, where the government warned four years ago of a critical need to boost imports, it now may approve an export terminal. Methanex Corp. (MX), the world’s biggest methanol maker, said it will dismantle a factory in Chile and reassemble it in Louisiana to take advantage of low natural gas prices. And higher mileage standards and federally mandated ethanol use, along with slow economic growth, have curbed demand.¶ The result: The U.S. has reversed a two-decade-long decline in energy independence, increasing the proportion of demand met from domestic sources over the last six years to an estimated 81 percent through the first 10 months of 2011, according to data compiled by Bloomberg from the U.S. Department of Energy. That would be the highest level since 1992.¶ “For 40 years, only politicians and the occasional author in Popular Mechanics magazine talked about achieving energy independence,” said Adam Sieminski, who has been nominated by President Barack Obama to head the U.S. Energy Information Administration. “Now it doesn’t seem such an outlandish idea.”¶ The transformation, which could see the country become the world’s top energy producer by 2020, has implications for the economy and national security -- boosting household incomes, jobs and government revenue; cutting the trade deficit; enhancing manufacturers’ competitiveness; and allowing greater flexibility in dealing with unrest in the Middle East.

### Oil Dependency Exts - #2 – No Peak Oil

#### Peak oil is nonsense---oil exists in the earth crust, we have not uncovered all deposits

**Worstall 11**, Tim Worstall is a writer and blogger who focuses mostly on economic issues and commodities—His online writings have millions of views and some are stored by the UK Web Archiving Consortium. He was a writer for the online magazine TCS Daily. Worstall compiled the book *2005 Blogged: Dispatches from the Blogosphere*—an anthology of blogging—He was the press officer for the UK independence part and he wrote the book *Chasing Rainbows: Economic Myths, Environmental Facts*—a book that examines the problems and solutions to global warming, 10/19/2011[Tim, “Peak Oil, Entirely Nonsense: As is Peak Gas” Forbes, [http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2011/10/19/peak-oil-entirely-nonsense-as-is-peak-gas/]ADravid](http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2011/10/19/peak-oil-entirely-nonsense-as-is-peak-gas/%5dADravid)

**Peak Oil, Entirely Nonsense: As is Peak Gas** One of the things that really rather annoys me about the **peak oil** (and in the UK, there’s a similar one about peak gas) **argument**s is that it **entirely ignores the impact of changing technology.** The point is indirectly made here at The Guardian: **The Earth’s crust is riddled with fossil fuels. The issue is not whether there is a shortage of the stuff, but the costs of getting it out. Until recently, the sheer abundance of low-cost conventional oil in places like the Middle East has limited the incentives to find more, and in particular to go after unconventional sources. But technical change has been driven by necessity – and the revolution in shale gas (and now shale oil, too) has already been transformational in the US, one of the world’s biggest energy markets**. And to make the point more directly. Once we invent a new technology to extract oil or gas (or indeed any other mineral you might like to think of) this does not mean that we’ve just found that one new field that we’ve developed the new technology to extract oil or gas from. It means that we’ve just created a whole new Earth, an entire new planet that we can prospect for similar deposits that can be exploited with the new technology. To take a few examples, **BP’s Macondo well was the first to drill down to 5,000 feet below the sea bed. Previously we had only been drilling perhaps a couple of thousand feet below the sea bed. Now it is true that that particular well didn’t work out so well (sorry) but the basic point still stands: that we now have the entire planet to prospect again at 5,000 feet down,** not just the 2,000 feet down that the previous technology afforded, to see how much oil there is. The Bakken Shale in North Dakota. This has propelled the State into the number three oil producing State in the nation. But now that we’ve found the technology to get oil from oil shales this does not mean that we’ve only found the Bakken Shale. **This means that we want to scour the entire planet for other oil shales that can be exploited using the same technology**. The Marcellus Shale, the technologies developed to exploit that gas shale: this does not mean that we’ve only got the gas from the Marcellus Shale. **It means that we’ve now got the whole Earth o explore again for shales that we can exploit using that same fracking technology.** As Cuadrilla Resources has just found out in Lancashire. As most people don’t know as yet, British Gas had explored that very same shale some 20 years ago. They knew the shale was down there, there was just no way of extracting the gas at that point. Now there is and there are other fields in Poland, China and so on as well. In fact, **what seems to be becoming a consensus among some geologists is that shales are abundant** (oil shales come from terrestrial plants, gas from marine) **and what we’ve been thinking of for a century or two as oil or gas deposits are just those few places where geology has done the fracking and collection for us already.** Now that we’ve developed fracking, to do what geology hasn’t done in the far more numerous shales, there just really isn’t any long term, long term meaning century or more, shortage of oil and or gas. This does pose other problems to do with atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions and climate change but that’s a very different argument. **What shale has really done is destroy the whole Peak Oil, and peak gas, argument.**

#### US oil demand decreasing radically---domestic energy production up

**Yergin 12,** Daniel Yergin is an author, writer, speaker, economist, and energy analyst to is the co-founder/chairman of Cambridge Energy Research Associates---An energy consulting organization. He is the author of *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money, and Power*; and *The Quest: Energy, Security, and the Remaking of the Modern World*. July/August 2012[Daniel, “How Is Energy Remaking the World?” Foreign Policy Magazine, [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/ho w\_is\_enrgy \_remaking\_the\_world](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/ho%20%20%20w_is_enrgy%20_remaking_the_world)]ADravid

**The outlook for the U.S. energy supply is very different from what it was just four years ago, the last time oil prices were going up -- and the last time Americans were electing a president. Back then, it seemed the only questions were how fast oil imports would continue to rise and whether the United States was destined to import increasing amounts of natural gas. But the years since have seen an astonishing revival in U.S. oil and gas production, and with it a change in the national conversation about energy.** In the presidential campaign ahead, the debate over America's energy policy is likely to be very different from years past. The FP Survey on energy, which sounded the views of 57 experts, demonstrates just how much the debate is already changing. "**Energy independence," a chimera invoked by every U.S. president since 1973, has now become a serious subject for discussion**. But nearly two-thirds of FP's respondents do not think that the United States will be energy independent or that independence is a sensible goal in the first place. As one wrote, "Unless the United States wishes to adopt the economic policies of the former Soviet Union, the U.S. economy will always be linked to global markets for oil." Even without energy independence, **the growth in the North American supply will have enormous geopolitical ramifications** -- not necessarily immediately, but over time -- according to the respondents. The top three consequences they listed are "less U.S. reliance on and influence in the Middle East," "diminished U.S. interest in combating climate change," and "less European reliance on Russian gas" (presumably because of newly tapped supplies of shale gas). Another major story is the changing picture of global demand. Oil consumption may be destined to continue to rise in emerging markets, but not in the traditional major consumers. U.S. oil demand, in fact, is down about 10 percent since 2005. **Simply put, the United States and other developed countries have hit "peak demand." An overwhelming share of respondents are convinced this is mainly a lasting structural change -- the product of more efficient automobiles and shifting demographics -- though, as one noted, it is "exacerbated by recession."** Over the past few years, **governments have heavily promoted renewable energy sources such as solar and wind.** The FP Survey respondents believe **renewables will grow dramatically as a percentage of U.S. energy consumption -- nearly tripling by 2030**. Wind energy alone will grow fivefold, they suggest, while solar energy will grow an astonishing 30-fold. But renewables are still growing from a very small base. Thus, by 2030, the respondents estimate, oil, natural gas, and coal will still account for 69 percent of U.S. energy, compared with 82 percent in 2011. Natural gas will gain markets, while coal will experience the steepest relative drop in market share. How does the United States fit into the global picture? After all, the real growth in consumption is taking place in emerging markets. China already consumes more energy (not to be confused with just oil) than the United States. In the conclusion to The Quest, I offer a view of the future that comes in two parts. First, based on what is known and can be foreseen today, global energy demand will increase about 35 percent over the next two decades. Second, while renewables will grow in absolute terms, so will conventional energy, owing to the continuing surge in coal, oil, and natural gas consumption in emerging markets like China. Thus, on a worldwide basis, the mix in energy demand will not be too different from what it is today. The real changes in the composition will come after 2030. Foreign Policy put that view to the respondents, and more than three-quarters agreed. But some highlight the uncertainty: "It totally depends on global action on climate," one said. Another wrote, "Agree on total demand but disagree on the mix. I think total hydrocarbon demand will be lower." **Shale gas, in terms of its impact, may well be the biggest innovation in energy supply in the last two decades.** Although initially cheered by many environmentalists as providing more of an alternative to coal, it has become controversial because of questions about how it is produced. Yet it is already 37 percent of U.S. natural gas production, up from just 2 percent at the beginning of the last decade, and virtually all respondents expect it to continue to increase. The question is by how much. The top shale gas environmental issue, by far, is considered to be water impacts, followed by methane leakage, according to respondents. But nearly three-quarters are convinced environmental issues can be managed "so that shale gas production can continue on its growth track." **"Peak oil" may have been a very hot topic back in 2008. But not today. Fully 85 percent of respondents reject the notion that world oil supply is about to decline. Implied in that answer, however, is that unconventional "liquids," such as Canadian oil sands and liquids found with natural gas, will be an increasing share of supply.** Who will be the future heavyweight champs when it comes to world oil? Three-quarters of respondents believe the top producer a decade from now will be Saudi Arabia. But 18 percent cast their vote for Russia, and a few even for the United States. The top consumer? Most think that America will remain No. 1, but more than a third predict that by 2025 China will have outstripped the United States. The surge in Chinese demand and the much-increased visibility of Chinese oil companies around the world have generated a new specter: the possibility of a geopolitical competition and even a clash between the United States and China over access to oil. Yet the heat around that question seemed much greater a few years ago, when peak oil was a more prominent concern than it is today. That shift is borne out in the survey. Three-quarters think access to oil will primarily be "a commercial matter" between the United States and China. But there are certainly dissenters. "Whether directly or indirectly," one said, "access to oil will be the main source of tension in Sino-American relations." Oil prices have a habit of surprising. After all, they do not exist in a vacuum but are the product of economic growth, political development, and technology. Still, 55 percent believe that, five years from now, prices will be between $100 and $150 a barrel -- around or not too much above where they are today. But notably, 22 percent think prices could be under $100, while only one respondent said they could be above $175. Sixteen percent answered, "Who knows?" Said one, "I would be rich if I could predict this." Forecasting oil prices is a fraught business, even for experts. But on one thing the majority agree: What happens with Iran, from sanctions on its oil exports to the possibility of conflict if its nuclear negotiations with major world powers fail, will have a big impact, given that the country has been a major exporter, at around 2.2 million barrels per day. Still, other factors could mute the impact of an Iran-related price spike, particularly the big increase in Saudi production and Europe's weak economy. In terms of security of supply, one area is at the top of the list of concerns: 70 percent say that "the impact of a potential oil supply disruption" in some part of the Middle East is what "keeps me up at night." (Twenty-three percent demurred, with one putting it this way: "I sleep well.") This is a U.S. election year, of course, and energy will likely be one of the major issues. On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being worst, the respondents gave President Barack Obama what averaged out to a 5.8, with the biggest cluster around 7 and 8. Climate change, in various forms, was identified as America's No. 1 energy problem, and many likewise think the Obama administration's "biggest mistake on energy issues so far" is "not enough attention to climate change." Agreeing with Mitt Romney, 56 percent support the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, which Obama has rejected for now, while 31 percent oppose it and 13 percent are not committed. At the top of the "biggest success" list for the Obama administration are "new fuel-economy standards" for automobiles and "a measured approach to natural gas drilling." Overall, the survey makes one thing very clear. **For years, the prospects of an "energy transition" away from conventional energy and toward new alternatives have been much debated.** Whatever the timing for any transition, the FP Survey demonstrates **that a transition in energy thinking is certainly at hand.**

### Oil Dependency Exts-#3-No Oil Shocks

#### No new oil shocks---though some say they are coming, pattern does not project so

**Mills 11**, Author of 'The Myth of the Oil Crisis' and 'Capturing Carbon'; energy strategist and economist, Head of Consulting at Manaar Energy Consulting, Non-Resident Scholar at INEGMA—Former: Petroleum Economics Manager at Emirates National Oil Company, Senior Evaluation Manager at Dubai Energy, Economist at Norske Shell, 2/8/11[Robin, “Despite familiar patterns from past, no new oil shock” The National, <http://www.thenational.ae/thenationalconversation/industry-insights/energy/despite-familiar-patterns-from-past-no-new-oil-shock#page2]ADravid>

A pipeline blazes in Egypt, global oil demand surges surprisingly, **inflation returns and oil prices jump above US$100 a barrel** for the first time since the financial crisis. These **are familiar elements from oil crises of the past. The first great oil shock, of 1973, accompanied rising inflation as the US printed money to pay for the Vietnam War, and was triggered by the October War between Egypt, Syria and Israel. The second, in 1978-1979, came as millions flooded on to the streets of Tehran to demand the removal of a western-backed dictator. So far, we are not in oil-shock territory.** Indeed, prices fell back on Friday after violence in Egypt receded. But **should the fragile world economy fear another round of higher prices?** The first key point is to untangle a slow-motion demand shock from a faster supply shock - or rather, the threat of one. **So far, the drama in Egypt has not interrupted the flow of a single barrel. The country is barely an oil exporter, only a moderately important exporter of gas, and the vital Suez Canal is so far operating normally. What is more important is fear - the fear that unrest might spread to a major energy producer or that transit might be interrupted. With such a threat, even if relatively unlikely, it is sensible for consumers to protect their interests.** A taxi driver cannot risk losing hundreds of dollars of fares for the sake of $40 of petrol - better to stock up ahead of a possible shortage. This precautionary demand was a key factor in driving prices to record heights in the 1970s. **There is no panic buying yet, but a milder form encourages traders to drive up prices - not "speculation" but a rational provision against an unknown future.** The other strand, demand, was a factor well before Egyptian protesters filled Tahrir Square or Zine el Abidine ben Ali abandoned the Tunisian presidency and boarded his flight to Jeddah. Global demand increased by 3 million barrels per day (bpd) in the second half of last year. **Short-term events - the cold winter in Europe and the US, and Chinese burning of diesel for power to offset coal rationing - combined with more fundamental triggers: a surprisingly strong recovery in US demand and a successful government stimulus in China. Supply and demand were joined by a third actor at the end of last year: monetary policy. The second round of quantitative easing in the US drove down the dollar - good news for American exporters - but it pushed dollar-denominated commodities higher. The second key is how oil prices, a host of other commodities and events in the real world are becoming entwined.** As in 1978 and again in 1990, oil prices drive geopolitics and vice versa. In 1978, a recession induced by a fall in oil prices and rampant inflation triggered the Iranian Revolution. Immediately after the fall of the Shah, Iraq and Iran fought a brutal war with the high-tech armaments accumulated in the boom years. In 1990, low oil prices combined with accumulated war debts to drive Saddam Hussein into his desperate, disastrous gamble of attacking Kuwait. His former supporter, the Soviet Union, was collapsing; its oil-dependent economy no longer able to feed its people. This time, the links are working the other way. High oil prices push up food prices, as the costs of farming, fertilisers and shipping grow. Those countries unlucky enough not to be major oil exporters, such as Tunisia and Egypt, cannot afford to maintain lavish subsidies. In a phrase variously attributed to Marx and Mao, "No government is more than three meals from a revolution".Following this logic, Jordan, Morocco and Yemen should be the countries to watch. And hoarding of food by oil exporters against possible shortages and instability, as Saudi Arabia and Algeria are doing, is more to be feared than their restraining oil supplies. **Yet analogies should not be overplayed. This is not 1973 or 1978; there is no war and the oil producers themselves are not embroiled in revolution. It is not even mid-2008, when oil prices reached their record high of $147 a barrel.** Then, refineries were unable to process the heavy oil that was the only surplus production, the needle of Opec's spare capacity was hovering dangerously close to "empty" at a bare 1 million bpd, and most forecasters missed the impending signs of economic doom. **Today, refining output is ample, Opec's spare capacity sits at 5 million bpd, stockpiles are close to five-year highs, and the exporting countries are much more aware of the world's economic fragility. There will be little physical tightness in the oil market this year. Oddly, Saudi Arabia, although it is the one holding back production, always manages to appear as a price "moderate". The hawks, Venezuela and Iran, are producing close to flat out.** But having worked so hard to reach a rare producer-consumer consensus on a price band around $75, the Saudis have quietly been stepping up output as prices exceed this target. If the Middle East tensions subside quickly, prices could drop sharply as precautionary inventories empty. But if the demand surge is the key factor, a sustained increase in production is called for, especially if high inflation triggers interest rate rises. For the central bankers of oil, uncomfortable reminders of past oil crises have to be weighed against balancing supply and demand, their perennial, insoluble task.

### Oil Dependency Exts - #4 – No Impact To Oil Dependence

#### US not key to global oil market---Asian energy demand swelling

**Rubin 11**, Economic analyst and top-ranked economist in Canada’s markets---Mr. Rubin stepped down as Chief Economist at CIBC World Markets 6/1/11[Jeffrey, “China, Not U.S., Key to Global Oil Demand” Huffington Post, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeffrey-rubin/china-not-us-key-to-globa\_b\_869564.html]ADravid](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeffrey-rubin/china-not-us-key-to-globa_b_869564.html%5dADravid)

**What's more important to world oil demand -- gasoline prices in the U.S. that are nearly $4 a gallon or power rationing in China?** **To Americans, of course, it's the former. But to world oil markets, the latter may be a far more significant indication of where oil prices will be heading this summer. At today's pump prices, it's a safe bet U.S. gasoline consumption during the peak summer driving season will be lower than last year.** One of the ironies for U.S. motorists is the relatively low taxation rates on gasoline makes their pump prices more sensitive to rising world oil prices than pump prices in higher taxed jurisdictions such as Western Europe or Canada. That makes U.S. gasoline demand one of the most price-sensitive in the world. **Four dollar per gallon gasoline prices will curb Americans' appetite for oil, as well as squeeze out a lot of other spending by the U.S consumer. But as the U.S. continues to pare back its oil consumption, other economies will seek a bigger share of the pie from a near static world oil supply. With power shortages spreading in China and Japan, as well as India and Pakistan, demand for diesel fuel is soaring in power-starved Asia. While few places in North America burn triple digit oil to generate electricity, many places in Asia still do.** Even more do when coal-powered grids start to ration power to major industrial users like what is occurring in China right now.. Past power outages have bumped up China's diesel consumption by as much as another 600,000 barrels/day once power rationing spurs the use of back-up diesel generators. And this summer's power shortages could be bigger than 2004, which temporarily blacked out huge swaths of the Chinese economy. When you throw in more demand of another 200,000 to 300,000 barrels a day for diesel from Japan to compensate for sidelined nuclear reactors, it is not hard to see nearly a million barrels a day of additional oil demand coming from the power needs of Asia's two biggest economies. And that doesn't even begin to include the demand for oil from another 18 million cars on the road in China from new sales this year. Guess where much of the oil to meet all this new Asian demand is likely to come from? With little, if any usable excess capacity in OPEC, world crude demand is already on the verge of outpacing world supply. In the resulting zero sum world, conflicting trends in oil consumption between the world's two largest oil consumers, the U.S. and China, will not be the exception but the norm. If the Chinese economy is going to continue to increase its oil consumption by 10% a year, another economy will have to cut back its oil consumption by a comparable amount to make room for the increase in Chinese demand. More and more, that place looks like America.

### Oil Dependence Adv Exts - #5 – Oil Dependence Good

#### Reducing oil dependence does not solve---the costs would be too significant, America would still have a presence in the Middle East and attempts at dependence kill free trade and peace

**Bast 08,** Joseph Bast is president and CEO of The Heartland Institute. The Heartland Institute is among the nation’s best-known and most highly regarded “think tanks.” Bast is the author or editor of 21 books. He also is the publisher of six newspapers. 6/1/08[Joseph, “The Mystery of Energy Independence” The Heartland Institute, [http://heartland.org/policy-documents/mystery-energy-independence]ADravid](http://heartland.org/policy-documents/mystery-energy-independence%5dADravid) and Kerwin

**Why Do We Import Energy? Despite plentiful domestic reserves, we import more than half the oil we need for two reasons. First, federal and state laws ban commercial access to billions of barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, and billions of tons of low-sulfur coal.** These laws were passed under pressure from environmentalist lobbies supposedly to protect wilderness areas, but the actual intent and real effect have been to restrict access to domestic sources of energy. **The second reason is economic: When the cost of imported oil is low, it is plainly in the interests of U.S. businesses and consumers to buy it, just as buying other goods and services from other countries when they are inexpensive is a boon to American consumers. Free trade benefits both parties to every transaction, and by encouraging greater specialization of labor it boosts productivity and therefore total wealth.** When the cost of imported oil is high, as it currently is, we import energy until domestic producers, alerted to profit opportunities by the higher prices, re-enter the market. Domestic supplies eventually increase, thereby moderating prices and once again benefitting consumers. This response, however, takes time and inflicts hardship in the short term. Increasing domestic supplies also can be slowed or even stopped by government policies such as restrictions on drilling and mining on public lands and “windfall” taxes. **Independence Is a Chimera** **Some people say we should pursue energy independence regardless of the short-term costs. This would be foolish for several reasons. First, genuine energy independence would require energy *isolationism*--the erection of barriers to free trade with other countries--which is known to slow economic growth and invite retaliation by trading partners. Free trade, not isolationism, is the way to enhance energy security and world peace.** According to Robert Ebel, head of the energy program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, **“It makes absolutely no sense to talk about energy independence. ... We cannot produce our way to energy independence, and we cannot use efficiency or conservation to achieve energy independence. It’s just not going to happen,** at least in my lifetime.” **The benefits of energy independence also are a chimera. Reducing oil imports would not affect U.S. foreign policy. Oil from the Mideast accounts for only 17 percent of all U.S. oil imports. Canada and Mexico are the two largest sources of oil imported to the U.S. Oil is bought, sold, and consumed globally.** According to some experts, newly discovered oil reserves in Russia, Central Asia, and West Africa are larger than those in Saudi Arabia and Iraq, and as they come online the U.S. will rely less on the Mideast. **The U.S. has historically maintained a military presence in the Mideast for several reasons, including to stop Soviet expansionism, protect Israel from its Arab neighbors, and most recently to stop the spread of Islamic terrorism. If the U.S. stopped buying oil from the Mideast, other countries would buy it instead, freeing up oil that the U.S. would then import. The U.S. cannot unilaterally “de-fund” Islamic fundamentalists by reducing its oil imports from the Mideast.**

### Oil Dependence Adv Exts - AT: Middle East War

#### Alternate Causality to Middle East War---geopolitical tensions will boil over

**Snyder 12**, Neil Snyder earned a Ph.D. degree in strategic management from the University of Georgia, and he taught leadership and strategy at the University of Virginia for 25 years. He retired from UVA in 2004, and currently he is the Ralph A. Beeton Professor Emeritus at UVA. Snyder is the author of numerous books. He has published more than 100 articles and business case studies, and he is a regular contributor to American Thinker. 4/8/12[Neil, “War in the Middle East May Be Inevitable” American Thinker ,http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/04/war\_in\_the\_midd le\_east\_may\_be\_inev itable.html#ixzz21w0VFvog]ADravid

Moshe Arens is one of the most knowledgeable people in Israel today. He understands Israel's predicament as well as anyone, and that includes Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. Arens has served as Israel's minister of defense and minister of foreign affairs, so when he speaks, we should pay careful attention. On Tuesday, Arens explained the true meaning of Shaul Mofaz's March 27 victory over Tzipi Livni for leadership of the Kadima Party: Of course Shaul Mofaz won, and Tzipi Livni lost. But there was much more to the Kadima primary race than that. It was the "two-state solution," at the forefront of Israeli political discourse for a number of years, that lost. It was the offer of more concessions to the Palestinians, whose most prominent advocate was former Kadima chairwoman, MK Tzipi Livni, that went down in defeat. The concession offers made by then-Prime Minister Ehud Olmert to Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas and by then-Foreign Minister Livni to then-senior Palestinian negotiator Ahmed Qureia were left in the dust in last week's Kadima primary. That was the verdict implicitly delivered by Kadima party members, a verdict that echoed the feelings of many Israelis. According to Arens, **the Israeli public's mood has changed dramatically as a result of the failure to achieve anything that even resembles peace despite repeated unilateral efforts** by the Israeli government to win the cooperation of Palestinian leaders. To buttress his point, Arens discussed **these failed attempts to move the peace process forward: 1. The Oslo Peace Accords: Arens calls them "an abject failure." 2. Ehud Barak's unilateral withdrawal from Southern Lebanon in 2000: it led to the Second Lebanon War in 2006. 3. Barak's attempt to buy off Yasser Arafat by offering him the Temple Mount and much more in Jerusalem: Arafat flatly rejected the offer and launched "an unprecedented wave of terror against Israeli civilians." 4. Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's unilateral withdrawal from Gush Katif in the Gaza Strip: it was a "grave mistake" because it led to "Hamas taking control of the Gaza Strip and the subsequent rain of rockets on southern Israel." 5. The Arab Spring: it brought "Islamic fundamentalist rule to the Arab world" and "strengthened the skepticism of many Israelis regarding the presumed advantages of offering territorial concessions to our Arab neighbors."** Those are good reasons for the Israeli public's mood change. Since the Oslo Peace Process began in 1993 and movement toward a "two-state solution" got underway in earnest, Israel has made concession after concession, and in return they have received nothing but rejection and more terrorist activity. According to Arens: The election that returned Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to power three years ago was a clear indication of a growing disenchantment with the much-vaunted "peace process" among many Israelis. Livni's defeat in the Kadima primary gave a stamp of approval to this trend, which has contributed to the surprising stability of the Netanyahu government. The current Knesset may yet set an Israeli longevity record. The strength of the political parties claiming that concessions will pave the path to peace is steadily dwindling. The Israeli public is finally waking up to reality. They desire peace because they have been at war, either declared or undeclared, since Israel was reborn as a state in 1948, and they are growing weary, but their Arab Muslim neighbors are committed to the eventual overthrow of the tiny Jewish state. More than three decades ago, Palestinian President Yasser Arafat explained what is taking place as clearly as anyone could have: Since we cannot defeat Israel in war we do this in stages. We take any and every territory that we can of Palestine, and establish sovereignty there, and we use it as a springboard to take more. When the time comes, we can get the Arab nations to join us for the final blow against Israel. (Yasser Arafat speaking on Jordanian television, September 13, 1993 -- the same day the Oslo Peace Accord ceremony was held in Washington, D.C.) Peace for us means the destruction of Israel. We are preparing for an all-out war, a war which will last for generations. Since January 1965, when Fatah was born, we have become the most dangerous enemy that Israel has[.] ... We shall not rest until the day when we return to our home, and until we destroy Israel. (El Mundo, Caracas, Venezuela, February 11, 1980) Even though Arafat died in 2004, the Palestinians are following his playbook to the letter. They are simply biding their time, taking what Israel gives them, offering nothing in return, and waiting for the day when "the Arab nations ... join us for the final blow against Israel[,]" just as Arafat said. But the Middle East situation is more complicated than that: **An increasingly belligerent Iran is seeking to develop nuclear weapons and long-range missiles to deliver them despite assurances to the contrary, is attempting to establish hegemony over the Middle East and North Africa, and has declared that it intends to "wipe Israel off the map." China is siding with Iran and attempting to increase its influence in the Middle East. Unrest in Syria is rapidly developing into a full-blown civil war despite former Secretary-General of the United Nations Kofi Annan's efforts to bring an end to the fighting, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad may not survive, and Islamists are positioning themselves to take control. Russia is flexing its muscles in the Middle East, siding with Iran and Syria, and challenging Western powers, most notably the United States. President Obama is perceived as weak in the Middle East, thus emboldening Islamists throughout the region and Russia and China. Egypt is poised to elect an Islamist president, and Egypt's parliament has declared that Israel is Egypt's "number one enemy." Turkey's Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan is leading his nation down an Islamist path and trying to re-establish the Ottoman Empire. In the process, he is turning against Israel and winning accolades from the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. These facts help to explain why there is growing skepticism among Israeli citizens about the prospects for peace in the Middle East**, and they cause bleak reality to come into crystal-clear focus. That's why Israelis are turning away from Tzipi Livni and politicians in Israel like her who preach peace despite the mounting evidence. **As unpleasant and undesirable as this may seem, the Israeli people are realizing that now is the time to plan for war, because it may be inevitable.**

#### Middle Eastern war inevitable---tensions are insurmountable

**Perthes 10,***Volker Perthes is Chairman and Director of Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Berlin. 7/28/10[Volker, “Is Middle East War Inevitable?” Project Syndicate* [*http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-middle-east-war-inevitable-]ADravid*](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-middle-east-war-inevitable-%5dADravid)

BERLIN – Fuad Siniora, Lebanon’s former prime minister, is a thoughtful man with deep experience in **Middle Eastern politics.** So when he speaks of “**trains with no drivers that seem to be on a collision course,”** as he recently did at a private meeting in Berlin, interested parties should probably prepare for unwanted developments. Of course, **no one in the region is calling for war. But a pre-war mood is growing.** **Four factors, none of them new but each destabilizing on its own, are compounding one another: lack of hope, dangerous governmental policies, a regional power vacuum, and the absence of active external mediation.** It may be reassuring that most **Palestinians and Israelis still favor a two-state solution. It is less reassuring that most Israelis and a large majority of Palestinians have lost hope that such a solution will ever materialize.** Add to this that by September, the partial settlement freeze, which Israel’s government has accepted, will expire, and that the period set by the Arab League for the so-called proximity talks between the Palestinians and Israelis, which have not seriously begun, will also be over. Serious direct negotiations are unlikely to begin without a freeze on settlement building, which Israel’s Prime Minister Netanyahu is unlikely to announce or implement, given resistance within his coalition government. Syria, which until the end of 2008 was engaged in its own Turkish-mediated proximity talks with Israel, does not expect a resumption of talks with Israel anytime soon. This may be one reason why Syrian President Bashar al-Assad mentions war as an option, as he recently did in Madrid. Moreover, Israelis and people close to Hezbollah in Lebanon are talking about “another round,” while many pundits in the Middle East believe that a limited war could unblock a stagnant political situation. Their point of reference is the 1973 war, which helped to bring about peace between Egypt and Israel. But the wars that followed, and the latest wars in the region – the Lebanon war of 2006 and the Gaza war of December 2008/January 2009 – do not support this reckless theory. Iran, whose influence in the Levant is not so much the cause of unresolved problems in the Middle East as the result of them, continues to defy the imposition of new sanctions by the United Nations Security Council. Iranian rulers have as little trust in the West as the West has in them, and they continue to increase international suspicion by their words and actions. Repeated calls by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad about Israel’s eventual disappearance play into the hands of those in Israel who argue that Iran’s nuclear program must be ended militarily. **Some of the Middle East’s most important players are increasing the risks of confrontation because they have either lost a proper feeling for their regional and international environment, or seek to increase their own political power through provocation and brinkmanship.** Netanyahu’s short-sighted reluctance to give up settlements and occupied territory threatens Israel’s long-term interest to reach a fair settlement with the Palestinians. In its deadly assault on the Gaza flotilla in May, Netanyahu’s government demonstrated a kind of political autism in its inability to realize that even Israel’s best friends no longer wish to accept the humanitarian consequences of the Gaza blockade**. In the Arab world, there is currently no dominant power able to project stability beyond its own national borders. It will take time before Iraq will play a regional role again. The Saudi reform agenda mainly concerns domestic issues. Egypt’s political stagnation has reduced its regional influence. Qatar over-estimates its own strength. The only regional power in the Middle East today is Iran, but it is not a stabilizing force. The Arab states are aware of this. Much as they dislike it, they are also fearful of a war between Israel or the United States and Iran, knowing that they would have little influence over events.** Indeed, intra-regional dynamics in the Middle East today are driven by three states, none of which is Arab: Israel, Iran, and, increasingly, Turkey. In recent years, Turkey tried to mediate between Israel and Syria, Israel and Hamas, opposing factions in Lebanon, and lately between Iran and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council plus Germany. Turkey should continue to play this role. But the Turkish government has increasingly allowed itself to be dragged into Middle East conflicts, rather than functioning as an honest broker. The Obama administration has had a strong start with respect to the Middle East. But a year and a half after his inauguration, Obama’s “outstretched hand” to Iran has turned into a fist, and his attempts to encourage Israeli-Palestinian negotiations seem stuck. Domestic issues are likely to preoccupy Obama and his team at least up until the mid-term elections this November, thus precluding active diplomacy during the critical months ahead. And the European Union? There has not been much active crisis-prevention diplomacy from Brussels or from Europe’s national capitals. None of the leading EU states’ foreign ministers seems even to have made an attempt to mediate between Europe’s two closest Mediterranean partners, Israel and Turkey. **Twenty years ago, in the weeks that preceded Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, many observers saw signs of a looming crisis. But Arab and Western players somehow managed to convince themselves that things would not get out of hand. That crisis, and others before and since, showed that tensions in the Middle East rarely dissolve with the passage of time. Sometimes they are resolved through active diplomatic intervention by regional or international players. And sometimes they are released violently.**

### Oil Dependence Adv Exts - AT: Oil Resource Wars and Strategic Pivot

#### No impact to oil dependence---oil resource wars impossible and U.S strategic pivot to Asia has no impact

Barnett 12, Barnett has worked in US national security circles since the end of the Cold War, starting first with the Department of Navy's premier think tank, the Center for Naval Analyses. From there he moved to serve as a senior researcher and professor at the Naval War College in Newport RI, where he became a top assistant to Vice Admiral Arthur Cebrowksi - the father of "network-centric warfare." After 9/11, Barnett served in Cebrowski's Office of Force Transformation in the Office of the Secretary of Defense as the Assistant for Strategic Futures. He developed a famous PowerPoint brief on the subject of globalization and international security, which later morphed into a New York Times-bestselling book, "The Pentagon's New Map: War and Peace in the Twenty-First Century" 5/29/12[Thomas, “Death to “Resource Wars”!” Time US, <http://battle> land.blogs.time.com/2012/05/29/death-to-resource-wars/]ADravid

Nice Washington Post piece on Saturday about how the “center of gravity” in global oil exploration and production is shifting to the Western hemisphere. No, **the bulk of global conventional oil reserves still sits in the Persian Gulf, but the larger point is worth exploring: we no longer project global futures where East and West logically fight over Middle East energy reserves. Those expected long-term dynamics are collapsing right now before our eyes. It’s not just the new conventional oil finds in the Americas, but the lifting of unconventional reserves (so-called tight oil). Then there’s the “fracking revolution” in natural gas that favors the Western Hemisphere in a big, big way, because four of the top seven reserves in the world (U.S., Argentina, Mexico, Canada) are found here.** **The fracking revolution kicks off two additional mini-revolutions in energy: the accelerated shift to natural gas-powered vehicles, reducing the oil demand even further, and the displacement of coal in electricity generation frees up the cleanest and most high-quality coal in the world for export to Asia, where electricity demand is skyrocketing**. So here’s the geo-strategic reality shaping up: **the Western Hemisphere doesn’t need the Persian Gulf, which is source #5 to the U.S. market, after the U.S. itself, North America, South America and Africa. But not only is the U.S. increasingly less worried about the Persian Gulf and more willing — logically — to let that become Asia’s problem to manage (it’s their oil after all, as more than half of it heads their way now, and that percentage will only grow), it also becomes a trusted and important energy supplier to Asia (liquid natural gas and coal over time). Toss in China’s growing food reliance on the Western Hemisphere, which only grows with that nation’s middle class, and the climate change that makes it harder to grow food over there, and we’re looking at a global future in which China and the U.S. are intertwined in basic resource dependencies: they need our food and energy,** and we need their savings. Those realities are already firmly in place: **the Western hemisphere largely feeds the Eastern one in terms of major grain flows (reflecting underlying water-resource realities), and Asia has been the primary saver in the global financial system for several decades now. So no, there is no civilizational fight over the Middle East**. All that imagined nonsense falls by the wayside. **Likewise, the “strategic pivot” pursued by the U.S. today is a complete whiff in strategic terms. Globalization has already “conquered” East Asia, creating the vast and inescapable interdependencies described here. That “battle,” however you want to describe it, is already over.** Don’t feel bad by any of this. I like my military types to be a bit slower – strategic awareness-wise – than my politicians (just consider the reverse), and I like my politicians to be a good step behind my business types. They’ll all get the message soon enough. Because this future is staring them in the face.

#### Syria and Libya prove – Need for America oil tech compels them to peacefully compromise with U.S.

Howard 08 Roger Howard is a writer and broadcaster specializing in the Middle East. A recent publication of his was “Iran Oil: The New Middle East Challenge to America and The Oil Hunters: Exploration and Espionage in the Middle East” (“An Ode to Oil”, http://sec.online.wsj.com/article/SB122791647562165587.html#printMode, 11/29/2008) Kerwin

Syria illustrates how this leverage can work. Although oil has been the primary source of national income for more than 40 years, ¶ production has recently waned dramatically: Output is now nearly half of the peak it reached in the mid-1990s, when a daily output ¶ of 600,000 barrels made up 60% of gross domestic product, and can barely sustain rapidly growing domestic demand fueled by a ¶ very high rate of population growth. With enough foreign investment Syrian oil could be much more productive and enduring, but ¶ Washington has sent foreign companies, as well as American firms, a tough message to steer well clear. It is not surprising, then, ¶ that the Damascus regime regards a rapprochement with the U.S. as a political lifeline and in recent months has shown signs of a ¶ new willingness to compromise.¶ The same predicament confronted Libya's Col. Moammar Gadhafi, who first offered to surrender weapons of mass destruction ¶ during secret negotiations with U.S. officials in May 1999. Facing a deepening economic crisis that he could not resolve without ¶ increasing the production of his main export, oil, Col. Gadhafi was prepared to bow to Washington's demands and eventually ¶ struck a path-breaking accord in December 2003. Col. Gadhafi had been the "Mad Dog" of the Reagan years, but oil's influence ¶ had initiated what President Bush hailed as "the process of rejoining the community of nations."

## Proliferation

### Proliferation Advantage Frontline

#### 1 - No escalation - Risk calculus is different in a nuclear world—nations are more cautious about military action

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

Much of the literature on deterrence empha­sizes the problem of achieving the credibility on which deterrence depends and the danger of relying on a deterrent of uncertain credibility. One earlier solution to the problem was found in Thomas Sche!ling’s notion of ‘the threat that leaves something to chance’. No state can know for sure that another state will refrain from retaliating even when retaliation would be irrational. No state can bet heavily on another state’s rationality. Bernard Brodie put the thought more directly, while avoiding the slippery notion of rationality. Rather than ask what it may be rational or irrational for govern­ments to do, the question he asked, and repeated in various ways over the years, was this: How do governments behave in the pres­ence of awesome dangers? His answer was ‘very carefully’.¶ ¶ To ask why a country should carry out its deterrent threat once deterrence has failed is to ask the wrong question. The question suggests that an aggressor may attack believing that the attacked country may not retaliate. This invokes the conventional logic that analysts find so hard to forsake. In a conventional world, a country can sensibly attack if it believes that success is probable. In a nuclear world, a country cannot sensibly attack unless it believes that success is assured. An attacker is deterred even if he believes only that the attacked may retaliate. Uncertainty of res­ponse, not certainty, is required for deterrence because, if retaliation occurs, one risks losing all. In a nuclear world, we should look less at the retaliators conceivable inhibitions and more at the challenger’s obvious risks.

#### 2 - Risk of accidental launch low—political agreements and de-targeting

Podvig 6 (Pavel, physicist trained at the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, currently works as a research associate at Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation. “Reducing the Risk of an Accidental Launch” pgs. 79-80 May 23, 2006 <http://www.princeton.edu/sgs/publications/sgs/pdf/14_2-3_%20Podvig.pdf>) Foster

The United States and Russia, as well as other countries, have already un- dertaken some measures that probably substantially reduced the danger of an accidental launch—reductions of their nuclear arsenals and de-targeting agreements. It has been argued that a combination of these steps with a political [end p.79] decision not to use launch on warning as an option, which countries could make unilaterally (and not necessarily openly), would be enough to reduce the risk of an accidental launch to an acceptably low level.¶ Reductions of strategic forces and the transformation of the U.S.–Russian relationships that accompanied them, as well as various cooperation programs, were probably the most important and most effective steps toward reducing the risk of an accident. In addition to that, in 1994 the United States and Russia agreed to remove targeting information from their strategic missiles.15 Later Russia and the United States reached similar agreements with other countries.16

#### 3 - No impact—rogue states won’t pursue nuclear weapons

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

What can one say? Four things primarily. First, Possession of nuclear weapons may slow arms races down, rather than speed them up, a possibility considered later. Second, for less developed countries to build nuclear arsenals requires a long lead time. Nuclear power and nuclear weapons programmes, like population policies, require administrative and technical teams able to formulate and sustain pro­grammes of considerable cost that pay off only in the long run. The more unstable a govern­ment, the shorter becomes the attention span of its leaders. They have to deal with today's problems and hope for the best tomorrow. In countries where political control is most diffi­cult to maintain, governments are least likely to initiate nuclear-weapons programmes. In such states, soldiers help to maintain leaders in power or try to overthrow them. For those pur­poses nuclear weapons are not useful. Soldiers who have political clout, or want it, are less interested in nuclear weapons than they are in more immediately useful instruments of poli­tical control. They are not scientists and tech­nicians. They like to command troops and squadrons. Their vested interests are in the military's traditional trappings.¶ ¶ Third, although highly unstable states are unlikely to initiate nuclear projects, such projects, begun in stable times, may continue through periods of political turmoil and suc­ceed in producing nuclear weapons. A nuclear state may be unstable or may become so. But what is hard to comprehend is why, in an inter­nal struggle for power, any of the contenders should start using nuclear weapons. Who would they aim at? How would they use them as instruments for maintaining or gaining control? I see little more reason to fear that one faction or another in some less developed country will fire atomic weapons in a struggle for political power than that they will be used in a crisis of succession in the Soviet Union or China. One or another nuclear state will experience uncertainty of succession, fierce struggles for power, and instability of regime. Those who fear the worst have not shown with any plausibility how those expected events may lead to the use of nuclear weapons.

#### 4 - Proliferation inevitable—policy created to restrain proliferation fails

Council on Foreign Relations 7/05 (Council on Foreign Relations 7/05/12, “The Global Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime”, <http://www.cfr.org/proliferation/global-nuclear-nonproliferation-regime/p18984>, 7/05/12, Bhattacharyya)

International instruments for combating nuclear proliferation were largely successful before 1991, but are proving unable to meet today's challenges. Although three states (India, Israel, and Pakistan) are known or believed to have acquired nuclear weapons during the Cold War, for five decades following the development of nuclear technology, only nine states have developed—and since 1945 none has used—nuclear weapons. However, arguably not a single known or suspected case of proliferation since the early 1990s—Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Libya, or Syria— was deterred or reversed by the multilateral institutions created for this purpose. The continued advancement of Iran's nuclear program—despite the implementation of crosscutting economic sanctions and near universal global condemnation—has elicited serious concerns from states including Israel, the United States, and Saudi Arabia. Additionally, recent nonproliferation success stories, such as Libya's abandoning its nuclear program in 2003 and the accession of all of the Soviet successor states except Russia to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) as nonnuclear weapon states, have been the result of direct government-to-government negotiations and pressure rather than action by global bodies.¶ In dealing with today's proliferation challenges, international organizations work in tandem with ad hoc forums of interested parties, such as the Six Party Talks on North Korea, the P5+1 grouping on Iran, and the most recent development of biannual global nuclear security summits. But such forums have often proven inadequate to arrest the spread of nuclear technology, and states such as Iran and North Korea continue to pursue nuclear capability, if not outright weaponization. Given these trends, rising doubts about the sustainability of the nonproliferation regime are no surprise.

#### 5 - Nuclear weapons de-escalate conflicts—deter full war

Gartzke, and Kroenig 8

(Erik Gartzke and Matthew Kroenig, professor of political science, and professor at Georgetown, A strategic approach to nuclear proliferation, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbelfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu%2Ffiles%2Fuploads%2FEditors\_A\_Strategic\_Approach\_to\_Nuclear\_Proliferation.pdf&ei=7gwpTPO-PMPvnQf1huCoAQ&usg=AFQjCNHwvajw7wcs4YacWUeJDEWVe2VeTw&sig2=fNjVvwNZYdk\_ImJpKaC\_jQ, 11/09/08, Bhattacharyya)

Robert Rauchhaus employs generalized estimating equation (GEE) models to ¶ examine the intensity of conflict involving nuclear powers by studying various levels of 3¶ conflict from disputes to full-scale war. He finds that the presence of nuclear weapons ¶ tends to shift the intensity of disputes toward the lower end of the conflict scale. ¶ Symmetric nuclear dyads are less likely to become involved in a full-scale war, though ¶ nuclear status increases other types of dispute behavior. Taken together, Rauchhaus’s ¶ findings provide strong support for the stability-instability paradox. Nuclear weapons ¶ induce lower levels of violence, but deter full-scale war. Consistent with the themes of ¶ this issue, nuclear powers can expect to enjoy an improved strategic environment in the ¶ form of lower incidences of large-scale international violence.

### Prolif Adv Exts - #1 - No Escalation

#### No spillover to domestic weapons use—countries would assert control Domestic weapons use won’t escalate

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

Fourth, the possibility of one side in a civil war firing a nuclear warhead at its opponent's stronghold nevertheless remains. Such an act would produce a national tragedy. not an inter­national one. This question then arises: Once the weapon is fired, what happens next? The domestic use of nuclear weapons is, of all the uses imaginable, least likely to lead to escalation and to threaten the stability of the central balance. The United States and the Soviet Union, and other countries as well, would have the strongest reasons to issue warnings and to assert control.

#### The logic of your authors is flawed—they assume that a safe past will become a disaster

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

The Effects of Nuclear Weapons¶ ¶ Nuclear weapons have been the second force working for peace in the post-war world. They make the cost of war seem frighteningly high and thus discourage states from starting any wars that might lead to the use of such weapons. Nuclear weapons have helped main­tain peace between the great powers and have not led their few other possessors into military adventures.5 Their further spread, however, causes widespread fear. Much of the writing about the spread of nuclear weapons has this unusual trait: It tells us that what did not happen in the past is likely to happen in the future, that tomorrow's nuclear states are likely to do to one another what today's nuclear states have not done. A happy nuclear past leads many to expect an unhappy nuclear future. This is odd, and the oddity leads me to believe that we should reconsider how wea­pons affect the situation of their possessors.¶ ¶ The Military Logic of Self-Help Systems¶ ¶ States coexist in a condition of anarchy. Self-help is the principle of action in an anarchic order, and the most important way in which states must help themselves is by providing for their own security. Therefore, in weighing the chances for peace, the first questions to ask are questions about the ends for which states use force and about the strategies and weapons they employ. The chances of peace rise if states can achieve their most important ends without actively using force. War becomes less likely as the costs of war rise in relation to possible gains. Strategies bring ends and means toget­her. How nuclear weapons affect the chances for peace is seen by considering the possible strategies of states.¶ ¶

#### High-stakes situations de-escalate, there are too many dangers and the states know it

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

Weapons and strategies change the situation of states in ways that make them more or less secure, as Robert Jervis has brilliantly shown. If weapons are not well suited for conquest, neighbours have more peace of mind. Accord­ing to the defensive-deterrent ideal, we should expect war to become less likely when weaponry is such as to make conquest more difficult, to discourage pre-emptive and pre­ventive war, and to make coercive threats less credible. Do nuclear weapons have those effects? Some answers can be found by con­sidering how nuclear deterrence and how nuclear defence may improve the prospects for peace.¶ ¶ First, wars can be fought in the face of deter­rent threats, but the higher the stakes and the closer a country moves toward winning them, the more surely that country invites retaliation and risks its own destruction. States are not likely to run major risks for minor gains. Wars between nuclear states may escalate as the loser uses larger and larger warheads. Fearing that.states will want to draw back. Not escalation but de-escalation becomes likely. War remains possible. but victory in war is too dangerous to fight for. If states can score only small gains because large ones risk retaliation, they have little incentive to fight.¶ ¶ Second, states act with less care if the expect­ed costs of war are low and with more care if they are high. In 1853 and 1854, Britain and France expected to win an easy victory if they went to war against Russia. Prestige abroad and political popularity at home would be gained. if not much else. The vagueness of their plans was matched by the carelessness of their acts. In blundering into the Crimean War they acted hastily on scant information, pandered to their people's frenzy for war, showed more concern for an ally's whim than for the adversary's situation, failed to specify the changes in behaviour that threats were supposed to bring. and inclined towards testing strength first and bargaining second. In sharp contrast, the presence of nuclear weapons makes States exceedingly cautious. Think of Kennedy and Khruschev in the Cuban missile crisis. Why fight if you can't win much and might lose everything?¶ ¶ Third, the question demands a negative answer all the more insistently when the deter rent deployment of nuclear weapons contributes more to a country's security than does conquest of territory. A country with a deter-rent strategy does not need the extent of terri­tory required by a country relying on a conven­tional defence in depth. A deterrent strategy makes it unnecessary for a country to fight for the sake of increasing its security, and this removes a major cause of war.¶ ¶ Fourth, deterrent effect depends both on one's capabilities and on the will one has to use them. The will of the attacked, striving to preserve its own territory, can ordinarily be presumed stronger than the will of the attacker striving to annex someone else's territory. Knowing this, the would-be attacker is further inhibited.

### Prolif Adv Exts - #2 - Accidental Launch

#### No accidental launch—risk of retaliation means small nuclear states have a large incentive to keep weapons under control and prevent accidental launch

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

If the survival of nuclear weapons requires their dispersal and concealment, do not prob­lems of command and control become harder to solve? Americans think so because we think in terms of large nuclear arsenals. Small nuclear powers will neither have them nor need them. Lesser nuclear states might deploy, say, ten real weapons and ten dummies, while permitting other countries to infer that the numbers are larger. The adversary need only believe that some warheads may survive his attack and be visited on him. That belief should not be hard to create without making command and control unreliable. All nuclear countries must live through a time when their forces are crudely designed. All countries have so far been able to control them. Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. and later among the United States, the Soviet Union, and China, were at their bitterest just when their nuclear forces were in early stages of development, were unbalanced, were crude and presumably hard to control. Why should we expect new nuclear states to exper­ience greater difficulties than the old ones were able to cope with? Moreover, although some of the new nuclear states may be economically and technically backward, they will either have an expert and highly trained group of scientists and engineers or they will not pro­duce nuclear weapons. Even if they buy the weapons, they will have to hire technicians to maintain and control them. We do not have to wonder whether they will take good care of their weapons. They have every incentive to do so. They will not want to risk retaliation because one or more of their warheads acciden­tally strikes another country.

### Prolif Adv Exts - #3 - Rogue States

#### No risk of rogue state conflict—Leaders of rogue states won’t risk the backlash weapons misuse causes

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

In what ways may the actions and inter­actions of new nuclear states differ from those of old nuclear powers? First, new nuclear states may come in hostile pairs and share a common border. Where States are bitter enemies one may fear that they will be unable to resist using their nuclear weapons against each other. This is a worry about the future that the past does not disclose. The Soviet Union and the United States, and the Soviet Union and China, are hostile enough; and the latter pair share a long border. Nuclear weapons have caused China and the Soviet Union to deal cautiously with each other. But bitterness among some poten­tial nuclear states, so it is said, exceeds that experienced by the old ones. Playing down the bitterness sometimes felt by the United States, the Soviet Union, and China requires a crea­tive reading of history. Moreover, those who believe that bitterness causes wars assume a close association that is seldom found between bitterness among nations and their willingness to run high risks.¶ ¶ Second, some new nuclear states may have governments and societies that are not well rooted. If a country is a loose collection of hos­tile tribes, if its leaders form a thin veneer atop a people partly nomadic and with an authori­tarian history, its rulers may be freer of con­straints than, and have different values from, those who rule older and more fully developed polities. Idi Amin and Muammar el-Qaddafi fit into these categories, and they are favourite examples of the kinds of rulers who supposedly cannot be trusted to manage nuclear weapons responsibly. Despite wild rhetoric; aimed at foreigners, however, both of these 'irrational' rulers became cautious and modest when puni­tive actions against them might have threat­ened their ability to rule. Even though Amin lustily slaughtered members of tribes he dis­liked, he quickly stopped goading Britain once the sending of her troops appeared to be a pos­sibility. Qaddafi has shown similar restraint. He and Anwar Sadat have been openly hostile since 1973. In July of 1977 both sides launched commando attacks and air raids, including two large air strikes by Egypt on Libya's el Adem airbase. Neither side let the attacks get out of hand. Qaddafi showed himself to he forbearing and amenable to mediation by other Arab leaders. Shai Feldman uses these and other examples to argue that Arab leaders are deter­red from taking inordinate risks not because they engage in intricate rational calculations but simply because they, like other rulers, are 'sensitive to costs'.¶ ¶ Many Westerners who write fearfully about a future in which third-world countries have nuclear weapons seem to view their people in the once familiar imperial manner as 'lesser breeds without the law'. As is usual with ethno­centric views, speculation takes the place of evidence. How do we know, someone has asked, that a nuclear-armed and newly hostile Egypt or a nuclear-armed and still hostile Syria would not strike to destroy Israel at the risk of Israeli bombs falling on some of their cities? More than a quarter of Egypt's people live in four cities: Cairo, Alexandria, Giza, and Aswan. More than a quarter of Syria's live in three: Damascus. Aleppo, and Homs. What government would risk sudden losses of such proportion or indeed of much lesser propor­tion? Rulers want to have a country that they can continue to rule. Some Arab country might wish that some other Arab country would risk its own destruction for the sake of destroying Israel, but there is no reason to think that any Arab country would do so. One may be impres­sed that, despite ample bitterness, Israelis and Arabs have limited their wars and accepted constraints placed on them by others. Arabs did not marshal their resources and make an all-out effort to destroy Israel in the years before Israel could strike back with nuclear warheads. We cannot expect countries to risk more in the presence of nuclear weapons than they have in their absence.¶ ¶ Third. many fear that states that are radical at home will recklessly use their nuclear weapons in pursuit of revolutionary ends abroad. States that are radical at home. how­ever, may not be radical abroad. Few states have been radical in the conduct of their foreign policy, and fewer have remained so for long. Think of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. States coexist in a competitive arena. The pressures of com­petition cause them to behave in ways that make the threats they face manageable, in ways that enable them to get along. States can remain radical in foreign policy only if they are overwhelmingly strong—as none of the new nuclear states will be—or if their radical acts fall short of damaging vital interests of nuclear powers. States that acquire nuclear weapons will not be regarded with indifference. States that want to be freewheelers have to stay out of the nuclear business. A nuclear Libya, for example, would have to show caution, even in rhetoric, lest she suffer retaliation in response to someone else's anonymous attack on a third state. That state, ignorant of who attacked, might claim that its intelligence agents had identified Libya as the culprit and take the opportunity to silence her by striking a con­ventional or nuclear blow. Nuclear weapons induce caution, especially in weak states.¶ ¶ Fourth, while some worry about nuclear states coming in hostile pairs, others worry that the bipolar pattern will not be reproduced regionally in a world populated by larger numbers of nuclear states. The simplicity of relations that obtains when one party has to concentrate its worry on only one other, and the ease of calculating forces and estimating the dangers they pose, may be lost. The struc­ture of international politics, however, will remain bipolar so long as no third state is able to compete militarily with the great powers. Whatever the structure, the relations of states run in various directions. This applied to rela­tions of deterrence as soon as Britain gained nuclear capabilities. It has not weakened deter­rence at the centre and need not do so region­ally. The Soviet Union now has to worry lest a move made in Europe cause France and Brit­ain to retaliate, thus possibly setting off Ameri­can forces. She also has to worry about China's forces. Such worries at once complicate cal­culations and strengthen deterrence.¶ ¶ Fifth, in some of the new nuclear states, civil control of the military maybe shaky. Nuclear weapons may fall into the hands of military officers more inclined than civilians to put them to offensive use. This again is an old worry. I can see no reason to think that civil control of the military is secure in the Soviet Union given the occasional presence of serv­ing officers in the Politburo and some known and some surmised instances of military inter­vention in civil affairs at critical times. And in the People's Republic of China military and civil branches of government have been not separated but fused. Although one may prefer civil control, preventing a highly destructive war does not require it. What is required is that decisions be made that keep destruction within bounds, whether decisions are made by civil­ians or soldiers. Soldiers may he more cautious than civilians. Generals and admirals do not like uncertainty, and they do not lack patriot­ism. They do not like to fight conventional wars under unfamiliar conditions. The offen­sive use of nuclear weapons multiplies uncertainties. Nobody knows what a nuclear battlefield would look like, and nobody knows what happens after the first city is hit. Uncertainiy about the course that a nuclear war might follow, along with the certainty that destruction can he immense, strongly inhibits the first use of nuclear weapons.

#### Horizontal proliferation is slow and unlikely to increase—very few countries are candidates for a nuclear program

Waltz 81 (Kenneth, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University and one of the founders of the field of structural realism. “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better,” Adelphi Papers, Number 171 London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981 <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>) Foster

What will the spread of nuclear weapons do to the world? I say ‘spread rather than prolifer­ation’ because so far nuclear weapons have proliferated only vertically as the major nuclear powers have added to their arsenals. Horizontally, they have spread slowly across countries, and the pace is not likely to change much. Short-term candidates for the nuclear club are not very numerous. and they are not likely to rush into the nuclear military busi­ness. Nuclear weapons will nevertheless spread, with a new member occasionally join­ing the club. Counting India and Israel, membership grew to seven in the first 35 years of the nuclear age. A doubling of membership in this decade would be surprising. Since rapid changes in international conditions can be unsettling, the slowness of the spread of nuclear weapons is fortunate.

### Prolif Adv Exts - #5 - Deterrence

#### Proliferation leads to deterrence—mass destruction is an incentive to de-escalate

Jervis 2001 (Robert Jervis, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Affairs at Columbia University, “‘Weapons Without Purpose? Nuclear Strategy in the Post-Cold War Era’, Foreign Affairs”, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/57069/robert-jervis/weapons-without-purpose-nuclear-strategy-in-the-post-cold-war-era>, July 2001, Bhattacharyya)

If deterrence fails for whatever reason, then both sides still have every incentive to start off with smaller weapons enabling them to escalate upwards if necessary. Moreover the reasons not to go to war (M.A.D) are still there when it comes to a possible escalation in a conflict. Each escalation makes the possibly of mass destruction more likely so if anything the incentives for de-escalation grow as there is escalation towards a nuclear war. “Defensive deployment, if it should fail to dis-suade, would bring small nuclear weapons into use before the physical, political and psychological environment had deteriorated. The chances of de-escalation are high if the use of nuclear weapons is carefully planned and their use is limited to the battlefield.”

#### Nuclear weapon possession decreases incentive for war—deterrence and dissuasion

Loss 2009 (Andrew Loss, director of the Center for Science, Technology, and Policy and professor of political science at University of New Mexico, “The Role of Nuclear Weapons in International Politics: A Strategic Perspective“, <http://www.fpri.org/footnotes/1405.200905.ross.nuclearweaponsintlpolitics.html>, 3/29/2009, Bhattacharyya)

Nuclear weapons have had a truncated war-fighting role. They were only used in August 1945; most of us think that’s a good thing. A tradition of nonuse, which some think is sufficiently strong as to constitute a nuclear taboo, has developed over the years.¶ For some, nuclear weapons clearly are a status symbol, an indicator or attribute of major power status. The U.S. development of nuclear weapons was replicated by the USSR (1949), Britain (1952), France (1960), China (1964), Israel (1966/67), India (1974, 1998) and Pakistan (1998), and the DPRK (2006). Now we’re concerned about Iran going nuclear. Is it a coincidence that the first five nuclear powers were the five permanent members of the UN Security Council? Of course they’re also the only nuclear weapons states recognized by the Nonproliferation Treaty of 1968.¶ In addition to their role as status symbols, nuclear weapons have served as an equalizer. During the Cold War, nuclear weapons were relied upon by the United States and its NATO allies to counter, or offset, the conventional advantage of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. This was what, for instance, the Eisenhower administration’s New Look was all about.¶ Today, the tables have been turned. It’s the U.S. that possesses an enormous conventional advantage; Russia, which in conventional military terms is a mere rump state of the former Soviet Union, relies on its nuclear capabilities to the extent that it’s concerned about the need to counter U.S. and NATO conventional capabilities. Others, state and non-state alike, seek a nuclear counter to U.S. conventional superiority. There are a number of reasons states seek to go nuclear. But to the extent that is U.S. military capabilities that spur them to do so, it is not U.S. nuclear capabilities but U.S. conventional capabilities, particularly the manner in which they have been used since 9/11, that is most prominently at play.¶ Nuclear weapons have thus served as a substitute for conventional forces. In the past, the U.S. and NATO quite explicitly substituted nuclear for conventional weapons. Today, Russia is doing that; like the United States and NATO in the past, Russia more recently hasn’t been able to afford, or hasn’t wanted to pay for, the conventional capabilities required to match those of an erstwhile adversary. Again as in the past, nuclear weapons continue to play a role in dampening defense spending.¶ Finally, nuclear weapons arguably have played a role in discouraging both horizontal and vertical proliferation. Extended deterrence has provided an excuse for European states such as Germany and Asian states such as Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan for not going nuclear. It has been suggested as well that the sheer size of the U.S. (and Soviet or Russian) nuclear arsenals have dissuaded others from attempting to increase their nuclear capabilities or even joining the nuclear club since competing seriously with the likes of the United States is hopeless. For some (although not this author), this dissuasion effect is cause for not reducing the U.S. nuclear arsenal below the Moscow Treaty range of 1,700-2,200 warheads.

### AT: NPT good

#### **NPT doesn’t solve - empirics**

Clarke 4/19 (Alex Clarke, writer at The Carnage Report, “Why The NPT Doesn't Work”, <http://thecarnagereport.blogspot.com/2012/04/opinion-why-npt-doesnt-work.html>, 4/19/12, Bhattacharyya)

While double standards are rife in international politics, they appear frequently when nuclear proliferation is considered. The media runs itself into a frenzy regarding the unproductive nuclear proliferation efforts of Iran and North Korea yet in the light of India's successful test of long range missiles , little criticism has been dispensed towards a nation hell bent on being regarded a major player on the world stage.¶ With its successful testing of long range missiles, it joins Israel, China, Britain, the United States, Russia and France in nuclear capability, enhancing its status as a nuclear power and its chances of becoming a member of the UN Security Council.¶ However, its successful test will inevitably cause concern among their neighbors, particularly nuclear states Pakistan and China. Pakistan has had frosty relations with India since independence and they stand to get worse as tensions between both nations are set to fuel Pakistan's attempts to achieve a balance of power with regards to nuclear capability.¶ China, however, have a relatively healthy relationship with India as both are part of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) and have good trade relations with each other. Their good relations aside, India and China find themselves in direct competition made worse by the latest news of India's growth in nuclear capability with India now being able to strike cites in China.¶ This serves as another blow to a already battered non proliferation treaty (NPT) as two nations, within days of each other have tested missiles, one being a signer of the NPT, . India also dealt a blow to the end goal of the NPT, nuclear disarmament. China in light of recent developments are unlikely reduce nuclear stockpiles as well as Pakistan with defense spending set to go up in response. ¶ Much talk has been lent on the potential threat of Iran becoming a nuclear state despite Iran having no nuclear capability to speak of with the media neglecting the nuclear proliferation of nations who have already reached nuclear capability clearly poses as much of a threat as some, including India, are neighbors to an unstable regime or find themselves in a volatile region. ¶ In sum, India may have helped their ambitions to accede the UN Security Council and bolster its position as a regional hegemon, it has caused stability with its neighbors as one has had a long stated rivalry and is known for its instability and another it finds itself in direction competition and actually threaten with recent developments. India's case has also revealed a prevailing double standard which makes mockery of the NPT as the threat of proliferation is not measured in capability but in the potentiality of disaster which allows for infinite possibilities and faulty decision-making.

### AT: CTBT Good

#### The CTBT would limit the US’s defense system – opens up opportunities for attack

Council on Foreign Relations 7/05 (Council on Foreign Relations 7/05/12, “The Global Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime”, <http://www.cfr.org/proliferation/global-nuclear-nonproliferation-regime/p18984>, 7/05/12, Bhattacharyya)

Critics argue that the CTBT would limit the United States' ability to maintain functional weapons for defensive and deterrence purposes, and could eventually lead to what has been referred to as involuntary disarmament. Opponents (PDF) also believe that the treaty would be impossible to monitor or enforce and that cheaters could use secret tests to advance their nuclear programs, possibly putting the United States at a disadvantage. Finally, they argue that only a strong U.S. nuclear deterrent and not arms control treaties, which the international community will ignore, can dissuade other states from acquiring nuclear weapons.

### AT: Radiation Exposure

#### Nuclear waste causes radiation exposure in the status quo

Shrader-Frechette, 2008

(Kristin Shrader-Frechette, professor at the University of Notre Dame, , America Magazine, “Five Myths About Nuclear Energy,” http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article\_id=10884, 6/23/08, Bhattacharyya)

Another problem is that high-level radioactive waste must be secured “in perpetuity,” as the U.S. National Academy of Sciences puts it. Yet the D.O.E. has already admitted that if nuclear waste is stored at Nevada’s Yucca Mountain, as has been proposed, future generations could not meet existing radiation standards. As a result, the current U.S. administration’s proposal is to allow future releases of radioactive wastes, stored at Yucca Mountain, provided they annually cause no more than one person—out of every 70 persons exposed to them—to contract fatal cancer. These cancer risks are high partly because Yucca Mountain is so geologically unstable. Nuclear waste facilities could be breached by volcanic or seismic activity. Within 50 miles of Yucca Mountain, more than 600 seismic events, of magnitude greater than two on the Richter scale, have occurred since 1976. In 1992, only 12 miles from the site, an earthquake (5.6 on the Richter scale) damaged D.O.E. buildings. Within 31 miles of the site, eight volcanic eruptions have occurred in the last million years. These facts suggest that Alvin Weinberg was right. Four decades ago, the then-director of the government’s Oak Ridge National Laboratory warned that nuclear waste required society to make a Faustian bargain with the devil. In exchange for current military and energy benefits from atomic power, this generation must sell the safety of future generations. Yet the D.O.E. predicts harm even in this generation. The department says that if 70,000 tons of the existing U.S. waste were shipped to Yucca Mountain, the transfer would require 24 years of dozens of daily rail or truck shipments. Assuming low accident rates and discounting the possibility of terrorist attacks on these lethal shipments, the D.O.E. says this radioactive-waste transport likely would lead to 50 to 310 shipment accidents. According to the D.O.E., each of these accidents could contaminate 42 square miles, and each could require a 462-day cleanup that would cost $620 million, not counting medical expenses. Can hundreds of thousands of mostly unguarded shipments of lethal materials be kept safe? The states do not think so, and they have banned Yucca Mountain transport within their borders. A better alternative is onsite storage at reactors, where the material can be secured from terrorist attack in “hardened” bunkers.

## US/Russian Relations

### US/Russian Relations Advantage Frontline

#### 1.US-Russian relations are deteriorating now: G8 summit, Syria, protests in Russia

Kliment 12

(Alexander Kliment is an analyst with Eurasia Group's Eurasia practice. May 15, 2012. *Foreign Policy*. “Putin's G-8 snub could keep the U.S. and Russia talking” <http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/05/15/putin_s_g8_snub_could_keep_the_us_and_russia_talking>) Sherman

Russian President Vladimir Putin's last minute decision to skip a G8 summit with President Barack Obama is a snub to Washington, but the Russian president's no-show may in fact increase the chances for a constructive relationship between the two countries.¶ Last week, just days after his inauguration, Putin let it be known that he would not attend the upcoming G8 summit at Camp David, where he and Obama were set for a one on one meeting.¶ The White House, in turn, said Obama wouldn't attend the 2012 Asia Pacific Economic Conference (APEC) summit this fall in Vladivostok, Russia -- though it was always hard to imagine Obama skipping the Democratic National Convention.¶ According to the Kremlin's official explanation, Putin can't leave Russia right now because approving the cabinet nominations submitted to him by Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev is too sensitive a task for Putin to oversee by phone from Maryland. So Medvedev will send the list to Putin and head to the summit himself.¶ Putin's decision is a breach of G8 protocol, which expects that sitting heads of state will attend the group's summits. French President Francois Hollande, for example, will attend, just days after his 15 May inauguration. And by sending his number two to an organization in which Russia is already something of a second fiddle, Putin is raising questions about the wisdom of keeping Russia in the group at all.¶ Accordingly, many analysts have cast the move as a brazen rebuke to the U.S., which Putin alleges is behind the unprecedented street protests that have become a feature of Moscow life since last December.¶ It's true that the Kremlin's official explanation isn't wholly credible. Most cabinet decisions have likely been agreed upon already, Putin's re-election was never in doubt, and the G8 summit's date has been known for some time. That said, he reassumes the presidency amid rising popular opposition, which has sowed fresh doubts about his legitimacy. Keen to prevent infighting or, worse, insubordination among Russia's powerful elites, Putin could well be preoccupied with some last minute horse-trading at home.¶ The timing may, in fact, be no better in Washington than it is in Moscow.¶ Obama is entering a challenging re-election campaign in which he has already drawn fire from his Republican opponent Mitt Romney about the pursuit of a reset with Russia and his broader foreign policy track record. U.S.-Russia ties have deteriorated recently -- on account of disagreements over Syria, continuing friction over missile defense, and Putin's allegations of U.S. complicity in the protest movement -- meaning the U.S. president would be under pressure to take a hard line with Putin.¶ But that could risk an unpredictable flare-up with the notoriously sharp-tongued and pugnacious Putin. At the very least, it might complicate White House attempts to secure congressional support for granting Russia normal trade relations status so that U.S. companies can benefit from Russia's WTO accession.¶ In short, with both men facing heightened domestic concerns and pressures, Obama's meeting with Medvedev, who has warmer relations with Obama and who is seen chiefly as a messenger for Putin, carries much less political significance, but also much lower political risk. The practical result is that it leaves open the chance of greater flexibility between Washington and Moscow that could help maintain a pragmatic relationship in the medium term.¶

#### 2.Relations are resilient due to cycles of good and bad relations

Fenenko 11

(Alexei Fenenko is Leading Research Fellow, Institute of International Security Studies of RAS, Russian Academy of Sciences. June 21, 2011. “Cycles of convergence and divergence” <http://en.rian.ru/valdai_op/20110621/164739508.html>) Sherman

There is nothing special or unusual about the current difficulties. Over the past twenty years, both Russia and the United States have experienced several cycles of convergence and divergence in their bilateral relations. It seems that Moscow and Washington are doomed to repeat these cycles time and again. ¶ Such changes in bilateral relations are no mere coincidence. Russia and the United States base their relations on mutual nuclear deterrence. The material and technical foundations for Russian-American relations differ little from those underpinning the Soviet-American relations of the 1980s. Thus, these cycles of Russian-American rapprochement are due to two factors. First comes the desire to consistently reduce aging nuclear systems so that during disarmament neither party risked destroying the military-strategic parity. Second, the reaction to a major military-political crisis after which the parties seek to reduce confrontation and update the rules of conduct in the military-political sphere. After confronting these tasks, Russia and the United States returned to a state of low intensity confrontation. ¶ The first rapprochement cycle was observed in the early 1990s. Yeltsin’s government needed U.S. support in recognizing Russia within the 1991 borders of the RSFSR. Boris Yeltsin also needed U.S. assistance in addressing the problem of the Soviet “nuclear legacy” and taking on the Supreme Council. The administrations of George Bush Senior and Bill Clinton were willing to help the Kremlin solve these problems. However, the Americans demanded major strategic concessions from Russia in return, outlined in START-III: making the elimination of heavy intercontinental ballistic missiles a priority. The parties reached an unofficial compromise: U.S. recognition of the Russian leadership in exchange for the rapid decrease in Russia’s strategic nuclear forces (SNF). ¶ However, the stronger Russian state institutions became, the weaker the impetus to the rapprochement. In autumn 1994, Russia refused to ratify the original version of START-II and declared NATO’s eastward expansion unacceptable. The United States adopted the concept of “mutually assured safety” (January 1995) under which Russia’s democratic reforms qualified as inseparable from continued armament reduction. The “Overview of U.S. nuclear policy” in 1994 also confirmed that America deemed Russian strategic nuclear forces a priority threat. ¶ The crises that unfolded during the late 1990s in Iran and Yugoslavia were, like NATO expansion, the logical results of a restoration of the old approach to Soviet-American relations. ¶ It was actually the events of 1994, not 2000, that in fact predetermined the subsequent development of Russian-American relations. ¶ The second cycle of Russian-American rapprochement was also rooted in strategic considerations. In 2000 START-II and the ABM Treaty collapsed. Both Washington and Moscow were faced with the problem of their agreed decommissioning of nuclear systems dating back to the 1970s. These events pushed presidents Vladimir Putin and George W. Bush to reach a strategic compromise at a meeting in Crawford (12 November 2001). The United States agreed to sign a new Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), and Russia did not object to Washington’s withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. Instead of the ABM Treaty, the parties signed the Moscow Declaration on May 24, 2002, under which the United States pledged to consult with Russia on all issues pertaining to missile defense deployment.¶ However, after the “compromise at Crawford,” the agenda for Russian-American rapprochement was exhausted. The disputes between Moscow and Washington over Iraq, Iran, Georgia, Ukraine and Beslan, which had been gathering steam since 2003, necessitated a return to the traditional format for Russian-American relations. At the Bratislava meeting (February 24, 2005) President Vladimir Putin refused to accept George W. Bush’s suggestion of including issues of fissile material safety in the agenda. Since then, the “rapprochement” between Russia and the U.S. has reached a dead end, including at the official level. ¶

#### 3.START treaty sustains US Russian relations, and is key to prevent decreasing the nuclear arsenal of both the US and Russia

VOA,11, Voice of America news organization,http://www.voanews.com/content/relations-between-us-russia-are-good-136389268/170976.html,”Analysts: US, Russia Relations Are Good Despite Differences “,12/28/11.

Most experts agree relations between the United States and Russia are good. The two countries still have differences, but they increasingly work together on a wide range of issues.¶ President Barack Obama has made better relations with Russia a cornerstone of his foreign policy. Experts say the so-called “reset” in relations that Obama launched shortly after coming into office almost three years ago has generated important achievements.¶ Angela Stent, a Russia expert at Georgetown University, said the highlight was the ratification by both countries of the New START treaty reducing long-range nuclear weapons.¶ “We can still destroy each other - it makes no sense to have all those warheads. The Cold War is over, so we’ve drastically cut down the number of warheads and we are going to cut them down further. So I think it was very important to accomplish that,” said Stent.¶ Stent and others say another achievement was the agreement allowing U.S. military transports to transit through Russia into Afghanistan. Given the frayed relationship between the United States and Pakistan, Stent says that supply route is crucial for the conduct of the war.¶ Moscow also has supported stronger United Nations sanctions against Iran and has canceled the delivery of S-300 anti-aircraft missiles to Tehran. In addition, the Russian government did not oppose a no-fly zone over Libya.¶ But Stent says the two sides still disagree on U.S. plans for a missile defense system in Europe.¶ “We have explained to them - our government [has], many, many times - this system has to do with concerns about the Iranians acquiring nuclear weapons, about the North Koreans, about countries that could threaten us all. It’s not aimed at Russia,” said Stent.¶ She said the “reset” in relations has been built on the relationship between President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev.¶ “They’ve met many times, they’ve talked much more. They spent a lot time together either virtually or really. President Obama met with Prime Minister [Vladimir] Putin once in July 2009 and it was a difficult meeting. Putin has a lot of resentment against the United States, against what he sees as failed promises from the Bush administration, and he certainly discussed those.”¶ Former National Security Adviser General Brent Scowcroft looks at Putin’s criticism.¶ “Putin’s basic complaint was at the end of the Cold War, 'When we - the Russians - were flat on our backs, you took advantage of it. You pushed the borders of NATO right up to include parts of the old Soviet Union. You denounced the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] treaty. You did a lot of things because we were weak. And now we are strong and you can’t do that anymore,'” said Scowcroft.¶ In a few months, Russian citizens go to the polls to elect a new president to succeed Medvedev. The odds-on favorite to win is Putin. Many experts wonder whether the good relationship between Washington and Moscow will continue, or whether there will be a harsher tone from the Kremlin, given Putin’s previous history.¶

#### 4.No risk of US Russia war

Thomas, Graham, 07, senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff, http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html,”The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness “,8/8/7.

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

### US/Russian Relations Adv - Exts #1 - Relations low now

#### Non-Unique, Relations down because of Magnitsky bill has passed in the Senate

Pecquet 7-23

(Julian Pecquest is a veteran staff writer and analyst for *The Hill*. July 23, 2012. “Russian ambassador warns Congress that pending human rights bill 'not going to be accepted'” [http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/trade/239463-russian-ambassador-warns-congress-that-pending-human-rights-bill-not-going-to-be-accepted](http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/trade/239463-russian-ambassador-warns-congress-that-pending-human-rights-bill-not-going-to-be-accepted/)) Sherman

Russia's ambassador to the United States slammed Congress in a sharply worded op-ed Monday, warning lawmakers that their plan to link pending trade legislation with a controversial human rights bill “is not acceptable, and it is not going to be accepted.”¶ The fiery rhetoric is a last-ditch attempt to try to get Congress to reconsider legislation that would impose financial and travel restrictions on officials from Russian and other countries that U.S. lawmakers accuse of human rights violations. The bill, named after a Russian whistleblower who died in police custody in 2009 while under investigation for tax fraud, is expected to sail through Congress next week, in time for the summer recess.¶ “All this amounts to an attempt to bring pressure upon an investigation in another sovereign state,” Sergey Kislyak wrote in a guest column for The Hill. “It is not acceptable, and it is not going to be accepted. It will cause a strong reaction in Russia. No interference in our internal affairs is going to be allowed (imagine someone trying to do the same to the American legal system).”¶ Despite repeated Russian warnings and against the White House's advice, lawmakers of both parties have decided to attach the so-called Sergei Magnitsky bill to legislation normalizing trade relations with Russia, which Congress needs to approve in order for U.S. companies to benefit from better trade terms after Russia joins the World Trade Organization. The Senate Finance Committee unanimously approved legislation linking the two bills last week.¶ The House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over trade, is expected to mark up the trade bill later this week, with the Rules Committee expected to tie it to the Magnitsky bill, giving the House and Senate time to establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with Russia before leaving for summer recess at the end of next week. Russia is scheduled to become the 156th member of the WTO on August 22.¶ In his column, Kislyak said the Magnitsky bill was a symptom of a larger breakdown in relations between Congress and Russia that will have far-reaching consequences. He said some lawmakers were acting like they're looking for “new irritants” in the U.S.-Russian relationship, and said the bill would cast a pall on the promise of increased business relations between the two countries.¶ “As a result of the Magnitsky proposal, relations between Russia and the United States might be burdened with additional difficulties,” he said. “And it looks like the whole history of adopting PNTR might end on a sad note.”¶

#### Relations low---Syria

**CFR 7/17** 2012, \*Council on Foreign Relations: Interviewer: Bernard Gwertzman, Consulting Editor, CFR.org and Interviewee: Dimitri Simes, President and CEO, Center for the National Interest, “Why Russia Won't Yield on Syria,” <http://www.cfr.org/russian-fed/why-russia-wont-yield-syria/p28712>) Sherman

UN Special Envoy to Syria Kofi Annan is in Moscow for talks with President Vladimir Putin aimed at intensifying pressure on the Syrian regime through UN Security Council sanctions, but Russia expert Dimitri Simes says that while Russia might at some point get fed up with Bashar al-Assad and see that his government is losing ground, it isn't "as opposed to the Damascus regime as the Obama administration and many other governments." Putin is generally committed to "maintaining the sovereignty of existing states," especially since "most of the regimes that were changed after the Cold War were the regimes that were friendly to Russia," says Simes. Additionally, says Simes, Putin "is more skeptical of U.S. and Western intentions, particularly U.S. intentions," than former president [Dmitry] Medvedev, who had forged a good relationship with President Obama. Despite the "reset" under President Obama and President Medvedev, many people around Putin were not persuaded there was a qualitative change in the U.S.-Russian relationship. The bottom line is that Putin is more hard-nosed; he is more skeptical of U.S. and Western intentions, particularly U.S. intentions, and he's not personally mesmerized by President Obama the way Medvedev was.

#### Relations low over ABM, Iran and Libya

Fenenko, 11(Alexia, The Cyclical nature of Russian-American relations, Rianovosti, http://en.rian.ru/valdai\_op/20110621/164739508.html, Date Accessed: June 26th, 2011)

The “reset policy” crisis has been discussed in the Russian and U.S. media for nearly a year. Both the Kremlin and the White House reported progress: from START-III entering into force to expanded economic contacts. But after the Washington summit that brought presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev together on 24 June 2010, there has been an increasingly dominant sense that the “reset” process is, somehow, going very wrong. The U.S. refusal to compromise over its ABM system, ongoing tensions over Iran, Libya and Georgia, Washington’s support for Japan in its territorial disputes with Russia, the U.S. media’s infatuation with the “Khodorkovsky case” -- all these are symptoms of a deeper problem.

### US/Russian Relations Adv Exts - #2 - Relations resilient

#### Relations are resilient due to common interests

DesMoines Register 8/26/09 (“Renew the focus on relations of U.S., Russia,”) Sherman

In recent years, U.S.-Russia relations have again taken a turn for the worse. Both nations have routinely portrayed the other in negative terms. Mutual distrust and suspicions have grown over many political, defense and economic issues. We have returned to describing each other in stereotypes.  The 50th anniversary of Khrushchev's visit is an excellent opportunity to focus again on the importance of better U.S.-Russia relations, honest dialogue and shared need to tackle nuclear and other global challenges. As President Barack Obama said in Moscow in early July, "But I believe that on the fundamental issues that will shape this century, Americans and Russians share common interests that form a basis for cooperation."

#### US-Russia relations inevitable – competition with China will force this

**Simón 9 (**Luis, *post-doctoral research fellow on European Security at the Institute for European Studies, coordinator security and defence programme at the Observatory of Spanish Foreign Policy, Ph.D. from Royal Holloway, University of London, M.A. in European Studies from the Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris and the University of Bath (Euromasters), B.A. in International Relations London Metropolitan University,* 8-21-2009, The future of US-Russia relations: Europe’s strategic litmus test?, <http://europeangeostrategy.ideasoneurope.eu/2009/08/21/russia-america-europe/>) Sherman

In any case, over the longer term, Russian-American relations certainly look brighter. For one thing, Russia’s relative power is projected to decline further, while other powers will go on rising – especially China. In the decades to come, Moscow will strive for an autonomous strategic space within the Eurasian heartland as the world system becomes progressively multipolar. And notwithstanding Shanghai Cooperation Organisation-type illusions, any future in which China and Russia cooperate harmoniously is hard to envision. Only American unilateralism has masked the inherent tension between Moscow and Beijing; as this wanes such tension will re-emerge, and Russia may look to its old rival in the Western Hemisphere for support. This does not necessarily mean that Russia will forge a rock-solid alliance with Washington; only that, in the unfolding American-Chinese struggle, Moscow’s allegiances are more likely to rest with Washington than with Beijing. The alternative – a strategic partnership with China – would be a far more oppressive scheme, and this is something Moscow is well aware of. A giant and powerful China, with its eyes set squarely on Russia’s vast Siberian wastes, would become a major concern for the Kremlin. If it comes down to a choice between Washington and Beijing (and some day it most likely will), Moscow would choose the lesser of two evils and eventually accept greater American involvement in Central Asia. Washington’s geostrategic focus in the Eastern half of Eurasia will only continue to grow. Many Americans will come to see greater Russian cooperation in both the Middle East and Central Asia as ever more desirable to offset a rising China. And any upgrade in Russian-American relations would require Washington to cut Moscow some slack in those areas that lie closest to the latter’s heart.

#### US Russia relations are resilient to cut Iran’s nuclear program

Andrew C. Kutchins,11,Senior Fellow and Dirctor of the Russia and Eurasia Program @ the Center for Strategic and International Studies, has been a professor @ Georgetown and Stanford, PhD in International Relations @ the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University,”A Durable Reset”,9/13/11.

Three years ago this month, after Russian military forces invaded Georgia, the U.S.-Russia relationship reached its lowest point, at least since the collapse of the Soviet Union. The Bush administration virtually froze relations for its last five months in the White House. President Obama and his team took office in January 2009 and soon signaled their interest in improving ties with Moscow. The main reasons are well known: need of Russian support in trying to curtail Iran’s nuclear weapons program; increasing U.S. military presence in Afghanistan; and return to a more multilateral approach in nuclear arms control and security. Despite considerable skepticism in Moscow and Washington, Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev have made significant progress in restoring the bilateral relationship with important achievements on all the issues above as well as a number of others. In recent months, however, critical voices in both countries have grown louder about prospects for further rapprochement. Skeptics point to disagreements over missile defense, the revolutionary events in the Middle East, the seemingly never-ending negotiations over Russia’s W.T.O. accession and other issues. Some analysts and political figures in both countries also cite the possibility that Vladimir Putin will return as Russia’s president in 2012 as a threat to future cooperation.

But unlike the two previous U.S.-Russian honeymoons, both of which ended in disappointment — in 1991-1992 after the emergence of the new Russia, and in 2001-2002 after 9/11 — the current warming trend should be more sustainable.

### US/Russian Relations Adv Exts - #3 - START

#### US Russia relations resilient, START treaty will prevent bad US Russia relations

John Kerry,10 US senator for Massachusetts, http://www.kerry.senate.gov/press/in\_the\_news/article/?id=7995d312-5056-a032-52b5-18aaa423fe09,”The merits of a Russian relationship “,6/22/10.

One year ago, the Obama administration launched an initiative to “reset” relations with Russia. As Russian President Dmitri Medvedev lands in Washington Tuesday, it’s clear that the outreach — which carried significant diplomatic and political risk — is paying off. ¶ The changes we’ve seen extend far beyond a transformed tone. Together, the United States and Russia have reached new agreements that have materially advanced our interests around the world.¶ The cornerstone of our new cooperation is a new strategic arms reduction treaty. The treaty significantly reduces the legal ceiling on both sides’ deployed nuclear warheads and replaces the verification regime that expired with the old START treaty last December. ¶ New START is essential to building the habits of cooperation we hope to expand to the many global problems that Washington and Moscow share. That’s one reason former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger called Senate approval of START “obligatory.” ¶ I’m hopeful that once we have addressed their concerns, my colleagues will match the remarkable bipartisan support from the former secretaries of state and defense, generals and national security advisers — Democrats and Republicans — who testified in support of New START. ¶ The second major achievement of our outreach has been Russia’s increased cooperation in addressing Iran’s nuclear ambitions. Until recently, Russia opposed further sanctions. But we worked to convince Russia that the threat was genuine. ¶ Last month, Russian support was decisive in tipping the balance at the United Nations Security Council in favor of tough new sanctions. After that vote, Russia scrapped the sale of strategically crucial anti-aircraft missiles to Tehran. ¶ The benefits don’t end there. Better relations have allowed us to translate our shared interest in a stable Afghanistan into transit agreements that make crucial new supply routes available to America. ¶ Since the agreement, some 10,000 railroad containers have traveled from Russia through Central Asia to Afghanistan’s northern borders. In addition, 300 flights, with 35,000 personnel aboard, have flown over Russia to reach Afghanistan — reducing U.S. dependence on the often dangerous southern supply routes. ¶ Critics mistakenly insist that any step repairing Russian relations is necessarily a step away from our European allies. In fact, their own “reset” with Russia has been helped by ours. ¶ In April, Norway concluded 40 years of negotiations with Russia to sign an agreement on their maritime border. Poland’s relationship with Russia has also improved, and Warsaw is working to secure visa-free travel and greater access to the European Union for Russian citizens. ¶ Still, any outreach to Russia would be unsustainable unless it also factored in a frank acknowledgment of our disagreements. We continue to assert that Russia is in violation of Georgia’s internationally recognized territorial integrity. And though Medvedev has made some encouraging statements about the need for reform inside Russia, we do not shy away from raising serious concerns about his government’s attitude toward human rights and democratization.¶ This week’s energy disagreement between Russia and Belarus reminds us that Moscow can use its vast natural resources to assert what it believes to be its national interest. ¶ Going forward, our challenge will be to translate the progress we’ve made into ever-deeper cooperation. Trade between our nations is woefully underdeveloped. We should continue to help Russia’s bid for World Trade Organization membership, which would help increase global confidence in Russia’s markets and promote trade and investment. ¶ A Russian firm’s recent agreement to purchase up to 65 U.S.-made planes was positive news. Resolving the impasse preventing multimillion-dollar exports of U.S. poultry would be another positive step. ¶ Last September, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov inaugurated the U.S.-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission, with 16 working groups covering culture to counterterrorism. This effort has only just begun, but it can provide a framework to initiate new projects, resolve emerging issues and generally keep relations on track. ¶ This May, America and Russia marked the 65th anniversary of our shared victory over Nazi Germany with a spectacle that would have been unimaginable just one generation ago: U.S. service members in their dress blues marched beside their Russian counterparts in a parade in Red Square. ¶ It was a surreal sight for this child of the Cold War — a measure of how far we’ve come. How far can our improved relations take us, given our enduring differences and historical baggage? We just don’t know. ¶ But survey the challenges of the next century — from the spread of nuclear weapons to energy security to Afghanistan — and it quickly becomes clear just how invaluable a Russian partner can be in solving them all. ¶ There will be times, of course, when our ideals and interests pull us apart. Recent history is clear on that point. ¶ But if we work together, we can achieve success: a partnership strong enough to seize our shared opportunities and resilient enough to withstand our differences.

### US/Russian Relations Adv Exts - #4 - No War

#### Russia US war won’t happen resilient relations proven

Leon Aron,06,resident scholar and the director of Russian Studies at AEI,http://www.aei.org/outlook/24606,”The United States and Russia”,6/29/6.

Yet the probability of a frontal confrontation and a new Cold War remains very remote for at least three reasons. First, despite the erosion, the countries’ geopolitical assets are still very weighty, as the bedrock issues of anti-terrorism, nuclear nonproliferation, and energy will continue to force them to seek common ground and at least limited partnership.[17] Second, the “restorationist” foreign policy notwithstanding, the three basic elements of the 1992-1993 national consensus on the foreign policy and defense doctrine remain largely the same. Russia is to stay a nuclear superpower and the regional superpower, but it seems to have settled for the role of one of the world’s great states, rather than a global superpower engaged in a worldwide competition with the United States. While these desiderata will continue to cause occasional sparring with the United States, they are no longer dedicated to the attainment of goals inimical to the vital interests of the United States and are not likely to ignite a relentless antagonistic struggle to the bitter end. Lastly, despite the muscular rhetoric emanating of late from the Kremlin, unlike the Soviet Union twenty years ago and China today, Russia is not a “revisionist” power. It does not seek radically to reshape the geopolitical “balance of forces” in its favor. Moscow may rail at the score, but it is unlikely to endeavor to change the rules of the game. For that, one needs a different ideology and, as a result, a different set of priorities. Yet even in today’s Russia flush with petrodollars, the share of GDP devoted to defense (around 3 percent) is not only at least ten times smaller than in the Soviet Union, but also below the 1992-1997 average in a Russia that inherited an empty treasury from the Soviet Union and that was, like every revolutionary government, unable to collect taxes. Calculated in purchasing power parity, Russia’s defense expenditures in 2005 ($47.77 billion) were less than one-eleventh of what the U.S. spent ($522 billion).[18]

#### Zero Probability of US Russia war economy and nuclear security check

Thomas Graham,07, senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff 2002-2007, , "Russia in Global Affairs” July - September 2007, The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

#### Russian Generals state US Russia war would end in peace relations before nuke launch

Colonel General Leonid Ivashov,07, President of the Academy of Geopolitical Problems. July“WILL AMERICA FIGHT RUSSIA”. Defense and Security, No 78. LN

Ivashov: Numerous scenarios and options are possible. Everything may begin as a local conflict that will rapidly deteriorate into a total confrontation. An ultimatum will be sent to Russia: say, change the domestic policy because human rights are allegedly encroached on, or give Western businesses access to oil and gas fields. Russia will refuse and its objects (radars, air defense components, command posts, infrastructure) will be wiped out by guided missiles with conventional warheads and by aviation. Once this phase is over, an even stiffer ultimatum will be presented - demanding something up to the deployment of NATO "peacekeepers" on the territory of Russia. Refusal to bow to the demands will be met with a mass aviation and missile strike at Army and Navy assets, infrastructure, and objects of defense industry. NATO armies will invade Belarus and western Russia. Two turns of events may follow that. Moscow may accept the ultimatum through the use of some device that will help it save face. The acceptance will be followed by talks over the estrangement of the Kaliningrad enclave, parts of the Caucasus and Caspian region, international control over the Russian gas and oil complex, and NATO control over Russian nuclear forces. The second scenario involves a warning from the Kremlin to the United States that continuation of the aggression will trigger retaliation with the use of all weapons in nuclear arsenals. It will stop the war and put negotiations into motion.

### No Impact to Russia Agression Ext

#### Russian officials talk big, but evidence proves struggling Russian military and economy

Tom Lasseter,08, Editor at McClatchy Newspaper,http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2008/09/11/52313/russian-leaders-talk-big-but-army.html,”Russian leaders talk big, but army and economy are weak”

MOSCOW — Russia's military is riddled with weakness. Its equipment is outdated. Its technology is decades behind the West. And its capacity for battlefield communications and intelligence gathering is terrible.¶ In short, Russia has a mid- to late-20th century military in a 21st century world.¶ That and more was revealed during Russia's war with U.S.-backed Georgia last month, when its troops routed the small Georgian army but looked woefully short of the fighting power of nations like the United States.¶ And to top things off, Russia's economy has recently been slammed by the double whammy of a plummeting stock market and falling currency as the effects of the global economic crunch were compounded by worried Western investors withdrawing billions of dollars in the aftermath of the Georgian war.¶ Instead of pausing, the Kremlin has charged ahead, warning and threatening the United States and its allies at every turn. Brushing aside American predictions that Moscow would isolate itself from the world by invading Georgia, the Kremlin this week announced joint training exercises with Venezuela — where President Hugo Chavez is an avowed foe of U.S. policy abroad.¶ News on Wednesday that two nuclear-capable Russian bombers, reportedly without nuclear weapons, had landed in Venezuela punctuated both the uncertainty and the gravity of the situation: Was this just a political jab by Moscow leaders, or is the Kremlin signaling it is willing to risk a fight despite its obvious weaknesses?¶ Prime Minister Vladimir Putin has publicly said he has no desire for conflict. Russian generals under his government's command, meanwhile, say they might target U.S. missile defense shield sites in eastern Europe with ballistic missiles.¶ "It's a very dangerous time," said James Townsend Jr., who from 2003 to 2006 was the director of European and NATO policy for the secretary of defense and is now director of the international security program at the Atlantic Council of the United States, a think tank. "It's made dangerous by uncertainty, it's made dangerous by the possibility of miscalculation."¶ Russia observers differ on the implications of the standoff.¶ Vladimir Dvorkin, a retired Russian major general who ran a premier military think tank from 1993 to 2001, said the maneuvers by the United States and Russia after the Georgian war have been political posturing, and the idea that Russia and the West would get into an armed confrontation is "absurd."¶ Some pro-Western analysts, however, say that Russian leadership is testing how far it can go in reclaiming parts of the former Soviet Union, or at least reducing Western influence in the region, at a time when the United States is perceived as being weak and Europe divided. They also say the Kremlin is in danger of overplaying its hand.¶ During the fighting in Georgia, Russian officers in the field frequently relied on cell phones or old radios, and they were unable to establish tactical command centers close to the front. The air force and ground forces were badly out of synch, and some soldiers complained to reporters that they hadn't eaten in a few days.¶ Their American counterparts would have been able to quickly establish satellite uplinks, visual feeds from unmanned aerial drones — which the Russians weren't able to use at all — and real-time communications between all branches of the military.¶ The Soviet-designed T-72 tanks that rolled into Georgia — there were newer tanks as well, but the T-72s seemed most prominent — are prone to breaking down and are considered several rungs below American battle tanks.¶ "Military equipment is very old, and at the same time it's absolutely clear that Russia has no resources to change it," said Alexander Goltz, a military analyst in Moscow. "For all of the '90s we had no money to produce new military equipment ... the whole chain of subcontractors was destroyed."¶ But former military officers, and officials connected with the Kremlin, emphasize that Russia is in the same league as America when it comes to nuclear missile stockpiles.¶ Pavel Zolotarev, a retired Russian major general and deputy director of a government-funded institute that studies the United States and Canada, reminded a reporter of nuclear realities.¶ "As far as general forces, the American army far surpasses the Russian army in terms of equipment," Zolotarev said. "An army is made up of different kinds of forces. If we compare the nuclear forces of these two sides, then we have parity. We can destroy each other five or six times."¶ Amid all the heated words, it's important to step back and see Russia for what it really is, said Robert Hunter, the U.S. ambassador to NATO under President Clinton and now a senior adviser at the RAND Corp.¶ "I don't believe that Russia is a great power again. ... Russia is Saudi Arabia with trees," Hunter said. "In reality, Russia is a second-rate military power and will be for some time."¶ Hunter said that to try to understand Russia's recent actions, it helps to keep in mind that it has felt besieged lately. Kremlin leaders have been unhappy about U.S. plans to build a missile defense shield in Poland and the Czech Republic, and American backing for the NATO membership of Ukraine and Georgia.¶ Given those tensions, Hunter said, the White House should allow the Kremlin some room to vent, as long as it doesn't go too far, and not provoke it toward bigger displays of military aggression.¶ "Most of it I would keep my mouth shut about," he said. "If they want to steer off to Venezuela, be my guest."¶ Read more here: <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2008/09/11/52313/russian-leaders-talk-big-but-army.html#storylink=cpy>

#### Weakness of Russian Military has been revealed through war

Vladimir Isachenkov,08, (The associated Press army times .com,http://www.armytimes.com/news/2008/08/ap\_russia\_military\_081808/,”War reveals Russian military might, weakness),8/18/8.

MOSCOW — Russia’s lightning war against Georgia looks like a military triumph: An armada of Russian tanks easily crushed Georgia’s modest army in a show of muscle intended to punish its U.S.-allied neighbor, scare others and reaffirm Moscow’s influence on its former Soviet turf.¶ But the conflict also revealed crucial weaknesses in Moscow’s military preparedness — including faulty intelligence, a shortage of modern equipment and poor coordination.¶ The swift Russian victory presented a stark contrast to the war in Chechnya in the 1990s, where Russian troops were bogged down for years, suffering a string of humiliating losses at the hands of lightly armed rebels.¶ When Georgia launched an offensive Aug. 7 to regain control of the breakaway province of South Ossetia, Russia responded immediately, sending thousands of troops and hundreds of tanks through the mountain tunnel that cuts through Russia’s border with South Ossetia.¶ At the same time, dozens of Russian warplanes ranged over Georgia, attacking military bases, airports, communications and transport facilities.¶ During the two wars in Chechnya, Moscow faced widespread criticism for leveling the capital of Grozny with carpet bombings and airstrikes. This time, the military says Russian aircraft used smart weapons to make precision attacks on equipment and installations.¶ On Monday, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev flew to Vladikavkaz, near the border with Georgia, and trumpeted the attack as he decorated 30 soldiers and servicemen.¶ “It has been only 10 days since you faced a cowardly aggression,” he said, standing on a drill square in front of camouflage-clad soldiers and officers he called “heroes.”¶ “I am sure that such a well-done, effective and peacemaking operation aimed at protecting our citizens and other people will be among the most glorious deeds of the Russian military,” Medvedev said.¶ But while Russian airstrikes for the most part seemed to pinpoint their targets in Georgia, AP reporters also witnessed heavy bomb damage to civilian areas in at least two places — the central city of Gori, where several residential structures were hit, and Ruisi, a village ravaged by Russian warplanes.¶ Human Rights Watch said at least 11 civilians were killed and dozens wounded by cluster bombs in Gori and Ruisi, and strongly urged Russia to stop using the weapons. The Russian military denied using cluster bombs, which disperse small “bomblets” over a wide area.¶ Moscow-based aviation analyst Konstantin Makiyenko said the civilian casualties appeared inadvertent. “Even the U.S. military, which has a greater number of smart weapons, sometimes accidentally hits civilians,” he said.¶ Ruslan Pukhov, head of the Center for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies, said the war showed that the Russian air force is still short of precision weapons and continues to rely on older types of bombs and rockets.¶ Some civilian casualties could probably have been avoided if Russia’s equivalent to the U.S. GPS satellite navigation system was fully working. But the GLONASS system doesn’t yet have the necessary number of satellites in orbit and, more importantly, portable navigation devices are still a rarity in the Russian military, according to officials.¶ Georgia said it downed at least 21 Russian warplanes, while Russia confirmed the loss of just four aircraft, including three Su-25 ground attack jets and a Tu-22 long-range bomber.¶ The conflicting claims couldn’t be resolved, but even the loss of four aircraft is a heavy toll given the small size of Georgia’s military.¶ Russia’s deputy chief of General Staff, Col. Gen. Anatoly Nogovitsyn, said the Georgians shot down the planes from hidden locations outside military facilities using Soviet-built Tor and Buk anti-aircraft missiles supplied by Ukraine. He said Russian pilots grew more cautious as the campaign continued.¶ While Russia would have to expect to lose some low-flying ground attack jets, former Russian air force chief Anatoly Kornukov said the loss of the heavy bomber — which the military said was on a reconnaissance mission — should have been avoided.¶ “They sent the Tu-22 crew to their deaths thinking that the Georgian air defense would mount no resistance,” Kornukov told Interfax news agency.¶ Moscow-based independent military analyst Alexander Golts said that sending the heavy bomber on a reconnaissance mission over Georgia was a mistake.¶ “Using the Tu-22 for a reconnaissance mission over Georgia was the same as using a microscope to drive nails,” he said.¶ Some Western experts believe that Russia spent months preparing for the invasion, and provoked the confrontation that led to Georgia’s attack on the South Ossetian capital, Tskhinvali. They pointed to military exercises the Russian military conducted just across the border in July, the lingering presence of extra Russian troops in the region in August and the speed and efficiency of Moscow’s response.¶ Russian military officials insist, however, that they were surprised by the attack and organized their response in a matter of hours.¶ Although the deployment was swift, it didn’t always run smoothly.¶ As hundreds of battered Russian armored vehicles wound through the mountain passes toward Tskhinvali, an AP reporter saw a number of tanks broken down in the road, blocking traffic; or being repaired, with soldiers working underneath them with wrenches; or even being towed by other vehicles.¶ Numerous armored vehicles also broke down en route to Chechnya 14 years ago.¶ After a hasty march to Tskhinvali, a Russian general in charge of the entire Russian military force in the region recklessly drove into the city in an advance convoy and was ambushed by Georgian forces. He suffered a leg wound.¶ Russia said 74 soldiers died and more than 170 were wounded in fighting, but Georgian officials claimed Russian losses were much higher.¶ Georgian officials said they lost 160 soldiers and that 300 are missing. Russia said the figure is much higher.¶ The physical damage inflicted by the air war on Georgia’s military and equipment is unclear. But there is no doubt of the political damage it caused.¶ The bombing campaign complicated Moscow’s efforts to persuade the world that the motive behind its intervention was the protection of South Ossetian civilians.¶ Media coverage in the West has tended to paint Georgia as the victim in the conflict. The Georgian assault on South Ossetia has often been overlooked in reports that focused on the Russian attack.¶ While foreign political reaction has been divided — with the U.S. offering the harshest condemnation of Russia — most countries have at least criticized Russia’s actions as disproportionate.¶ “The victorious Russia has found itself in complete isolation. That raises the question of whether it was a victory,” Golts said.¶ Russia may also have made ousting Georgian President Mikhail Saakashvili a key goal in its brief war. If so, it failed. After the fighting stopped, a pro-government rally in the Georgian capital drew tens of thousands of people.¶ “Georgia’s military losses were higher than Russia’s, but financial, political and moral losses of Russia were much higher than those of Georgia,” Andrei Illarionov, former Kremlin adviser turned opposition activist, said in a commentary posted in the online Yezhednevny Zhurnal.

## Middle East Stability Advantages

# Middle Eastern Stability Frontline

By: Niti, Tiffany, and James

### Iranian Proliferation Advantage Frontline

#### 1 - History and retaliation prove no Iranian nuclear proliferation-threatened by U.S retaliation

Chapman 7/8. (Steve, columnist and editorial writer for Chicago Tribune, “The arms race that won't happen Iran and the phony proliferation scare”, Chicago Tribune, 07/08/12, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-07-08/news/ct-oped-0708-chapman-20120708_1_nuclear-proliferation-iran-regional-proliferation>, 07/23/12, Chin)

Nuclear proliferation is always said to be on the verge of suddenly accelerating, and somehow it never does. In 1981, there were five declared nuclear powers — the U.S., the Soviet Union, China, Britain and France — as well as Israel, which was (and is) undeclared.¶And today? The number of members added since then is not 15 but three: India, Pakistan and North Korea. Most of the other countries on the list of likely proliferators never came close — including Argentina, Chile, Morocco and Tunisia. Iraq tried and failed. Libya made an effort and then chose to give up.¶Theperil was greatly overblown. It probably is again. But our leaders are not about to let mere history debunk the apocalyptic scenarios. They are committed to a policy based on fear rather than experience.¶TheUnited States keeps trying to force Iran to abandon its suspected efforts to build a nuclear arsenal, and so far it has been rebuffed. Both Obama and Mitt Romney have said they would use force rather than let Iran acquire nukes. Chances are good that whoever wins in November, we will be at war with Tehran sometime in the next four years.¶But there is no reason to think Iran would ever use such weapons, and there is little reason to think it would spur other countries to get them. If all it takes to unleash regional proliferation is one fearsome state with nukes, the Middle East would have gone through it already — since Israel has had them for decades.¶Why would governments in the region respond differently to Iran? Many of them are allied with the U.S. — which means Iran can't attack or threaten them without fear of overwhelming retaliation. Turkey, as a member of NATO, enjoys a formal defense guarantee from Washington. The U.S. might offer similar assurances to Saudi Arabia, Egypt and other nervous neighbors.

#### 2 - No impact to Iranian proliferation – nuclear weapons are not being used

Chapman 7/8. (Steve, columnist and editorial writer of Chicago Tribune, “The arms race that won't happen Iran and the phony proliferation scare”, Chicago Tribune, 07/08/12, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-07-08/news/ct-oped-0708-chapman-20120708_1_nuclear-proliferation-iran-regional-proliferation>, 07/23/12, Chin)

¶One way or another, they would probably find they can manage fine. Iran is no scarier than Mao's China was in 1964, when it detonated its first atomic device. Writes Francis Gavin, a professor at the Lyndon B. JohnsonSchool of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, "It was predicted that India, Indonesia and Japan might follow."¶In recent decades, some countries have actually given up their nukes — including Ukraine and South Africa. Others, like Brazil and Sweden, have scrapped their weapons programs. After the Cold War, it was assumed the newly reunified Germany would want to assert its new status by joining the nuclear club. It has yet to exhibit a glimmer of interest.¶A nuclear Iran would soon learn something previous nuclear powers already know: These weapons are not much use except to deter nuclear attack. What help have they been for the U.S. in Iraq or Afghanistan?¶If Iran does get nukes, its neighbors that have survived without them will find that nothing much has changed. Nuclear proliferation is the danger that lurks just over the horizon, and that's where it is likely to stay.

### Iran Prolif Adv - Exts #1 - No prolif

#### Iranian proliferation unlikely and could be easily stopped—Iran just wants security

Waltz 6/17.(Waltz, “Column: Iranian nukes? No worries”, USA Today, 06/17/12, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-06-17/iran-nuclear-bomb-israel-proliferation/55654248/1>, 07/25/12, Chin)

It should not. In fact, a nuclear-armed Iran would probably be the best possible result of the standoff and the one most likely to restore stability to the Middle East.¶Thecrisis over Iran's nuclear program could end in three ways. First, diplomacy coupled with sanctions could persuade Iran to abandon pursuit of a nuclear weapon. But that's unlikely: The historical record indicates that a country bent on acquiring nuclear weapons can rarely be dissuaded. Take North Korea, which succeeded in building its weapons despite countless rounds of sanctions and U.N. Security Council resolutions. If Tehran decides that its security depends on possessing nuclear weapons, sanctions are unlikely to change its mind.¶Thesecond possible outcome is that Iran stops short of testing a nuclear weapon but develops a breakout capability, the capacity to build and test one quite quickly. Such a capability might satisfy the domestic political needs of Iran's rulers by assuring hard-liners that they can enjoy all the benefits of having a bomb (such as greater security) without the downsides (such as international isolation and condemnation).The third possible outcome of the standoff is that Iran continues its course and publicly goes nuclear by testing a weapon. U.S. and Israeli officials have declared that outcome unacceptable, arguing that a nuclear Iran is an existential threat to Israel. Such language is typical of major powers, which have historically gotten riled up whenever another country begins to develop a nuclear weapon. Yet every time another country has managed to shoulder its way into the nuclear club, the other members have always changed tack and decided to live with it. In fact, by reducing imbalances in military power, new nuclear states generally produce more regional and international stability, not less. Another oft-touted worry is that if Iran obtains the bomb, other states in the region will follow suit, leading to a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. But the nuclear age is now almost 70 years old, and fears of proliferation have proved to be unfounded. When Israel acquired the bomb in the 1960s, it was at war with many of its neighbors. If an atomic Israel did not trigger an arms race then, there is no reason a nuclear Iran should now.¶For these reasons, the U.S. and its allies need not take such pains to prevent the Iranians from developing a nuclear weapon. Diplomacy should continue because open lines of communication will make the Western countries feel better able to live with a nuclear Iran. But the sanctions on Iran can be dropped: They primarily harm ordinary Iranians, with little purpose.¶

#### Iran is not proliferating now- they have no nuclear weapons program

Kaveh L Afrasiabi, 2006( Iran expert who has taught political science at Tehran University, Boston University, and Bentley College. Afrasiabi has been a visiting scholar at Harvard University, UC Berkeley, Binghamton University, Center For Strategic Research, Tehran and Institute For Strategic [Studies](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kaveh-l-afrasiabi-phd) in Paris.) <<http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/HJ25Ak01.html>> (Shah)

Indeed, there is no evidence that Iran is proliferating, that it deserves the same punishment as North Korea. This is a point emphasized by the Iranian leadership, as well as others, including the former chief UN weapons inspector, Scott Ritter, at a recent talk sponsored by the Nation Institute in New York, also featuring veteran investigative reporter Seymour Hersh, who has written extensively on the United States' plans for military strikes on Iran. According to Ritter, whose new book *Target Iran* is a powerful jab at the Bush administration's Iran policy, if the US bombed Iran's nuclear facilities today, there would be "no environmental damage" because Iran's facilities are mostly [concrete buildings](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/HJ25Ak01.html) and rudimentary equipment with little actual nuclear material involved. "That is the whole insanity of this thing. Iran has no nuclear-weapons program and its enrichment program is at the lab scale," said Ritter. He added that the United States' Iran policy was pushed by a nexus of Washington's neo-conservatives and Israel's right-wing Likud politicians who have a "faith-based" rather than a "fact-based" approach with regard to Iran, that is, the Israelis have adopted the wrong policy toward Iran by deluding themselves into believing that Iran is proliferating nuclear weapons and is at the advanced stages of this process.

### Iran Prolif Advantage Exts - #2 - No impact

#### No impact-Iran is not proliferating now- no development of nuclear weapons

Mueller 2/16. (John, professor of political science at Ohio State University, “Iran: false nuclear fears cloud the west's judgment”, the guardian, 02/16/12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/feb/16/iran-false-nuclear-fears>, 07/23/12, Chin)

Alarmism about nuclear proliferation is fairly common coin in the foreign policy establishment. And of late it has been boosted by the seeming efforts of Iran or its friends to answer covert assassinations, apparently by Israel, with attacks and attempted attacks of their own in India, Georgia and Thailand.¶A non-hysterical approach to the Iran nuclear issue is entirely possible. It should take several considerations into account. If the rattled and insecure Iranian leadership is lying when it says it has no intention of developing nuclear weapons, or if it undergoes a conversion from that position (triggered perhaps by an Israeli air strike), it will find, like all other nuclear-armed states, that the bombs are essentially useless and a considerable waste of time, effort, money and scientific talent.¶Nuclear weapons have had a tremendous influence on our agonies and obsessions since 1945, inspiring desperate rhetoric, extravagant theorising, wasteful expenditure and frenetic diplomatic posturing. However, they have been of little historic consequence. And they were not necessary to prevent a third world war or a major conflict in Europe: each leak from the archives suggests that the Soviet Union never seriously considered direct military aggression against the US or Europe. That is, there was nothing to deter.¶Moreover, there never seem to have been militarily compelling – or even minimally sensible – reasons to use the weapons, particularly because of an inability to identify targets that were both suitable and could not be effectively attacked using conventional munitions.¶Iran would most likely "use" any nuclear capacity in the same way all other nuclear states have: for prestige (or ego‑stoking) and to deter real or perceived threats. Historical experience strongly suggests that new nuclear countries, even ones that once seemed hugely threatening, like communist China in the 1960s, are content to use their weapons for such purposes.¶Thepopular notion that nuclear weapons furnish a country with the capacity to "dominate" its area has little or no historical support – in the main, nuclear threats since 1945 have either been ignored or met with countervailing opposition, not timorous acquiescence. It thus seems overwhelmingly likely that, if a nuclear Iran brandishes its weapons to intimidate others or get its way, it will find that those threatened, rather than capitulating or rushing off to build a compensating arsenal of their own, will ally with others, including conceivably Israel, to stand up to the intimidation – rather in the way an alliance of convenience coalesced to oppose Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990.¶Iran's leadership, though hostile and unpleasant in many ways, is not a gaggle of suicidal lunatics. Thus, as Schelling suggests, it is exceedingly unlikely it would give nuclear weapons to a group like Hezbollah to detonate, not least because the rational ones in charge would fear that the source would be detected, inviting devastating retaliation.¶Nor is an Iranian bomb likely to trigger a cascade of proliferation in the Middle East, as many people insist. Decades of alarmist predictions about proliferation chains, cascades, dominoes, waves, avalanches, epidemics and points of no return have proven faulty. The proliferation of nuclear weapons has been far slower than routinely expected because, insofar as most leaders of most countries, even rogue ones, have considered acquiring the weapons, they have come to appreciate several defects: the weapons are dangerous, distasteful, costly and likely to rile the neighbours. And the nuclear diffusion that has transpired has had remarkably limited, perhaps even imperceptible, consequences. As Professor Jacques Hymans has shown, the weapons have also been exceedingly difficult to obtain for administratively dysfunctional countries like Iran.¶There is also an uncomfortable truth. If Iran wants to develop a nuclear weapon, the only way it can be effectively stopped is invasion and occupation, an undertaking that would make America's costly war in Iraq look like child's play. Indeed, because it can credibly threaten invaders with another and worse Iraq, Iran scarcely needs nuclear weapons to deter invasion. This fact might eventually dawn on its leaders.

### Iraq Instability Advantage Frontline

#### 1 - Status quo solving - Steps have already been taken to achieve Iraqi stability- state construction

Al-Maliki 11.(Nouri, Prime Minister of Iraq, “Building a stable Iraq”, The Washington Post, 12/04/11, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/building-a-stable-iraq/2011/12/04/gIQAhoxrTO_story.html>, 07/23/12, Chin)

Solidifying a durable relationship between our two countries is vital. In the coming months, we must mutually focus on economic growth as well as culture, education and the sciences. Iraq has progressed to the stage of state building. We are building more than a million homes for low-income families, and I look forward to seeing construction cranes and high-rises dotting the Baghdad skyline. The struggle for reconstruction is no less daunting than the struggle for security. We are working to breach barriers that impede investment so this vision can become a reality. I am working diligently with our Investment Commission to ensure the rights of foreign investors and to create an environment conducive to investment.¶Thestability of Iraq after the withdrawal of American forces has been a major concern of both our nations. I believe in the capabilities of our security forces and in the necessity of U.S. assistance.¶There are still some who seek the destruction of our country. The Baath Party, which is prohibited by the constitution, believes in coups and conspiracies; indeed, these have been its modus operandi since the party’s inception. The Baathists seek to destroy Iraq’s democratic process. Hundreds of suspected Baathists recently were arrested; some of those detained have been released while others are awaiting trial. Those still in custody will receive due process and equitable treatment under Iraqi law. These detainees come from all over Iraq, and I refute characterizations that the detentions were a sectarian action based on political motives. These steps were taken to protect Iraq’s democracy.

#### 2 - Multiple alternative causes of Iraqi instability including insurgents and lack of security

Jakes 7/1. (Lara, reporter for USA Today, “Surge in violence spurs fear for Iraq’s stability”, USA Today, 07/01/12, <http://www.usatoday.com/USCP/PNI/Nation/World/2012-07-01-BCMLIraqSix-Months-Later_ST_U.htm>, 07/23/12, Chin)

BAGHDAD — BAGHDAD A half-year after the U.S. military left Iraq, dire predictions seem to be coming true: The country is mired in violence and the government is on the verge of collapsing. With no relief in sight, there's growing talk of Iraq as a failed state as al-Qaida's local wing staged near daily attacks that killed at least 234 people in June.¶Iraq no longer suffers widespread retaliatory killings between Sunni and Shiite extremists that brought the country to the brink of civil war. But the spike in violence heightens fears that Iraq could limp along for years as an unstable and dangerous country.¶Insurgents have exploited the political struggles between the country's ethnic and sectarian factions, and June was the second-deadliest month since U.S. troops withdrew from Iraq in mid-December. More significant than the numbers was the fact that insurgents appeared able to sustain the level of violence over a longer period than usual. There was a major deadly bombing or shooting rampage almost every three days, many targeting Shiite pilgrims.¶Theviolence has brought the weakness of Iraq's security apparatus into sharp focus even as deepening political divisions dim the prospects that the country will emerge as a stable democracy after decades of war and dictatorship.¶"Thestate is almost paralyzed and dysfunctional due to political feuds. In such circumstances, the security forces also will be paralyzed and the insurgents groups are making use of this chaos," Haider al-Saadi, the Shiite owner of an internet cafe in eastern Baghdad, said Saturday. "I do not think that al-Qaida is getting any stronger -- it is the state that is getting weaker."¶Thesituation deteriorated shortly after American troops left Iraq on Dec.18, following failed negotiations to stay beyond a year-end withdrawal deadline that was cemented in a 2008 security agreement.

### Iraq Stability Adv Exts - #1 - Status Quo solving

#### **Iraq is confident to achieve stability- does not need U.S presence**

Abdul-Zahra 11.(Qassim, journalist for The Daily Star, “Maliki confident Iraq can achieve stability after U.S. troop pullout”, The Daily Star, 12/05/11, <http://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Middle-East/2011/Dec-05/156029-maliki-confident-iraq-can-achieve-stability-after-us-troop-pullout.ashx>, 07/23/12, Chin)

BAGHDAD: Weeks before the U.S. pullout, Iraq’s prime minister confidently predicted Saturday that his country would achieve stability and remain independent of its giant neighbor Iran even without an American troop presence.¶Maliki insisted that Iraq will chart its own policies in the future according to national interests, not the dictates of Iran or any other country.¶“Iraq is not a follower of any country,” Maliki said. He pointed out several areas in which Iraq had acted against Iran’s desires, including the signing of the security agreement in 2008 that required all U.S. forces to leave Iraq by the end of this year. Iran had been pushing for American troops to be out of the country even sooner.¶¶“Through our policies, Iraq was not and will not be a follower of another country’s policies,” he said.¶“Nothing has changed with the withdrawal of the American forces from Iraq on the security level because basically it has been in our hands,” he said.

### Syrian War Advantage Frontline

#### 1 - US incapable of solving Syrian civil war—Syria’s army too powerful and well-armed

Rusling 7/20. (Matthew, freelance writer, “News Analysis: U.S. unlikely to involve in Syria despite Republican push: analyst”, English.xinhuanet.com, 07/20/12, <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/indepth/2012-07/20/c_131727734.htm>, 07/24/12, Chin)

WASHINGTON, July 19 (Xinhua) -- The United States and its NATO allies are unlikely to insert themselves directly into Syria's ongoing chaos, despite a renewed Republican Party's push Thursday toward more overt U.S. action, U.S. analysts said.¶¶That is because Syria's army is one of the most formidable and well-armed in the Arab world, maintaining a constant state of readiness for what it sees as a possible war with Israel, said Wayne White, a scholar at the Middle East Institute.¶¶In stark contrast to NATO's operation in Libya -- a country that under deposed ruler Muammar Gaddafi had one of the Arab world's most ill-equipped and incompetent armies -- NATO would be unable to undertake an operation against Syria, he said.¶¶"That's beyond the capability of NATO," said White, also a former deputy head of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research's Office of Analysis for the Near East and South Asia under the U.S. State Department.¶¶Geography would be another major obstacle, as Syria is further inland than Libya, which has a broad coastline across from European bases, he said. The country's position on the map would put NATO aircraft in jeopardy, as pilots could not retreat to a nearby aircraft carrier when hit.¶¶The White House also reiterated Wednesday that the U.S. military will not involve itself in the mounting violence.¶¶The United States and allied European countries called for a 45-day renewal of the UN's peace mission in Syria, with sanctions that kick in if the violence did not stop. China and Russia called for a 90-day extension free of sanctions.¶

#### 2- Status quo solving now - US already taking action to end Syrian Civil War

Ditz 7/21. (Jason, managing news editor, “US Abandons ‘Diplomatic’ Efforts, Aims to Forcibly Oust Syrian Govt.”, Antiwar.com, 07/21/12, <http://news.antiwar.com/2012/07/21/us-abandons-diplomatic-efforts-aims-to-forcibly-oust-syrian-govt/>, 07/24/12, Chin)

According to those officials, the White House is now holding daily “high-level” meetings about ways to aid the various rebel factions in the Syrian Civil War, as well as contingency planning for their own military action to seize Syria’s chemical weapons arsenal.¶¶The “chemical weapons” invasion talk, interestingly, comes just days after Pentagon officials were dispatched to Israel to try to talk them out of doing the exact same thing, warning that it would make Assad’s position stronger and foster sympathy domestically for the long-time dictator if Israel just randomly invaded and started looting their arsenal.¶¶Likewise, the discussion of more overt aid to the rebels comes despite lobbyists for those same rebels claiming earlier in the week that President Obama had told them he wasn’t going to intervene directly until after the US election in November.¶¶The narrative surrounding what the US is or isn’t going to do to impose a regime change in Syria isn’t necessarily following a straight line, but this endgame is largely in keeping with the Obama Administration’s recent strategy of feigning interest in a diplomatic solution while undermining it until it finally collapses, then insisting they are reluctantly moving toward unilateral action, a strategy Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has been very open about using against Iran, bragging that the “negotiations” were only being used to forward sanctions, while other officials said that the sanctions were also going to eventually fail, leading to a full scale war.

#### 3 - Increased intervention in Syria will only spur more conflict—alliances and formidable forces prove

Milne 6/5. (Seumas, Guardian columnist and associate editor, “In Syria, foreign intervention will only shed more blood”, the guardian, 06/05/12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/jun/05/syria-un-intervention-bashar-al-assad>, 07/24/12, Chin)

Today, Russian and Chinese leaders reaffirmed their opposition to forced regime change and support for UN envoy Kofi Annan's peace plan. But Susan Rice, US ambassador to the UN, has made clear western powers might act alone and take action "outside the authority" of the UN. Even the new French president François Hollande has said military intervention in his country's former colonial territory was "not to be ruled out".¶Thelatest calls for action against Bashar al-Assad's regime follow the slaughter of 108 people, including 49 children, in Houla less than a fortnight ago. Opposition activists have blamed pro-regime "shabiha" sectarian militias for the massacre; the government al-Qaida terrorists. But there's no doubt that atrocities such as Houla – let alone killings on a larger scale – have the potential to turn intervention grandstanding into the real thing.¶In fact, Iran's alliance with Syria is one more reason why increasing western and Gulf dictators' intervention in Syria would escalate the conflict, not end it. Last year's Nato intervention in Libya increased the death toll by a factor of 10 to 15 and left a country of lawless warlords, torture and ethnic cleansing. Intervention in Syria, whether by fully arming the opposition or using air power to create "humanitarian corridors", would have a far more devastating impact.¶That's partly because the Syrian regime has significant air defences and large-scale armed forces and the conflict is being fought out in heavily populated areas. But it's also because of the sectarian schisms and the risk of spreading the conflict further into countries such as Iraq and Lebanon. Why the states that brought blood and destruction to Iraq and Afghanistan should be thought suitable vehicles of humanitarian deliverance to Syria is a mystery. But full-scale foreign intervention would certainly lead to a far greater civilian death toll and many more Houlas.

### Syrian Civil War Adv Exts - #1 - US not key

#### US already taking action to end Syrian Civil War

Ditz 7/21. (Jason, managing news editor, “US Abandons ‘Diplomatic’ Efforts, Aims to Forcibly Oust Syrian Govt.”, Antiwar.com, 07/21/12, <http://news.antiwar.com/2012/07/21/us-abandons-diplomatic-efforts-aims-to-forcibly-oust-syrian-govt/>, 07/24/12, Chin)

According to those officials, the White House is now holding daily “high-level” meetings about ways to aid the various rebel factions in the Syrian Civil War, as well as contingency planning for their own military action to seize Syria’s chemical weapons arsenal.¶¶The “chemical weapons” invasion talk, interestingly, comes just days after Pentagon officials were dispatched to Israel to try to talk them out of doing the exact same thing, warning that it would make Assad’s position stronger and foster sympathy domestically for the long-time dictator if Israel just randomly invaded and started looting their arsenal.¶¶Likewise, the discussion of more overt aid to the rebels comes despite lobbyists for those same rebels claiming earlier in the week that President Obama had told them he wasn’t going to intervene directly until after the US election in November.¶¶The narrative surrounding what the US is or isn’t going to do to impose a regime change in Syria isn’t necessarily following a straight line, but this endgame is largely in keeping with the Obama Administration’s recent strategy of feigning interest in a diplomatic solution while undermining it until it finally collapses, then insisting they are reluctantly moving toward unilateral action, a strategy Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has been very open about using against Iran, bragging that the “negotiations” were only being used to forward sanctions, while other officials said that the sanctions were also going to eventually fail, leading to a full scale war.

#### U.S. intervention in Syria can only bring more harm – instability and past revolutions prove

Brooks 7/25. (Mo, U.S. Representative of the 5th Congressional district of Alabama, “U.S. cannot afford to intervene in Syria’s civil war”, The Hill’s Congress Blog, 07/25/12, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/239971-us-cannot-afford-to-ntervene-in-syrias-civil-war>, 07/25/12, Chin)

America’s debt threatens our economic stability and national security. The United States borrows from China. We blew through the $15 trillion dollar debt mark last November, and we will blow through the $16 trillion dollar debt mark later this year. ¶Bear in mind that America’s intervention in Libya cost over a billion dollars. An American intervention in Syria would cost much more. America cannot afford to spend money we don’t have, money that, if spent, hastens an American insolvency and in turn undermines our ability to pay for our national defense. A case in point is sequestration and the 700,000 national defense-related lay-offs it triggers starting in January 2013. These cuts reduce America’s defense capabilities by roughly 25 percent. ¶Basically, the United States is broke. We lack the financial strength to serve as global cops.¶In addition to the potentially severe financial burden of American involvement in Syria, history has shown that when the United States picks short-term winners in internal conflicts like Syria, we create enemies and ill will that increase the likelihood of retaliatory attacks on America. From Vietnam to Iraq, triumphant regimes feel little loyalty toward the U.S., while the defeated blame the U.S. for their condition and seek revenge for the loss of their loved ones.¶Even if the U.S. were to wage war with money we don’t have, there is a real risk we would make matters worse, not better. Revolution in Egypt specifically, and the Arab Spring generally, have shown great promise, then were followed by political gains for Muslim extremists who threaten war with Israel and share views with those who masterminded 9/11 attacks on New York City and the Pentagon. Syrian rebels’ ties with extreme Islamists raise the very real possibility that America’s intervention will empower the very terrorists who seek to attack us on our own soil. ¶All of these considerations do not mean President Bashar al-Assad’s resolve to cruelly hunt his own countrymen and lay waste to his own lands must go unchallenged. Syria is in the backyard of Middle Eastern nations and a close neighbor of Europe. If military intervention in Syria is appropriate, then Syria’s regional neighbors should shoulder that burden. The Arab League, European Union, and other Syrian neighbors should not expect the United States to act from half a world away while they twiddle their trigger fingers.¶America should not intervene in Syria. We must not spend money we don’t have on causes that don’t involve substantial American interests. America simply does not have the resources to enforce peace in every conflict in the world, particularly in a part of the world where people do not fully appreciate our sacrifice of blood. To the contrary, it will create lasting ill will toward us.¶The United States has always been, and will always be, an ally of freedom. But we must put America’s future and the future of our children and grandchildren first.Generations to come deserve a better future than unrestrained American military adventurism gives them. They deserve policies that preserve America’s solvency, minimize international ill will toward us, and promote peace. Intervention in Syria supports none of these things.

### Syrian Civil War Adv Exts - #2 - Status quo solving

#### The US is already taking action in Syria

Milne 6/5. (Seumas, Guardian columnist and associate editor, “In Syria, foreign intervention will only shed more blood”, the guardian, 06/05/12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/jun/05/syria-un-intervention-bashar-al-assad>, 07/24/12, Chin)

As Syria descends deeper into civil war and human misery, pressure for yet another western military intervention in the Arab world is growing. Last week, General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the US joint chiefs of staff, declared that the US might take the "military option" in Syria if it was "asked to do so". Barack Obama's Republican rival Mitt Romney is meanwhile demanding that the US government arm the Syrian opposition.¶The reality is that intervention in Syria by the US and its allies has already begun. The western powers have backed the fractious opposition Syrian National Council since the early days of last year's uprising. So have the Gulf autocracies led by Saudi Arabia, who have stepped up the flow of weapons and cashtofavoured Syrian rebel groups in recent months, while Turkey has provided a cross-border base. That is co-ordinated with the US, which supplies the same groups with "non-lethal assistance" and "communications equipment".¶ In other words, the US and its allies are sponsoring regime change through civil war. And while paying lip service to the Annan plan for demilitarisation and negotiation, they are making sure it won't succeed. The results can be seen on the ground. Overall, lethal violence is estimated by human rights groups to have dropped by 36% since the plan was supposed to come into effect, but government casualties have increased sharply over the same period (953 reported killed since mid-March). Rebel fighters claimed to have killed 80 government troops last weekend alone.

#### U.N. taking action to solve Syrian civil war

Olesen 7/17. (Alexa, writer for the Associated Press, “UN head visits China seeking tough action on Syria”, The Kansas City Star, 07/17/12, <http://www.kansascity.com/2012/07/17/3708046/un-head-visits-china-seeking-tough.html>, 07/24/12, Chin)

BEIJING -- U.N. leader Ban Ki-moon was headed to China on Tuesday amid alarm over the spiraling violence in Syria and a diplomatic push to get Russia and China to back a tougher response to attacks by President Bashar Assad's regime.¶Ban's trip comes ahead of a U.N. Security Council vote Wednesday on whether to allow sanctions and authorize actions to enforce them that could ultimately include the use of military force, which U.S. administration and European officials are playing down as a possibility. Russia and China have blocked previous efforts to sanction Syria.¶There has been heightened urgency to global diplomatic efforts on Syria since it was reported last week that dozens were killed in a regime assault on the Syrian village of Tremseh. U.N. observers said the attack appeared to target army defectors and activists.¶In response to the Tremseh attacks, Ban on Friday urged U.N. members to "take collective and decisive action" on Syria immediately and warned that inaction would be "license for further massacres."¶China has maintained that a diplomatic solution is the only way to end the crisis and resisted calls to pressure Assad to step down. The official People's Daily newspaper ran a commentary Tuesday strongly opposing force against Syria and calling for a political solution, a sign that China may again block the Western-backed resolution.¶"Sovereign equality and noninterference in internal affairs (of other countries) is a red line that must not be crossed," said the commentary. "A political solution is the only way out of the Syrian problem."¶World powers remain deeply divided over who is responsible and how to stop it. The U.S. and many Western nations have called on Assad to leave power, while Russia, China and Iran have stood by the regime.

#### The US alone can’t solve, diplomacy is key

Bennis 6/26. (Phyllis, Fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies and of the Transnational Institute in Amsterdam, “Syria: Only diplomacy can stop the war”, Aljazeera, 06/26/12, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/06/201262475838515783.html>, 07/24/12, Chin)

The human cost of this conflict is incalculably high. It's not surprising that the normal human reaction is "we've got to do something". But what is needed is serious diplomacy - not an army or air force action. US/NATO military intervention didn't bring stability, democracy or security to Libya, and it certainly is not going to do so in Syria.¶¶Kofi Annan has proposed new negotiations including the Syrian regime's supporters, Iran and Russia, as well as those western, Arab and regional governments backing the armed opposition. So far the US has rejected the proposal, at least regarding Iran, with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton saying that Tehran is part of the problem in Syria and thus can't be part of the solution.

### \*\*\*1NC- Spillover Inevitable\*\*\*

#### Lebanon’s current political environments mean spillover is inevitable

**Araabi, 12**(SamerAraabi, SamerAraabi is a contributor to a number of prominent foreign policy sites including the Institute for Policy Studies, Foreign Policy in Focus, the Balkans Project, and the Arab American Institute. Samer recently graduated from the London School of Economics with an MSc in Conflict Studies, and holds dual bachelor's degrees in Political Theory and Economics. The primary focus of the site is on U.S. foreign policy toward Levantine states, but often extends to cover broader regional issues as well; “Syrian Instability Exacerbates Lebanese Tensions”; <http://www.aaiusa.org/index_ee.php/blog/entry/syrian-instability-exacerbates-lebanese-tensions>; May 30th, 2012) James

After the spontaneous arrest of an anti-Syrian cleric in the northern Lebanese city of Tripoli for suspected ties to Al-Qaeda, a series of escalating reciprocal protests lead to gun-battles across Lebanon. The convulsion of violence appeared to be an inevitable spillover of the Syrian uprising onto its fragile neighbor. Though the violence clearly has some basis in the Syrian uprising (and has certainly been framed that way), to what extent is this round of violence a product of Lebanon’s own political environment? Several analysts have weighed in on this question, with a number of different answers. One of the most interesting interpretations comes from Patrick Galey, who writes about the [intersection of economic deprivation and political allegiances](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/may/18/lebanon-leaders-fuelling-tripoli-fighting) in Tripoli: “Behind all of Syria's influence in Lebanon, and underneath a past of political manipulation, the true cause of Tripoli's violent present lies in the city's appalling neglect.” It’s a compelling narrative that doesn’t necessary explain the entirety of the conflict – after all, the underlying resentments between the parties still originates from somewhere – but offers a much more robust view than the [narrow sectarian](http://www.npr.org/2012/05/29/153901346/syrias-problems-cross-border-into-lebanoan) explanations that are often presented elsewhere.It remains unclear to what extent Lebanon will be further destabilized by the growing violence in Syria, but all indications point to a steadily-worsening effect as the uprising grows increasingly militarized. It does seem clear, however, that Lebanon’s existing problems of wealth inequality, political instability, and pervasive militarization, will only make matters worse.

### \*\*\*EXT: Spillover Inevitable\*\*\*

#### Rebellion victory inevitable; means no spillover

**Mohammed and Quinn, 7/14**(Arshad Mohammed, U.S. Foreign Policy Correspondent for Reuters; Andrew Quinn a writer for Reuters; “Syria Conflict: U.S. Secretary Of State Hillary Clinton Says Rebel Gains Inevitable”; 7/24/2012) James

Syrian rebels are gaining ground and will eventually control swathes of territory, but Syrian President Bashar al-Assad still has time to negotiate an exit, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on Tuesday.Speaking as if military victory bythe Syrian opposition was an inevitability, Clinton told reporters that it was now time to plan the "day after," urging the rebels think through how they may govern the country and how to prevent sectarian reprisals.The last week appears to have been the bloodiest in the conflict in which the Alawite minority that has ruled the Sunni majority country for four decades has sought to crush the rebels' 17-month violent uprising against Assad."We have to work closely with the opposition because more and more territory is being taken and it will, eventually, result in a safe haven inside Syria which will then provide a base for further actions by the opposition," Clinton said at a news conference with Haitian Prime Minister Laurent Lamothe."We do believe that it is not too late for the Assad regime to commence with planning for a transition, to find a way that ends the violence by beginning the kind of serious discussions that have not occurred to date," Clinton said.Clinton said that among the challenges the opposition must prepare for are creating governing entities, protecting Syria's chemical weapons, facilitating humanitarian relief and committing to protect the rights of all Syrians should Assad fall."It's important to look at these day-after issues," Clinton said."We're working across many of these important pillars of a transition that is inevitable. It would be better if it happened sooner both because fewer people would die or be injured, but also because it would perhaps prevent sectarian retribution," she added.

## Iran Strikes

### \*\*\*1NC- No Iran Strikes\*\*\*

#### **Iran is unlikely to strike- won’t intentionally provoke conflict**

Capaccio 2/16.(Tony, reporter for Bloomberg News, “Iran Unlikely To Strike First, U.S. Official Says”, Bloomberg, 02/16/12, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-16/iran-unlikely-to-strike-first-in-conflict-u-s-intelligence-official-says.html>, 07/26/12, Chin)

The Iranian military is unlikely to intentionally provoke a conflict with the West, the top U.S. military intelligence official said today. ¶Lieutenant General Ronald Burgess, director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, said Iran probably has the ability to “temporarily close the Strait of Hormuz with its naval forces,” as some Iranian officials have threatened to do if attacked or in response to sanctions on its oil exports by the U.S. and European Union. ¶“Iran has also threatened to launch missiles against the United States and our allies in the region in response to an attack,” Burgess said in testimony at a hearing today of the Senate Armed Services Committee. “It could also employ its terrorist surrogates worldwide. However, it is unlikely to initiate or intentionally provoke a conflict or launch a preemptive attack.” ¶Iran’s known nuclear activities are monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and there are no reports of enriched uranium being diverted from those facilities for weapons use.

### \*\*\*EXT: No Iran Strikes\*\*\*

#### Iran unlikely to strike- not developing nuclear weapons now

CBS News 2/16. (“General: Iran unlikely to strike unless hit”, CBS News, 02/16/12, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-202_162-57379278/general-iran-unlikely-to-strike-unless-hit/>, 07/26/12, Chin)

Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Defense Intelligence Agency chief Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess said Iran is unlikely to initiate or intentionally provoke a conflict. His comments came amid growing international fears that Israel would launch military strikes against Iran to thwart its nuclear ambitions and counter recent diplomatic attacks in Thailand, India and Georgia. Israel has accused Iran of trying to kill its diplomats.¶On the other side of the Capitol, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said intelligence shows that Iran is continuing to enrich uranium but that Tehran has not made a decision to proceed with developing a nuclear weapon. The former CIA director said the United States is open to negotiations with Iran to find a diplomatic solution, but he said the U.S. keeps all options on the table to ensure that Tehran does not acquire a nuclear weapon.¶Clapper said it's "technically feasible" that Tehran could produce a nuclear weapon in one or two years, if its leaders decide to build one, "but practically not likely."

#### Iran unlikely to attack – geographical advantages in its homeland prove

Wagner and Doyle 2/1.(CEO of Country Risk Solutions, BA in Economics and MPhil in Development Studies, “Iranian Attack on the US Unlikely”, International Policy Digest, 02/01/12, <http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2012/02/01/iranian-attack-on-the-us-unlikely/>, 07/26/12, Chin)

¶Given the evidence that international economic sanctions against Tehran are beginning to have a significant impact on the Iranian economy, and given Iran’s increasing isolation, some analysts believe that Iran may think it has little to lose by attacking the US homeland.¶¶Iran could sponsor an attack if it believed the consequences for such an action would be small and bearable. If Iran utilized a proxy, for example, its involvement may be difficult to prove with certainty, and Tehran could maintain plausible deniability for an attack. It could sponsor a strike that was either too insignificant to justify a full-scale US response, or too nebulous to clearly identify Iran as the perpetrator. Iran knows that the US government does not desire another conflict in the Persian Gulf, given the state of the American economy and ongoing resource constraints in its military. In the event of a minor attack, the US would probably launch some type of retaliatory strike, but far smaller than a full-scale retaliation.¶¶Tehran may believe that a conflict with the US may ultimately strengthen the country by prompting Iranians of many political persuasions to back the regime out of a sense of nationalism. Even though the Iranian government knows that a full-scale war will leave it militarily devastated, it also understands that it will survive the conflict – perhaps stronger than it is today. The US has neither the money, manpower, nor inclination to use ground troops to attempt to topple Iran’s leaders or occupy the country.¶¶The leaders in Tehran are veterans of the Iran-Iraq war, and are not unaccustomed to carnage. They could prove surprising willing to put their country through yet another bloodbath, in the name of national pride. In their minds, a war with the US may potentially strengthen their position, weaken US influence in the Persian Gulf, and bring a sense of unity to what is otherwise a fractious country. It would also presumably seize the opportunity to crack down on a multitude of opposition figures in the process.¶¶Given these above scenarios, the likelihood of Iranian sponsored attack on the US homeland seems unlikely, for Iran holds a significant logistical and geographical advantage on its own turf.¶¶Any closure of the Strait of Hormuz by Iran would undoubtedly prove short-lived, but would in all likelihood result in a major spike in oil prices that would be slow to fall back to pre-conflict levels. This has more of a chance of inflicting longer-term economic pain on the US (and the rest of the world), which is why Iran is likelier to attempt to close the Strait than attack the US homeland.

## Israel Palestine

### \*\*\*1NC-Peace Plans\*\*\*

#### Peace plans will solve the impact- Hanania’s two state solution checks

**Burston, 09**(\*\*Cross Examination Note; Ray Hanania is an American-Palestinian Journalist and Comedian who wants is activist in Middle Eastern Political Topics\*\* Bradley Burston, an American-born Israeli journalist. Burston is a columnist for Haaretz and senior editor of Haaretz.com; “A Palestinian peace plan Israelis can live with”; <http://www.haaretz.com/news/a-palestinian-peace-plan-israelis-can-live-with-1.3510>; November 24th, 2009) James

Ray Hanania is a compassionate and, in fact, delightful person, with rare insight into the aspirations and failings of Palestinians and Israelis.TheHanania plan embodies the radicalism of the truly moderate, and deserves much more than cursory consideration. Consider his proposal for one of the thorniest municipal quandaries in the West Bank. Jews who wish to live in Hebron in a future state of Palestine, should be allowed to do so, he writes, "and should be protected, just as non-Jews. In fact, for every Jewish individual seeking to live in Palestine, a Palestinian should be permitted to live in Israel." What Hanania is proposing is a two state solution that addresses not only quantifiable issues, but underlying emotional grievances, and the anguish in the histories of both sides. Cynics, and, in particular, the extremists among them, will reject it out of hand as simplistic and artificially balanced. But if peace is ever to be made in the Holy Land, it will be made despite extremists and not by them. As in every potentially workable peace proposal, Hanania's plan has something in it to upset and disappoint everyone. But its underlying principle of compromise based on mutual respect and compassion, its openness to the needs and wounds of two victimized peoples, and its suggestion that grassroots sentiment for peace can succeed where leaders have so consistently failed, are surely as worthy of serious consideration, as anything currently on the table.

### \*\*\*1NC- Israeli/Palestinian Conflict Inevitable\*\*\*

#### An Israeli/Palestinian Conflict is inevitable due to a failure in creating a stable political process

**Alpher, 05**(Yossi Alpher, an Israeli consultant and writer on Israel-related strategic issues; The Future of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict”; <http://www.usip.org/files/resources/sr149.pdf>; September 2005) James

The conflict, in turn, continues to suffer from the failure to create a more stable andmature political process in Israel that could address conflict-related issues more rationally.In effect, Israeli political instability and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict help perpetuateone another. Meanwhile, the influence exercised by the ideological settler minority on thepolitical scene significantly obstructs territorial progress based on removing settlements.Together, these two factors virtually guarantee that efforts in the near term to pursuepeace with the Palestinians, or even unilateral measures in the Palestinian context, willat best be sporadic, lacking in continuity, and highly traumatic for Israeli society.Finally, international legal, political, and economic pressures on Israel are likely toincrease in the near future. Paradoxically from the Israeli standpoint, the unilateral route,which to some extent reflects an attempt by Prime Minister Sharon to bypass loominginternational pressures, may even increase the international role, and with it the potentialfor friction with the international community.How might these and additional trends affect Israeli policy decisions regarding theIsraeli-Palestinian conflict in the years ahead? On the one hand, some of the likely developments to which we have pointed could, understandably, generate diverse and evencontradictory Israeli policies. For example, should the advent of an Iranian military nuclearcapability hasten or delay Israeli territorial concessions? Should Israel welcome or opposeArab democratization processes that bring to the fore militant Islamist movements? Norecommendations are offered in these spheres.

### \*\*\*EXT:Israeli/Palestinian Conflict Inevitable\*\*\*

#### The Israel-Palestinian Conflict is inevitable-both in wait-and-watch situations

**Abrams and Gwertzman, 12**(Bernard Gwertzman, Consulting Editor, interviews

Elliot Abrams, U.S. policy in the Middle East, Israel-Palestinian affairs, democracy promotion, human rights policy, U.S. foreign policy; “Unsettled times in Israel”; <http://www.cfr.org/israel/unsettled-times-israel/p28720>; July 18th, 2012) James

What is striking is that we have been discussing Syria and Iran, not the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and what is striking in talking to Israelis--and for that matter in talking to Arab diplomats--is that they do want to talk about Syria, and Iran, and Egypt, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict doesn't arise, or arises only very late in the conversation.Secretary Clinton's visit was her first to Israel and the West Bank in two years, which is remarkable. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice visited Israel as national security adviser or secretary of state more than twenty times. Some of her predecessors also made numerous trips to the region, so it's striking that Secretary Clinton has not. I don't say that critically. It seems to me to reflect the policy [of] George Mitchell, later Dennis Ross, [who] were the lead diplomats on that conflict, and partly a judgment on her part that it wasn't moving anywhere, that she would be wasting time and that she needed to address other world problems. Most people in Israel would agree that the Israeli-Palestinian situation is not going to change until after the U.S. elections and the elaboration of a policy by President Obama or President Romney. Israelis and Palestinians, with respect to the Israeli-Palestinian situation, are in a watch-and- wait situation. There isn't really anything the Israelis can do about Syria, so they are watching the Americans, the Turks, the Arabs. When it comes to Egypt and Sinai, the Israelis are actually doing one significant thing; they are building a very elaborate security fence separating Israel from Sinai, in an effort to prevent both illegal immigration and smuggling on the one hand, and to prevent terrorist attacks on the other. And they are trying to prevent any kind of confrontation with Egyptian security officials. So when it comes to Egypt, though they're generally watching to see what the new Morsi government will do. On security in Sinai, they are able to act on their own and are doing so. And when it comes to Iran, the Israelis are indeed watching and waiting, unless they reach the conclusion that the window is closing fast and they really need to make a decision to act even before the U.S. election. I think that's still possible.

## Saudi State Collapse

### \*\*\*1NC-Saudi Arabian Stability\*\*\*

#### Saudi Arabian stability will continue- news programs have ensured stability

**Cordesman, 11**(Anthony Cordesman, holds the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS. He is a recipient of the Department of Defense Distinguished Service Medal. During his time at CSIS, he has completed a wide variety of studies on energy, U.S. strategy and defense plans, the lessons of modern war, defense programming and budgeting, NATO modernization, Chinese military power, the lessons of modern warfare, proliferation, counterterrorism, armed nation building, the security of the Middle East, and the Afghan and Iraq conflicts; “Saudi Stability in a Time of Change”; <http://csis.org/publication/saudi-stability-time-change>; April 21st, 2011) James

There are reasons to believe that Saudi Arabia will remain stable and continue on the path to peaceful reform and change. No country in the MENA region has done more to invest in government services, education and jobs for youth, and broadly based economic development. The monarchy is reforming, putting more emphasis on performance, improving the ruler of law, and reducing corruption.

In broad terms, Saudi governance is effective enough so that the end result of the current turmoil in other states is unlikely to present a major threat to Saudi stability, and the prompt action the government has taken to deal with the material needs of its people indicate such pressures may well end in aiding reform efforts rather than threatening the regime. Saudi Arabia also has demonstrated over decades that its leadership can adjust to change and meet popular demands, and it has a strong core within its royal family, technocrats, and business community.Saudi Arabia will face problems in implementing some of its more ambitious plans to create jobs through industrial cities and an high rate of growth and development, but it can compensate through government stimulus of the private sector, and by reducing dependence on foreign labor which now amounts to 5.6 million by CIA estimates ion comparison with a total labor force of 7.3 million (The CIA estimates that about 80% of the labor force is non-national (2010 est.) Saudi Arabia’s new programs to help ensure internal stability will have a major near-term impact on the budget, but it is important to note that they will also support many of the programs in the ninth Saudi Five Year Plan that was announced before the crisis in the region began. They will aid the momentum of development and reform rather than divert resources away from the Kingdom’s needs.Current estimates indicate that their cost will be spread out over a period years. Saudi Arabia’s near term ability to maintain and expand oil production is not questioned in any recent DOE or US intelligence analysis, and it seems likely that demand for Saudi exports and oil prices will not keep Saudi Arabia from having a budget surplus. As for the overall impact of current events on the economy, the end result may be that this is a major window of opportunity for Saudi and outside investors, rather than a time of added risk. Saudi Arabia is going to be very sensitive as to what firms do and do not maintain their investment plans and take advantage of opportunities over the next few years.  So are the Saudi people, and this will be particularly true of investments in areas that have a Saudi partner, particularly ones that have won the kind of popular confidence and trust that Aramco has.

### \*\*\*EXT: Saudi Arabian Stability\*\*\*

#### Saudi Arabia will never collapse; its people show support and it holds a strong economy

**Obaid, 11**(NawafObaid, NawafObaid is a senior fellow at the King Faisal Center for Research and Islamic Studies and is pursuing a doctorate on the rise of Saudi nationalism at the department of war studies at King's College London; “Why Saudi Arabia is stable amid the Mideast unrest”; <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/09/AR2011030904372.html>; March 11, 2011) James

Saudi Arabia shares some characteristics that have been causes for unrest - such as high unemployment among its youth and public-sector corruption - but the kingdom has strengths its neighbors lack. Its strong economy and weak opposition are clear. Less understood in the West is another critical element: a nationalism that has been fostered by and is strongly linked to the monarchy. These qualities make it highly unlikely that the unrest in other Arab countries will spread to the kingdom.Economically, Saudi Arabia is able to fund projects that satisfy the needs of its growing population. Record revenue from energy exports has been invested in infrastructure and social services. It has spent tens of billions the past several years on universities and other schools, hospitals, rail lines and housing developments. An additional [$29.5 billion in financial benefits](http://arabia.msn.com/Business/Economy/AF/2011/March/4136498.aspx) to poorer Saudis - including help for the unemployed - was recently announced, as were raises for public servants and efforts to mitigate inflationary pressures. Last year, the salaries of all soldiers and military officers were increased.Although Saudi Arabia has amassed more than [$500 billion in foreign reserves](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/733c7df2-4e11-11de-a0a1-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1G8hVWCk8) during the reign of King Abdullah - a measure widely seen as representative of the government's fiscal responsibility - the kingdom still faces economic challenges. By world standards, Saudi Arabia is wealthy; the global poverty line is $1.25 per day. All Saudis receive housing assistance and free health care and education; per capita income is about $18,500. Yet many Saudis feel that this standard of living is not commensurate with a country so rich in resources. To address embarrassment and unhappiness, the government launched a national strategy a few years ago to combat poverty, aiming to reduce the number of those living below the poverty level ($1,015 per month) from 13.3 percent in 2010 to 2.2 percent in 2020. Another initiative is on track to help the 1.63 percent of Saudis living in "extreme poverty" (less than $450 per month) by the end of this year.

## Israel Sampson Option

### \*\*\*1NC-Israel Sampson Option Inevitable\*\*\*

#### Israel launch inevitable – Samson scenario proves

**CFR, 02**(Council on Foreign Relations, James Lindsay, is the Senior Vice President, Director of Studies, and Maurice R. Greenberg Chair at the Council on Foreign Relations and a leading authority on U.S. foreign policy; Michael O’Hanlon, a senior fellow at The Brookings Institution, specializing in defense and foreign policy issues. He began his career as a budget analyst in the defense field; Charles Glaser, Professor of Political Science and International Affairs Director, Institute for Security and Conflict Studies; Steve Fetter, a physicist at the University of Maryland; “Limited National and Allied Missile Defense”; <http://www.cfr.org/world/limited-national-allied-missile-defense/p6406>; Spring 2002) James

Enemy missile launch could occur for other reasons as well. Even if an enemy leader had already accepted the inevitability of his downfall, he might choose not to go qui- etly. Instead he might employ a “Samson scenario,” after the biblical agure who pulled down the Philistine temple to kill himself along with his captors, and attempt to kill as many Americans as possible in the process. This possibility is hardly mythical. To take a more modern image, it simply assumes that a leader might behave like trapped or out- numbered Japanese soldiers in World War II—who often fought to the death even when defeat was foreordained—rather than surrender or commit suicide like Adolf Hitler. Moreover, even if a country’s top leader did not choose to mimic Samson, his military commandersmight.As noted, although Glaser and Fetter do brieoy acknowledge that there could be cases of deterrence failure, they consider the probabilities quite low. But the odds do not strike us as low under such counterinvasion-and-overthrow scenarios.

## Closing Strait of Hormuz

### \*\*\*1NC-Iran Won’t Close Strait\*\*\*

#### Iran is not going to close the Strait of Hormuz- Tangsiri checks

Nasser Karimi 7/23 (Reporter for the Huffington Post, *The Huffington Post* is an American [news website](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Online_newspaper), [content aggregator](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/News_aggregator), and blog founded by [Arianna Huffington](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arianna_Huffington), [Kenneth Lerer](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kenneth_Lerer), [Andrew Breitbart](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrew_Breitbart),[[2]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Huffington_Post#cite_note-1)[[3]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Huffington_Post#cite_note-2) and [Jonah Peretti](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonah_Peretti), featuring columnists and various news sources.[[4]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Huffington_Post#cite_note-3) The site offers news, blogs, and original content, and covers politics, business, entertainment, environment, technology) (Shah)<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/23/iran-strait-of-hormuz_n_1694258.html>

A top Iranian naval commander said Monday that Tehran's forces have full control over the Gulf's strategic Strait of Hormuz, but have no plans to try to close the route for one-fifth of the world's oil. The comments by Adm. Ali Reza Tangsiri, acting commander of the Revolutionary Guard naval forces, appear designed to reinforce Iran's claims of military dominance over the Strait as U.S. naval forces boost their presence in the Gulf. "Enemies regularly say Iran is after closing the Strait of Hormuz. But we say that wisdom does not recommend closing the strait while Iran is using the Strait of Hormuz," Tangsiri was quoted as saying by the official IRNA news agency. He did not elaborate, but the remarks appear to point to Iran's efforts to build pipelines to Asian markets and develop other Iranian ports with direct access to the Indian Ocean.

### **\*\*\*EXT: Iran Won’t Close Strait\*\*\***

#### **Iran couldn’t close the Strait of Hormuz- navy doesn’t have the size to blockade**

TabassumZakaria 11(Journalist for Reuters, She used to run the Front Row Washington politics blog, was a White House correspondent during President George W. Bush's second term, and has covered intelligence, defense, foreign policy, and Congress. As Dallas correspondent she covered the stand-off in Waco. Early years in New York were spent covering financial markets and New York Fed.") (Shah) <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/12/28/us-iran-usa-hormuz-idUSTRE7BR1DG20111228>

Iran's navy does not have the size for a sustained physical blockade of the Strait, but does have mine-laying and missile capability to wreak some havoc, analysts said."It wouldn't be a cakewalk" for [Iran](http://www.reuters.com/places/iran), said Caitlin Talmadge, a George Washington [University](http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/12/28/us-iran-usa-hormuz-idUSTRE7BR1DG20111228) professor who has written about the Strait of Hormuz. "If Tehran really wanted to cause trouble, it could."But the Bahrain-based U.S. Fifth Fleet is nearby and keeping a close eye on Iran's activities in the Strait. Mine-laying or missile activity would not go undetected and would likely generate a U.S. response.The Fifth Fleet said on Wednesday that "any disruption will not be tolerated." That came after Iran's navy chief said closing the Strait of Hormuz "is really easy... or as Iranians say, it will be easier than drinking a glass of water."

#### Iran has to more lose if they close the Strait- closure of revenues from oil

ArashIrandoost 12 (Dr. ArashIrandoost is the founder of Pro-Democracy Movement of Iran (PDMI) which focuses on social, political and current events pertaining to Iran. He is an independent, non-partisan Iranian-American pro-democracy activist who works to inform and educate about the threat posed by Islamic Republic and radical Islam. Dr. Irandoost maintains close contact with dissidents inside Iran as well as Iranian pro-democracy organizations and individuals outside of Iran.; Jan 15) (Shah)

<http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/01/strait_of_hormuz_in_greater_context.html>

Will Iran even try to close the Strait of Hormuz? The answer to that question is "no" -- even the attempt would have devastating strategic consequences for Iran. For sure, Iran has the naval capability to shut down the Strait and temporarily choke off the flow of oil. But doing so will have catastrophic consequences for the regime. Knowing that Iran derives 80% of its revenues from oil, a closure of the strait would be self-defeating. Without imported gasoline Iran's economy would grind to a halt. Indeed Iran has more to lose from shutting down of the Strait than the West.

## Agriculture

### Agriculture Advantage Frontline

#### 1. US agriculture is resilient—increasing demand and decreases in other nations’ competitiveness increased its strength

White 10 (Thomas, senior executive at Enron and United States Secretary of the Army, “A Postcard from the Americas:¶ U.S.: Agricultural Sector Emerges as Bright Spot”¶ 9/17/10, <http://www.thomaswhite.com/explore-the-world/postcard/2010/us-agriculture-sector.aspx>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

Recent estimates released by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) show that agricultural exports are predicted to rise $107.5 billion for the fiscal year 2010, the second highest year ever, with the previous such highs recorded in 2008 when a commodity boom fueled agriculture exports worldwide. A delighted USDA stated that “agriculture is one of the only major sectors of the American economy with a trade surplus – expected to be $30.5 billion this year.” Next year is supposed to be even better with exports increasing to $113 billion.¶ The U.S. has benefited from a fall in fortunes from key competitors like Russia, whose wheat crop has been scorched by record heat, and even the Ukraine and Kazakhstan have struggled to match export grain targets. This leaves the U.S. in the enviable position of being able to take advantage of rising demand from markets in the Middle East and North Africa – markets that the U.S. so far has failed to dominate. And then there is the giant called China, whose voracious demand is forecasted to make it the America’s second largest market, overtaking Mexico in the [process](http://www.thomaswhite.com/explore-the-world/postcard/2010/us-agriculture-sector.aspx). The U.S. is benefiting from China’s transition from being a net exporter of corn to a net importer of corn. Chinese corn imports are expected to grow to 5.8 million tons in 2011, up from 1.7 million tons this year. Figures like these have helped the agricultural sector sustain its momentum in what has been a rocky year for the U.S. economy. The agriculture industry, in its quiet way, has been generating jobs, sustaining rural America’s economy. The USDA estimates that ‘every billion dollars worth of agricultural exports supports more than 8,000 jobs and generate $1.4 billion in economic activity.’¶ As the world economy continues to recover, [global trade](http://www.thomaswhite.com/explore-the-world/postcard/2010/us-agriculture-sector.aspx) in grain, meat and [commodities](http://www.thomaswhite.com/explore-the-world/postcard/2010/us-agriculture-sector.aspx) is only going to rise. The U.S. has worked itself up to this lofty position, and it is an advantage it is not going to surrender anytime soon. There are risks, no doubt. A double-dip recession in the U.S., a widening trade surplus with China or an economic plunge in the European Union. But having weathered many a storm in the past three years, there is a steely resilience to this sector. Strange as it sounds, American agriculture is truly emerging as the leading light at the end of a long recession tunnel.

#### 2. **Food prices falling now—increased supply predictions**

Ruitenberg 7/7 (Rudy, reporter for Bloomberg News, “Global Food Prices Fall Most In 2 Years On Dairy Plunge”, 7/7/12, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-07/golbal-food-prices-fell-most-in-2-years-in-may-on-grains.html>, Accessed 7/23/12, Chan)

[Global food prices](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/FAOFOOD:IND) had their biggest drop in more than two years in May as the cost of dairy products slumped on increased supply, easing strain on household budgets.¶ An index of 55 food items tracked by the [United Nations](http://topics.bloomberg.com/united-nations/)’ Food & Agriculture Organization fell 4.2 percent to 203.9 points from 213 points in April, the Rome-based agency reported on its website. That was the biggest percentage drop since March 2010.¶ A stronger U.S. dollar may weaken the effect of falling prices on importers’ food bills, [Abdolreza Abbassian](http://topics.bloomberg.com/abdolreza-abbassian/), an FAO economist, said by phone from [Rome](http://topics.bloomberg.com/rome/). The U.S. [Dollar Index](http://topics.bloomberg.com/dollar-index/), which tracks the [exchange rate](http://topics.bloomberg.com/exchange-rate/) against major world currencies, jumped 5.4 percent in May, the biggest monthly gain since September.¶ “The dollar has strengthened tremendously, so if you’re an importing country and you have to pay in dollars, you’re not really getting the full impact of these sliding prices,” Abbassian said. “You’re not getting the full effect.”¶ Meat prices may fall in coming months, mirroring a price correction for dairy, according to Abbassian. The FAO Dairy [Price Index](http://topics.bloomberg.com/price-index/) slumped 12 percent to 164.1 points, the biggest drop since January 2009, while the meat index slipped 0.5 percent to 178.8 points.¶ “The dairy decline is from a very high level,” Abbassian said. “It’s a delayed correction. It would not surprise me to see the same for meat.”¶ Freight Rates¶ World milk production is forecast to climb 2.7 percent this year to 750.1 million metric tons, accelerating from last year’s 2.3 percent increase, the FAO has forecast.¶ Falling agricultural-commodity prices and “really low” [freight](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-07/golbal-food-prices-fell-most-in-2-years-in-may-on-grains.html) rates help food-importing countries, the FAO economist said.¶ Ukrainian consumer prices fell for the first time in more than nine years in May, led by a 0.8 percent month-on-month drop for food and beverages. [Turkish inflation](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/TUCPIY:IND) last month slowed the most since January 2003 as the central bank tightened lending and food prices slumped.¶ “International prices for most [commodities](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-07/golbal-food-prices-fell-most-in-2-years-in-may-on-grains.html) weakened in recent weeks on generally favorable supply prospects amid growing economic uncertainties and a strengthening [U.S. dollar](http://topics.bloomberg.com/u.s.-dollar/),” the FAO wrote.¶ Cereals Drop¶ The FAO Cereals Price Index dropped for a second month, slipping 1.1 percent to 220.9 points.¶ Corn futures fell 12 percent in [Chicago](http://topics.bloomberg.com/chicago/) last month amid expectations for record world production after U.S. farmers increased planting. Wheat slipped 1.6 percent in Chicago, while [soybean futures](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-07/golbal-food-prices-fell-most-in-2-years-in-may-on-grains.html) declined 11 percent.

#### 3. Food prices don’t matter long term—a focus on productivity is key

Paarlberg 8 [Robert Paarlberg, professor of political science at Wellesley College, 4/22/8, “It’s not the price that causes hunger”, *NY Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/22/opinion/22iht-edpaarlberg.1.12230340.html>.] AJacobson

Over the past two decades **the U.S. Agency for International Development has cut its support for agricultural science in Africa by 75 percent**.¶ **World Bank lending** for agriculture **has dropped** from 30 percent of bank lending in 1978 **to just 8 percent**. In 2005, the World Bank president at the time, Paul Wolfowitz, told a business forum: "My institution has largely gotten out of the business of agriculture."¶ **This may be changing, and if high world food prices help speed the change, so much the better.**¶In a recent interview, the new World Bank president, Robert Zoellick, said he planned to raise agricultural lending to Africa next year from $450 million to $800 million. Since 2006, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has also begun to focus more of its grant-making on the needs of poor smallholder farmers in Africa through an Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) chaired by Kofi Annan.¶ These are encouraging initiatives, because the productivity of farms in Africa - not food prices on the world market - should be the long-term focus.

#### 4. High food prices don’t cause hunger – poor nations can’t afford to use international food markets

Paarlberg 8 [Robert Paarlberg, professor of political science at Wellesley College, 4/22/8, “It’s not the price that causes hunger”, *NY Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/22/opinion/22iht-edpaarlberg.1.12230340.html>.] AJacobson

It is certainly a troubling instance of price instability in international commodity markets, leading to social unrest among urban food-buyers. But we must be careful not to equate high crop prices with hunger around the world. Most of the world's hungry people do not use international food markets, and most of those who use these markets are not hungry.¶ **International food markets,** like international markets for everything else, **are used** primarily by the prosperous and secure,not the poor and vulnerable. In world corn markets, the biggest importer by far is Japan. Next comes the European Union. Next comes South Korea. Citizens in these countries are not underfed.¶ **In the poor countries of Asia,** **rice is the most important staple, yet most** Asian countries **import** very **little rice**. As recently as March, India was keeping imported rice out of the country by imposing a 70 percent duty.¶ **Data on** the actual incidence of **malnutrition reveal that the regions of the world where people are most hungry, in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, are those that depend least on imports from the world market. Hunger is caused** **in these countries not by high international food prices**, but by local conditions, especially rural poverty linked to low productivity in farming.¶ When international prices are go up, the disposable income of some import-dependent urban dwellers is squeezed. But most of **the actual hunger takes place in the villages and in the countryside, and it persists even when international prices are low.** When hunger is measured as a balanced index of calorie deficiency, prevalence of underweight children and mortality rates for children under five, we find that South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa in 2007 had hunger levels two times as high as in the developing countries of East Asia, four times as high as in Latin America, North Africa or the Middle East, and five times as high as in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. **The poor** in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa **are hungry even though their connections to high-priced international food markets are** quite **weak.**¶ **In the poorest developing countries of Asia,** where nearly 400 million people are hungry, **international grain prices are hardly a factor, since imports supply only 4 percent of total consumption** - even when world prices are low.¶ Similarly **in sub-Saharan Africa, only** about **16 percent of grain supplies have** recently **been imported, going mostly into the more prosperous cities** rather than the impoverished countryside, with part arriving in the form of donated food aid rather than commercial purchases at world prices.¶ The region in Africa that depends on world markets most heavily is North Africa, where 50 percent of grain supplies are imported. Yet food consumption **in North Africa is so high** (average per capita energy consumption there is about 3,000 calories per day, **comparable to** most **rich countries**) **that increased import prices** may **cause** economic stress for urban consumers (and perhaps even street demonstrations) but **little real hunger.**¶ Import dependence is also high in Latin America **(**50 percent for some countries) **but** again **high world prices will not mean large numbers of hungry people**, because per capita GDP in this region is five times higher than in sub-Saharan Africa.¶ There is a severe food crisis among the poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, but it does not come from high world prices. Even in 2005 in sub-Saharan Africa, a year of low international crop prices, 23 out of 37 countries in the region consumed less than their nutritional requirements.¶ **Africa's food crisis grows primarily out of the low productivity,** year in and year out, of the 60 percent of all Africans who plant crops and graze animals for a living. The average African smallholder farmer is a woman who has no improved seeds, no nitrogen fertilizers, no irrigation and no veterinary medicine for her animals. Her crop yields are only one third as high as in the developing countries of Asia, and her average income is only $1 a day.

#### 5. Agriculture can’t change the economy—shift to industrial technology

Meijerink and Roza 7 (Gerdien, economist at the Agricultural Economics Research Institute of Wageningen University and Rsearch Center, and Pim, pAolitical scientist at the Agricultural Economics Research Institute of Wageningen University and Research Center, Markets, Chains and Sustainable Development, Strategy & Policy paper 4, “[The role of agriculture in economic development”, April 2007, http://www.boci.wur.nl/NR/rdonlyres/98CCE2E3-0FA2-4274-BCA0-20713CA1E125/62608/Fullreport4\_Meijerink\_Roza.pdf](file:///C:\Users\Owner\Downloads\The%20role%20of%20agriculture%20in%20economic%20development), Accessed 7/23/12, Chan)

The past decade has been one of agro-pessimism. The promises that agricultural development seem to hold did not materialise. This pessimism seemed to coincide with pessimism about Sub-Saharan ¶ Africa. Especially for Sub-Saharan Africa the hope was that economic development would be brought ¶ about by agricultural development. After the success of the green revolution in Asia, the hope was that ¶ a similar agricultural miracle would transform African economies. But this hope never materialised, ¶ agricultural productivity did not increase much in SSA (figure 1), and worse, the negative effects of the ¶ green revolution in Asia became more apparent, such as pesticide overuse and subsequent pollution. ¶ Also in Asia the yield increases tapered off. ¶ The sceptics put forward several arguments why agriculture is no longer an engine of growth¶ 2¶ . For ¶ instance, the liberalisation of the 1990s and greater openness to trade has lead to a reduction in the ¶ economic potential of the rural sector: cheap imported Chinese plastic buckets out compete the locally ¶ produced pottery. On the other hand, it does mean cheaper (imported) supplies. With rapid global ¶ technical change and increasingly integrated markets, prices fall faster than yields rise. So, rural ¶ incomes fall despite increased productivity if they are net producers¶ 3¶ . The integration of rural with ¶ urban areas means that healthy young people move out of agriculture, head to town, leaving behind ¶ the old, the sick and the dependent. It is often also the men who move to urban areas, leaving women ¶ in charge of the farm. This has resulted in the increased sophistication of agricultural markets (and ¶ value chains) which excludes traditional smallholders, who are poorly equipped to meet the demanding ¶ product specifications and timeliness of delivery required by expanding supermarkets. The natural ¶ resource base on which agriculture depends is poor and deteriorating. Productivity growth is therefore ¶ increasingly more difficult to achieve. Finally, multiplier effects occur when a change in spending ¶ causes a disproportionate change in aggregate demand. Thus an increase in spending produces an ¶ increase in national income and consumption greater than the initial amount spent. But as GDP rises ¶ and the share of agriculture typically decreases, the question is how important these multiplier effects ¶ are, especially when significant levels of poverty remain in rural areas, which is the case in middleincome countries¶ 4¶ .

#### 6. Alt cause—food shortages are products of population growth and resource misallocation

Schuman 11 (Michael, Time Business, “Was Malthus right?”, 7/15/11, <http://business.time.com/2011/07/15/was-malthus-right/#ixzz21Tarnbmz>, Accessed 7/23/12, Chan)

The reason we’ve avoided a Malthusian nightmare over the past two centuries is that we’ve been able to outsmart nature. Malthus misjudged man’s ability to develop the necessary technologies to use the land, water and other limited resources of our planet more efficiently. Food production has more or less kept up with population growth. Yes, hundreds of millions are malnourished, but that’s not because the planet can’t produce enough for everyone. It’s because the food we do produce either gets wasted, or doesn’t get to the people who need it. The problem of hunger is made by man, not Mother Nature.¶ So are the roots of our current food crisis. As demand for food has continually increased, not just due to population growth, but also to expanding wealth, the productivity of our farms has waned. Annual yield growth has fallen precipitously from the gains we achieved during the 1950s and 1960s. .You’d think just the opposite would be true – in a world in which technology is advancing by the second, it would make sense to think the same is happening in agriculture. But the reality is that we’ve taken our hand off the plough – policymakers simply haven’t devoted the funds to agriculture that are needed to make our farms more productive. We haven’t been investing enough in R&D to achieve important technologically breakthroughs or in rural infrastructure ([irrigation systems](http://business.time.com/2011/07/15/was-malthus-right/), roads, [storage facilities](http://business.time.com/2011/07/15/was-malthus-right/)) to help farmers grow more food and get it to the consumer more easily. Nor have we been utilizing the technology that is already out there to improve yields.¶ We’re seriously paying for the neglect of the world’s farms. Reserves of grain have been on the decline (relative to demand) – which means our [food safety](http://business.time.com/2011/07/15/was-malthus-right/) net has shrunk. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization, we consumed more grain than we produced in the 2010/11 marketing season. Even if prices come off their current high, food is still expected to cost significantly more over the next decade than the previous one. And as our population continues to expand, while our land and water resources do not, the strain on food markets is only going to get worse. Yes, this all sounds scary. I’m not predicting a Malthusian crisis, or widespread food shortages and famines. But making sure we have enough food – and not just enough, but at levels where prices come down to the point where poor people can afford proper diets – is really one of the biggest issues facing the global community.

#### 7. Reverse causality—war causes famine, not the other way around—multiple reasons

Pedersen 9 (Jon, professor of science education and Director of Science Education for the Center for Mathematics, Science and Computer Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, “Health and Conflict: A review of the links”, p. 15, <http://www.fafo.no/pub/rapp/20110/20110.pdf>, Accessed 7/24/12, Chan)

Most likely famine has been a corollary of war since wars started. Measurement of child ¶ malnutrition belongs to the standard toolkit used by many humanitarian organizations ¶ to measure the severity of crisis (SMART Initiative, 2008). ¶ Famine occurs in conjunction with war for many reasons: because soldiers eat the ¶ food that should have gone to other members of the population, because the security ¶ situation makes it impossible to work and to produce and procure food; because ¶ of mass displacement; because the population is forcibly relocated; because food is ¶ exported from the area; because of breakdown in transport and because of inflation ¶ associated with war. ¶ Some argue that the open war is not even necessary to create child hunger. Thus it ¶ has been demonstrated using cross national data, that militarization as such, i.e. that ¶ the military controls a large portion of a society’s resources, in addition to war, gender ¶ inequity and lack of political rights contribute to child hunger, as measured by acute ¶ malnutrition ( Jenkins, Scanlan, & Peterson, 2007)

### Agriculture Adv Exts - #1 - Agriculture resilient

#### Agriculture resilient - rebounding due to separation from other sectors of the economy

NYT 10 (New York Times, “Strong Exports Lift U.S. Agriculture Sector”, 7/31/10, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/01/business/economy/01exports.html>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

Even as the broader economy falters amid signs of a weakening recovery, the nation’s agriculture sector is **going strong**, bolstered in part by a surge in exports, according to federal estimates of farm trade and income released on Tuesday.¶ The estimates confirm what economists have been saying for months: agriculture, which was generally not hit as hard by the [recession](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/r/recession_and_depression/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) as many other segments of the economy, remains a small bright spot going forward.¶ “We’re just having a robust rebound in the agricultural sector and promises of more growth,” Jason R. Henderson, vice president and economist at the Omaha branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, said in a recent interview.¶ The estimates show that American farmers will ship $107.5 billion in agricultural products abroad in the fiscal year that ends Sept. 30. That is the second-highest amount ever, behind the record $115.3 billion in exports logged in 2008, when commodity prices soared as the global demand for agricultural products was helped by fast-growing economies in the developing world. Next year, exports are expected to total $113 billion. In releasing the data, [Tom Vilsack](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/v/tom_vilsack/index.html?inline=nyt-per), the secretary of agriculture, said exports of grains and meats were leading the rebound. He called the new estimates “very encouraging.”

### Agriculture Advantage Exts - #2 - Prices Low

#### Crop prices declining—US and Chinese production remain strong as demand falls

McIntyre 11 (Douglas, Editor-in-Chief of Financial World Magazine and partner at 24/7 Wall St., LLC, “Consumers, Rejoice: Clothing and Food Prices Should Fall Soon”, 5/5/11, <http://www.dailyfinance.com/2011/05/05/consumers-rejoice-clothing-and-food-prices-should-fall-soon/>, Accessed 7/23/12, Chan)

There are a number of reasons commodities prices are dropping. First, weather-related shortages will probably not be as bad as some analysts had feared: American crop production should be strong this year, and the droughts that plagued China have begun to ease. Concerns about a global slowdown in growth have also raised the specter of a drop in demand for commodity-based products. The economic slowdown could be particularly sharp if China's hot economy begins to cool, which could happen thanks to the Beijing government's tightening of bank reserves there. The manufacturing sector could also slow as demand in Japan and Europe falters.

### Agriculture Adv Exts - #3 - No Solvency

#### No solvency—we already have enough food, but structural inequalities ensure crops go to feedlots and biofuels

Alternate News Media 6/13 (“We Already Grow Enough Food for 10 Billion People… and Still Can’t End Hunger”, 6/13/12, <http://alternatenewsmedia2012.wordpress.com/2012/06/13/we-already-grow-enough-food-for-10-billion-people-and-still-cant-end-hunger/>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

Hunger is caused by poverty and inequality, not scarcity. For the past two decades the rate of global food production has increased faster than the rate of global population growth. The world already produces more than 1 ½ times enough food to feed everyone on the planet. That’s enough to feed 10 billion people, the population peak we expect by 2050. But the people making less than $2 a day—most of whom are resource-poor farmers cultivating unviably small plots of land—can’t afford to buy this food.¶ In reality, the bulk of industrially produced grain crops goes to biofuels and confined animal feedlots rather than food for the 1 billion hungry. The call to double food production by 2050 only applies if we [continue](http://alternatenewsmedia2012.wordpress.com/2012/06/13/we-already-grow-enough-food-for-10-billion-people-and-still-cant-end-hunger/) to prioritize the growing population of livestock and [automobiles](http://alternatenewsmedia2012.wordpress.com/2012/06/13/we-already-grow-enough-food-for-10-billion-people-and-still-cant-end-hunger/) over hungry people.

#### Data proves hunger decreasing now, but to eradicate famine is virtually impossible

STL 10 (Saint Louis Post-Dispatch, “World Hunger Decreasing, Figures Show”, 9/15/10, <http://www.stltoday.com/news/national/article_5c620053-c94a-5778-81ca-5a785b0383e1.html>, Accessed 7/25/12, Chan)

The latest hunger data indicate that the very first goal, reducing the number of hungry people in the world to half of what it was in 1990, will be virtually impossible to meet, Jacques Diouf, the director general of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, said at the news conference, which was broadcast on the Web.¶ The report estimated that the number of undernourished people in the Asia-Pacific region would decline 12 percent from 2009, to 578 million, because of economic growth there. Seven countries account for two-thirds of the world's hungry people: China, India, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Ethiopia and Pakistan. India and China alone account for 40 percent of the world's hungry, the report said.

### Agriculture Adv Exts - #4 - No Impact—Hunger

#### Hunger estimates are hype—flawed models mean high food prices don’t cause starvation

The Guardian 1/26 ([“Global hunger: do the figures add up?”, 1/26/12, ¶ http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2012/jan/26/global-hunger-fao-figures-add-up](file:///C:\Users\Owner\Downloads\“Global%20hunger:%20do%20the%20figures%20add%20up%3f”,%201\26\12,%20http:\www.guardian.co.uk\global-development\poverty-matters\2012\jan\26\global-hunger-fao-figures-add-up), Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

Almost immediately, these figures seemed to take on a life of their own. References to the global hunger crisis affecting "1 billion people" or "one-sixth of humanity" began appearing in speeches, media reports, and advocacy campaigns around the world. [Well over 3 million people](http://www.1billionhungry.org/)signed an online petition calling on governments to prioritise the "1 billion hungry".¶ But where did these numbers come from? For decades, the FAO produced global hunger figures by estimating the availability, need and distribution of calories within a country. But these numbers were usually estimates averaged over several years and could not be produced on the fly. To deliver the short-term projections so desperately in demand, the UN food agency shifted gears and borrowed a statistical model from the US department of agriculture (USDA) to estimate how undernourishment might increase due to the economic crisis.¶ Though they flourished in headlines, the projections produced in 2009, and again in 2010, were [never without their critics](http://aidwatchers.com/2010/09/%E2%80%9Cproofiness%E2%80%9D-trashing-back-on-fao-hunger-numbers/). Crucially, because the USDA model focused on [low-income](http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2012/jan/26/global-hunger-fao-figures-add-up) countries, any figures for countries like India and China – where most of the world's poorest people live – were "guesstimates" at best.¶ Now that data is finally becoming available for that period, it is "contradicting" the projections made in 2009 according to FAO statistician Carlo Cafiero.¶ "I don't see changes in 2009 compared to 2008 that justify such a huge swing in the global figure," says Cafiero. It is more likely, he adds, that the famous "1 billion hungry" figure was an overestimate.¶ A long list of issues with global hunger numbers, past and present, was on full display last week at [an under-reported UN statistics symposium](http://www.foodsec.org/web/newsevents/iss/home/en/). Because of growing concerns about its estimates, the FAO did not release new figures in 2011. Instead, it quietly backed away from its 2009 and 2010 projections. Now, it's undergoing a root-and-branch review of how it constructs estimates on global hunger, looking for ways to improve the underlying data and make the FAO hunger indicator more sensitive to crises, shocks, changes in income and food prices.¶ Unfortunately, little of the uncertainty surrounding global hunger estimates is ever reported alongside the emotive, top-line figures. Debating the merits of different statistical models could seem trivial, even distasteful, in the face of the scandalous situation whereby large numbers of people worldwide are going hungry. Global hunger figures are not just soundbites, however. They are also used to help guide where to send foreign aid, track progress towards international development goals, and hold governments to account for promises made.¶ Cafiero says the FAO should have done more to explain the difference between the 2009 and 2010 projections and the estimates released in previous years. "Instead, a profound difference was signalled only with a dotted line," he says.¶ While the FAO hunger indicator has long dominated discussions, it is not the only way to measure food insecurity. Over the years, it has been criticised on many fronts: for the poor quality of underlying data; for the focus on calorie intake, without consideration of proteins, vitamins and minerals; and for the emphasis on availability – rather than affordability, accessibility or actual use – of food. Some say we'd be better off focusing on improving household consumption surveys, opinion polls, and direct measures of height and body weight.¶ There is also evidence to show that people don't always respond to high food prices in ways we might expect. Last year, a paper from Oxfam and the Institute of Development Studies emphasised how diverse the impact of food price spikes can be.¶ "People spend less on personal items like clothes and cosmetics, and scale down their social lives. And while some people are eating less and going hungry, more often people shift to lower quality, more boring food and less diverse diets," suggested the paper, based on [the findings of Duncan Green and Naomi Hossein](http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/jun/21/food-price-rises-discontent-among-poor). "The overall result of food price rises is not generally starvation, but an increased level of discontent and stress."¶

### Agriculture Adv Exts - #5 - No Effect on Economy

#### No impact—even with strong agriculture there’s been no response in the overall recession

Cline 10 (Harry, member of the California Chapter of the American Society of Agronomy executive council, Western Farm Press, “Agriculture faring better than overall economy”, 12/13/10,

<http://westernfarmpress.com/markets/agriculture-faring-better-overall-economy>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

The 18-month U.S. “great recession” ended a year ago, according to the federal government. Nevertheless, no one told the economy. Since the proclaimed end of the recession a year ago, the economy has been like a lost marathon runner searching for the finish line and recovery after completing the 26-mile, and 385-yard course. The economy is still out of gas, struggling to find relief.¶ John Penson, Jr., regents professor and Stiles Professor of Agriculture at Texas A&M University, told the 29th Annual Agribusiness Management Conference in Fresno, Calif., that many economic indicators are worse now than they were when the government declared the recession over in December 2009.¶ “Things are a little bit better than the last time I was here (a year ago),” Penson told attendees at the conference sponsored by three departments at California State University, Fresno and Bank of America.¶ Fortunately, agriculture is faring considerably better than the rest of the economy. The latest USDA figures project that net farm income will increase this year to $77.1 billion, the fourth highest level ever.¶ Agriculture is being helped along with low interest rates and a falling value of the dollar, which is boosting exports.

### Agriculture Adv Exts - #6 - Alternate Causalities

#### Alternate causality—climate change

Stevenson 9 [David Stevenson, Director of Policy, Planning and Strategy Division of the World Food Programme, November 2009, “Forward to Climate Change and Hunger: Responding to the Challenge”, *World Food Programme*, <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp212536.pdf>.] AJacobson

Climate change is a defining challenge of our times. Its impact and implications will be global, far-reaching and largely irreversible. **Climate change is already increasing the risk of exposure to hunger, malnutrition and food insecurity** among the poorest and most vulnerable people. **Natural disasters are becoming more frequent and intense, land and water are becoming more scarce and difficult to access, and increases in agricultural productivity are becoming more difficult to achieve.** The figures presented in this report reflect recent scientific evidence on the scale of the projected impacts of climate change. By 2050, **the number of people at risk of hunger as a result of climate change is expected to increase by** 10 to **20 percent more than would be expected without climate change;** and the number of malnourished children is expected to increase by 24 million – 21 percent more than without climate change. **Sub-Saharan Africa is likely to be the worst affected region.** There is growing consensus amongst the international humanitarian community that adaptation measures are urgently needed to help vulnerable people cope with the changing environments in which they are living. **This requires** adapting global and local food production methods through investments, technical capacity transfers and technological innovations, while also making existing agricultural production systems more resilient, sustainable and equitable. 4 Foreword Adaptation strategies must be supported by strong institutions and enabling policy and legal frameworks. They must also be complemented by other **responses that address the immediate effects of climate change and protect those who cannot adapt.** This entails enhancing social protection and safety net systems, programmes and capacities at regional, national and local levels to support the most vulnerable. **It also involves developing capacities and systems in risk reduction and disaster management, and in emergency preparedness and response.** WFP has a crucial role to play in the global response to climate change. Vulnerability analysis and mapping, early warning systems and weather-based insurance programmes help governments and partners predict the onset of natural hazards and take appropriate measures to cushion their impacts. WFP also provides emergency relief food assistance when disasters strike, helping devastated families to recover and rebuild, while assisting vulnerable communities to adapt to more difficult and uncertain times. **Responding to increased hunger and malnutrition caused by the effects of climate change is expected to be a major focus** of WFP’s work in the 21 st century

#### Alternate causality – climate change causes hunger

Block 9 [Ben Block, Ben Block is a staff writer with the [Worldwatch Institute](http://www.worldwatch.org/), 9/30/9, “Climate Change Will Worsen Hunger, Study Says”, *Worldwatch Institute*, <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/6271>.] AJacobson

**Climate change is expected to lower grain yields and raise crop prices across the developing world,** leading to a 20-percent rise in child malnutrition, a new study finds.

**The total calories available in 2050 will be lower than in 2000, the  International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)estimates, increasing malnutrition rates in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa in particular.**

**"Farmers will have reduced yields,** but it will vary by region, vary by crop, and vary by management system," said Gerald Nelson, an IFPRI senior research fellow and lead author of the report, released today.

**Higher temperatures are expected to reduce crop yields, allow damaging weeds and insects to spread, and shift precipitation patterns worldwide**. While some agricultural regions are expected to benefit from climate change, **overall production will decline for the world's rice, wheat, maize, millet, and sorghum harvests, the report said.**

The report, released as international climate negotiators discuss a successor agreement to the Kyoto Protocol, is the first to combine climate and agricultural models to measure the effects of climate change on the global food supply.

Most severely affected will be the wheat-growing regions of South Asia, Europe and Central Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa, where production is projected to decline by 46, 47, and 35 percent, respectively. Also under threat are Middle Eastern rice paddies, where production is expected to fall by 36 percent.

The regions that would benefit from climate change would experience relatively smaller changes. The analysis estimates that wheat production in Latin America will grow by 13 percent and that millet production

#### Alt cause—reduction of private property rights has decreased agricultural output

Pasour 75 (Dr. E.C. Jr., Professor of Economics at North Carolina State University at Raleigh, Freeman, Volumer 25, Issue 12, “The World Food Crisis”, December 1975, <http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-world-food-crisis/>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

Why has the hunger problem suddenly become more acute? Conventional wisdom holds that the world food crisis is caused by a population explosion. But this is not the case. World food production has increased twice as fast as world population during the past 25 years. Why, then, has the hunger problem suddenly become more acute? Numerous reasons have been cited—war, droughts, floods, earthquakes, and the like. Examples probably can be found to support each of these reasons. Yet, there is a more fundamental reason for the recent worsening of the food problem.¶ Much of the cause for the current world food crisis can be attributed to the destruction or reduction of[private property](http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-world-food-crisis/) rights of food producers in countries where the hunger problem is most acute. Numerous example can be cited where governments have weakened or destroyed economic incentives by confiscating private land, forcing [farmers](http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-world-food-crisis/) to work on collectivized farms, instituting price controls on food, and other such measures.¶ India provides a good example. India has a serious hunger problem which gets worse each day. Only a few years ago, the food situation appeared fairly bright. There was an agricultural boom, with food production doubling from 1950 to 1970. Yields increased, stocks of food were built up, and India produced more food than it consumed as weather and technology contributed to bumper yields in a Green Revolution. Today, however, the hunger problem in India commands the world’s attention.

### Agriculture Adv Exts - #7 - War causes famine

#### War is the root cause of famine—destruction of food supplies becomes a weapon

Cohen 1 (Mark J., researcher at the International Food Policy Research Institute, IFPRI, April 2001, Issue 12, p. 9, “Conflict: a cause and effect of hunger”, <http://fex.ennonline.net/12/conflict.aspx>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

At the end of 2000, violent conflict and its aftermath had left nearly 24 million people in 28 developing and transition countries and territories food insecure and in need of humanitarian assistance. In addition, some 35 million war-affected refugees and internally displaced persons showed high rates of malnutrition.¶ Armed conflict leads to the destruction of crops, livestock, land, and water, and disrupts infrastructure, markets, and the human resources required for food production, distribution, and safe consumption. Combatants frequently use hunger as a weapon: they use siege to cut off food supplies and productive capacities, starve opposing populations into submission, and hijack food aid intended for civilians.

### Agriculture Adv Exts - Offense - High food prices good

#### Low prices contribute to food insecurity—long-term harm to agrarian economies

SAPA 7/24 (South African Press Association, “South Africa: Nation Ranked 40 On Food Security Index”, 7/24/12, ¶ <http://allafrica.com/stories/201207250163.html>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

Low food prices could also cause food insecurity, especially in [low income](http://allafrica.com/stories/201207250163.html), agrarian economies.¶ Low prices depressed smallholder [farmers](http://allafrica.com/stories/201207250163.html)' incomes, disrupted their ability to produce food, and were a disincentive to produce.¶ According to the index, economic activity in rural areas could be tied in some way to farming, and low incomes for farmers meant low incomes for all.¶ Sudden price changes and price shocks could force poor consumers and suppliers to sell important assets at low prices to maintain short term food security.¶ In the longer term, this kept families in poverty.

#### **Low food prices worsen the problem—empirics prove they lead to decreasing production**

Kharas 8 (Homi, Senior Fellow at the Wolfensohn Center for Development at the Brookings Institute, “The Economist debate: Rising food prices: The Proposition's rebuttal statement”, 7/1/8, <http://www.economist.com/node/11829065?zid=318&ah=ac379c09c1c3fb67e0e8fd1964d5247f>, Accessed 7/23/12, Chan)

They are an easy scapegoat but are not responsible for hunger and malnutrition in the developing world. Government interventions and distortions in food markets have been with us for decades. So have the problems of hunger and malnutrition in the developing world. During a 30-year period of declining food prices from 1973 to 2002, these problems got worse, not better, in many countries.¶ The prolonged period of low food prices did very little to reduce poverty and hunger, especially in Africa where it is most intransigent. According to the United Nations, more than 20% of children under five were severely or moderately underweight (the UN's indicator of hunger) in 2000-04 in most of sub-Saharan Africa and in several countries in Asia. There has been very little progress in Africa over the last decade.¶ Low [international food](http://www.economist.com/node/11829065?zid=318&ah=ac379c09c1c3fb67e0e8fd1964d5247f) prices were partly to blame. By the mid-1990s, rice production in Africa was being outstripped by population growth. Africa had to use scarce [foreign exchange](http://www.economist.com/node/11829065?zid=318&ah=ac379c09c1c3fb67e0e8fd1964d5247f)to import rice and household food consumption did not grow. African conditions were not suitable for high-yielding Asian hybrids and African high-yielding varieties were not developed and distributed. African food production per head has declined by 12% since 1980. Falling production is the inevitable response when private producers are faced with falling prices. But governments also responded by cutting their investments in agriculture. As real food prices fell from 1975 onwards, the growth rate of public investment in agriculture fell in every region in the world. The fall in developed countries was most dramatic: from 1991 to 2000 real growth was negative. In Africa in the 1990s, it averaged just 1% per year. USAID support for agricultural science in Africa has been cut by 75% over the last two decades.

#### High food prices have a net beneficial effect on poverty—models indicate increases in demand for unskilled labor

Wise 10 (Timothy A., Director of the Research and Policy Program at the Global Development and Environment Institute at Tufts University, “Are High Agricultural Prices Good or Bad for Poverty?”, 11/10/10, <http://triplecrisis.com/are-high-agricultural-prices-good-or-bad-for-poverty/>, Accessed 7/23/12, Chan)

Seems obvious, but not so fast: What if the poor also work for wages and agricultural prices affect labor markets? Sandra Polaski and others have shown that when one incorporates labor market effects of high vs. low agricultural prices, high prices will clearly be better for many developing countries.¶ In her Carnegie Endowment report, “[India’s Trade Policy Choices](http://carnegieendowment.org/files/india%27s_trade_policy_choices_final.pdf),” she and her co-authors use their innovative model to examine the effects of price increases and decreases for international prices for rice and wheat, both grown and consumed by Indian farmers. Their model is innovative because it incorporates labor market effects of policy reforms in ways that most other prevailing models – including the World Bank models [cited by Rodrik](http://rodrik.typepad.com/dani_rodriks_weblog/2008/05/food-prices-and.html) in his earlier posts on the issue – do not. They punch a major hole in the “net buyer/net seller” analysis of food prices.¶ Carnegie finds that higher rice prices have positive overall poverty impacts, and lower prices have significant negative impacts on poverty, and that this is true even among many groups of urban consumers. Based on their modeling of a 25% decrease in world rice prices, they find: “Seventy-eight percent of households would experience real income losses from such a price change, and the distributional impact would be regressive, with the poorest households losing the most.” (p. viii)¶ In their chapter explaining their agricultural modeling, they explain why even the urban poor – net buyers all of them – experience losses from lower agricultural prices: “The likely channel through which the decrease in the price of rice affects poor urban households is the labor market. The drop in rice prices reduces demand for labor in rice production sharply, by almost 12 percent in the case of a 50 percent decline, and reduces overall demand for labor in the agricultural sector. Displaced rural laborers spill over into urban unskilled labor markets…. The incomes of illiterate workers in urban areas, typically the least skilled, decline.” (p. 29)

#### High prices good—empirics prove they lead to increases in food production

Kharas 8 [Homi Kharas, Senior Fellow at the Wolfensohn Center for Development at the Brookings Institute, 8/6/8, “The Proposition’s Closing Statement”, The Economist, <http://www.economist.com/node/11829068?zid=318&ah=ac379c09c1c3fb67e0e8fd1964d5247f>.] AJacobson

Are today's food prices fair to producers and consumers?¶ Yes, because **higher food prices** will **bring** about new **investments in agriculture and higher global production. This is** already **happening in Asia** and other parts of the world, **and will accelerate** over time.¶Yes, because **without higher food prices, land use would shift towards** corn-for-ethanol and other **biofuel crops and we would have less food available.**¶ Yes, because **a system with food prices in free fall for 30 years did not produce any measurable decline in hunger** and poverty. But the last time food prices were as high as they are today we witnessed the Green Revolution and a rapid reduction of rural povertyin one of the largest population centres of the world, South Asia.¶ Yes, because the great urban/rural divide that was cleaving societies across the developing world has now narrowed.¶Some have argued that the proposition is unfairly worded. As there is an upside to most things, surely food prices are no exception. I do not want this debate to be about such sophistry. Instead let us be clear about the real changes in people's lives that can come about in the long run from higher food prices. Most of the evidence I have seen suggests that when looked at in detail, **most poor people will gain from higher food prices.**

#### High food prices good—increase value of farmland

Morris 3/13 [Frank Morris, 3/13/12, “Record-High Food Prices Boost Farmers' Bottom Lines”, *NPR*, <http://www.npr.org/2012/03/13/148161727/record-high-food-prices-boost-farmers-bottom-lines>.] AJacobson

**Thanks to high** commodity **prices** and surging productivity**,** U.S**. farmers earned a net income of nearly $98 billion last year** **— a record**, according to the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute.¶ Those **strong earnings are helping boost the demand for farmland**. In the past year, even as most Americans struggled with falling home prices, farmers saw spikes in the price of land used for agriculture.¶ As spring now approaches, farmers are gearing up to plant again, and farm stores are humming. At the Farmers Union co-op in Spring Hill, Kan., men in hard-worn canvas jackets are lining up to buy fertilizer and other supplies.¶ "They are going ahead and committing to the dollars, committing to the orders, planting, getting it into the ground," says Rita Cooper, the store's general manager. "And yes, they are going that extra above and beyond, to get the crop."¶ It wasn't always like this. In the 1980s, tens of thousands of farmers went broke and were forced off of their land. That was the era of the "Farm Aid" concerts, held to raise money and help some hang on. The hard times and foreclosures went on for years. But that has all changed now, says Jason Henderson, who runs the Omaha branch of the Kansas City Federal Reserve Bank. He says **farm income has jumped nearly 30 percent in each of the past two years.**¶"Over the last two, three years, **the U.S. farm sector has been enjoying banner farm incomes,"** he says. "It's been a real boom time."¶ Chad Hart, an economics professor at the University of Iowa, says both **prices and production are high.**¶"As we look at the 2011 corn and soybean crops in this country, they're probably the most valuable crops we've ever produced," he says.¶ For instance, the value of **last year's corn crop topped $76 billion** on its own. Economists say two major factors have been driving demand: exports and ethanol.¶ Exports have been surging to record levels because of China's growing appetite for American farm products. And in the U.S., there has been a rise in consumption of ethanol, a fuel usually made from corn.¶ It all adds up to high prices, and happy farmers.¶ "Oh, yeah! Can't complain. **Prices been real good**," **farmer** Rick **Kroll says** with a smile. "Crops ain't been bad, either."

### Agriculture Adv Exts - Offense - Industrial Agriculture Bad—Unsustainable

#### Industrial agriculture is unsustainable—mass crop growth hurts the environment and economy

UCS 11 (Union of Concerned Scientists, “Food and Agriculture: Toward Healthy Food and Farms”, 7/15/11, <http://www.ucsusa.org/food_and_agriculture/>, Accessed 7/23/12, Chan)

Our agricultural system has lost its way.¶ Millions of acres of corn, soybeans, and other commodity crops, grown with the help of heavy government subsidies, dominate our rural landscapes.¶ To grow these crops, industrial farms use massive amounts of synthetic fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides, which deplete our soil and pollute our air and water.¶ Much of this harvest will end up as biofuels and other industrial products—and most of the rest will be used in CAFOs (confined animal feeding operations) or in heavily processed junk foods, which seem cheap only because their hidden costs don't show up at the cash register.¶ Industrial agriculture is unhealthy—for our environment, our climate, our bodies, and our rural economies.

#### Low food prices bad—cause environmental degradation and disease

Toomer-Cook 8 (Jennifer, Deseret News, “Pros, cons of food production explored”, <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/705260936/Pros-cons-of-food-production-explored.html?pg=all>, 11/6/8, Accessed 7/24/12, Chan)

While industrialized food production makes more food available at low cost, the system is hitting the point of "dangerously diminishing returns" in nutritional quality and risks for food-borne illness, the book contends.¶ Some farming practices have compromised soil, water systems and other natural food-production infrastructure, perhaps to the breaking point. Another problem is that 1 billion people worldwide are overweight or obese, while another 1 billion don't get enough to eat.