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## \*\*Financial Regulation

### 1NC/2NC Financial Regulation

#### Republican administration would halt financial regulation-causes global economic crisis

#### Konczal, 12 [Michael, fellow at the Roosevelt Institute, “Financial Regulation,” Washington Monthly, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/financial_regulation034477.php>, ALB]

Immediately after the GOP took the House last year, Alabama Republican and chairman of the House banking committee Spencer Bachus made the mistake of saying what he actually believes about financial regulation. “In Washington, the view is that the banks are to be regulated,” he told the Birmingham News, “and my view is that Washington and the regulators are there to serve the banks.” This view is consistent with thirty years of Republican-backed financial deregulation as well as with the conservative explanation of what went wrong in the financial crisis. And if the Republicans manage to take both elected branches of the government next year, this is likely to be the spirit in which they’ll approach the post-Dodd-Frank era. On July 21, 2010, President Obama signed the Dodd- Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act into law. A large reworking of the financial economy, it was opposed by Republicans from the beginning. House Republicans voted in committee against crucial planks like derivatives reform and throughout the entire process added loopholes and exemptions, including one that removed auto lending from the consumer financial protection umbrella. With few exemptions, notably on the matter of auditing the Federal Reserve, there was no bipartisan support for new regulations. Going forward, the Republicans’ intentions with respect to Dodd-Frank are already clear: in Congress, they have introduced repeal legislation, and every major Republican presidential candidate has pledged to repeal Dodd- Frank in its entirety. It’s fair to take them at their word. Even if a Republican majority set out to kill the bill in one fell swoop but was blocked by a Democratic filibuster, it wouldn’t really matter. That’s because there are a series of simple steps Republicans can take to pull apart Dodd- Frank piece by piece. The collective effect would be similar to that of an overall repeal and would leave the global financial system in serious peril. Why does the GOP view Dodd-Frank as an unnecessary overreach? In their minds, there’s no problem to solve where the financial system is concerned. While the vast majority of economists and financial experts view the 2008 collapse of the banking sector, and the ensuing Great Recession, as the result of decades of unrestrained, unregulated experimentation by Wall Street firms, the right rejects this view. Conservatives see the crash as a cautionary tale about government intervention in the housing markets, in which the subprime mortgage boom was egged on by community organizers and government-sponsored enterprises like Fannie Mae. That George W. Bush was one of the biggest backers of “the ownership society” and that the much-maligned community activists were actually shouting early warnings about problems in the housing market are inconvenient facts to be ignored. As if suffering from a form of ideological color blindness, wherever there are large market failures in the current infrastructure of our financial system, conservatives can’t see the problems themselves, only the presence of the government. It has long been the case that, in the conservative imagination, the best market is one with the least amount of rules. In the 1990s, Senator Phil Gramm infamously told SEC Chair Arthur Levitt that “unless the waters are crimson with the blood of investors, I don’t want you embarking on any regulatory flights of fancy.” This guiding principle led many at Alan Greenspan’s Federal Reserve to ignore signs of fraud in subprime lending early on, despite the warnings. At the same time, there was a very conscious effort to tie state regulators in knots whenever possible, mostly by overruling, or “preempting,” state laws on behalf of large national banks. And in the years since the crisis, even without controlling the White House and the Senate, Republicans have managed to block key presidential appointments, tighten budgets, and harass regulators at every turn. All of these strategies— softening federal oversight, hampering regulatory institutions, and interfering in any state-level attempts to provide tough oversight of the financial industry—would surely be reprised by a Republican White House and Congress in each of the major battlegrounds on financial reform.

**Global economic decline causes extinction**

**Aulin and Lachman, 9** [Michael, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, Desmon, Resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels, Forbes, <http://www.aei.org/article/100187>, ALB]

Conversely, global policymakers do not seem to have grasped the downside risks to the global economy posed by a deteriorating domestic and international political environment. If the past is any guide, the souring of the political environment must be expected to fan the corrosive protectionist tendencies and nationalistic economic policy responses that are already all too much in evidence. After spending much of 2008 cheerleading the global economy, the International Monetary Fund now concedes that output in the world's advanced economies is expected to contract by as much as 2% in 2009. This would be the first time in the post-war period that output contracted in all of the world's major economies. The IMF is also now expecting only a very gradual global economic recovery in 2010, which will keep global unemployment at a high level. Sadly, the erstwhile rapidly growing emerging-market economies will not be spared by the ravages of the global recession. Output is already declining precipitously across Eastern and Central Europe as well as in a number of key Asian economies, like South Korea and Thailand. A number of important emerging-market countries like Ukraine seem to be headed for debt default, while a highly oil-dependent Russia seems to be on the cusp of a full-blown currency crisis. Perhaps of even greater concern is the virtual grinding to a halt of economic growth in China. The IMF now expects that China's growth rate will approximately halve to 6% in 2009. Such a growth rate would fall far short of what is needed to absorb the 20 million Chinese workers who migrate each year from the countryside to the towns in search of a better life. As a barometer of the political and social tensions that this grim world economic outlook portends, one needs look no further than the recent employment forecast of the International Labor Organization. The ILO believes that the global financial crisis will wipe out 30 million jobs worldwide in 2009, while in a worst case scenario as many as 50 million jobs could be lost. What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

### Exts-Romney=Financial Deregulation

**GOP ends consumer protection-Rolls back major financial regulations**

#### Konczal, 12 [Michael, fellow at the Roosevelt Institute, “Financial Regulation,” Washington Monthly, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/financial_regulation034477.php>, ALB]

Take the issue of consumer protection. The root cause of the financial crisis was an abusive, predatory, unregulated lending market that drove lots of bad mortgages to unknowing consumers as well as investors. Though most regulatory agencies list consumer protection among their goals, no regulator was dedicated explicitly to the task until Dodd- Frank mandated the creation of the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Reformers were careful to structure the CFPB for maximum clout and independence. It has a single director, and its budget, a guaranteed appropriation from the Federal Reserve, cannot be cut by Congress. These features are exactly what the GOP wants to dismantle. Senate Republicans have signed a letter declaring that they’ll oppose any candidate for director of the CFPB unless the bureau is subjected to the congressional appropriation process, allowing the next aspiring Phil Gramm to slash its budget at first chance. They also want to replace the director with a board and muddle the mission of the bureau away from its consumer focus. All these moves will lead to gridlock, creating a much weaker CFPB. Republicans would also like to undo the components of Dodd-Frank that force hitherto unregulated, “over the counter” derivative trading into open exchanges that are transparent and well regulated. During the decade leading up to the financial crash, derivatives, once mainly used by companies to hedge risk on commodities with fluctuating prices (e.g., oil for airlines), were seized upon by Wall Street, and the size of this potentially explosive market skyrocketed. By 2003, Warren Buffet was calling derivatives “financial weapons of mass destruction.” When the markets crashed in 2008, derivatives transactions had gotten so large yet so murky that it was nearly impossible to know who was on the hook for the tremendous losses. In an attempt to prevent a repeat of these circumstances, Dodd-Frank requires derivatives trading to take place in public exchanges, and obliges firms to put up enough collateral to ensure that, if their bets go bad, they can pay back investors (unlike AIG, which required billions of taxpayer funds to do so). During negotiations over the law, there was a big fight over what kinds of derivatives would be exempted from these rules. There was also a battle over which kinds of nonfinancial firms, “end users” like airlines and industry, would be exempt. Republicans will try to expand these end user exemptions and narrow the types of derivatives that have to follow the new rules laid out in Dodd-Frank, bringing us closer to the pre-crisis status quo. There’s already movement in the House to try to rewrite the parts of Dodd-Frank dealing with price transparency in derivatives trading so that less information has to be disclosed.

### Exts-Financial Regs K2 Econ

#### Financial regulations key to prevent economic collapse

#### Barr, 11 [Michael S., professor of law at the University of Michigan Law School, served as assistant secretary of the Treasury for Financial Institutions, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, “Don’t Roll Back Wall Street Reform,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/03/dodd_frank.html>, ALB]

The House Financial Services Committee this week considers implementation of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Congressional oversight of implementation is critical but there’s a risk that the hearings will degenerate into yet another salvo against much-needed financial reform. In fact, some in the financial sector and in Congress are now calling for repeal and are seeking to defund the agencies charged with implementing consumer financial protection, investor protection, and derivatives regulation. Critics argue that reform will hurt jobs and stifle growth. But the opposite is true—the lack of strong financial regulation is what nearly sent our economy over a cliff during the Great Recession. It’s what cost our country so many jobs, homes, and businesses. So let’s take this opportunity instead to take a step back and remember why reform is necessary. Before Dodd-Frank, major financial firms were essentially regulated by what they called themselves rather than what they did, with the legal name often determining regulation by the least stringent supervisory agency or no supervision at all. Huge amounts of risk moved outside the more regulated parts of the banking system into the so-called “shadow banking” world, leaving these firms subject to less oversight, lower capital requirements, and weaker consumer-protection rules. Today, Dodd-Frank provides authority for clear, strong, and consolidated supervision and regulation by the Federal Reserve of any financial firm—regardless of legal form—whose failure could pose a threat to financial stability. Before Dodd-Frank, the government did not have the authority to unwind large, highly leveraged, and substantially interconnected financial firms that failed. Think Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, and American International Group Inc.—all of which collapsed amid the 2008 financial crisis, threatening the very stability of the broader financial system. These and other "too-big-to-fail" financial institutions reduced market discipline, encouraged excessive risk-taking, provided an artificial incentive for financial institutions to grow, and created an uneven playing field. Today, Dodd-Frank ends "too big to fail." Major financial firms will now be subject to heightened prudential standards, including higher capital requirements. By forcing firms to internalize the costs they impose on the broader financial system, they will have strong incentives to shrink and reduce their complexity, leverage, and interconnections. And should such a firm fail, there will be a bigger capital buffer to cushion losses. Moreover, our nation no longer has to make the untenable choice between taxpayer bailouts and market chaos. Instead, Dodd-Frank provides the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with the authority to wind down any firm whose failure would pose substantial risks to our financial system—in a way that will protect the economy while ensuring that large financial firms, not taxpayers, bear any costs. Before Dodd-Frank, no regulator had the responsibility to look across the full sweep of the financial system and take action when there was a threat. Today, the new Financial Stability Oversight Council boasts clear responsibility for examining emerging threats to our financial system regardless of whence they come. Before Dodd-Frank, enormous risks grew up in the shadows of the over-the-counter derivatives market for financial products such as credit default swaps, which had a notional amount of $700 trillion prior to the financial crisis. Today, regulators are putting in place the tools to comprehensively regulate the derivatives market for the first time. The new financial reform law provides for transparency and price competition. It moves the market toward central clearing. It provides for strong prudential, capital, and business conduct rules for all dealers and other major participants in the derivatives markets. And it combats manipulation, fraud, and other abuses. Before Dodd-Frank, consumer-protection regulation was fragmented over seven federal regulators, with no accountability. So-called nonbanks—among them mortgage brokerages and payday lenders—could avoid federal supervision altogether. Banks could choose the least restrictive consumer approach among competing banking agencies. Federal regulators preempted state consumer-protection laws without adequately replacing these safeguards. Fragmentation of rule writing, supervision, and enforcement led to finger-pointing in place of action and made actions taken less effective. Today, Dodd-Frank ensures there is one agency accountable for one marketplace with one mission—protecting consumers. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau will help consumers by giving them the tools to make their own choices and weed out bad practices. Despite outcries to the contrary, these reforms are all about restoring the necessary balance between the incentives for innovation and competition, on the one hand, and adequate protections for consumers and investors, on the other. So that is where we were before the Dodd-Frank Act, why reform was necessary, and how Dodd-Frank delivers the necessary reforms. Now is not the time to undercut Dodd-Frank and return to a financial system that caused widespread harm to our economy, our businesses, and our people. Now is the time to fully implement the reforms to safeguard our financial system, our economy, and American consumers.

GOP administration will roll back financial regulations-Causes economic disaster

#### Konczal, 12 [Michael, fellow at the Roosevelt Institute, “Financial Regulation,” Washington Monthly, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/financial_regulation034477.php>, ALB]

A third aspect of Dodd-Frank that the GOP has in its crosshairs is the law’s effort to deal with the “too big to fail” problem. In the wake of the financial crisis, many economists argued that the best and perhaps only way to avoid the need for massive bailouts in the future would be to cut the nation’s biggest financial institutions down to size, such that the failure of any one would not drag down the entire financial system. That’s not the course the Obama administration and congressional Democrats took. Instead, with Dodd-Frank, they placed a special set of regulations on the largest and most complicated financial firms, known as “systemically important financial institutions” firms—companies like Goldman Sachs and Citigroup. Under the law, these behemoths are required to hold more capital in reserve than they did before the crisis, and must prepare “living wills” so the government can take control of them if they do fail, cushioning the impact on the rest of the economy. When Barney Frank bragged that there “will be death panels enacted by this Congress, but they will be for nonbank financial institutions,” he was referring to this living-will provision and the government’s new authority to take over these institutions in the event of their failure. Several of the firms would also likely fall under the Volcker Rule, which bans firms with FDIC protection from outright gambling with a taxpayer backstop and secretly betting against the interests of their own clients. Needless to say, the banks would be glad not to have to deal with any of these new rules. Beyond these three main areas of regulation, virtually all the other reforms in Dodd-Frank would be at risk from Republican efforts to stop regulators from writing the necessary rules and implementing them in the marketplace. Funding for the agencies will be important here; House Republicans have already attempted to radically cut the budget of the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Nor will GOP attacks on financial regulation be limited to Dodd- Frank. Most of the major presidential candidates have stated that they intend to repeal Sarbanes-Oxley, the financial reporting mandate put into place after the corporate scandals at Enron and WorldCom. If laws like Sarbanes-Oxley and Dodd-Frank are repealed or eviscerated in the ways Republicans have explicitly called for—or have at least hinted at—it is not hard to imagine the possible consequences. The largest firms would be dangerously risky, continuing to exert way too much influence over the markets and to keep finding new, innovative ways to gamble with other people’s money. Reforms that would limit abusive practices across the market won’t be put into place. The financial markets will be set up to generate maximum panic and confusion in a crisis. When the next set of problems starts to occur in the financial market, we’ll be in no better shape to deal with the crisis than we were before. Financial firms are constantly creating new, complex products and services that could pose risks to the entire financial system but are little understood by regulators. Unless agencies are given the funding and mandate to keep up with Wall Street’s innovations, it will be difficult if not impossible to stop the next crisis at an early stage. It may be hard to fathom why Republicans would want to do away with commonsense regulations meant to stop the kinds of financial practices that wrecked the American economy—especially when, in the eyes of many, those regulations didn’t go far enough. But if the story you tell, against all available evidence, is that the government is the primary culprit, and the financial markets work fine without any serious oversight, then the only logical conclusion is to govern like you are there to serve the banks.

### Econ Impact Extensions

**Nuclear War**

**Ockham Research 8** [Ockham Research, Economic Distress and Geopolitical Risks by: Ockham Research, Ockham Research Staff November 18, 2008????Ockham Research Ockham Research is an independent research provider based in Atlanta, Georgia providing??security analysis]

The hardship and turmoil which impacted the world during the Great Depression provided fertile ground for the rise of fascist, expansionist regimes in Germany, Italy and Japan.?Hard times also precluded the Western democracies from a more muscular response in the face of growing belligerence from these countries.?The United States largely turned inward during the difficult years of the 1930s.?The end result was a global war of a size and scale never seen by man (SIC) either before or since.?Economic hardship is distracting. It can cause nations to turn their focus inward with little or no regard for rising global threats that inevitably build in tumultuous times.?Authoritarian regimes invariably look for scapegoats to blame for the hardship affecting their populace.?This enables them to project the anger of their citizenry away from the regime itself and onto another race, country, ideology, etc.??Looking at the world today, one can certainly envision numerous potential flashpoints that could become problematic in a protracted economic downturn.?Pakistan, already a hotbed of Islamic extremism and armed with atomic weapons, has been particularly hard hit by the global economic crisis.?An increasingly impoverished Pakistan will be harder and harder for its new and shaky democratically-elected government to control.?Should Pakistan’s economic troubles cause its political situation, always chaotic, to spin out of control, this would be a major setback, in the global war on terror.??Russia, whose economy, stock markets and financial system have literally imploded over the past few months, could become increasingly problematic if faced with a protracted economic downturn.?The increasingly authoritarian and aggressive Russian regime is already showing signs of anger projection. Its invasion of Georgia this summer and increasing willingness to confront the West reflect a desire to stoke the pride and anger of its people against foreign powers?particularly the United States. It is no accident that the, Russians, announced a willingness to deploy tactical missile systems?to Kaliningrad the day after Barack Obama?s election in the U.S.?This was a clear ?shot across the bow? of the new administration and demonstrates Russian willingness to pursue a much more confrontational foreign policy going forward. Furthermore, the collapse in the price of oil augers poorly for Russia?s economy. The Russian budget reputedly needs oil at $70 per barrel or higher in order to be in balance. Russian foreign currency reserves, once huge, have been depleted massively over the past few months by ham-fisted attempts to arrest the slide in both markets and the financial system.Bristling with nuclear weapons and nursing an ego still badly bruised by the collapse of the Soviet Union and loss of superpower status, an impoverished and unstable Russia would be a dangerous thing to behold.??China too is threatened by the global economic downturn.?There is no doubt that China has emerged during the past decade as a major economic power. Parts of the country have been transformed by its meteoric growth. However, in truth, only about a quarter of the nation’s billion plus inhabitants?those living in the thriving cities on the coast and in Beijing, have truly felt the impact of the economic boom. Many of these people have now seen a brutal bear market and are adjusting to economic loss and diminished future prospects.?However, the vast majority of China?s population did not benefit from the economic boom and could become increasingly restive in an economic slowdown.?Enough economic hardship could conceivably threaten the stability of the regime and would more than likely make China more bellicose and unpredictable in its behavior, with dangerous consequences for the U.S. and the world.

**Econ collapse causes extinction**

Friedberg **and Schoenfeld 8** [professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, senior editor of Commentary, is a visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute in Princeton ,“The Dangers of a Diminished America”, 10-21, WSJ, <http://online.wsj.vom/articles/SB122455074012352571.html>]

Pressures to cut defense spending, and to dodge the cost of waging two wars, already intense before this crisis, are likely to mount. Despite the success of the surge, the war in Iraq remains deeply unpopular. Precipitous withdrawal -- attractive to a sizable swath of the electorate before the financial implosion -- might well become even more popular with annual war bills running in the hundreds of billions. Protectionist sentiments are sure to grow stronger as jobs disappear in the coming slowdown. Even before our current woes, calls to save jobs by restricting imports had begun to gather support among many Democrats and some Republicans. In a prolonged recession, gale-force winds of protectionism will blow. Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

Escalates across the globe

Austin 9 [Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187]

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

Nuclear war – turns every impact

Harris and Burrows 9 [Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf Increased Potential for Global Conflict]

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

## \*\*China

### 1NC/2NC China

**Romney will label China a currency manipulator-that causes a trade war**

**Shobert, 12** [Benjamin A., Managing Director of Rubicon Strategy Group, also author of upcoming book Blame China, “Romney lays ground for China trade war,” <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China_Business/NB22Cb01.html>, ALB]

Part of what Romney wrote aligns with his early September 2011 economic plan, where he announced that his administration would formally label China a "currency manipulator". On this point, his Wall Street Journal op-ed doubled down; there, he wrote, " ... on day one of my presidency I will designate it a currency manipulator and take appropriate counteraction." As a head nod to the influential parts of the GOP who represent the interests of big-business, he subsequently added, "A trade war with China is the last thing I want, but I cannot tolerate our current trade surrender." For someone who claims not to want a trade war with China, Romney is making a pretty compelling case for how his administration would make one all but certain. It is a temptation to read Romney's op-ed as the sort of positioning during the primaries that Americans have come to expect during their elections. Even in the US-China policy-community, many draw comfort from past election cycles where blustery comments from potential presidential candidates were dramatically toned down - if they did not go away altogether - once their transition into elected office took place. The present administration went through a similar smoothing out of the rough edges about its stance towards China once it emerged victoriously from both the primary and the general election. Admittedly, this is the safest way to interpret Romney's most recent volley towards the Chinese: as the primary shifts back to his "home state", China presents an issue that certainly has bi-partisan traction in a manufacturing-sensitive midwestern economy like Michigan, where China's economy is perceived to have benefited at the expense of middle-class American blue-collar workers. It is a note the Romney campaign believes can be safely struck not only in the midst of a heated GOP primary, but in the general election as well. Tradition says nothing should be made of Romney's saber rattling towards China, but is tradition wrong? Choosing to interpret Romney's attitude towards China as something not to be alarmed about overlooks a major difference between past election cycles and today's: now the American psyche is deeply frustrated over the difficulties the country's economy must face. In the past, the relative confidence felt about America's economic future allowed many to overlook the potential threat China might present. Today, that confidence is gone. The average American worker remains traumatized and deeply insecure since the 2008 financial crisis. Many also feel brutalized over the ugly state of American politics, precisely when the latter should be shedding light on how best to deal with the former. An economic crisis has quickly devolved into a political one, leaving many in middle America eager for someone to blame. Tied to these economic insecurities are deep misgivings about America's place in the world, which go back to the US response to 9/11 and the subsequent invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. Americans are torn between the GOP world view that argues for America to remain a hegemonic force for good around the world, versus a libertarian-progressive framework that believes that America can be powerful and influential, but must do so within a the realities of both a multi-polar world and the economic limitations imposed on Washington based on years of fiscal imprudence. When Romney disparagingly writes of President Barack Obama that he "came into office as a near supplicant to Beijing", he touches on this insecurity and appeals to the American desire to appear muscular and able to "go it alone" where others counsel caution and compromise. The popular temper American politicians tap into over China is not necessarily new, although a good argument could be made that negative portrayals of China during American elections has been growing more common in this, and recent election cycles. Conventional thinking has it that the real decision-makers about American policy towards China are those who never run for elected office, the safe wise men (SIC) who, behind closed doors, know how to calm everyone down and focus on how best to maintain the status-quo. That is precisely why Romney's ongoing diatribe against China is so distressing: he is supposed to be one of those calm, level-headed people that could be trusted not to demagogue China in order to score cheap political points. For US-China policy-makers, Romney's elevation of China as an issue for the general election should not be overlooked, downplayed, or rationalized. To have the supposedly most business-savvy candidate for president the country has seen in years run within the most pro-business, historically free trade American political party with a major plank of his economic plan being to call out China as a currency manipulator is noteworthy. But it would be a mistake only to point out Romney's fixation on how China has negatively hurt the American economy: after all, of the 17 paragraphs that constitute Romney's editorial, only two of them have to do with matters related to the two countries' economies. The other 15 all focus on Romney's assertion that China is not a trustworthy partner for America, and that the Beijing model represents, as he writes, "a widespread and disquieting norm" that must be challenged by a change in American policy towards China. If there is a common thread that ties together Romney's heavy-handed editorial about China it is this: the American and Chinese attitudes about freedom and fairness are not shared values, and because they are not shared values nor is it likely they will become shared anytime soon, the policy of engagement towards China that stressed overlooking these differences has served its purpose and must be discarded. Yes, as Romney sees it, the cause for doing so will initially be realizations forced upon Americans as a result of the 2008 financial crisis; but, if Romney is correct, 2008 simply brought into focus something America had been willing to overlook when times were good: specifically, that the United States was doing business with a repressive government that had no aspirations of ever changing. It wanted commerce, not democracy. Throughout his piece, Romney repeatedly points towards the "suppression of political and personal freedom", takes issue with the Obama administration having "demurred from raising issues of human rights" with the Chinese government, to what is perhaps both his most direct and confusing statement: towards the end of his op-ed, Romney writes of China, "A nation that represses its own people cannot ultimately be a trusted partner in an international system based on economic and political freedom." As a portrayal of the tension that has existed in China relative to its reform process for the last 30 years, this is an obvious frustration. Where Romney fails is in how to respond to China's shortcomings. He makes little attempt to answer the question; rather, he simply makes note of the fact that "While it is obvious that any lasting democratic reform in China cannot be imposed from the outside, it is equally obvious that the Chinese people currently do not yet enjoy the requisite civil and political rights to turn internal dissent into effective reform." Romney seems to believe China would reform more quickly if only America spent more on its military, took a more confrontational position up in the Asia Pacific region towards China, and called Beijing out on its unfair trade practices. Long-time China policy hands might chuckle at this sort of brutishness, but to do so is a mistake given these policy proposals are all coming from the most sane, pro-business candidate still viable in the GOP primary. If one of the last bulwarks that has separated mob rule towards Beijing has been the stoic Republican Party's view of China, then Romney's fixation on the country as a threat to the American economy and ideals the country holds dear is worth noting. Of all of Romney's statements, the most dangerous may be the false choice he offers the American people: that China's rise is somehow incompatible with America's ongoing safety and economic stability. Romney begins his op-ed by asking the question, "Should the 21st century be an American century?", as if the only two choices were between an American and Chinese century. This is dangerous and highly reductionist thinking, and its impact ranges from how Romney would have American economic policy towards China change, to more fundamental questions of whether the United States should further increase military spending in order to deal with China as a potential regional threat. As he frames it, this also leaves little oxygen in the room for other countries - both developed and emerging - who feel they have something of note to offer the 21st century. Romney's words need to be properly called what they are: irresponsible fear mongering. The path towards war has been paved by comments just like these in times past, in moments of historical insecurity just like those his desired-presidency would encounter. Romney wants the reader to believe that, as he writes, "The sum total of my approach will ensure that this is an American, not a Chinese century". What is the key to making sure this happens? According to Romney, it is making sure that China is not a "prosperous tyranny" that can "pose problems for us, for its neighbors, and for the entire world". Absent throughout Romney's op-ed is any reference to what China is doing better than America, where China's single-minded focus on economic growth forces politics to take a second chair to questions of how best to align national industrial policy with limited resources, or what role government should play in helping American entrepreneurs compete with China's growing bio-tech and green technology industries. Rather, Romney wants to cast China in the role of villain, a role the country easily fits within the American imagination, and one American politics seems bent on making a reality.

**China bashing will undermine cooperation on North Korea and warming**

NYT 10 [“Eye on China, House Votes for Greater Tariff Powers,” http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/30/business/30currency.html?\_r=1&src=un&feedurl=http%3A%2F%2Fjson8.nytimes.com%2Fpages%2Fpolitics%2Findex.jsonp]

The Obama administration never took an emphatic position on the legislation and some officials say that, if passed, signed into law and challenged at the World Trade Organization, it might well be struck down. But this is a case where the symbolism may be more important than the legal niceties, and for that reason, the White House has been of two minds about the bill. Mr. Obama has tried to use the rising public anger over China’s trade advantage to argue to Chinese leaders that the United States would no longer tolerate deliberate currency manipulation, a point Mr. Obama made repeatedly in a meeting last week with Wen Jiabao, China’s prime minister. He did so again on Wednesday in Des Moines, where one businessman asked the president about the issue. “The reason that I’m pushing China about their currency is because their currency is undervalued,” he said, adding: “People generally think that they are managing their currency in ways that make our goods more expensive to sell and their goods cheaper to sell here. And that contributes — that’s not the main reason for our trade imbalance — but it’s a contributing factor to our trade imbalance.” But in conversations with Congress, the Treasury secretary, Timothy F. Geithner, and other officials have warned of the danger of touching off a trade war, in which China blocks American goods in retaliation, that could hurt both economies. The risks go beyond trade. Mr. Obama is pressing China for help on cutting exports to Iran, managing a dangerous leadership transition in North Korea and some kind of accord on curbing carbon outputs that contribute to global warming. He is also coming up with what one senior administration official called on Tuesday “new rules of the road” over disputed maritime territory. But in Beijing, and on Capitol Hill, all that pales in comparison to the currency dispute, which is often portrayed in the Chinese news media as an effort to curb China’s growth, and thus its power. Eswar S. Prasad, a professor of trade policy at Cornell, called the legislation “a shot across the bow that indicates a clear escalation from overheated rhetoric about Chinese currency policy to more substantive action.” While it is unlikely there will be a trade war, he said, “there is now a real risk that a cycle of tit-for-tat trade sanctions could spin out of control and cause some real, if not lasting, damage.” Under the bill, Mr. Obama would not have personal control to turn sanctions on or off. The legislation would make it easier for the Commerce Department to place duties on imports from countries that have “fundamentally undervalued” currencies — defined as “protracted, large-scale intervention” in foreign exchange markets; an undervaluation of at least 5 percent; persistent global current account surpluses; and “excessive” foreign asset reserves. Traditionally, only direct subsidies to an industry, rather than the indirect help that comes from an undervalued currency, have been considered a reason for retaliatory tariffs. Because so many countries have managed their currency rates for so long, it is unclear that the W.T.O. would uphold any American efforts to make the manipulation of a currency a justification for action. While the bill did not mention China by name, the criteria were clearly written with China, the largest creditor of the United States, in mind. In response, the official Xinhua news agency quoted China’s commerce ministry spokesman, Yao Jian, as saying: “Starting a countervailing investigation in the name of exchange rates does not conform with relevant W.T.O. rules.” But later in the day the Chinese Foreign Ministry was more emphatic about its displeasure, saying the House effort could harm economic ties between the two countries. "We firmly oppose the U.S. Congress approving such bills," Jiang Yu, a ministry spokeswoman told reporters in Beijing. "We urge the U.S. congressmen to be clearly aware of the importance of China-U.S. trade and economic relations, resist protectionism so as to refrain from any damage to the interests of both peoples and people around the world." So far the administration has been reluctant to pursue retaliation against China. The Treasury Department has repeatedly declined to formally declare China a currency manipulator. And last month, the Commerce Department decided not to investigate allegations that China’s currency practices amounted to an improper export subsidy. “The United States does not gain leverage in these negotiations by doing things China doesn’t find credible,” said Marc L. Busch, a political scientist at Georgetown. “The Chinese are aware that this is just not going to fly.” But the Obama administration may have few other options and few allies. Europeans are largely uninterested in the problem: the euro has weakened because of the sovereign debt crisis, limiting European incentives to get involved. Japan is intensely interested, and this month intervened in the currency markets for the first time since 2004, moving to devalue the yen unilaterally. But in the House, the politics of the moment seemed more important than the long-run economic strategy of managing economic relations with China. Representative Sander M. Levin, Democrat of Michigan and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, said that “China’s persistent manipulation of its currency” had resulted in a “tilted field of competition” and the loss of as many as 1.5 million American jobs. “This manipulation is one of the causes of outsourcing of our jobs — manufacturing and other good jobs,” he said. “Talk hasn’t worked.” The top Republican on the committee, Representative Dave Camp of Michigan, said that the Obama administration had been insufficiently engaged in securing international pressure on the Chinese; that the bill would not promote Mr. Obama’s goal of doubling American exports over five years; and that other issues — like China’s tolerance for violations of intellectual property rights — were as significant as the currency undervaluation. Even so, Mr. Camp said, “I will vote for this bill because it signals to China that Congress’s patience is running out.”

Extinction – North Korea

#### Fungamwango, 99 [Pat, October 25th, “Africa-at-Large; Third World War: Watch the Koreas Africa News”]

Lusaka - If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or build-up in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.

Warming leads to extinction

#### Henderson, 6 [Bill, environmental scientist, “Runaway Global Warming Denial.” Countercurrents.org, August 19, [http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm](https://webmail.whitman.edu/horde/services/go.php?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.countercurrents.org%2Fcc-henderson190806.htm)]

The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction. If impossibly Draconian security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of man's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

### Exts-Romney Kills China Relations

Romney election means confrontational China policy-destroys relations and destroys the environment, climate change, and the global economy

#### Traub, 12 [James, journalist specializing in foreign affairs, writes “Terms of Engagement,” a weekly column on ForeignPolicy.com, “Foreign Affairs: The “more enemies, fewer friends” doctrine, *Washington Monthly*, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/foreign_affairs034475.php?page=1>, ALB]

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

**Romney will China bash if elected**

#### Roarty, 12 [Alex, politics writer for National Journal, “Romney’s Anti-China Rhetoric Raises Concerns,” 2/20, National Journal, pg. ProQuest, ALB]

Mitt Romney's investment-banking background and free-market message would seem to make him the candidate of choice for America's business community. Except when he talks about China. The Republican presidential hopeful sounds more like a card-carrying union member than a former CEO when he outlines his White House agenda for China, urging tariffs and downplaying the threat of a trade war. He extended his tough talk recently to the pages of The Wall Street Journal in a piece epitomizing the protectionist rhetoric he's deployed for much of his presidential campaign. "Unless China changes its ways, on day one of my presidency I will designate it a currency manipulator and take appropriate counteraction," Romney wrote. "A trade war with China is the last thing I want, but I cannot tolerate our current trade surrender." Politically speaking, Romney has good reason to attack the economic relationship with the world's largest country. The issue resonates with the conservative activists his campaign has struggled to attract. But the approach has also tarnished his reputation in the business community. Private-sector leaders aren't panicking quite yet about a leading GOP contender sounding like a Rust-Belt Democrat, but there's a palpable nervousness among them that Romney isn't an ally on what they consider a crucial economic issue. "It doesn't make a huge amount of sense," said Bill Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council. "I don't know why anyone would think that on the first day in office, the most important thing to do is to stick it to the Chinese." Even Romney allies have blasted Romney's position as oversimplified. Jon Huntsman, the former U.S. ambassador to China, who endorsed Romney after exiting the presidential race last month, criticized him during an appearance on MSNBC last week. "When it comes to China, I think it's wrongheaded when you talk about slapping a tariff on day one," Huntsman said. "That pushes aside the reality, the complexity of the relationship." The political reality is something else entirely. A May 2011 survey by the Pew Research Center found that the most conservative part of the electorate, the 11 percent of registered voters it calls "staunch conservatives," is by far the most eager to apply economic pressure on China. Seventy-nine percent want to "get tough" on China instead of increasing cooperation. That's a dramatic 30 points higher than get-tough sentiment among the "Main Street Republicans" who account for 14 percent of registered voters. "Republicans tend to have more negative views about China, and the conservative base in particular tends to have negative views toward China," said Richard Wike, an associate director of the Pew Global Attitudes Project. The politics have shaped not only Romney's views but those of the Republican Party as a whole, which has lurched leftward on free trade with China. That helps explain the thinking behind ads like Michigan GOP Senate candidate Pete Hoekstra's controversial Super Bowl spot, which linked too much U.S. domestic spending (and borrowing from China) with a rise in China's global dominance. The timing of Romney's anti-China piece in The W all Street Journal wasn't an accident. It came during Chinese Vice President Xi Jinping's visit to the United States. It also came during a critical time for his campaign in Michigan, where he faces a fierce challenge from former Pennsylvania Sen. Rick Santorum in the Feb. 28 primary. In a state where employment has been hollowed by the decline of the manufacturing industry, tough talk toward China seems a sure political winner. The business community for decades has watched presidential contenders routinely use free trade with China as a political punching bag, only to preserve the same policies once in office. But Romney's campaign is giving them pause. According to one Washington lobbyist who works on U.S.-China relations, and who requested anonymity in order to speak candidly, Romney's continued hammering on the issue -- he has mentioned it frequently for months -- has raised concern among private industry leaders that this is more than rhetoric. "He has clearly staked out a position," said the lobbyist, who backed Romney in 2008. Romney's stand also doesn't sit well in free-market circles, where some dispute the idea that China's currency manipulation has wreaked havoc on the U.S. economy. That a former CEO would lend credence to the theory shifts the public debate leftward, said Derek Scissors, a research fellow who focuses on Asia at the conservative Heritage Foundation. "I've had members of Congress say to me, 'You know, Romney thinks you're wrong,' when I'll make argument that the exchange rate doesn't affect us," he said. Challengers to a sitting president usually attack incumbents as soft on China, putting Romney -- who calls President Obama a "supplicant" to China -- well in the mainstream. But Scissors said there's a difference this year because Obama, who imposed a tariff on tires imported from China, is already farther to the protectionist left on China trade than any recent president. "Republicans have made a choice that even though President Obama is ambivalent about free trade and on the protectionist side, we're going to move even farther" in that direction, he said. Harming trade with China would have huge reverberations across the U.S. economy. According to the Census Bureau, China was America's second-largest trading partner in 2011, behind only Canada. It accounted for 13.6 percent of all trade. In other words, billions upon billions of dollars are at stake.

### China Impact Extensions

**Conflict with China will escalate to global nuclear war**

**Hunkovic, 9** [Lee, Professor of Political Science at the American Military University, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict: Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan, and the United States of America,” [http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/ Hunkovic.pdf](http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf)]

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

#### U.S.-China conflict is the most probable scenario for great power war

**Gill and O’Hanlon, 2** [Bates, Freeman Chair in China Studies, and Michael E., Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, 12/26, “China and Taiwan: An Offer Washington Ought to Consider,” http://

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2002/1226china\_ohanlon.aspx]

China has viewed its missile phalanx as its most effectivecoercive tool against Taiwan, and used it to bracket the island with warning shots in 1995 and 1996. This prompted the United States to implicitly threaten force in return by deploying aircraft carriers to the region. Thus Beijing?s offer—which a senior Chinese official has confirmed, according to a Washington Post report (IHT, Dec. 11)—could be of great significance. But was the offer just a political gesture or a tactical ploy? One thing is clear: Without prejudicing their relationship to Taiwan, U.S. policymakers should test the idea and see how far Beijing is willing to take it. Preoccupation with the war against terror, Iraq and now North Korea must not blind U.S. officials to any opportunity to defuse the only conflict that could plausibly take America to war against another great power in the early years of the 21st century. Jiang?s offer may be part of a much larger effort by Beijing during the past 18 months, and especially since the terrorist attacks on the United States in September 2001, to put forward a more constructive and responsible international face, particularly in improving U.S.-Chinese relations. Beijing?s toned down rhetoric in opposition to the U.S. missile defense program, its helpful contributions to the Washington-led counter-terror campaign, its willingness to support a new UN Security Council resolution on Iraq well before Russia or France would, and its recent request to open a security dialogue with NATO are examples of the trend. China?s approach toward Taiwan has appeared markedly less shrill in recent months. Beijing has shown a more nuanced approach, giving greater emphasis to political and economic carrots while still strengthening its military stick. The missile offer could be a piece of that overall approach to draw Taiwan closer into China?s orbit. But the Chinese offer of a trade-off may also be nothing more than a political gesture to gain some diplomatic high ground. Knowing that a missile redeployment or freeze would not substantially alter the real military balance on the ground, and knowing that it is unlikely that the United States would agree to any firm quid pro quo, Beijing can appear the conciliatory party. With some 350 to 400 short- and medium-range missiles positioned opposite Taiwan, it could be that China?s deployments have reached a saturation point in any case. How should Washington and Taipei respond? Some ideas are nonstarters. America should categorically refuse to limit arms sales to Taiwan for nonmissile threats, regardless of China?s willingness to freeze or reduce missile deployments. In particular, the Bush administration should not withdraw its offer to sell Taipei maritime patrol aircraft, submarines, Kidd-class destroyers and improved air-to-air missiles. The United States should still abide by the "six assurances" it offered Taiwan in 1982. In particular, it pledged not to set any date to end arms sales to Taiwan and not to consult with China over the specifics of any weapons sale to Taiwan prior to making that sale. America should also recognize that any reductions in Chinese missile deployments near Taiwan could be quickly reversed, and avoid responses that would be difficult to reverse. Still, the Chinese offer is potentially far too significant to brush aside. The United States should encourage China to reduce its missile deployments unilaterally, and promise that any such decision would have important, if indirect, effects on its arms sales policy. With less of a Chinese missile threat, Taiwan would have less need for controversial Aegis-class destroyers. It still may need improvements to its existing Patriot missile defense technology, but that measure might be postponed. Since Taiwan is having a hard time concluding arrangements for the weapons already promised in 2001, that may be a small price to pay. The United States cannot make concrete promises to China about postponements, but it can suggest a process of phased mutual restraint that could build on itself.

#### Turns the case in less than 15 years – warming causes nuclear conflict

Harris, ‘4. [Paul, The Observer, Feb 22, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2004/feb/22/usnews.theobserver>]

Climate change over the next 20 years could result in a global catastrophe costing millions of lives in wars and natural disasters.. A secret report, suppressed by US defence chiefs and obtained by The Observer, warns that major European cities will be sunk beneath rising seas as Britain is plunged into a 'Siberian' climate by 2020. Nuclear conflict, mega-droughts, famine and widespread rioting will erupt across the world. The document predicts that abrupt climate change could bring the planet to the edge of anarchy as countries develop a nuclear threat to defend and secure dwindling food, water and energy supplies. The threat to global stability vastly eclipses that of terrorism, say the few experts privy to its contents. 'Disruption and conflict will be endemic features of life,' concludes the Pentagon analysis. 'Once again, warfare would define human life.'

### Exts-China Relations Impacts

#### US-China Relations solve extinction

Wenzhong, 4 [Zhou, PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2-7-04. “Vigorously Pushing Forward the Constructive and Cooperative Relationship Between China and the United States,” <http://china-japan21.org/eng/zxxx/t64286.htm>, ALB]

China's development needs a peaceful international environment, particularly in its periphery. We will continue to play a constructive role in global and regional affairs and sincerely look forward to amicable coexistence and friendly cooperation with all other countries, the United States included. We will continue to push for good-neighborliness, friendship and partnership and dedicate ourselves to peace, stability and prosperity in the region. Thus China's development will also mean stronger prospect of peace in the Asia-Pacific region and the world at large. China and the US should, and can, work together for peace, stability and prosperity in the region. Given the highly complementary nature of the two economies, China's reform, opening up and rising economic size have opened broad horizon for sustained China-US trade and economic cooperation. By deepening our commercial partnership, which has already delivered tangible benefits to the two peoples, we can do still more and also make greater contribution to global economic stability and prosperity. Terrorism, cross-boundary crime, proliferation of advanced weapons, and spread of deadly diseases pose a common threat to mankind. China and the US have extensive shared stake and common responsibility for meeting these challenges, maintaining world peace and security and addressing other major issues bearing on human survival and development. China is ready to keep up its coordination and cooperation in these areas with the US and the rest of the international community.

#### Sustainable cooperation with China key to solve several scenarios for extinction

#### China Daily, 8 [Rikki N. Massand and Gazelle Emami, “U.S.-China relations at the world's fingertips,” 4-20-2008, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2008-04/20/content_6629700.htm>, ALB]

To frame the importance of this discussion and the topics that must be met, Siegal used the analogy of “the U.S. and China having their hands around each other’s necks and we’re both going over the waterfall.” After that comment a man in the audience then suggested that in that case both countries would have to look to the other for help and teamwork would be the only way to survive. That theme resonated from coast to coast. At the University of California-Berkeley, speaker Sidney Rittenberg took a more intimate approach to U.S.-China relations. A man who lived in China for 35 years, Rittenberg has worked for the past two decades as an advisor to major corporations doing business in China such as AIG, Intel, Hughes Aircraft, Pricewaterhouse Coopers, and Ford. At the Bay Area gathering he emphasized respect and dignity through his own stories, and instead of categorizing the issues into right and wrong Rittenberg advocates looking at the bigger picture. For him the imperative for Americans is to learn to get along with the Chinese. “We must -- we don't have a choice. The crises that threaten the human race, like weapons of mass destruction in the hands of terrorist groups, global warming, none of the issues will get resolved unless we work with China, Brazil, India and of course Europe and other countries. Really the central axis that holds the whole thing together is the U.S. and China," Rittenberg said.

## \*\*Iran

### 1NC Iran Strike (Romney Will attack)

#### Romney election means first striking Iran-leads to escalation and retaliation

#### Traub, 12 [James, journalist specializing in foreign affairs, writes “Terms of Engagement,” a weekly column on ForeignPolicy.com, “Foreign Affairs: The “more enemies, fewer friends” doctrine, *Washington Monthly*, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/foreign_affairs034475.php?page=1>, ALB]

But elsewhere, a Republican president would turn up the dial of confrontation**.** Iran is a particularly starkexample**,** since Obama’s rivals have described his engagement policy there as complicity with evil (Rick Santorum: “We sided with evil because our president believes our enemies are legitimately aggrieved”). As a candidate, Obama argued that the U.S. had sacrificed even the possibility of finding common ground with nations like Iran by refusing to talk to them. As president, he replaced the bellicose moralism of George Bush’s “axis of evil” with a more anodyne lexicon of “mutual respect” for “mutual interests.” He took pains to extend greetings to the Iranian people on the holiday of Nowruz and to refer to the country as the “Islamic Republic of Iran.” In his speech in Cairo in June 2009, Obama even acknowledged America’s role in the 1953 overthrow of a democratically elected Iranian leader. There is more to this strategy than Republicans like to acknowledge. Perhaps Obama did believe (naively) that this more beguiling language would make it easier for the Iranian leadership to come out of its shell and make concessions on its nuclear program. But officials around him said from the outset that his ulterior purpose was to help forge an international coalition around tough measures toward Iran by first showing that the Iranians would not respond to gentle ones. And in this he succeeded: in 2010, Obama persuaded Russia and China to accept tough sanctions on Iran adopted by the UN Security Council. Iran is much more isolated today than it was only a few years ago. The Obama administration has been using clandestine methods as well, and in all likelihood collaborated with Israel to develop the Stuxnet computer virus, which disrupted Iran’s nuclear centrifuges. Indeed, here, as elsewhere, Obama has proved to be less “liberal,” and more traditionally pragmatic, than many of his supporters hoped or his critics have charged. He has increased the use of Predator drones and continued the practice of extraordinary rendition of terror suspects to other countries, despite criticisms from human rights groups. Many of the old-line foreign policy professionals who served under the first President Bush, like Brent Scowcroft, the former national security advisor, feel more comfortable with Obama’s conduct of foreign policy than with the more confrontational one that Romney and others promise. (Only Jon Huntsman, of all the Republican candidates, has sought the advice of this group.) A Republican president would thus move American foreign policy not from the left to the right, but from the center to the right.For all Obama’s efforts, his Iran policy is at best a qualified success; the leadership there is still enriching uranium, still apparently seeking to design a warhead, still posing a profound threat to Israel. The Republican candidates insist that Iran hasn’t capitulated because Obama has not applied enough pressure. They would, of course, cut out the deferential language and the holiday greetings. They would attempt regime change, if from a distance. But the real difference between a hypothetical Republican president and Obama—and it is a very important one—is that a Republican would be prepared to launch an attack on Iran designed to slow their development of nuclear technology, or would give Israel the go-ahead to do so. Yes, Obama has said that “all options are on the table,” but he might not be prepared to attack Iran. The Republicans say they would. “If we reelect Barack Obama,” Mitt Romney said in Spartanburg, “Iran will have a nuclear weapon. And if you elect Mitt Romney, Iran will not have a nuclear weapon.” At bottom, Obama’s policy is designed to buy time in hopes that the collective bite of sanctions will change the Iranian calculus, or that some as yet unforeseeable change inside Iran will produce a new policy. He seeks, in Cold War language, to contain Iran. Romney and others argue that the U.S. doesn’t have the luxury of containment—that Iran represents an existential threat, which must be stopped now. But airstrikes, whether by the U.S. or Israel, would not wholly eliminate Iran’s nuclear program, and would provoke very serious blowback. Leon Panetta, Obama’s defense secretary, has warned the Israelis of possible “unintended consequences” of such a mission, including attacks on American soldiers, diplomats, and assets across the Middle East. And while some Arab elites might welcome an attack, ordinary citizens in the Middle East would be enraged. The U.S. could thus pay a very grave price for a relatively modest gain.

**Iran strikes fail and trigger US-Iran war**

**Melman, 11** [Yossi, Haaretz (Israeli newspaper, “Former Mossad Chief: Israel Air Strike on Iran ‘Stupidest Thing I Have Ever Heard,” <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/former-mossad-chief-israel-air-strike-on-iran-stupidest-thing-i-have-ever-heard-1.360367>, KHaze]

Dagan emphasized that attacking Iran would be different than Israel's successful air strike on Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981. Iran has scattered its nuclear facilities in different places around the country, he said, which would make it difficult for Israel to launch an effective attack. According to Dagan, there is proof that Iran has the capability to divert its nuclear activities from place to place in order to take them out of the watchful eye of international supervision and intelligence agencies. No one in Iran would have any problems in building a centrifuge system in a school basement if they wished to, he said. The IAF's abilities are not in doubt, Dagan emphasized, but the doubts relate to the possibilities of completing the mission and reaching all targets. When asked about what would happen in the aftermath of an Israeli attack Dagan said that: "It will be followed by a war with Iran. It is the kind of thing where we know how it starts, but not how it will end." The Iranians have the capability to fire rockets at Israel for a period of months, and Hizbollah could fire tens of thousands of grad rockets and hundreds of long-range missiles, he said. At the same time, Tehran can activate Hamas, and there is also a danger that Syria will join the war, Dagan added.

**Global nuclear war**

Hirsch, 6 [Jorge, Professor of Physics at the University of California-San Diego, “Nuking Iran,” Znet, 4/10, http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=10071]

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

### Exts-Romney Will Attack Iran

**Romney election means he’ll attack Iran-Won’t even require Congressional authorization**

**Berman, 12** [Ari, Investigative Journalism Fellow at The Nation Institute, contributing writer for The Nation, “Romney: Bomb, Bomb, Bomb, Bomb, Bomb Iran, 6/19, <http://www.thenation.com/blog/168478/romney-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-iran>, ALB]

Over the weekend, Jamie Fly and Bill Kristol, two high-profile neoconservatives, wrote an article in the Weekly Standard urging President Obama to “ask Congress for an Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iran’s nuclear program.” Fly is executive director of the Foreign Policy Initiative, a neoconservative advocacy group that is a successor to the Project for the New American Century, which laid the intellectual groundwork for the US invasion of Iraq. Kristol is an FPI board member. Fellow FPI board members Eric Edelman, Robert Kagan and Dan Senor are foreign policy advisers to the Romney campaign. Romney was asked about the Fly/Kristol article on Face the Nation on Sunday. He responded: I can assure you if I'm President, the Iranians will have no question but that I would be willing to take military action, if necessary, to prevent them from becoming a nuclear threat to the world. I don't believe at this stage, therefore, if I'm President, that we need to have war powers approval or a special authorization for military force. The President has that capacity now. It’s worth pausing a moment to consider the magnitude of this statement. Romney is saying that he doesn’t need Congressional approval for a US attack on Iran**.** Notes Andrew Sullivan: “Remember that this was Cheney's position vis-a-vis Iraq. Bush over-ruled him. Romney is to the neocon right of George W. Bush in foreign affairs.” He’s also to the right of Bill Kristol, which is no small feat. Perhaps this shouldn’t be surprising, considering that Romney has chosen a team of neoconservative advisers hellbent on resurrecting the hawkish unilateralism of the early Bush years. As I reported in The Nation in May, nearly a dozen Romney advisers have urged the US to consider a military strike against Iran. Top Romney adviser John Bolton, who many neocons hope will be secretary of state in a Romney administration, has been advocating war with Iran since 2008 and recently wrote that he wanted diplomatic talks between Iran and the international community to fail. “John’s wisdom, clarity and courage are qualities that should typify our foreign policy,” Romney said when Bolton endorsed him last January. (Less hawkish members of Romney’s foreign policy team have urged a negotiated settlement with Iran along the lines the Obama administration is currently pursuing.) One could argue that the Obama administration’s refusal to seek Congressional approval for the NATO incursion in Libya set a precedent for Romney to sidestep Congress on Iran. But the Libya mission had the support of the Arab League and the United Nations Security Council, which wouldn’t be the case with an Iran attack. And a military strike against Iran would be far more dangerous and risky than taking out the Qaddafi regime. That’s why the administration and its diplomatic partners are trying to peacefully resolve what has unnecessarily become a brewing conflict. On Saturday, Romney once again ridiculed Obama’s Middle East policy. “I think, by and large, you can just look at the things the president has done and do the opposite," Romney told the Faith and Freedom Coalition, a Christian right group run by Ralph Reed. If Obama seeks peace with Iran, then Romney and his ilk want yet another war.

Romney will cause war with Iran

**Berman, 12** [Ari, Investigative Journalism Fellow at The Nation Institute, contributing writer for The Nation, “Mitt Romney’s Neocon War Cabinet,” 5/2, <http://www.thenation.com/print/article/167683/mitt-romneys-neocon-war-cabinet>, ALB]

It’s safe to say that foreign policy was not the strong suit of this year’s contenders for the GOP presidential nomination. Rick Perry labeled the Turkish government “Islamic terrorists.” Newt Gingrich referred to Palestinians as “invented” people. Herman Cain called Uzbekistan “Ubeki-beki-beki-beki-stan-stan” and memorably blanked when asked what he thought of NATO’s incursion into Libya. Michele Bachmann pledged to close the US embassy in Iran, which hasn’t existed since 1980. Rick Santorum gave a major foreign policy speech at a Jelly Belly factory in California. Yet though the candidates and their views were often hard to take seriously, their statements on foreign policy reflected a more disturbing trend in the GOP. Despite facing a war-weary public, the candidates—with the exception of Ron Paul, an antiwar libertarian, and Jon Huntsman, a moderate internationalist—positioned themselves as unapologetic war hawks. That included Mitt Romney, marginally more polished than his rivals but hardly an expert. Given Romney’s well-established penchant for flip-flopping and opportunism, it’s difficult to know what he really believes on any issue, including foreign affairs (the campaign did not respond to a request for comment). But a comprehensive review of his statements during the primary and his choice of advisers suggests a return to the hawkish, unilateral interventionism of the George W. Bush administration should he win the White House in November. Romney is loath to mention Bush on the campaign trail, for obvious reasons, but today they sound like ideological soul mates on foreign policy. Listening to Romney, you’d never know that Bush left office bogged down by two unpopular wars that cost America dearly in blood and treasure. Of Romney’s forty identified foreign policy advisers, more than 70 percent worked for Bush. Many hail from the neoconservative wing of the party, were enthusiastic backers of the Iraq War and are proponents of a US or Israeli attack on Iran. Christopher Preble, a foreign policy expert at the Cato Institute, says, “Romney’s likely to be in the mold of George W. Bush when it comes to foreign policy if he were elected.” On some key issues, like Iran, Romney and his team are to the right of Bush. Romney’s embrace of the neoconservative cause—even if done cynically to woo the right—could turn into a policy nightmare if he becomes president. If we take the candidate at his word, a Romney presidency would move toward war against Iran; closely align Washington with the Israeli right; leave troops in Afghanistan at least until 2014 and refuse to negotiate with the Taliban; reset the Obama administration’s “reset” with Russia; and pursue a Reagan-like military buildup at home. The Washington Monthly dubbed Romney’s foreign policy vision the “more enemies, fewer friends” doctrine, which is chillingly reminiscent of the world Obama inherited from Bush. In March the Rev. Richard Land of the Southern Baptist Convention told the Romney campaign it could win over “recalcitrant conservatives,” reported the Washington Post, by “previewing a few Cabinet selections: Santorum as attorney general, Gingrich as ambassador to the United Nations and John Bolton as secretary of state.” That suggestion, which might seem ludicrous, not to mention terrifying, is more plausible than one might think. In December Gingrich pledged at a forum sponsored by the Republican Jewish Coalition that he would appoint Bolton to run Foggy Bottom. But the mustachioed über-hawk, who was a controversial under secretary of state for arms control and UN ambassador in the Bush administration, endorsed Romney instead. Bolton has since campaigned energetically for him, serving as a key surrogate on national security issues. “Many conservatives hope that [will] include accepting a senior national security post in a Romney administration,” wrote Jennifer Rubin, a neoconservative blogger for the Post. Few advisers personify the pugnacity of Romney’s foreign policy team better than Bolton. He has been a steadfast opponent of international organizations and treaties and seems never to have met a war he didn’t like. Shortly before the invasion of Iraq, he told Israeli officials that Syria, Iran and North Korea would be the next US targets. Over the past few years Bolton has been an outspoken proponent of an Israeli attack on Iran. “Mitt Romney will restore our military, repair relations with our closest allies and ensure that no adversary—including Iran—ever questions American resolve,” Bolton said when endorsing Romney. “John’s wisdom, clarity and courage are qualities that should typify our foreign policy,” Romney responded. \* \* \* Romney knew little about foreign policy when he ran for president in 2008. An internal dossier of John McCain’s presidential campaign said at the time that “Romney’s foreign affairs resume is extremely thin, leading to credibility problems.” After being branded as too liberal by conservative GOP activists four years ago, Romney aligned himself with Bolton and other neocons in 2012 to protect his right flank. Today there’s little daylight between the candidate and his most militant advisers. “When you read the op-eds and listen to the speeches, it sounds like Romney’s listening to the John Bolton types more than anyone else,” says Brian Katulis, a senior fellow for national security at the Center for American Progress. (The Romney campaign’s openly gay foreign policy spokesman, Richard Grenell, who had been an indefatigable defender of Bolton as the latter’s PR flack in the Bush years, was forced to resign after harsh attacks by anti-gay conservatives.) Bolton is one of eight Romney advisers who signed letters drafted by the Project for a New American Century, an influential neoconservative advocacy group founded in the 1990s, urging the Clinton and Bush administrations to attack Iraq. PNAC founding member Paula Dobriansky, leading advocate of Bush’s ill-fated “freedom agenda” as an official in the State Department, recently joined the Romney campaign full time. Another PNAC founder, Eliot Cohen, counselor to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice from 2007 to 2009, wrote the foreword to the Romney campaign’s foreign policy white paper, which was titled, perhaps not coincidentally, “An American Century.” Cohen was a tutor to Bush administration neocons. Following 9/11, he dubbed the war on terror “World War IV,” arguing that Iraq, being an “obvious candidate, having not only helped Al Qaeda, but…developed weapons of mass destruction,” should be its center. In 2009 Cohen urged the Obama administration to “actively seek the overthrow” of Iran’s government. The Romney campaign released the white paper and its initial roster of foreign policy advisers in October, to coincide with a major address at The Citadel. The cornerstone of Romney’s speech was a gauzy defense of American exceptionalism, a theme the candidate adopted from another PNAC founder and Romney adviser, Robert Kagan. The speech and white paper were long on distortions—claiming that Obama believed “there is nothing unique about the United States” and “issued apologies for America” abroad—and short on policy proposals. The few substantive ideas were costly and bellicose: increasing the number of warships the Navy builds per year from nine to fifteen (five more than the service requested in its 2012 budget), boosting the size of the military by 100,000 troops, placing a missile defense system in Europe and stationing two aircraft carriers near Iran. “What he articulated in the Citadel speech was one of the most inchoate, disorganized, cliché-filled foreign policy speeches that any serious candidate has ever given,” says Steve Clemons, a senior fellow at the New America Foundation. Romney’s team is notable for including Bush aides tarnished by the Iraq fiasco: Robert Joseph, the National Security Council official who inserted the infamous “sixteen words” in Bush’s 2003 State of the Union message claiming that Iraq had tried to buy enriched uranium from Niger; Dan Senor, former spokesman for the hapless Coalition Provisional Authority under Paul Bremer in Iraq; and Eric Edelman, a top official at the Pentagon under Bush. “I can’t name a single Romney foreign policy adviser who believes the Iraq War was a mistake,” says Cato’s Preble. “Two-thirds of the American people do believe the Iraq War was a mistake. So he has willingly chosen to align himself with that one-third of the population right out of the gate.” Shortly after McCain’s 2008 defeat, Kagan, Edelman, Senor and Weekly Standard editor Bill Kristol launched the Foreign Policy Initiative, a neocon successor to PNAC. FPI’s mission has been to keep the Bush doctrine alive in the Obama era—supporting a troop increase in Afghanistan and opposing a 2014 withdrawal; advocating a 20,000-troop residual force in Iraq; backing a military strike and/or regime change in Iran; promoting military intervention in Syria; urging a more confrontational posture toward Russia; and opposing cuts in military spending. Three of FPI’s four board members are advising Romney. Edelman, having worked for Dick Cheney in both Bush administrations, is Romney’s link to Cheneyworld. (Edelman suggested to Cheney’s chief of staff, Scooter Libby, the idea of leaking the identity of CIA agent Valerie Plame to undermine former ambassador Joe Wilson for his New York Times op-ed detailing the Bush administration’s falsified Iraq-Niger connection.) As ambassador to Turkey in 2003, Edelman failed to persuade Ankara to support the Iraq War. Turkish columnist Ibrahim Karagul called him “probably the least-liked and trusted American ambassador in Turkish history.” Edelman later moved to the Defense Department, where in 2007 he became infamous for scolding Hillary Clinton when she asked how the Pentagon was planning its withdrawal from Iraq. He’s one of nearly a dozen of Romney advisers who have urged that the United States consider an attack Iran. Senor is best known for his disastrous stint in Iraq under Bremer, when the United States disbanded the Iraqi Army and tried to privatize the economy. In his book on Iraq, Rajiv Chandrasekaran of the Washington Post wrote of Senor, “His efforts to spin failures into successes sometimes reached the point of absurdity.” Senor is particularly close to the Israeli right, co-writing the 2009 book Start-up Nation: The Story of Israel’s Economic Miracle, which reads like an extended investment brochure. He now serves as a conduit between Romney and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. “Mitt-Bibi will be the new Reagan-Thatcher,” Senor tweeted after the New York Times ran a story about the close friendship of the two men, which dates to the late 1970s. A mixture of domestic politics (trying to make Obama appear weak and courting conservative elements of the Jewish vote) and neocon ideology has led Romney to call for everything short of war on Iran. “Either the ayatollahs will get the message, or they will learn some very painful lessons about the meaning of American resolve,” he wrote in a March 5 Washington Post op-ed. Romney has been similarly hawkish on military spending, another neocon priority. His plan to spend a minimum of 4 percent of GDP on the Pentagon would increase its budget by more than $200 billion in 2016, a 38 percent hike over Obama’s budget, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. “Romney’s proposal to embark on a second straight decade of escalating military spending would be the first time in American history that war preparation and defense spending had increased as a share of overall economic activity for such an extended period,” wrote Merrill Goozner in the Fiscal Times. “When coupled with the 20 percent cut in taxes he promises, it would require shrinking domestic spending to levels not seen since the Great Depression—before programs like Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid began.” Such cuts, Goozner noted, “would likely throw the U.S. economy back into recession.” Since the 2010 election, military spending has been a topic of great debate on the right. Fiscal conservatives like Grover Norquist’s Americans for Tax Reform and the Cato Institute have urged Congress to consider serious Pentagon cuts. “Department of Defense spending, in particular, has been provided protected status that has isolated it from serious scrutiny and allowed the Pentagon to waste billions in taxpayer money,” twenty-three conservative leaders, led by Norquist, wrote to Congressional Republicans in November 2010. “Simply advocating more ships, more troops and more weapons isn’t a viable path forward,” Huntsman echoed during the primary campaign. That view met a furious pushback from the Defending Defense coalition, a joint project of FPI, the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and the Heritage Foundation, which mirrored Romney’s plan to increase military spending drastically. “When the Soviet Union disappeared, a lot of people on the right failed to notice,” Norquist said on Capitol Hill last year [see Robert Dreyfuss, “GOP Fires at the Pentagon,” February 14, 2011]. Romney hasn’t said what he’d do with a bigger military or how he’d pay for it. But it’s safe to assume the money will go toward preserving or enlarging the national security state. Romney’s counterterrorism adviser since 2007 has been former CIA operative Cofer Black, another controversial figure from the Bush era. The Daily Beast calls Black “Romney’s trusted envoy to the dark side” and “the campaign’s in-house intelligence officer.” In 2007 Romney sourced Black in refusing to classify waterboarding as torture (and also said he wanted to “double Guantánamo”). As head of the CIA’s Counterterrorism Center following 9/11, Black supervised the agency’s “extraordinary rendition” program, which illegally transported alleged terrorists to secret detention centers abroad, where they were tortured. “After 9/11 the gloves come off,” Black infamously testified before Congress. He joined the private security firm Blackwater in 2005, specializing in intelligence gathering for governments and business. More recently, the Daily Beast reported, Romney has relied on Black for security assessments of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt and Iran, including Iran’s nuclear program. The hardliners on Romney’s team have sidelined moderates like Mitchell Reiss, the candidate’s principal foreign policy adviser in 2008 and former director of policy planning at the State Department under Colin Powell. In December Romney disavowed Reiss’s call to negotiate with the Taliban, pledging to defeat the insurgency militarily (which few foreign policy experts believe is realistic) and criticizing the Obama administration’s plan to begin withdrawing troops next year. Romney also sided with the likes of Senor over Reiss by backing the Bush surge in Iraq and Obama’s escalation in Afghanistan. This black-and-white worldview is dangerously myopic, obsessed with military power and evil foes while ignoring complex challenges like Europe’s economic crisis and the Arab Spring. Romney and his chief advisers “see the world through a cold war prism that is totally out of touch with the realities of the twenty-first century,” Vice President Joe Biden said recently in a major foreign policy speech. Romney’s case for election rests on his credentials as a competent businessman who can restructure the economy and government. Yet his choice of foreign policy advisers undercuts that sales pitch by elevating radical ideologues who want to spend profligately on unnecessary weapons and wars. If Romney wants to run a fiscally prudent and well-managed country, his GOP model should be Eisenhower, not Bush. But someone like Ike would never make it through a Republican primary today. \* \* \* This year’s GOP primary was supposed to showcase a long-simmering party debate on foreign policy. “The hawkish consensus on national security that has dominated Republican foreign policy for the last decade is giving way to a more nuanced view,” the Times reported last June. What was left of the moderate wing of the party was particularly excited about the campaign of Huntsman, Obama’s former ambassador to China, who opposed the war in Afghanistan and advocated “a more judicious approach toward foreign entanglements.” Huntsman advisers included realist Republicans like former George H.W. Bush national security adviser Brent Scowcroft, former Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and Council on Foreign Relations chair Richard Haass. Yet Huntsman withered under blistering attacks from the neocons and other GOP standard-bearers, including Senators John McCain and Lindsay Graham. “I don’t think you saw a whole lot of appetite in the party for his views on foreign policy,” said Jamie Fly, executive director of the Foreign Policy Initiative. And Ron Paul’s isolationist views didn’t help him in the primaries, either. Indeed, Romney veered right in response to Bachmann, Cain, Gingrich, Perry and Santorum rather than left to appeal to Huntsman or Paul voters. After the twin disasters of Iraq and Afghanistan, you’d think Republicans would be more skeptical of interventionism and the neocons more humbled. Yet the party’s major neoconservative institutions, like FPI, AEI and Heritage, have pushed aggressively for US intervention in Libya, Iran and Syria. “How do you get out of this state of interminable war?” asks Lawrence Wilkerson, former chief of staff to Powell. “My party has not a clue. In fact, they want to deepen it, widen it and go further, on Chinese and Japanese dollars.” Wilkerson says he was “astonished by how much the neocons seem to still have influence,” and that he was “scared to death” about the prospect that people like McCain and Graham would have sway over foreign policy. I asked Cato’s Preble why the neocons haven’t lost more clout in GOP circles after the failures of the Bush years. ”They’ve crafted this narrative around the surge, claiming Iraq was, in fact, a success,” Preble says. “They’ve ridden that ever since.”

## \*\*Russia

### 1NC Russia

**Romney election ruins Russian relations-Causes escalation**

**Bandow, 12** [Doug, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties, “Romney and Russia: Complicating American Relationships,” <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/romney-and-russia-complicating-american-relationships/>, ALB, Austin]

Mitt Romney has become the inevitable Republican presidential candidate. He’s hoping to paint Barack Obama as weak, but his attempt at a flanking maneuver on the right may complicate America’s relationship with Eastern Europe and beyond. Romney recently charged Russia with being America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” As Jacob Heilbrunn of National Interest pointed out, this claim embodies a monumental self-contradiction, attempting to claim “credit for the collapse of the Soviet Union, on the one hand [while] predicting dire threats from Russia on the other.” Thankfully, the U.S.S.R. really is gone, and neither all the king’s men (SIC) nor Vladimir Putin can put it back together. It is important to separate behavior which is grating, even offensive, and that which is threatening. Putin is no friend of liberty, but his unwillingness to march lock-step with Washington does not mean that he wants conflict with America. Gordon Hahn of CSIS observes: Yet despite NATO expansion, U.S. missile defense, Jackson-Vanik and much else, Moscow has refused to become a U.S. foe, cooperating with the West on a host of issues from North Korea to the war against jihadism. Most recently, Moscow agreed to the establishment of a NATO base in Ulyanovsk. These are hardly the actions of America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” Romney’s charge is both silly and foolish. This doesn’t mean the U.S. should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to act like one. Moreover, treating Moscow like a foe will make Russia more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union—and especially Washington’s determination to continue expanding NATO. After all, if another country ostentatiously called the U.S. its chief geopolitical threat, ringed America with bases, and established military relationships with areas that had broken away from the U.S., Washington would not react well. It might react, well, a lot like Moscow has been reacting. Although it has established better relations with the West, Russia still might not get along with some of its neighbors, most notably Georgia, with its irresponsibly confrontational president. However, Washington should not give Moscow additional reasons to indulge its paranoia.

**US-Russian relations are critical for global security, preventing proliferation, sustaining US leadership and averting nuclear war.**

**Allison and Blackwill, 11** [Graham, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs; Douglas Dillon Professor of Government; Faculty Chair, Dubai Initiative, Harvard Kennedy School, Robert D., International Council Member, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, 10 Reasons Why Russia Still Matters,”http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/21469/10\_reasons\_why\_russia\_still\_matters.html]

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

**The impact is extinction**

Bostrom 2 [Nick, Dir. Future of Humanity Institute and Prof. Philosophy – Oxford U., Journal of Evolution and Technology, “Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards”, 9, March, <http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html>]

The first manmade (SIC) existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[2] At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[3] A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

### Exts-Romney Kills Russian Relations

**Romney election kills relationship with Russia-views won’t evolve after in office**

**Larison, 12** [Daniel, Ph.D. in history and contributing editor for The American Conservative, “Romney’s Russia Policy Is Not Going to “Evolve,” <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/romneys-russia-policy-is-not-going-to-evolve/>, ALB]

Anything’s possible, but it not “highly probable” that Romney’s views on Russia will “evolve,” as Simes says. One might wish that to happen, but there is no good reason to expect it. The reasons for this are fairly straightforward. There is no large constituency in Romney’s party that cares very much about good relations with Russia. His party’s foreign policy professionals seem to be nearly unanimous in their loathing for the “reset,” and even if they don’t loathe it very few of them are going to object to its demise. The “reset” label was always silly, but it reflected a correct assessment that Bush-era Russia policy was a disaster and U.S.-Russian relations were unacceptably poor. Most of the people advising Romney instinctively dislike the repudiation of Bush-era policy that the “reset” represents, and they are also inclined to blame the deterioration of relations solely on Moscow. Rejecting a signature Obama policy would allow him to start his administration with a clear break from his predecessor. If Romney wants to govern in an “anything but Obama” fashion, what better way to start than by undoing one of the policies that is most closely associated with Obama himself? Romney can expect glowing editorials from the Post and elsewhere praising his “moral clarity” as he trashes the relationship with Moscow. He isn’t likely to pay any political price for it. Unfortunately, all of the political incentives indicate that Romney would follow through on his anti-”reset” statements. Romney is a famously unprincipled opportunist. That’s why we can expect him to follow through on his opportunistic opposition to Obama’s Russia policy. We have no reason to doubt that Romney’s Russia policy will be every bit as bad as he promises it will be. It’s a disservice to the public to pretend that this isn’t the case.

**Romney election tanks Russian relations-and emboldens Putin**

**Larison, 6/20** [Daniel, Ph.D. in history and contributing editor for The American Conservative, “The Presidential Election’s Effects on U.S.-Russian Relations,” <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/the-presidential-elections-effects-on-u-s-russian-relations/>, ALB]

Andrew Weiss considers the reasons for U.S.-Russian tensions, and finds the presidential elections in both countries to be partly responsible: A third big drag on U.S.-Russian relations comes from the so-called silly season that accompanies presidential campaigns in both countries. Of course, 2012 was always supposed to be a dead year in U.S.-Russian relations. Back-to-back presidential campaigns have overshadowed just about everything on the bilateral agenda, and practically no one in Washington or Moscow had been predicting that significant progress could be made this year on the toughest issues. Take missile defense, for example. Putin has shown little interest in cutting deals on major arms control issues with a U.S. president who might not be around in just a few months time to implement them. Not only does Putin have no strong incentive to take risks in pursuing new deals with Obama before the election, but he has good reason to believe that a Romney administration would halt or reverse most or all of Obama’s initiatives related to Russia. If Romney wins in November, Putin has even less incentive to cooperate with the U.S., because he will assume (correctly) that the incoming administration is going to be much more antagonistic. Arms control isn’t likely to be a top priority in a Romney White House. To the extent that he has said anything about arms control, Romney is openly hostile to new agreements and unwilling to make even the smallest concessions on missile defense. The good news is that U.S.-Russian relations might start to recover once the election is over, but that depends on the outcome. Romney’s election would represent the confirmation of Russian hard-liners’ suspicions that the post-2008 thaw in relations was a fluke and couldn’t be sustained. Indeed, the Republican nominee seems to have crafted his Russia policy to maximize distrust and paranoia in Moscow. The 2008 and 2012 campaigns have been unusual in the post-Cold War era for the intensity of anti-Russian sentiment expressed by the Republican nominees in these cycles. If it had just been the 2008 cycle, it could have attributed to McCain’s longstanding anti-Russian attitudes and dismissed as such. The re-emergence of Russophobia as a major theme of Republican foreign policy makes that impossible**.** Weiss also points to the danger that Putin will contribute to wrecking the relationship for opportunistic domestic reasons: Still, Putin knows how to cater to the two-thirds of the Russian electorate that voted for him in March and reside primarily in Russia’s smaller cities and countryside. He may find it hard to resist the temptation to play upon their worst fears and anti-Western stereotypes. Sacrificing the past several years of dramatic improvement in the U.S.-Russian relationship may seem like a small price to pay if it breathes new life and legitimacy into his rule. If Romney is elected, his desire to scrap good relations with Russia would make it extremely easy for Putin to do just that.

Romney will act belligerently towards Russia if elected

Shelley, 6/19 [Matthew, CBS News, “Romney keeps up strong rhetoric on Russia,” <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-57456060-503544/romney-keeps-up-strong-rhetoric-on-russia/>, ALB]

Showing no sign of backing down on his hawkish stance on Russia, Mitt Romney said in a radio interview broadcast on Tuesday that the country is continuing "to pursue a course which is antithetical" to that of the United States. In the interview with Fox Radio, Romney repeated his earlier characterization of Russia as "geopolitical foe" - a remark that has raised questions among Democrats and even some Republicans about whether he remains stuck in a Cold War mindset. He sought to put the notion to rest, but did not deviate from his earlier controversial assertions. "The nation which consistently opposes our actions at The United Nations has been Russia," Romney said. "We're of course not enemies. We're not fighting each other. There's no Cold War, but Russia is a geopolitical foe in that regard." Romney's remarks came as President Obama has been meeting with Russian leader Vladimir Putin at Mexico's G20 summit to try to seek common ground over how to deal with Syria, one of Russia's allies. Romney blasted Obama for what he called an ill-advised concession on withdrawing missile-defense sites from Eastern Europe, which he called Putin's "number one foreign-policy objective." Obama, Putin call for end to violence in Syria "I think it was an enormous mistake to give them that and what he got in return shows the extraordinary naiveté of a Presidency that does not understand the power of resolve and strength," he said. Asked if he thinks Putin respects Obama, Romney replied: "I believe that people around the world tend to act on their own self-interests as they perceive it. I do not believe that they respond to magnetic personalities and pleasantries, and believe that the best way to shape the course of American foreign policy is show strength -- strength in our homes and our economy and our military. And to have a president who shows resolve and locks arms with our allies, as opposed to attacking our allies and trying to control our geopolitical foes." On another subject, Romney was asked about the heckling between his supporters and Obama supporters that has escalated at his recent campaign stops. He said it would be "a nice thing" if he could reach agreement with Obama strategist David Axelrod, but added: "I'm not sure it's possible."

**Romney’s approach to Russia fails-collapses relations**

**Adomanis, 12** [Mark, contributer to Forbes, “Mitt Romney’s Russia Problem,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/05/12/mitt-romneys-russia-problem/>, ALB]

Moving right along, the idea that Romney’s dealings in the business world will in any way prepare him to deal with the Russians is an extremely strange one\*\* (I could use other adjectives to describe it, but I’m trying to stay polite). Vladimir Putin isn’t some chubby, balding corporate executive from flyover country, the sorts of people over whom Mitt Romney is used to running roughshod in his business dealings, he’s someone who’s been at the highest levels of state power for more than a decade, someone who knows how the game is played. Putin is not going to be won over with PowerPoint presentations about “synergy,” he won’t be impressed to hear someone use the word “leverage” in every sentence, and he can’t simply be “bought out” as would often happen in Bain-style hostile takeovers. If your plan to extract concessions from Vladimir Putin is “aggressively bluster in the hope that he caves” you’re going to be extremely disappointed. Moreover the entire Russian diplomatic corps is basically opposed to zero-sum deals as a matter of principle. The Russians, and this is not a personal characteristic of Vladimir Putin but something that characterized Russian/Soviet diplomacy for decades, never give up something for nothing. If Romney views the United States-Russia relationship as something he can “win,” then he is guaranteed to fail.

**Romney win collapses Russian relations**

**Oppel, 12** [Richard A., journalist for The New York Times, “Romney’s Adversarial View of Russia Stirs Debate,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/12/us/politics/romneys-view-of-russia-sparks-debate.html?_r=1&pagewanted=1&pagewanted=print>, ALB]

Mitt Romney’s recent declaration that Russia is America’s top geopolitical adversary drew raised eyebrows and worse from many Democrats, some Republicans and the Russians themselves, all of whom suggested that Mr. Romney was misguidedly stuck in a cold war mind-set. But his statement was not off the cuff — and it was not the first time Mr. Romney had stirred debate over his hawkish views on Russia. Interviews with Republican foreign policy experts close to his campaign and his writings on the subject show that his stance toward Russia reflects a broader foreign policy view that gives great weight to economic power and control of natural resources. It also exhibits Mr. Romney’s confidence that his private-sector experience would make him a better negotiator on national security issues than President Obama has been. Mr. Romney’s views on Russia have set off disagreements among some of his foreign policy advisers. They put him in sync with the more conservative members of his party in Congress, who have similarly criticized Mr. Obama as being too accommodating to Russia, and generally reflect the posture of some neoconservatives. But they have frequently put him at odds with members of the Republican foreign policy establishment, like Senator Richard G. Lugar of Indiana, who was defeated in a primary this week, and the party’s shrinking band of foreign policy “realists” — those who advocate a less ideological and more pragmatic view of relations with rival powers. The Romney campaign has been critical of Mr. Obama’s record and positions on a variety of national security issues, including containing Iran’s nuclear ambitions and confronting China’s rise. But many of the positions taken by Mr. Romney, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, have either been vague or not fundamentally different from those of the administration. Russia, however, is an exception, one where Mr. Romney, the former Massachusetts governor, has carved out a clear contrast to Mr. Obama, who came to office promising to “reset” relations with Moscow, only to find that Russia can be a difficult partner. Just this week, President Vladimir V. Putin abruptly canceled his plans to visit the United States next week for the Group of 8 summit meeting and for talks with Mr. Obama at Camp David. Mr. Romney was a leading opponent of the most recent arms-reduction treaty with Russia, ratified by the Senate and signed last year by Mr. Obama. Russia figures prominently in Mr. Romney’s book, where he calls it one of four competitors for world leadership, along with the United States, China and “violent jihadism” embraced by Iran and terrorist groups. Some advisers close to Mr. Romney, who declined to be quoted or identified by name, say Russia is a good illustration of his belief that national security threats are closely tied to economic power — in this case stemming from Russia’s oil and gas reserves, which it has used to muscle European countries dependent on energy imports. They also cite his tendency to view foreign policy conflicts as zero-sum negotiations. Mr. Romney, an accomplished deal-maker at Bain Capital, views his negotiating skills as an advantage he holds over Mr. Obama. Mr. Romney signaled his stance toward Russia two years ago, when he argued that the New Start missile treaty with Russia should be rejected, putting him at odds with a long line of former Republican secretaries of state and defense. A number of arms control specialists said they were startled by some of Mr. Romney’s assertions, like fretting about intercontinental ballistic missiles mounted on bombers. “It would be really fun to watch a Russian bomber with an SS-25 strung to its stomach try to take off,” said Steve Pifer, a former American ambassador to Ukraine and now director of the Arms Control Initiative at the Brookings Institution. “Some of the arguments just left people scratching their heads.” Within hours, rebuttal pieces to Mr. Romney’s position, laid out in an op-ed article in The Washington Post, were being circulated among arms control experts. Mr. Lugar, who had spent decades working on arms control issues, publicly disparaged some of Mr. Romney’s arguments as “discredited objections.” Mr. Romney felt the missile treaty was a bad deal partly because it would impede American defenses by preventing ballistic missile silos from being converted to missile defense sites, while treaty supporters said that was not an issue because American officials prefer to build missile defense installations from the ground up. Mr. Romney also criticized a White House decision scrapping a proposed antiballistic missile shield in Eastern Europe and building in its place a reconfigured system to shoot down short- and medium-range Iranian missiles. Mr. Romney argued that Mr. Obama had caved to Russian pressure, trading away a crucial program with little in return. Administration officials say their reconfigured system offers better protection for American allies. Mr. Romney’s more recent statements on Russia have also drawn criticism from nonpartisan Russia experts who say he mischaracterizes Russia’s potential economic power and paints an inaccurate picture of Russian recalcitrance. Republicans close to Mr. Romney acknowledge that politics are a factor, but they also say Mr. Romney is driven by fears that Mr. Putin will continue political repression and use his country’s energy wealth to finance military expansion. Some former diplomats and Russia specialists, and some leading Republicans in Congress, have also questioned his characterization of the country as America’s major foe. Many experts, including some close to his campaign, see a declining power that the United States will need to help manage global challenges. Some analysts also say Mr. Romney understates the help Russia has provided in dealing with rogue states, like backing a heavy-arms embargo and other sanctions against Iran in 2010.

### AIDS 2nc

#### Relations solves the AIDS epidemic and saves millions of lives

**Vershbow, 4** [Alexander, US Ambassador to Russia, State Department April 22]

Without intervention, researchers predict that over 75 million people will be infected worldwide by 2010, with a loss of human life to AIDS totaling 100 million by 2020. Scientists predict that more than two million Russians could be infected by 2005 - next year - and millions more by 2010; in fact, the HIV virus is spreading more rapidly here than in almost any other country on the planet. Unless decisive action is taken - and soon - Russia faces a humanitarian catastrophe rivaling that of World War II. Fortunately, this represents an area tailor-made for bilateral cooperation. As the AIDS epidemic began in the United States years before it struck Russia, we have considerable experience in treating the disease and controlling its spread. Russia has an educated population and an expanding sector of dedicated NGOs that provide hope that concerted efforts at prevention can succeed. What these organizations lack is resources and, most crucially, high-level political support. In addition, Russia is blessed with a large and talented medical and scientific community that can play an important role in international efforts to find a cure and develop a vaccine. Given our complementary resources and our mutual interest in staving off disaster, the AIDS crisis provides an ideal opportunity to demonstrate the potential of our partnership for the betterment of Russia's own people, and all of humanity.

**Extinction**

Kerns, **99** [Tom professor of philosophy, AIDS and Apocalyptics for Questioning Millennium Madness, http://bioethicscourse.info/aidsite/lec-millemad.html]

The worst threat to humankind AIDS is "the number one health problem on this planet." (C. Everett Koop, former US Surgeon General) "AIDS is the single greatest threat to well-being facing the world's population today." (Marc Lappé) AIDS is "a messenger of apocalyptic change," as it is spread through "one of the most biologically urgent of human behaviors." - Dr June Osborn (former member of the US Presidential Commission on HIV/AIDS, & professor in U Mich SPH) Economic costs are high "Although it is less than a decade since the virus that causes AIDS was discovered, it has become increasingly evident that this pandemic will have profound economic and social implications for both developed and developing countries. The importance of health as an input to the economic development and growth of a country is well established - a healthier population is more productive and has an increased capacity for learning. The adverse impacts of the HIV/AIDS pandemic will undermine improvements in health status and, in turn, reduce the potential for economic growth. AIDS is distinct from other diseases, and its impact can be expected to be quite severe.... Its most critical feature, distinguishing AIDS from other life-threatening and fatal illnesses, such as diarrhea (among children in developing countries) or cancer (among the elderly in developed countries), is that it selectively affects adults in their sexually most active ages, which coincide with their prime productive and reproductive years." - in AIDS in the World, 1992, p 195 (Jill Armstrong is an economist in the Eastern Africa Dept of the World Bank, Washington, DC. Eduard Bos is a demographer in the Population, Health, and Nutrition Division of the World Bank's Population and Human Resources Department.) E. "Whatever else AIDS is, it's not just another disease." (Dr June Osborne, former member of the US Presidential Commission on HIV/AIDS) Features that make AIDS unique: High morbidity & mortality Lifelong infectiousness lengthy asymptomatic stage highly mutable virus Joshua Lederberg considers the possibility of HIV "learning the tricks of airborne transmission:" "We know that HIV is still evolving. Its global spread has meant there is far more HIV on earth today than ever before in history. What are the odds of its learning the tricks of airborne transmission? The short answer is "No one can be sure." ... [A]s time passes, and HIV seems settled in a certain groove, that is momentary reassurance in itself. However, given its other ugly attributes, it is hard to imagine a worse threat to humanity than an airborne variant of AIDS. No rule of nature contradicts such a possibility; the proliferation of AIDS cases with secondary pneumonia [and TB] multiplies the odds of such a mutant, as an analog to the emergence of pneumonic plague." effective modes of transmission destroys the immune system viral reservoir expanding

## \*\*Courts

### 1NC/2NC Roe v. Wade

**Romney election overturns Roe v. Wade**

**Baumann, 6/12** [Nick, covers national politics and civil liberties issues for *Mother Jones’* DC Bureau, “Supporters of Abortion Rights Should Fear a Supreme Court Shaped by Romney,” http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2012/06/romney-abortion-supreme-court]

Roe v. Wade**,** the landmark Supreme Court case that paved the way for legal abortions in America, is likely to be in serious danger if GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney is elected in November. The future of the nation's highest court hasn't gotten a lot of attention this election year, but the subject was thrown into stark relief on Friday, when Cecile Richards, the president of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, discussed it with a group of journalists at Netroots Nation. "Oh my god, it's just immeasurable how bad it would be," Richards said in response to a question from my colleague Andy Kroll about Romney's potential impact on the court. "It's difficult to make it a voting issue for average Americans because they don't think of the Supreme Court every morning when they get up. But the next nominees to this court are going be critical." Given the aging profile of the Supreme Court, the next president is expected to nominate several justices. The court already has an active conservative majority, and the next nomination is likely to be for the spot of liberal justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who is 79. Stephen Breyer, another liberal justice, is 73; conservative Antonin Scalia and Republican-appointed Anthony Kennedy (often the swing vote) are 76 and 75, respectively. If all four step down during the next administration—something that's certainly possible—whoever is president will have an opportunity to reshape the court in his image. Barack Obama, who supports abortion rights, would be able to ensure that abortion remains legal for the foreseeable future. Romney, who believes states should be allowed to outlaw abortion, would almost certainly be able to ensure that would happen. (The Senate does have to confirm Supreme Court nominees, so control of that body will matter, too.)

#### Abortion restrictions deny agency

#### Nossiff, 7 [Rosemary, Prof Marymount Manhattan College, “Gendered Citizenship: Women, Equality, and Abortion Policy,” New Political Science, Vol. 29, no. 1, pg. Ebsco]

Since 1973 numerous books have examined the legal, social and political dimensions of abortion policy,2 but less attention has been paid by scholars to the implications of abortion restrictions for women’s citizenship. The chief exception is Rosalind Petchesky, who has argued that when the State criminalized abortions in the second half of the 19th century and later limited access to birth control, it did so as a way to control its population, maintain the gender hierarchy, and regulate women’s sexuality. Catharine MacKinnon’s work has focused on how abortion laws have contributed to women’s sexual inequality, as opposed to how they have affected their equality within the broader context of citizenship.3 Yet few issues affect women’s right to self-determination more directly than access to abortion,and for that reasonrestrictions to it raise significant questions regarding their standing as citizens.As T. H. Marshall noted,to be a citizen means to have the political, civil, and social rights necessary to fully participate in the political which implies the ability to pursue them free of discrimination and domination. Gould’s definition of equality and freedom is particularly relevant to the case of women’s citizenship, because it is based on the premise of self-development,“ . . . requiring not only the absence of external constraint but also the availability of social and material conditions necessary for the achievement of purposes and plans.”5 Shaver’s conception of abortion as a “body right . . . a personal right attached not to medical need but to the legal personhood of the woman” captures its centrality to women’s equality, and is the starting point for this article.6 In it I argue that one of the root causes of the persistent inequality between the sexes is the legal primacy given to women’s roles as wives and mothers over their rights as individuals, which results in gendered citizenship.

#### Agency is a prerequisite to every impact

**Lang, 99** [Anthony, The American University in Cairo, European Journal of International Relations, Vol. 5, (1): 67-107, p. 77-79]

This article proposes that the attribution of state responsibility undermines the agency of individual citizens. This consequence is morally important because agency is the basis of first generation human rights, or political and civil rights. Without agency, individuals will be subjects and not citizens, that is, they will become pliant adherents to the will of the government and not political actors interested in and able to affect the future of their political community. Certainly, other factors will contribute to the undermining of' first generation human rights, ones that have no relation to the attribution of state responsibility, or even a relation to foreign policy. But, as this article will argue, the attribution of state responsibility contributes toward the undermining of those rights in a number of ways. What is agency, and why is it so important for civil life? The concept of agency has been a part of' sociology since Max Weber's analyses of it (Weber, 1964: 87‑157). In the past 15 years, it has found its way into the discipline of International Relations as well, specifically through the works of Alexander Wendt (Wendt, 1987) who has generally followed the debates in sociology that focus on agency and structure. The debate in International Relations parallels that between Weber from Marx ‑ are individual, goal seeking persons or social and political structures more important in understanding human interaction? In International Relations, the question has been posed as ‑‑ are individual, goal seeking states or the structure of the international system more important in understanding the outcomes of international political interaction? While drastically simplified, this question captures the debate in the social sciences, including International Relations, concerning the question of agency. The notions of agency that underlie the arguments of' this article, however, are drawn more from political philosophy than from the sociological literature. More specifically, my notion of' agency draws on three political philosophers. Hannah Arendt has argued that action defines the human person in the political realm, that without the ability to remake the web of social and political relations that action provides there can be no separate sphere defined as the political(Arendt, 1958). Charles Taylor has also placed agency at the center of his attempts to understand the political. He has argued persuasively that human agency is primarily the ability to interpret the self's actions in a meaningful way, i.e. a self‑ interpretation that cannot be reduced to mere biological desire (Taylor, 1985). Richard Flathman's analyses of liberalism rely on a form of agency in his argument that liberalism requires individuals who are able to resist the encroachments of normalization and institutionalization as they assert themselves through their actions, words and thoughts (Flathman, 1992). Following these three thinkers, I assume the following meaning for agency ‑‑ agency is the ability to act and speak publicly with meaningful intentions in such a way as to have an effect on the world. It requires the ability to interpret those actions in ways that may not always be communicable at first, but do presume some sense of shared meaning (Taylor, 1985: 25).18 Furthermore, following Arendt, the ability to act is central to the creation of the political sphere. Without action, politics could not take place, for it is through actions that communities are constituted. Finally following Flathman, strong notions of agency are necessary for liberal and democratic citizenship. Unless individuals can think and act qua individuals, they will be unable to create a political community in which their rights are protected. Agency is a necessary**,** although not sufficient, **condition** for creation of a community that respects civil and political rights. While this definition cannot be considered final, the elements of meaningfulness, publicness and willfulness are all central to the understanding of agency I am using here. How does the attribution of state responsibility undermine individual agency? Because the attribution of state responsibility does not depend on the responsibility of individuals within the state, there is a prima facie sense in which individual agency is irrelevant to considerations of international responsibility. While being irrelevant does not cause something to disappear, it certainly does not help in making that thing an important consideration. But even more importantly, certain manifestations of state responsibility tend to undermine individual responsibility and agency. This article focuses on three aspects of agency ‑‑ physical, legal and political. Each one of these aspects of agency is necessary to be an active citizen as opposed to simply a pliant subject of a community. Physical agency means having a level of health and welfare that would allow one to pursue political activity. Legal agency means having the legal status as a citizen necessary to protect one's civil rights. Political agency, perhaps the most difficult to identify, is the set of political beliefs and ideas that prompt an individual to act on behalf of his or her own interests in the public sphere. Again, Arendt's work on political action captures the idea suggested here ‑‑ the idea that political action is not just an addition to our daily lives, but something ‑which distinguishes us from animals and which is necessary for our happiness. To inculcate the idea that **political** action is a value in and of itself is a necessary step in the direction of a true democracy (Arendt, 1958)

### Exts-Romney Turns Supreme Court

**Romney win means huge shift to right for Supreme Court**

**Berman, 12** [Ari, Investigative Journalism Fellow at The Nation Institute, contributing writer for *The Nation*, “Why the Supreme Court Matters,” *The Nation*, 4/30, <http://www.thenation.com/article/167350/why-supreme-court-matters>, ALB]

These high stakes add significance to the 2012 election. Regardless of what happens with healthcare reform, the Court should be a major issue in November. A 6-3 conservative Court under a President Romney would be nothing like a 5-4 moderate-to-liberal Court under President Obama. “There’s no overlap between the people Obama would appoint to the Court and the people Romney would appoint,” says Pam Karlan, co-director of Stanford University’s Supreme Court Litigation Clinic. “There’s more than just daylight.” Four justices are now in their 70s: Ginsburg (79), Scalia (76), Kennedy (75) and Breyer (73). If Romney wins, he could shore up the right flank of the Court; if Obama wins, he could tip the balance of power back to the center. “Citizens United would have never been put into law and America would never have been sold to the highest bidder had Al Gore won in 2000,” says former DNC chair Howard Dean. “Obama, if he wins, is going to appoint maybe one or two more Supreme Court justices. That could make all the difference.” At the Conservative Political Action Committee convention in February, Wayne LaPierre, head of the NRA, warned conservatives about an Obama second term. “If Obama wins re-election, he will likely appoint one—and perhaps three—more Supreme Court justices,” LaPierre said. “It’ll be the end of our freedom forever.” Some of this rhetoric is election-year sloganeering designed to rile up the base. But not only would Obama and Romney make vastly different Court appointments; they would ask the Court to hear very different cases, and they would take radically different positions on the cases it does hear. And, of course, the legislation that will come before the Court partly depends on who wins in November. Conservatives have long focused on the Court, railing against “activist judges” since the days of Brown v. Board of Education. Progressives are only now fully comprehending the dangers of a judiciary dominated by conservatives, who have spent decades cultivating their strength through institutions like the Federalist Society. “The conservative base is much more energized and aggressive about the Court than the progressive base,” says Doug Kendall, president of the Constitutional Accountability Center, a center-left legal advocacy group. “Progressives are fighting against a thirty-to-forty-year mobilization effort against the Warren Court and Roe v. Wade.” The federal judiciary is as important as the Supreme Court— something the Bush administration understood in a way the Obama administration has not. By the time he left office, Bush had appointed a third of all serving federal judges, stacking the bench with “smart, young, aggressively conservative judges,” says Karlan. Aside from nominating Justices Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan to the High Court, Obama has done little to remake the judiciary. Senate Republicans under Mitch McConnell have filibustered Obama’s nominees, with little pushback from the administration or Senate Democrats. “Rahm Emanuel kept telling people that the left doesn’t care about judges,” says Karlan, “and the base wouldn’t punish Obama for not filling judicial vacancies.” Consider these mind-boggling statistics: March 27 marked the thousandth day with a record-high eighty vacancies on the federal bench. Obama’s judicial nominees have waited, on average, five times as long as Bush’s to be confirmed by the Senate. Obama has appointed forty-five fewer justices than Bill Clinton and thirty-six fewer than Bush at similar junctures of their presidencies. Obama could leave office with more judicial vacancies than when he entered. The possibility that healthcare reform may be overturned has belatedly forced Obama to pay attention to the Supreme Court. “It’s nice that the president has finally recognized, after nearly four years in office, that the Court matters a lot,” says Karlan. “Up until now, the president has had this ‘minimalism’ position toward the courts. He’s put virtually no effort in building a lower court bench that has progressive and moderate values.” Obama’s recent statements about the Court should be part of a broader focus on the judiciary. If ever there was a time for the president to run against the Court, it is now. According to the latest Gallup polling, trust in the judiciary is the lowest it’s been since 1976. The Supreme Court’s approval ratings have dropped fifteen points in the past two years, largely because of the Citizens United decision, which more than 60 percent of Americans disapprove of. (By contrast, the 2000 Bush v. Gore decision mostly increased Republican support for the Court.) “Recent polling shows that more and more Americans are disenchanted with the Court and believe it is just like the other two partisan branches of government,” says Nan Aron, president of the Alliance for Justice, a consortium of progressive legal groups. Citizens United has crystallized everything that’s wrong with the Court today—and it could get a lot worse, given the crucial issues looming on its docket. If Obama wants to frame the election as a battle of the 99 percent versus the 1 percent, there’s no sidestepping the heightened importance of the Supreme Court. “To borrow from John Roberts’s metaphor,” says Karlan, “you can have all the players, but if the other side has all the umpires, you’re not going to win.”

**Romney win means Supreme Court takeover-ends environmental protections, abortion rights, explodes presidential power, and leads to torture**

**Lithwick, 12** [Dahlia, senior editor at Slate, where she writes the “Supreme Court Dispatches” and “Jurisprudence” columns, “The Courts: The conservative takeover will be complete,” Washington Monthly, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/the_courts034474.php?page=2>, ALB]

For anyone considering the 2012 election’s importance to the future of the American judiciary, one fact stands out: next November, Ruth Bader Ginsburg will be seventy-nine years old. If a Republican wins the presidential election, he or she may have an opportunity to seat Ginsburg’s successor, replacing the Supreme Court’s most reliably liberal jurist with a conservative. That would mean that the Court—currently balanced almost elegantly between four liberals, four conservatives, and the moderate conservative Anthony Kennedy—would finally tilt decisively to the right, thereby fulfilling Edwin Meese’s dream, laid out in his famous 1985 speech before the American Bar Association, of reshaping the Court around one coherent “jurisprudence of original intention.” Meese, who was then Ronald Reagan’s attorney general, wanted nine conservative constitutional originalists on the Court. He may soon get his wish. A 2008 study by Richard Posner, a federal appeals court judge, and William Landes, a law professor at the University of Chicago, examined the voting records of seventy years of Supreme Court justices in order to rank the forty-three justices who have served on the Court since 1937. They concluded that four of the five most conservative justices to serve on the Supreme Court since 1937 sit on the Supreme Court today. Justice Clarence Thomas ranked first. Kennedy, who is ranked tenth in that study, will be seventy- six next November. If a Republican successor of Obama gets to replace both Kennedy and Ginsburg, it’s fair to predict that the Roberts Court may include five or even six of the most conservative jurists since the FDR era. Following the ideological disappointment that was David Souter, Republicans have been spectacularly successful in selecting and confirming justices who consistently vote for conservative outcomes. Indeed, the replacement of moderate Sandra Day O’Connor with Samuel Alito may have produced the most consequential shift at the Court in our lifetimes; in a few short years O’Connor’s pragmatic legal doctrine in areas ranging from abortion to affirmative action to campaign finance reform has been displaced by rulings that would make Edwin Meese’s heart sing. But it’s not just the Supreme Court that would tilt further right. The high court only hears seventy-some cases each year. The vast majority of disputes are resolved by the federal appellate courts, which are the last stop for almost every federal litigant in the country. And the one legacy of which George W. Bush can be most proud is his fundamental transformation of the lower federal judiciary—a change that happened almost completely undetected by the left. At a Federalist Society meeting in 2008, Bush boasted that he had seated more than a third of the federal judges expected to be serving when he left office, most of them younger and more conservative than their colleagues, all tenured for life and in control of the majority of the federal circuit courts of appeals. The consequences of that change at the appeals court level were as profound as they were unnoticed. As Charlie Savage of the New York Times put it at the time, the Bush judges “have been more likely than their colleagues to favor corporations over regulators and people alleging discrimination, and to favor government over people who claim rights violations. They have also been more likely to throw out cases on technical grounds, like rejecting plaintiffs’ standing to sue.” In short, they have copied and amplified the larger trends at the Roberts Court: a jurisprudence that skews pro-business, pro-life, anti-environment, and toward entangling the church with the state. Under the rhetorical banners of “modesty” and “humility” and “strict construction,” the rightward shift has done more to restore a pre-New Deal legal landscape than any legislative or policy change might have done. The current administration has not done much to restore the ideological balance of the federal appeals courts. For one thing, this was never Obama’s priority the way it was for Bush, his father, and Ronald Reagan. Obama, like Bill Clinton before him, has selected lower court judges more notable for their racial and gender diversity than their hard-left judicial orientation. And he also has failed to seat them in numbers comparable to the Bush record. Republicans have used Senate rules so effectively to block Obama judges that the judicial vacancy rate currently stands at eighty-four vacancies, with thirty of those designated “judicial emergencies” based on courts’ inability to manage caseloads. Filibusters, holds, and other arcane Senate rules have brought the system to the point where civil litigants may wait years to get into court. And the unprecedented waste of time that results from GOP obstruction of Obama judges has led some of the most interesting and thoughtful jurists, most famously California’s Goodwin Liu, to withdraw their names from contention. Why have the Republicans been so much more effective at dragging the judicial branch rightward than Democrats have been in yanking it back? Focus, mainly. Since the Meese revolution of the mid-1980s, the GOP has been better at constitutional messaging, better at mobilizing the electorate, and better at laying out a judicial vision than liberals, who still seem to believe that unless the Supreme Court overturns Roe v. Wade (or perhaps the Affordable Care Act), judges are not really a voting issue. Perhaps the best evidence of the resulting “intensity gap” over the work and composition of the federal courts lies not in the lopsided makeup of the bench but in the proposals to “reform” the judicial branch that have been put forward in recent months by GOP presidential hopefuls. Just for starters: Rick Perry seeks to term-limit federal judges, and before he left the race Herman Cain talked about “overturning” the Supreme Court (whatever that means) if it ever legalizes same-sex marriage. Michele Bachmann believes Congress can and should keep the federal courts from ruling on same-sex marriage. Rick Santorum says he wants to just do away with the entire U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. And Newt Gingrich says his plans for the federal judiciary include empowering members of Congress to summon Supreme Court justices to defend their opinions. He also wants Congress to pass a “personhood law” that would define life as beginning at conception under the Fourteenth Amendment, and thus, as he said, “undo all of Roe vs. Wade, for the entire country, in one legislative action.” Ron Paul joins Bachmann, Gingrich, and Perry in promising to strip judges of authority to hear any cases involving religion, privacy, the right to marry, and other matters. Even if you consider all of these threats, promises, and pledges about the courts to be more performance art than actual policy (and I do—Republicans have been running against the ghost of the Warren Court since the 1970s), it says something about the primacy of curbing runaway courts in GOP rhetoric. As Chief Justice John Marshall famously said in 1803, “It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.” But Republicans are running on the premise that the courts may only say what the law is if the law means what Gingrich believes. Imagine a Democratic presidential nominee running on promises to reshape, remake, make over, hog-tie, or even just refinish the federal bench. It doesn’t happen. And so, even though the most conservative Supreme Court in decades sits poised to decide cases ranging from the constitutionality of President Obama’s health care legislation to the future of affirmative action in schools, the rights to gay marriage, and the fate of the voting rights act, Republicans portray both the Supreme Court and the lower courts as a collective of lefty hippies. And Democrats mainly just look at their fingernails. If you care about the future of abortion rights, stem cell research, worker protections, the death penalty, environmental regulation, torture, presidential power, warrantless surveillance, or any number of other issues, it’s worth recalling that the last stop on the answer to each of those matters will probably be before someone in a black robe. Republicans have understood that for decades now, and that’s why the federal bench—including the Supreme Court—is almost unrecognizable to Democrats today.

### Agency=Impact Extensions

#### That’s a prerequisite to ethical decision making

**Isaac, 96** [Jeffrey, Professor of Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, American Political Science Review, March, v. 90, n.1 p. 61]

Action, then, represents a kind of civic initiative whereby humans resist degradation and assert their dignity. When we act we define ourselves for ourselves, and in so doing we inscribe the world as our world.(18) This sheds a different light on why Arendt laments the "politically pernicious doctrine" that life is the highest good. It is not because she devalues life but precisely because she values living freely - both terms are important here - that she places so much emphasis on the capacity to begin anew, the basis of courageous civic initiative. A careful reading of the chapter on labor in The Human Condition reveals that the "philosophy of life" Arendt deplores is not really a strong conviction about the dignity of the human personality or the sanctity of human life; it is the ethos of consumption that she associates with modern mass society, the idea that the essence of life is the appropriation of material objects, and that human productivity is the preeminent criterion of human well-being. It is this idea she resists. Yet, she is careful not to dismiss categorically the emphasis on basic material thriving that is the product of the Enlightenment. She describes it as politically rather than humanly pernicious. Why? Perhaps because she does not wish to deny completely the value of such an ethos but only to caution against its hegemony. The emphasis on basic human needs that has informed so much of modern moral philosophy has helped to advance the idea of an elemental, universal humanity, an idea Arendt does not reject but cannot embrace. For the irony is that the modern age, which proclaims the value of life above all else, is also the age of genocidal mass murder. This was surely not an irony lost on Arendt. I would suggest, then, that when she places action over life, she is not endorsing a mystique of heroic sacrifice or the existential confrontation with death but, rather, a conception of civic initiative that alone can affirm basic human rights and dignities. She wants to resist the enormous brutality and suffering characteristic of the twentieth century. She does so, however, not by appealing to a doctrine of natural rights before which men are passive recipients but by emphasizing the activity of human beings, who can only achieve their dignity by doing something about it. In a world filled with cruelty, mendacity, and callous indifference, such activity will surely often involve danger, and the person who acts will be a person of courage, willing to endure sacrifice and perhaps risk death in the name of a higher value. But the risk is endured in the name of a higher value - human dignity - and not out of an existential attraction to limit-situations.

## \*\*Internal Level

### A2: Romney Won’t Shift Far Right

**Romney win means a shift to the right**

**Mann and Ornstein, 12** [Thomas, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Norman, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, “Congress: The good news is, no more gridlock…,” Washington Monthly, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine//features/congress034473.php?page=2>, ALB]

Whoever is the standard-bearer, a Republican victory in 2012 would do nothing to reverse or restrain the radically rightward march of the party. The Tea Party movement has accelerated a process that has been under way for many years within the GOP, which is now firm in its identity as the insurgent party, set upon blowing up policies and public responsibilities that enjoyed bipartisan support for many decades. The Democrats are the status quo party— protective and pragmatic. The asymmetric polarization of the two camps is the most significant feature of contemporary American politics. A President Romney would be in a poor position upon taking office to change the course outlined in his campaign. He is already suspected as an infidel by many Republican activists. His fiscal policy would almost certainly be ambitious, one not unlike the budget resolution written by Representative Paul Ryan and passed by House Republicans. Indeed, this is the course Romney has taken with his professed economic plan, released in early November. If Romney tried to dilute his own proposal, he would be met at the beginning of his presidency with a full-scale revolt on his hands from his own party, both in and out of Congress.

#### The Tea Party will force Romney to shift right

#### Weigel, 12 [David, reports on politics and policy for Slate, “The Tea Party,” Washington Monthly, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/the_tea_party034472.php>, ALB]

It’s easy to think that the Tea Party is on the wane. Its obituary has been written countless times in the past

The next Republican nominee will agree with the Tea Party on every issue of substance. This won’t be true if Jon Huntsman stages a series of miracle surges in key states and grabs the nomination. Fine, sure: leave that possibility aside. If anyone else wins, he or she will have given the Tea Party most of what it wants, all during the audition stage. Start with Mitt Romney, the presumptive front-runner who Tea Partiers are happiest to trash on the record, and a good test case for what the movement can extract from candidates before the polls open. He was cagey during the debt fight right up until June 29, when he endorsed the “Cut, Cap, and Balance” pledge. FreedomWorks, Dick Armey’s group, had endorsed the pledge on June 28. It was a radical set of promises. Developed by the conservative Republican Study Committee, endorsed immediately by big Tea Party groups, it committed the signer to reduce nondefense discretionary spending to 2008 levels, cap spending so that it falls below 20 percent of GDP by 2021, and get ratified a new version of the Balanced Budget Amendment that prohibits tax increases unless two-thirds of the Congress agrees to them. And now, cutting and capping is Romney’s default answer to thorny debate questions about the budget. That’s just a taste of what the Tea Party has extracted from Romney. Throughout 2011, he lagged the flavors of the various months—Trump, Bachmann, Perry, Cain, Gingrich—in the support of self-proclaimed “Tea Party voters.” The main reason: as governor, he signed a health care bill that became the model for the eventual patchwork Affordable Care Act. Fear of the Tea Party has gotten Romney to denounce his work. In the September 7 debate, he imagined his first day behind the Oval Office desk, and promised to grant “a waiver from Obamacare to all fifty states.” But that wasn’t enough. In a subsequent debate, still feeling the pressure, Romney pledged to go one better and use reconciliation to repeal “Obamacare” on day one of his administration— a long-standing Tea Party demand endorsed by many of the other Republican contenders.

#### Tea Party will still have huge influence-causes Romney to shift far right

#### Weigel, 12 [David, reports on politics and policy for Slate, “The Tea Party,” Washington Monthly, January/February, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january\_february\_2012/features/the\_tea\_party034472.php]

It’s easy to think that the Tea Party is on the wane. Its obituary has been written countless times in the past twelve months. And, in a couple of big, visible ways, it’s true. The large “taxpayer march on Washington” on September 12, 2009, was never matched or repeated. April 15, 2011, the third annual day of tax protests, was mostly a fluke. And the Tea Party’s punching weight in the GOP presidential primary has been hard to measure. Just as conservatives failed to decide on an alternative to John McCain, they have fumbled and staggered from candidate to candidate in a vain attempt to challenge Mitt Romney. In September, Romney appeared at a ballyhooed Tea Party Express rally in New Hampshire. I was there. The activists only outnumbered the reporters by around four to one. But this is the wrong way to look at the Tea Party. After 2010, the movement evolved. Activists got jobs with newly elected Republicans. Political organizations like Americans for Prosperity and FreedomWorks grew their staffs and budgets. Elected Republicans continued to draw on them for strength, support, and warm bodies at campaign events. Think of Florida Governor Rick Scott signing his budget at a Tea Party rally instead of in the Capitol, or of Senator Jim DeMint and other conservatives holding Tea Party events to defend their hell-no stances on raising the debt ceiling. This new, professionalized Tea Party may not have the numbers to pack the National Mall with tricorne hats, but it has proved itself spectacularly adept at two other tasks: exacting promises and submission from presidential candidates; and setting the Republican policy agenda. And in a representative government, at a time when a languishing economy and anemic voter turnout may turn the odds against Democrats, truly—what else matters? If, as is quite possible, the Republicans gain control of both the White House and Congress, the Tea Party will have gained a hugely disproportionate amount of control over the government through the use of these two mechanisms. One of them is playing out right now in the garish arena of the primary campaign. The other has been in rehearsals for the past year in the halls of Congress. Here’s a brief description of both.

## Links

### Generic Links

**Obama wants spending on transportation infrastructure—unpopular with the public**

**Brownfield** **12** [Mike, writer for Heritage Foundation, Morning Bell: Believe it. Obama’s A Big Spender, May 25, 2012, http://blog.heritage.org/2012/05/25/morning-bell-believe-it-obamas-a-big-spender/]

You can see the proof for yourself in Heritage’s 2012 edition of the Federal Budget in Pictures. Of the last ten presidents, going back to John F. Kennedy, president Obama’s budget deficits as a percentage of GDP have exploded. And if you take a look at where spending is headed under President Obama’s budget, you’ll see that the country’s debt crisis just keeps getting worse. The President’s FY 2013 budget would increase the debt to 76.5 percent of GDP by 2022, despite $2 trillion in tax hikes. That’s not “fiscal restraint,” no matter how you slice it. As bad as spending is today, President Obama wants to spend more, especially on transportation infrastructure, education and research. He says that more spending, paid for with higher taxes, is the key to getting the U.S. economy back on track — even though that strategy has failed miserably over the past three years. Here’s the president’s problem. The American people don’t want Washington to spend more, they want it to spend less. They don’t want Washington to tax more, they want it to tax less. According to a new Rasmussen Reports poll, 53 percent of voters believe that tax cuts help the economy, and most say that more government spending has a negative impact. The president wants to have it both ways. He’d like to be viewed as someone who cuts taxes and has demonstrated fiscal restraint, but he also wants to keep on taxing and spending. But sure as apples fall from trees and go down, not up, President Obama is a big spender who has done anything but show fiscal restraint. There are some laws of nature that just can’t be denied.

#### Any federal spending is unpopular among the public

Collender 2012 [Stan, June 26, 2012, “America Realizes It Likes Federal Spending After All”,http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2012062626/america-realizes-it-likes-federal-spending-after-all]

There’s about to be a big change in the federal budget debate**. In the end,** the big winner will be the part of the budget that supposedly is so unpopular — federal spending — that a candidate for office this year cannot currently say he or she supports it without risking massive political condemnation and reprisals**. It’s been relatively easy** to be anti-spending up to now because the reductions being proposed have mostly been theoretical and weren’t really likely to happen.

## \*\*Other Potential Scenarios

### U.N. Relations

#### Traub, 12 [James, journalist specializing in foreign affairs, writes “Terms of Engagement,” a weekly column on ForeignPolicy.com, “Foreign Affairs: The “more enemies, fewer friends” doctrine, *Washington Monthly*, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/foreign_affairs034475.php?page=1>, ALB]

U.N. Relations

The Republicans, by contrast, see the UN as a fundamentally hostile place, the more so as the issue of Palestinian statehood continues to play out there. Under a Republican president, U.S.-UN tensions might sink to the level of Bush’s contentious first term, and Washington might respond by defunding all or part of the institution. Whatever immediate satisfactions this provided to some might fade as the new president discovered that the UN does a lot of things—like peacekeeping—that the U.S. wishes to have done but doesn’t want to do itself. The Republicans are also skeptical of many of America’s traditional allies. Few of them even mention western Europe. Romney, for example, speaks of Europe chiefly as the home of a failed experiment in social democracy. Gingrich does the same. But Europe’s problems will soon become America’s, and the U.S. will have to work with European capitals in order to contain the spreading financial crisis.

### EPA Regs

**Romney win destroys environmental regulation**

**Roberts, 12** [David, senior staff writer at Grist.org, where he covers energy policy and politics, “The Environemnt: The end of the EPA as we know it,” <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/the_environment034476.php?page=2>, ALB]

Conservatives have inveighed against federal regulations since time immemorial, but the antipathy they harbor toward the EPA is unique in its intensity, particularly under the Obama administration. To appreciate the threat the agency faces if the GOP sweeps the 2012 elections, it helps to understand the roots of that animosity. The core laws that shape the EPA’s mission—the Clean Air and Water Acts, passed in the early 1970s—are among the most dynamic and aspirational ever to issue from the U.S. Congress. It’s not that the standards in the original bills were all that strict, but that they were designed to evolve. The laws mandate that the EPA regularly revisit its standards and update them based on the latest science. Take the Clean Air Act, the main target of recent GOP attacks. It not only establishes specific rules for an enumerated class of pollutants, it also instructs the EPA to set standards for “any air pollutant” that “may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare,” and to review and update those standards every five years. That makes the law a living, breathing thing. Congress or the president must intervene to prevent stronger and stronger clean air protections. Environmental law, in other words, is one of the few federal domains where political gridlock can work in favor of science-based policy. All elected officials have to do is stay out of the way. Scholars David Sousa and Christopher Mc- Grory Klyza call this fitful but persistent advance of the law “green drift.” What’s happened under Obama is that green drift has become a green sprint; his EPA’s schedule is, comparatively speaking, incredibly aggressive. This isn’t because Obama is a government-loving socialist; it’s because of two factors that played out before he even took office. First, the Bush administration spent eight years slowwalking scientific review and cranking out rules too weak or ill-formed to withstand judicial scrutiny. In cases where the Bush EPA’s rules were challenged in federal court, the agency’s decisions were rejected in whole or in part eighteen out of twenty-seven times. That left an enormous backlog of court-mandated work for the EPA under Obama—more than any sane president would want, given the choice. Second, there was a turning point in 2007: the Supreme Court ruled that carbon dioxide, as long as it can be shown to “endanger public health or welfare,” qualifies as a pollutant within the EPA’s purview. The agency then conducted an “endangerment finding,” consulting the latest science, and determined that, yes, climate change is a threat. It e-mailed the results to the Bush administration’s Office of Management and Budget, which promptly … refused to open the e-mail. (Really.) That left the task of developing the first-ever regulations on CO2 to Obama’s EPA chief, Lisa Jackson. The pace of rule making combined with the extension of the rules to greenhouse gases has given conservatives the “regulatory overreach” story they need to declare war, not only on the individual rules coming out of the EPA, but on the agency’s ability to implement rules at all. This is not the first time a Congress full of hotheaded freshmen has gone after the EPA. When Newt Gingrich rode to power in the Republican Revolution of 1994, he made the agency one of his first targets. However, as National Journal’s Ron Brownstein recounted in a recent column, Gingrich’s efforts quickly died out as more and more moderate Republicans turned against him. Back then, it was seen as politically dangerous to be pro-pollution. Today’s politics are different. First of all, the economic downturn has left the public unusually receptive to an antiregulatory message, and the GOP has pressed that fact to their advantage—hard. Representative Henry Waxman, ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, has grown so alarmed at the number of anti-environment votes in the 112th Congress that he built a searchable online database to keep track of them. At the time of this writing, Waxman’s database cites 191 votes to block, defund, undermine, or repeal environmental protections—an average of one a day. Of those votes, sixty-one target the Clean Air Act. Second, Republicans have maintained astonishing lockstep unanimity throughout these votes. Rather than shedding moderates, as happened in the Gingrich years, they have been picking up centrist Democrats, even Democrats from competitive districts that Obama won in 2008. The prevailing conventional wisdom in Washington today is that it’s safer to be anti-regulation than to be pro-clean air—and that there’s nothing to fear from environmentalists or the president. And finally, Republican proposals today are unprecedented in their sheer scope and ambition. They do not simply block this or that rule (though just about every proposed EPA rule has been voted down by the House at one point or another). Instead, they reshape the basic operations and independence of executive branch agencies. One example of this is the TRAIN Act (that stands for Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation). Introduced by Republican Representative John Sullivan, of Oklahoma, in September, it would create a special committee of cabinet members to analyze the costs to industry of any new EPA regulations. By law, EPA rule making is concerned only with public health and feasibility. States, which are charged with implementing the rules, are allowed to take costs to industry into consideration; in writing the rules, the EPA is not. TRAIN would introduce cost considerations into the rule-making process itself, a radical change and diminution of the law. (According to the EPA’s intensive, peer-reviewed studies, between 1990 and 2010 alone the Clean Air Act will produce almost $2 trillion in public health benefits; the cost to industry will reach just $65 billion.) Or consider the REINS Act (Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny). This law would require that every “economically significant” federal regulation (one that has an annual impact of $100 million or more) be affirmatively approved by Congress. Again: no rule would go into effect until it has been voted through by both houses of Congress and signed by the president. If a regulation is not voted on within seventy legislative working days of being sent to Congress, it is “tabled.” That is, it dies. It’s difficult to overstate how radical a change this would represent for U.S. government. It would subject fifty to a hundred regulations a year to the partisanship, rancor, and gridlock of Congress. Every rule would be a new opportunity for lobbying and industry influence. Worse, legal observers say the bill does not clearly prohibit a filibuster in the Senate, raising the possibility that a determined minority of forty senators could effectively shut down federal rule making. REINS would not overturn the Clean Air Act or shutter the EPA, but it would end forward momentum in environmental law, freezing it in place. Green drift would end for good. It might sound like something out of the far-right fringe, but the TRAIN Act passed the House by a vote of 249 to 169—out of 234 Republican votes, 230 were in favor. The Senate has not voted on TRAIN yet, but it has voted on bills that include REINS twice, once garnering forty-seven votes for it, once forty. Crippling the EPA is now a consensus objective in the mainstream of the Republican Party. So far, the Democratic Senate has prevented the House’s anti-environment votes from becoming laws. But if the economy continues to sputter and Republicans have a 2010-style sweep year, says analyst Nate Silver, “it’s within the realm of possibility that they could gain a net of thirteen seats.” That would give them a majority large enough to override filibusters. (Given the number of Democrats who have demonstrated willingness to vote against clean air protections, they might even have four or five votes to spare.) Should that happen, a Republican Congress would almost certainly pass the TRAIN Act, the REINS Act, and bills blocking new EPA rules on ozone, mercury, and carbon dioxide. That would leave the fate of the Clean Air Act—indeed, the fate of the entire environmental regulatory apparatus— in the hands of the president. Obama has said he would veto these bills. Rick Perry and Newt Gingrich would not. What would Mitt Romney do? As Massachusetts governor, he passed strict new clean air standards and proclaimed boldly that “I will not protect jobs that kill people.” Is there any of that Romney left? Or will he go with the anti-environmental flow of the national Republican Party? America’s environmental laws have faced threats before. But depending for survival on the tensile strength of Mitt Romney’s integrity? That would be a precarious position indeed.

### Filibuster

**Romney election ends the filibuster**

**Mann and Ornstein, 12** [Thomas, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Norman, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, “Congress: The good news is, no more gridlock…,” Washington Monthly, January/February, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine//features/congress034473.php?page=2>, ALB]

So here is one plausible governing scenario for 2013: After an election in which Republicans prevail, a lame-duck President Obama in December of 2012 lets all the Bush tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 expire. Starting in January of 2013, House Republicans begin a process not only to reinstate all those tax cuts but to forcefully roll back government. Though the 2012 elections have shrunk the House’s Republican majority, that majority is also farther to the right because many of its members are Tea Party types who barely survived tough primary fights from challengers who accused them of having “gone Washington”—that is, voted for a continuing resolution or a debt limit deal. As a result, Speaker John Boehner’s clout is even more eclipsed by “Young Guns” Eric Cantor, Kevin McCarthy, and Paul Ryan, making bipartisan compromises even less likely. So the House passes a budget that is akin to Paul Ryan’s plan, one that massively cuts taxes while repealing most elements of the Affordable Care Act, moving Medicare toward a premium support system for private insurance, turning Medicaid into a block grant to the states and eventually cutting its federal funding by as much as 35 percent, and enacting draconian cuts in discretionary domestic spending. Because that bill, like the Ryan plan, would vastly widen the deficit, it runs into a problem when it moves to the Senate. According to the “Byrd Rule,” any budget bill that increases the deficit cannot be brought up under reconciliation— the process that allows budget bills to be voted on without being first subject to sixty-vote supermajority “cloture” votes. This means the legislation can be effectively bottled up if as few as forty Democrats threaten to filibuster it— which, of course, they do. Under Majority Leader Harry Reid back in the Bush and Obama years, the Senate hewed to the Byrd Rule. But the new Senate majority leader, Mitch Mc- Connell, has two precedents to rely on: the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, both adopted under reconciliation (the latter on a 50-50 vote, with Vice President Cheney breaking the tie). He pushes the 2013 bill through reconciliation. This move is sufficient to bring the tax-cutting parts of the budget bill up for a vote. But other parts of the legislation, including many of the Medicare changes, are still subject to cloture votes. To get these past the Democrats, McConnell faces a more daunting set of challenges. He could ignore the Byrd Rule—by appealing the ruling of the chair that the Byrd Rule applies—and thus undo it by majority vote. But that step would do more than just cause howls of outrage from Democrats and editorial writers. It would also require unanimity or near unanimity on the part of Republican senators, including several who are up for reelection in 2014, like Susan Collins, Saxby Chambliss, and Lamar Alexander, and others, like Olympia Snowe, who would object to many parts of the plan. McConnell would likely have to adjust it and dilute it some—but with what conservatives would see as a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for revolution, he would extract the best and most extreme plan he could in order to make it happen. Yet even with this audacious victory, some items remain on the GOP agenda that simply couldn’t be wedged into a reconciliation bill. These include changes to Social Security, repeal of financial reform, possibly the full repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and the nomination of like-minded judges. To secure these measures, McConnell’s first option, of course, is to try to win over enough Democrats to get to sixty votes, or at least get enough Democrats to make the plan appear bipartisan. That is the route George W. Bush used with tax cuts in 2001, and Max Baucus’s willingness to accommodate Bush, despite the fact that the supporters in the end numbered fewer than sixty, made the use of reconciliation at that time seem less illegitimate. But two things have changed since 2001. First, back then filibusters were still relatively rare events; since Obama, they have become routine, applied to everything, big and small. Second, far fewer Democrats, Baucus included, will be willing to be used in this fashion now. So while there may be a few Democrats who move, far more than the forty necessary to sustain a filibuster are firm in their willingness to do so. Faced with that roadblock, McConnell’s only other choice is to try to limit the reach of the filibuster. He will not be eager to do this. Filibuster-empowered delay tactics such as holds have become the bread-and-butter means of exerting power by many senators on both sides of the aisle. But the Senate leader quickly finds himself under immense pressure from the Wall Street Journal editorial page, Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, and others to throw caution to the wind. If McConnell can find fifty votes to pass through a bill that fundamentally alters the policy landscape, eviscerating or erasing health reform and financial regulation and changing Social Security and Medicare, and confirming a slew of forty-something conservative judges who will be on the bench for decades, there is a better-than-even chance that he would succumb to temptation and erase the filibuster rule by fiat. Would a President Romney, who, after all, has endorsed many of these elements in the course of his campaign, veto these bills? Not a chance. Would he be able, in his early days, to influence their content, perhaps by including in the Medicare plan a continuation of traditional Medicare as an option for seniors, and by adjusting the inflation levels for increasing the vouchers given to seniors? Maybe, especially since Ryan and Senator Ron Wyden announced a plan in December with those elements included. But it is very likely that Republican conservatives would seize their window of opportunity to enact at least semirevolutionary change.

# AFF

## China

### A2 China Scenario

No impact-Romney won’t act aggressively towards China if elected

Bennett, 12 [John, covers national security and foreign policy for U.S. News & World Report, “Romney Likely to Follow Obama’s Lead on China,” http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/dotmil/2012/06/19/romney-likely-to-follow-obamas-lead-on-china-2]

Should Mitt Romney become president, he likely would use the same kind of nonconfrontational approach to China that occupants of the Oval Office have used for over four decades, says one foreign policy analyst. Since the 1970s, U.S. presidents have sought to persuade Beijing to make economic and social reforms. In foreign policy circles, this is called trying to "integrate China into the international order," as Brookings Institution analyst Michael O'Hanlon put it Tuesday. U.S. presidents from both political parties for decades have sought to "convince China it is best served playing ball with us the way the rest of the world does," O'Hanlon said during a forum in Washington. O'Hanlon, also a Johns Hopkins University professor, said he sees no evidence that Romney would alter that course. Yet, Romney has been tough on Beijing on the campaign trail, claiming he would, as president, formally call China a currency manipulator. Romney also has said Beijing uses the lure of cheap labor to rob Americans of jobs. But, as Kurt Campbell, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, noted last week, the U.S.-Chinese relationship "is much more complicated and much more sophisticated" than even was the U.S.-Soviet relationship during the Cold War. One main reason is China holds much more U.S. debt than any other nation or global institution. Some foreign policy officials and experts believe this alone will keep U.S.-Sino relations stable because if Beijing picked a fight with Washington, not only would it cripple the United States's ankles but it would do permanent damage to its

### No China War

#### No US-China war – economic and geopolitical constraints

**Goldstein, 11** [Joshua S., professor emeritus of international relations at American University, Sept/October, “Think Again: War,” *Foreign Policy*,

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/think_again_war?page=full>]

"Wars Will Get Worse in the Future." Probably not. Anything is possible, of course: A full-blown war between India and Pakistan, for instance, could potentially kill millions of people. But so could an asteroid or -- perhaps the safest bet -- massive storms triggered by climate change. The big forces that push civilization in the direction of cataclysmic conflict, however, are mostly ebbing. Recent technological changes are making war less brutal, not more so. Armed drones now attack targets that in the past would have required an invasion with thousands of heavily armed troops, displacing huge numbers of civilians and destroying valuable property along the way. And improvements in battlefield medicine have made combat less lethal for participants. In the U.S. Army, the chances of dying from a combat injury fell from 30 percent in World War II to 10 percent in Iraq and Afghanistan -- though this also means the United States is now seeing a higher proportion of injured veterans who need continuing support and care. Nor do shifts in the global balance of power doom us to a future of perpetual war. While some political scientists argue that an increasingly multipolar world is an increasingly volatile one -- that peace is best assured by the predominance of a single hegemonic power, namely the United States -- recent geopolitical history suggests otherwise. Relative U.S. power and worldwide conflict have waned in tandem over the past decade. The exceptions to the trend, Iraq and Afghanistan, have been lopsided wars waged by the hegemon, not challenges by up-and-coming new powers. The best precedent for today's emerging world order may be the 19th-century Concert of Europe, a collaboration of great powers that largely maintained the peace for a century until its breakdown and the bloodbath of World War I. What about China, the most ballyhooed rising military threat of the current era? Beijing is indeed modernizing its armed forces, racking up double-digit rates of growth in military spending, now about $100 billion a year. That is second only to the United States, but it is a distant second: The Pentagon spends nearly $700 billion. Not only is China a very long way from being able to go toe-to-toe with the United States; it's not clear why it would want to. A military conflict (particularly with its biggest customer and debtor) would impede China's global trading posture and endanger its prosperity. Since Chairman Mao's death, China has been hands down the most peaceful great power of its time. For all the recent concern about a newly assertive Chinese navy in disputed international waters, China's military hasn't fired a single shot in battle in 25 years

#### Economics prevents war

**Arkedis, 9** [Jim, Director for the Progressive Policy Institute’s National Security Project, 7/27, “China and America: Mutually Assured Bankruptcy,” <http://www.allourmight.com/?p=719>]

This cooperation that makes large-scale military confrontation almost unfathomable.  Love it or hate it, with [$1.5 trillion in US securities](http://www.npr.org/templates/player/mediaPlayer.html?action=1&t=1&islist=false&id=111046667&m=111046645) currently owned by Beijing, the United States and China are sharing the world’s economic driver’s seat for the foreseeable future.  Because of our ever-increasing co-dependence, the financial tidal wave that would follow any military confrontation is almost unthinkable–if China stops buying American Treasury bills, the US would effectively go bankrupt.  And then a bankrupt America can’t buy Chinese goods.

## Financial Regs

### Financial Regs Aff

**Dodd-Frank Act doesn’t solve the economy**

**Wallison, 12** [Peter J., “Dodd-Frank’s Liquidation Plan is Worse than Bankruptcy,” 6/11, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-11/dodd-frank-s-liquidation-plan-is-worse-than-bankruptcy.html>, ALB]

Some of the key provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010, advertised as crucial to preventing a new financial crisis, won’t live up to the claims of its sponsors. We have a nice example of this in the plan that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. revealed last month for how it expects to deal with troubled financial institutions under the Orderly Liquidation Authority outlined in the new law. Under the plan, the agency would create a bridge institution to assume the assets and liabilities of a failed firm and could force some creditors to take equity in place of their debt holdings. The firm’s subsidiaries would continue operating with funds the FDIC is permitted to borrow from the U.S. Treasury. Whatever costs the FDIC incurs would be assessed against the largest members of the financial community. As with most things in Dodd-Frank, the public knows little about the liquidation authority, although it has been touted by the Obama administration and others as solving the problem of bailouts for firms seen as too big to fail. But it does nothing of the kind; instead it makes the problem worse. The powers granted by the liquidation authority to the secretary of the Treasury are unprecedented. With the concurrence of the Federal Reserve and the FDIC, the secretary can seize any financial firm -- not just the largest ones -- if he (SIC) believes its failure would cause instability in the U.S. financial system. One Day If the firm’s directors object to the seizure, the secretary can apply to a U.S. district court for an order authorizing him to appoint the FDIC as receiver. The court has one day -- yes, one day -- to decide whether the secretary’s judgment was correct. If the court takes no action within this window, the firm is turned over to the FDIC. It’s a felony to disclose that the secretary has applied for the court order. The constitutional issues here are obvious and breathtaking. Essentially, there’s no appeal. The secretary’s seizure isn’t subject to a stay or injunction, and once the firm has been delivered into the arms of the FDIC, it’s as good as dead. It is true that the agency has a well-deserved reputation for taking control of small insolvent banks over a weekend and opening them under new ownership the following Monday. But the FDIC has never closed anything other than a small bank. With the larger and more complicated lenders, it simply sells one to another, as it did with Washington Mutual Inc. (to JPMorgan Chase & Co.) and Wachovia Corp. (to Wells Fargo & Co.). There is nothing in the FDIC’s history to suggest that the agency would be able to liquidate an investment bank on the scale of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., which had $600 billion in assets; or a major bank-holding company; or a large insurer or hedge fund. The Dodd-Frank Act also creates a crucial too-big-to-fail problem by authorizing a group of regulators to designate certain nonbank firms as systemically important because their collapse “may cause instability in the U.S. financial system.” The liquidation authority is supposed to cure this problem, but how so? The concern is that large firms get bailed out because regulators -- fearful of the disruptions caused by a major bankruptcy -- won’t let them fail. As Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner and Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke have said again and again, when Lehman Brothers was about to collapse, the government only had a choice between a bailout and bankruptcy; the liquidation authority, they say, provides a middle course -- an opportunity to wind down an important financial institution without the disruption that a bankruptcy would cause. Advance Notice But this idea doesn’t stand up to scrutiny. A bankruptcy is disruptive because the firm’s creditors know in most cases they won’t be fully repaid. Accordingly, as the firm nears bankruptcy its creditors refuse to extend new credit or withdraw the funds they can. By the time the company files for bankruptcy, shareholders usually have been wiped out and the remaining creditors suffer losses. A large bankruptcy can also be disruptive if investors and creditors run from other firms that they fear might have similar financial troubles. This happened in 2008 when Lehman’s bankruptcy sparked a panic because investors were concerned that almost all financial institutions were weakened by the mortgage meltdown. How is a liquidation-authority seizure any different? Instead of bankruptcy, the Treasury secretary assumes control of the firm and hands it over to the FDIC. Will that be any less of a market shock? In both cases, creditors will run if they suspect a bankruptcy or a government takeover is near, and after the seizure -- again as in the Lehman case -- they will run from other firms if conditions in the market are the same as those in 2008. So the liquidation authority is no better than bankruptcy in preventing chaos after a large firm fails. But it is worse than bankruptcy because it has no rules subject to legal oversight. Secured creditors don’t know in advance whether they will be repaid and, in contrast to bankruptcy, the creditors have no say in whether the firm is liquidated or recapitalized by turning their debt into equity. Under the FDIC plan, the government makes this decision, picking winners and losers. Politics will hover in the background. The uncertainties inherent in the liquidation authority will make credit more expensive for all financial firms of any size. No wonder the House Financial Services Committee voted in April to repeal this part of Dodd-Frank even before the FDIC unveiled how it would manage the liquidation authority. It was a bankrupt idea from the start.

Dodd-Frank doesn’t solve the economy-Recent Moody Ratings prove

Wall Street Journal , 12 [“The Dodd-Frank Downgrade,” 6/22, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304765304577482711212837808.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>, ALB]

We've never put much stock in the judgment of credit-ratings agencies. But by issuing a series of downgrades of giant banks this week, Moody's Investors Service may have performed a taxpayer service. Two years ago President Obama and Congressional Democrats told Americans they had strengthened the banking system and revoked too-big-to-fail privileges from the financial giants. Now Moody's can help Americans understand that the 2010 Dodd-Frank law has fulfilled neither promise. The law's signature achievements are higher costs, reduced opportunities and weaker banks. Moody's conducted an extensive review of the 15 banks that are the largest players in the global capital markets. The Wall Street gang's all here—Bank of America, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, J.P. Morgan Chase, Morgan Stanley, etc. The result is a series of credit-rating downgrades. In other words, Moody's is opining that the risk that one of these financial giants will default on its bonds, while still small, has been on the rise. Taxpayers hoping that perhaps this is a sign that government has finally sworn off bailouts will be disappointed. In a handy bar graph, Moody's makes clear that government "systemic support" is still a significant factor that elevates the credit rating of every big bank in its review. Interestingly, Moody's tends to rate the debt of bank holding companies lower than the debt of their operating subsidiaries. This makes sense given that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is now sending clear signals on how it will pick winners and losers when a giant bank gets into trouble. The FDIC's current approach, subject to change at the whim of the bureaucracy, is that it will seek to protect the creditors, and particularly the short-term creditors, of the operating subsidiaries while seeking to impose losses on the long-term creditors of the parent companies. Assuming investors believe the FDIC means what it says, and that this plan won't be scrapped the next time the FDIC's senior staff turns over, we're still trying to forecast all of the market distortions that could result. Readers may recall that this special FDIC power to manage the failure of a financial giant, called "Orderly Liquidation Authority" in Dodd-Frank, was promoted by its backers as a way to rain fire and brimstone upon a failing bank and its creditors. Two years later, the latest forecast from the FDIC is for partly cloudy skies as the failed bank is nursed back to health and taxpayers supply liquidity to its subsidiaries. Sometime since the enactment of the law, the regulators apparently decided that they have no idea how to liquidate a financial giant. They specifically don't know where they could find buyers for the biggest pieces—other than the remaining too-big-to-fail institutions, which would then become even bigger. And Congress gave up 200 years of legal tradition in the bankruptcy courts for this? What else could be weighing on the ratings? Even Moody's acknowledges that banks have been building higher capital buffers and have more liquidity than they used to have, which would normally argue for higher credit ratings, not lower ones. It should be noted that this capital-building trend was under way regardless of Dodd-Frank as part of Adam Smith's natural healing process. Regulators have also long had the power to force banks to improve capital and liquidity. Moody's focuses much of its attention on the risks and volatility of the capital markets businesses. And yes, Wall Street firms carry large risks. Underwriting the issuance of new stocks and bonds, lending money to home buyers, making markets in different securities, and taking particular trading positions all carry risks and do not lend themselves to steady, predictable earnings. But these risks are not new. What comes through in the Moody's assessment and in any review of their returns on equity is that banks have lost significant ability to generate earnings to offset the inevitable losses. The lost earnings power is surely due in part to reduced leverage, which helps protects taxpayers. But 2,300 pages of Dodd-Frank and countless other federal efforts to put sand in the financial gears are also taking their toll. The Obama tax and regulatory frenzy, of which Dodd-Frank is a part, weighs on economic growth. Those are our words, not Moody's, but the rating agency does note that the abysmal economic environment is a drag on ratings for everyone. Most investors understand that opinions from ratings agencies like Moody's do not arrive from a mountain top carved in stone. But when a bank can raise capital, improve liquidity and still suffer from a weakening credit rating, it does not suggest a healthy financial system, nor a vibrant economy. The goal of financial reform should not be weak banks, but strong banks that are independent of the taxpayer.

## Russia

### Romney Won’t Tank Russian Relations

**Romney won’t hurt Russian relations-His position will evolve**

**Gasyuk, 6/13** [Alexander, Rossiyskaya Gazeta’s Washington D.C. correspondent, “Romney keeps the gloves off,” <http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/06/13/romney_keeps_the_gloves_off_15854.html>, ALB]

Given the sharp disagreements between the United States and Russia on Syria, which is now careening toward civil war, Republicans will harshly criticize every attempt by Obama to further emphasize any progress in bilateral relations. “Some realism regarding U.S.-Russia relations would be constructive for the White House if it wants to avoid Republican attacks,” Simes told Russia Now. But this doesn’t mean that presumptive GOP nominee Mitt Romney, if elected, will transform his public anti-Russian statements into political practice. “I believe that most likely Governor Romney believes in the statements he made, but that does not mean that in practice this rhetoric will be his guide for action,” Simes said. “Many statements from the GOP candidates including those on foreign affairs surely have to be taken in the context of the political and electoral reality in the U.S.,” Aron said. “It is not only possible, but highly probable,” that Mitt Romney’s views on Russia will evolve if he is elected, Simes said. American political history is rife with examples of strategic U-turns that begin the morning after the inauguration balls. When Dwight Eisenhower ran for president, his advisers—such as the famous John Foster Dulles—spoke of Harry Truman’s “cowardly” policy of containment of the Soviet Union and called for the speedy liberation of Eastern Europe. However President Eisenhower instead started the process of normalizing relations through personal meetings with Nikita Khrushchev in 1955 and 1959. President Richard Nixon was viewed as a leading anti-Communist, but it was Nixon who found the way toward detente. Nixon made the first-ever trip by an American president to then-Communist Russia in 1972, but also opened the door to dialogue with Communist China. No one should be too surprised that Mitt Romney, if elected, might rethink his position. When needed for supply routes, Russia is no longer America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” As a president, many observers believe he would take a more realistic approach to handling bilateral ties.

### 2AC Relations Resilient

**Resilient – cooperation and de-escalation of all conflicts**

Karaganov et al 2011 [Report by the Russian Participants of the Working Group on the Future of the Russian—U.S. Relations, Sergei Karaganov is the head of the Working Group, the main co-author and executive edito Dean of the School of the World Economy and International Affairs at the National Research University–Higher School of Economics (NRU-HSE); Chairman of the Presidium, the Council on Foreign and Defense Policy (CFDP); Chairman of the Editorial Board, Russia in Global Affairs journal. r. Dmitry Suslov is the Coordinator of the Working Group and the main co-author. The Working Group includes: Pavel Andreyev, Oleg Barabanov, Timofei Bordachev, Maxim Bratersky, Sergei Karaganov, Feodor Lukyanov,Yulia Nikitina, Alexei Pilko, Marsel Salikhov, Nikolai Silayev, Dmitry Suslov, Mikhail Troitsky, and Alexei Fenenko. The Consultants of the project are: Sergei Dubinin, Andrei Kolosovsky, Sergey Ryabkov and Yevgeny Savostyanov., March 2011, “The U.S.—Russia after the «Reset»: Building a New Agenda. A View from Russia” Valdai Discussion Club, accssed 8/3/11, http://vid-1.rian.ru/ig/valdai/US-Russia%20relations\_eng.pdf]

The U.S.—Russian have markedly improved over the past two years. The «reset» of proposed by the Barack Obama administration has been a success. The threat of a retreat to a systemic confrontation has almost disappeared. Many of the conflicts between the two countries have been either resolved or, for the most part, reduced to a simmer. Both Russia and the United States have displayed pragmatism by lowering the importance of persisting conflicts in favor of the benefits of cooperation. For the first time in the post-Soviet era, the U.S. has partially revised its position on Russia-related issues and its interests with regard to Russia for the sake of gaining Moscow’s support in matters of interest to Washington. Unlike the previous rounds, the current improvement of the U.S.—Russian rests on a more solid foundation — namely, the parties have a clear and pragmatic understanding of their interests and the importance of constructive mutual for their implementation.

**Economic cooperation and investment**

**RTT News 2-23** [“Latvia To Make Its Economic Environment 'Interesting' For US Investors” http://www.rttnews.com/Content/MarketSensitiveNews.aspx?Id=1559419&SM=1]

Visiting Latvian Foreign Minister Girts Valdis Kristovskis has said that the Latvian government will do its best to make the country's economic environment "interesting" for U.S. investors, who can create good joint ventures with Latvian entrepreneurs. He was addressing a joint press conference with his American counterpart Hillary Rodham Clinton in Washington on Tuesday. Kristovskis said they discussed several aspects relating to the development of Latvia. "We try to learn U.S. experience which is related with shale gas aspects." He expressed the hope that Latvian entrepreneurs would increasingly participate in Northern Distribution Network (NDN) project relating to cargo flow via Riga to Afghanistan. "This road will not be just as a road for supplement of military needs, but I believe in future also that will work for civil needs and civil targets," he told reporters. An alternative supply route to Afghanistan opened due to escalating threats in Pakistan, 60 per cent of fuel consumed by U.S. troops in Afghanistan was delivered via "northern routes" in 2010. A major NDN shipping port and developed European Union economy make Riga an attractive market from which supplies and materials could be purchased to support the ISAF mission. He voiced Riga's support for recent improvement in U.S.-Russia relations. "We are looking forward that we will extend our economic cooperation and that will be a good opportunity for development of policy of and economy of Latvia."

### 1AR Relations Resilient

**Extend Karaganov 11**

1. **reset – obama and Russia have performed a reset of relations and set a mechanism in place to resolve dispute – that’s Karagonav**
2. **priorities – both countries recognize the important oce cooperation and are willing to weigh cooperation over confrontation**

**Cooperation has reset US-Russia relations**

**Washington Post 2-1** (“Russia's Ryabkov on U.S.-Russia relations: 'We can offer tangible results, and we will do more in the future'” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/31/AR2011013105759.html)

Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov, who daily oversees relations between Moscow and the United States, last week provided interesting insight on Iran, Afghanistan and arms control, among other topics, in an appearance at the Nixon Center in Washington. He set the stage by saying that President Obama's plan to "reset" relations between Moscow and Washington "has already happened." "We can offer tangible results, and we will do more in the future," he said. On Iran, Ryabkov pointed to "unprecedented" coordination, citing Moscow's vote for U.N. resolutions on the issue, including the acceptance of sanctions on the Tehran regime. He did make the point more than once that his country disagrees with the United States on sanctions: "One [the U.S.] believes in the result of sanctions, the other [Russia] doesn't." Sanctioning "only brings suffering to each and every nation that is being sanctioned." And unilateral U.S. sanctions do not bring the hoped-for results, he said, and the move "only adds to strain of the international community." Russia is not conducting separate negotiations with Tehran on the nuclear issue, he said, though Moscow has had bilateral discussions with the Iranians. "We speak to them frankly, as they do with us, and it is not always an easy discussion, but we see no alternative to dialogue," he said. He called the present proposals to Iran by the P5+1 group (Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States - plus Germany) fine, but added, "We may in the end have some discussion of this sort [about their enrichment program], but it is premature." It would have to be preceded by a step-by-step road map, he said. Afghanistan is another area where he said the United States and Russia are working together. Calling the cooperation "a success story," he noted that Washington and Moscow are cooperating on supply routes, transportation, training and even economic support to the Afghan government. Russia fully shares in the new strategy, he said, including support for Afghan national conciliation, though, he added, "We would definitely not accept what is being called re-Talibanization." Moscow does not want to give support to any radical Islamic movements, having enough trouble at home from such groups.

## First Wave Defense

### Prolif

**No impact to prolif—U.S. can deter threats**

**Colby 7** [Eldridge, Adjunct Staff Member of the RAND Corporation, formerly a staff member in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and on the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, “Restoring Deterrence,” Orbis, Vol. 51, No. 3, p. 413-428, <http://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/images/issues/200707u/Restoring%20Deterrence.pdf>]

This logic’s bottom line seems clear. If the proliferation of weapons technology is inevitable, then it hardly makes sense to embark on a quixotic crusade to prevent it. Better to accept the new reality and deal with it as best we can. Seen in this light, deterrence is quite appealing. Such a posture, accepting the inevitability of proliferation, would state as a policy only that the use (or allowance of use) of such weapons against the United States or its allies would provoke a devastating response. Countries could, if they wanted, develop these weapons, but the United States would take little strategic cognizance of them. There would be some strategic downside—regime change, for instance, would lose luster as a policy. But, overall, **the weapons would have little effect** if America maintained a basically status quo posture, defending its established interests and allies. If, for instance, Iran rattled its nuclear saber and insisted the United States withdraw from Saudi Arabia, we would have to play the brinksmanship game and not back down—but what would be new about that? And would Iran be so foolish as to do something to call down the wrath of the American retaliatory capability? Those who say so need do more than point to the rantings of Ahmadinejad. History has shown many enemies who poured scorn on a nuclear-armed United States, **but none who were foolish enough actually to act on their bluster and thereby incur its full wrath.** Further, Iran is hardly the Soviet Union of the Khrushchev era, bristling with nuclear and conventional weapons. Indeed, a deterrent posture would, through not placing as much value on WMD, help the cause of disarmament by positively disincentivizing countries from developing them. If the U.S. took an agnostic position on the development of unconventional weapons, but maintained its same status quo red lines while demanding strict accountability for the use or loss of such weapons, why would countries want to build them? If North Korea’s nuclear weapons, in other words, will not affect the American commitment to South Korea (if the South Koreans don’t wreck it themselves in the meantime) and Japan, and if the United States holds the North Koreans responsible for whatever uses their nuclear weapons are put to, then is not the danger of possessing them greater than their beneﬁt? After all, these rogue states are not building these weapons to win a war against us. Instead, they are developing them either as last-ditch weapons—in which case we have no reason to push them into a corner anyway—or as cards to bluff with—in which case we simply need to call that bluff.

### Nuclear Terror

**Terrorism won’t go nuclear and they won’t be able to attack the US- several warrants**

**Mearsheimer, 11,** [John J., Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, He is on the Advisory Council of The National Interest, January, “Imperial by Design,”http://nationalinterest.org/article/imperial-by-design-4576?page=3, KHaze]

The fact is that states have strong incentives to distrust terrorist groups, in part because they might turn on them someday, but also because countries cannot control what terrorist organizations do, and they may do something that gets their patrons into serious trouble. This is why there is hardly any chance that a rogue state will give a nuclear weapon to terrorists. That regime’s leaders could never be sure that they would not be blamed and punished for a terrorist group’s actions. Nor could they be certain that the United States or Israel would not incinerate them if either country merely suspected that they had provided terrorists with the ability to carry out a WMD attack. A nuclear handoff, therefore, is not a serious threat. When you get down to it, there is only a remote possibility that terrorists will get hold of an atomic bomb. The most likely way it would happen is if there were political chaos in a nuclear-armed state, and terrorists or their friends were able to take advantage of the ensuing confusion to snatch a loose nuclear weapon. But even then, there are additional obstacles to overcome: some countries keep their weapons disassembled, detonating one is not easy and it would be difficult to transport the device without being detected. Moreover, other countries would have powerful incentives to work with Washington to find the weapon before it could be used. The obvious implication is that we should work with other states to improve nuclear security, so as to make this slim possibility even more unlikely. Finally, the ability of terrorists to strike the American homeland has been blown out of all proportion. In the nine years since 9/11, government officials and terrorist experts have issued countless warnings that another major attack on American soil is probable—even imminent. But this is simply not the case.3 The only attempts we have seen are a few failed solo attacks by individuals with links to al-Qaeda like the “shoe bomber,” who attempted to blow up an American Airlines flight from Paris to Miami in December 2001, and the “underwear bomber,” who tried to blow up a Northwest Airlines flight from Amsterdam to Detroit in December 2009. So, we do have a terrorism problem, but it is hardly an existential threat. In fact, it is a minor threat. Perhaps the scope of the challenge is best captured by Ohio State political scientist John Mueller’s telling comment that “the number of Americans killed by international terrorism since the late 1960s . . . is about the same as the number killed over the same period by lightning, or by accident-causing deer, or by severe allergic reactions to peanuts.”

### Bioweapons

**Bioweapons are impossible**

**Stratfor, 7** [private intelligence agency, analyzes geopolitical trends, 12/21,“Bioterrorism: Sudden Death Overtime?,” http://www2.stratfor.com/analysis/bioterrorism\_sudden\_death\_overtime]

In this season of large college bowl games and the National Football League playoffs in the United States, and large nonsporting events such as the New Year’s Eve celebration in New York’s Times Square — not to mention the upcoming Olympic Games in Beijing — a discussion of bioterrorism and the threat it poses might be of interest. First, it must be recognized that during the past several decades of the modern terrorist era, biological weapons have been used very infrequently — and there are some very good reasons for this. Contrary to their portrayal in movies and television shows, biological agents are difficult to manufacture and deploy effectively in the real world. In spite of the fear such substances engender, even in cases in which they have been somewhat effective they have proven to be less effective and more costly than more conventional attacks using firearms and explosives. In fact, nobody even noticed what was perhaps the largest malevolent deployment of biological agents in history, in which thousands of gallons of liquid anthrax and botulinum toxin were released during several attacks in a major metropolitan area over a three-year period. This use of biological agents was perpetrated by the Japanese apocalyptic cult Aum Shinrikyo. An examination of the group’s chemical and biological weapons (CBW) program provides some important insight into biological weapons, their costs — and their limitations. In the late 1980s, Aum’s team of trained scientists spent millions of dollars to develop a series of state-of-the-art biological weapons research and production laboratories. The group experimented with botulinum toxin, anthrax, cholera and Q fever and even tried to acquire the Ebola virus. The group hoped to produce enough biological agent to trigger a global Armageddon. Between April of 1990 and August of 1993, Aum conducted seven large-scale attacks involving the use of thousands of gallons of biological agents — four with anthrax and three with botulinum toxin. The group’s first attempts at unleashing mega-death on the world involved the use of botulinum toxin. In April of 1990, Aum used a fleet of three trucks equipped with aerosol sprayers to release liquid botulinum toxin on targets that included the Imperial Palace, the Diet and the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo, two U.S. naval bases and the airport in Narita. In spite of the massive quantities of agent released, there were no mass casualties and, in fact, nobody outside of the cult was even aware the attacks had taken place. When the botulinum operations failed to produce results, Aum’s scientists went back to the drawing board and retooled their biological weapons facilities to produce anthrax. By mid-1993, they were ready to launch attacks involving anthrax, and between June and August of 1993 the group sprayed thousands of gallons of aerosolized liquid anthrax in Tokyo. This time Aum not only employed its fleet of sprayer trucks, but also use sprayers mounted on the roof of their headquarters to disperse a cloud of aerosolized anthrax over the city. Again, the attacks produced no results and were not even noticed. It was only after the group’s successful 1995 subway attacks using sarin nerve agent that a Japanese government investigation discovered that the 1990 and 1993 biological attacks had occurred. Aum Shinrikyo’s team of highly trained scientists worked under ideal conditions in a first-world country with a virtually unlimited budget. The team worked in large, modern facilities to produce substantial quantities of biological weapons. Despite the millions of dollars the group spent on its bioweapons program, it still faced problems in creating virulent biological agents, and it also found it difficult to dispense those agents effectively. Even when the group switched to employing a nerve agent, it only succeeded in killing a handful of people. A comparison between the Aum Shinrikyo Tokyo subway attack and the jihadist attack against the Madrid trains in 2004 shows that chemical/biological attacks are more expensive to produce and yield fewer results than attacks using conventional explosives. In the March 1995 Tokyo subway attack — Aum’s most successful — the group placed 11 sarin-filled plastic bags on five different subway trains and killed 12 people. In the 2004 Madrid attack, jihadists detonated 10 improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and killed 191 people. Aum’s CBW program cost millions and took years of research and effort; the Madrid bombings only cost a few thousand dollars, and the IEDs were assembled in a few days. The most deadly biological terrorism attack to date was the case involving a series of letters containing anthrax in the weeks following the Sept. 11 attacks — a case the FBI calls Amerithrax. While the Amerithrax letters did cause panic and result in companies all across the country temporarily shutting down if a panicked employee spotted a bit of drywall dust or powdered sugar from doughnuts eaten by someone on the last shift, in practical terms, the attacks were very ineffective. The Amerithrax letters resulted in five deaths; another 22 victims were infected but recovered after receiving medical treatment. The letters did not succeed in infecting senior officials at the media companies targeted by the first wave of letters, or Sens. Tom Daschle and Patrick Leahy, who were targeted by a second wave of letters. By way of comparison, John Mohammed, the so-called “D.C. Sniper,” was able to cause mass panic and kill twice as many people (10) by simply purchasing and using one assault rifle. This required far less time, effort and expense than producing the anthrax spores used in the Amerithrax case. It is this cost-benefit ratio that, from a militant’s perspective, makes firearms and explosives more attractive weapons for an attack. This then is the primary reason that more attacks using biological weapons have not been executed: The cost is higher than the benefit. Certainly, history has shown that militant organizations and homegrown militants are interested in large sporting events as venues for terror; one needs to look no further than the 1972 Munich Massacre, the 1980 Olympic Park bombing or even the 2005 incident in which University of Oklahoma student Joel Hinrichs died after a TATP-filled backpack he was wearing exploded outside a football game at Oklahoma Memorial Stadium, to see this. Because of this, vigilance is needed. However, militants planning such attacks will be far more likely to use firearms or IEDs in their attacks than they will biological agents. Unfortunately, in the real world guns and suicide bombs are far more common — and more deadly — than air horns filled with creepy bioterror.